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#### Prohibitions are absolute bans without exemption.

PEDIAA 15. “Difference Between Prohibited and Restricted”. https://pediaa.com/difference-between-prohibited-and-restricted/

Main Difference – Prohibited vs. Restricted

Prohibited and Restricted are used in reference to limitations and prevention. However, they cannot be used interchangeably as there is a distinct difference between them. Prohibited is used when we are talking about an impossibility. Restricted is used when we are talking about something that has specific conditions. The main difference between prohibited and restricted is that prohibited means something is formally forbidden by law or authority whereas restricted means something is put under control or limits.

What Does Prohibited Mean

Prohibited is a variant of the verb prohibit. Prohibited can be taken as the past tense and past participle of prohibiting as well as an adjective. Prohibited means that something is formally forbidden by law or authority. When we say ‘smoking is prohibited’, it means that smoking is not allowed at all, there are no exceptions. Prohibit indicates an impossibility. This gives out the idea that it is not at all possible under any condition or circumstance. The term Prohibited goods is used to refer to items that are not allowed to enter or exit certain countries. For example, the government of South America lists Narcotic and habit-forming drugs in any form, Poison and other toxic substances, Fully automatic, military and unnumbered weapons, explosives and fireworks as prohibited goods. The following sentences will further explain the use of prohibited.

Inter-racial marriages were not prohibited by the government.

He was proved guilty of using prohibited substances.

No one was allowed to enter the grounds; entry was prohibited.

Prohibited imports are the items that are not allowed to enter a country.Difference Between Prohibited and Restricted

What Does Restricted Mean

Restrict means to put under limits or control. Restricted can be either used as the past tense of restrict or as an adjective meaning limited. When we say something is restricted, it means that limits or conditions have been added to it. It does not mean that it is completely impossible. For example, Restricted goods are allowed to enter or exit a country under certain circumstances. A written permission can help you to import or export that item. Likewise, a restricted area does not mean that people are not allowed to enter; it means that a special permission is required to enter the place. Restricted information refers to information that are not disclosed to the general public for security purposes.

The new regulations restricted the free movement of people.

The club was restricted to its members and their family members.

Only the highest military personnel had access to the restricted area.

American scientists had only restricted access to the area.Main difference - Prohibited vs Restricted

Difference Between Prohibited and Restricted

Meaning

Prohibited means banned or forbidden.

Restricted means limited in extent, number, scope, or action

Possibility

Prohibited means that there is no possibility of doing something.

Restricted means that something can be done under certain conditions.

Adjective

Prohibited functions as an adjective derived from prohibit.

Restricted functions as an adjective derived from restrict.

Past tense

Prohibited is the past tense and past participle of prohibit.

Restricted is the past tense and past participle of restrict.

#### Business practices are ongoing conduct defined by the behaviors of many market participants.

Kerry Lynn Macintosh 97, Associate Professor of Law, Santa Clara University School of Law. B.A. 1978, Pomona College; J.D. 1982, Stanford University, “Liberty, Trade, and the Uniform Commercial Code: When Should Default Rules Be Based On Business Practices?,” 38 Wm. & Mary L. Rev. 1465, Lexis

These new and revised articles reflect a strong trend toward choosing default rules 4 that codify existing business practices. 5 [FOOTNOTE 5 BEGINS] In this Article, the term "business practices" is used to refer to practices that emerge over time as countless market participants exercise their freedom to engage in profitable transactions. For an account of the evolution of business practices, see infra Part II. As used here, "business practices" is broader and less technical than "trade usage," which the Code narrowly defines as "any practice or method of dealing having such regularity of observance in a place, vocation, or trade as to justify an expectation that it will be observed with respect to the transaction in question." U.C.C. 1-205(2). [FOOTNOTE 5 ENDS] This is particularly true of the recent revisions to Articles 3 (Negotiable Instruments), 4 (Bank Deposits and Collections) and 5 (Letters of Credit).

#### Violation---the plan doesn’t increase prohibitions on anticompetitive business practices, it increases limited restrictions.

#### Vote neg:

#### 1) Limits – there are infinite practices that could be restricted, makes the topic MASSIVE. This aff is a perfect example of the “practices of the week” --- imagine the NDT under their model of the topic, it’s a race to the margins

#### 2) Ground – there’s no DA or link uniqueness for an aff that just regulates or restricts, only prohibitions guarantee a topic DA.

### Cap K [Commons]---1NC

#### Anti-trust is capitalist---competition inevitably replicates market collapse.

Richard Wolff 19 Professor Emeritus of Economics at University of Massachusetts, Amherst. Transcript from YouTube video: “Economic Update: Competition and Monopoly in Capitalism.” Democracy @ Work. December 9th, 2019. https://www.democracyatwork.info/eu\_competition\_monopoly\_in\_capitalism.

Today I'm going to devote the program to something many of you have asked me to present, to talk about, to analyze, and that is the question of monopoly. It has to do with the assertions we hear often these days that somehow our capitalist system, here in the United States and beyond, is being negatively affected because monopolies have replaced or displaced competition. The idea here is if only we can get competition back, recreate a competitive capitalism, why then the problems we face will go away. Today's program is a design to show you how and why that is not the case, to think about these things in a different way from this nice story that capitalism is basically fine; it's just the monopoly form we have to get rid of so we get back to the competition which we're all supposed to believe is wonderful and presents us with no problems to solve. So let's go, and let's do it in a systematic way.

First, it is of course easier, faced with a declining capitalism, a capitalism that's all around us with its extreme inequalities, with its instabilities – here we are, trying to cope with the effects of the Great Crash of 2008, even while we anticipate the next downturn coming down the road soon – an economic system that has shown (that is, capitalism) that it is not respectful of the natural environment; it is not, as the words now go, sustainable in a reasonable way. Yeah, we're surrounded by problems of capitalism. So it's comforting in that situation to get the idea from somewhere that this really isn't a problem of capitalism as a system but rather the problem brought in somehow from the outside – monopoly – a situation in which competition among many companies gives way in some way we're not quite sure about to a domination by one or a small handful of companies. And so the argument goes, we don't have to be critical of capitalism; we don't have to think about an alternative system. No, no, we just have to deal with this little detail, the monopoly problem. And if we can deal with that, well, we'll get back to a competition, to a competitive capitalism that is good.

There are three big mistakes involved in this way of thinking, which is nonetheless very widespread and very popular, more so now than in quite some years. First mistake: Capitalism has been wrestling with the problem of monopoly from day one. We have had repeated periods of monopoly. They have eventually led to movements, often of many people, to destroy or remove monopoly. We used to call that in America trust-busting, or antitrust. We even have a department within the Department of Justice in Washington devoted to antitrust activities. Yeah, we've been waging battles against monopoly over and over again, and you know why? Because we keep having monopolies over and over again. Google is a monopoly. Amazon is a monopoly. They're all around us: companies that have effectively no real competition. This is a problem that capitalism has always displayed. And that ought to lead you to wonder whether thinking about it as something we can do away with isn't maybe the best possible example of wishful thinking.

The second big mistake is to imagine that competition is some unmixed blessing. It never was, and it isn't today. A competitive market is a human institution. Like every other human institution, it has strengths, and flaws, and weaknesses. To think of competition as some magical perfection is a silly abnegation of your own rational capability to evaluate something. It's sort of advertising thinking. By that, I mean the advertiser tells you what's good about the product they've been told to advertise; they don't tell you what's bad about it. If you want to evaluate it, you don't talk to an advertiser because they only give you one side. The people who promote competition use advertising logic. We're not going to do that here. Competition is no unmixed blessing.

And finally, I'm going to show you that competition is itself the major cause of monopoly. So that even if we ever got back to a competitive capitalism, all that would mean is we're back in the process that produces monopoly – as it always has.

All right, so let's begin. I'm going to start with explaining how competition has all kinds of consequences that most of you, like me, don't like, don't want. It's a discussion, if you like, of competition's other side: you know, the part that the advertiser doesn't tell you about. The used-car salesman who wants you to buy that junk doesn't tell you about what happened last week in the car crash that that was part of, etc., etc.

All right, let's begin. One of the major reasons that American corporations shut down their operations in the United States and moved them to China, among other places, is because of – you guessed it – competition. They wanted to make more money than they had been before. They were afraid of other companies beating them in the competitive game, so they said wow, let's go to China, because there you can pay workers a lot less. There you don't have the same rules to obey. There they don't care that much about pollution as they do here. So we can save on all kinds of costs, and that will allow us to undercut our competitors. Yeah, one of the consequences of competition was the exodus of American companies to other parts of the world, and the enormous unemployment that resulted from it. Yeah, that was a result, among other things, of competition.

Here's another one: Capitalists, employers, seeking to compete with one another, often engage in what we call automation. They bring in machines that are cheaper to use than human laborers, and that gets them a step ahead of their competitors. Okay, if we replace people with machines, we throw those people out of work. That has an impact on them, their self-esteem, their relationship to their spouse, their relationship to their children, their relationship to alcohol – should I continue? What are the social costs of automation? They're huge. They've been documented over and over again. Competition provokes and produces automation.

Let me give you another example: Companies are competing, say, in the food business – you know, trying to get a customer like you or me to buy this kind of cereal rather than another. So they get their labs to go to work, and they discover we can replace wheat, which we used to put in our little flakes, with – Lord help us – some chemical that is cheaper than wheat. We're not going to worry about what that chemical does to your chemistry in your body because we can now lower the price of our cereal, because we're saving on wheat, and undercut the competitor. The human beings who eat this stuff will suffer, now and in the future, but competition left our producer of cereal no choice.

And in case you think I'm making some up, let me give you some concrete ones. The Boeing Corporation, the major producer of airplanes in this country, is in a crisis as a corporation. You know why? Because the 737 Max crashed a couple of times, killing hundreds of people. And you know why? It turns out they economized on safety measures, and training measures. And you know why they did that? Because they're in a very tight competition with European and other airplane manufacturers, and that leads them – as it usually does – to look to cut corners: that race for, quote, "efficiency." Yeah, it was competition that contributed to those deaths and to that problem. That's competition too. You can't whitewash this story; they're real. One of the ways Amazon beats its competition is it speeds up the work process. It has figured out ways to make people work much more intensely, using up their brains, their muscles, their nerves, in ways that cause real long-term physical damage to working people. That, too, is a result of the competitive effort.

And you know, it wasn't so long ago that children were part of the labor force. That's right, kids as young as five and six years of age. We were told they have little fingers, you see. They can be more productive than people who are adults with big fat fingers, you know – that doesn't work. And by the way, you should be grateful because poor kids are the ones we hire, and that gives their poor families more income than they would otherwise have. We heard those arguments. Competition, the companies said, required them to use the more productive, and the lower-wage, children rather than adults. So child labor was also a result of competition. It was so ugly and so troubling to so many people that finally there were movements in the United States and many other countries simply to outlaw child labor. So it became a crime for any employer to use a worker who was under 16 or 18 years of age. That was a way in which people said we are not going to allow competition among capitalists to destroy our children. They were recognizing that competition has an awful effect in what it does to children.

Well, it has many awful effects. So let's be clear: In the history of capitalism, the monopoly problem (which we're going to get to in the second half of today's program) is no worse, it's just different, from the competition problems. Capitalism goes through phases of competition and monopoly, going from one to the other, as I will explain. But we shouldn't bemoan the one in favor of the other, any more than vice-versa. These are neither of them solutions; they are both phases of the problem. And the problem is capitalism, which does its number on us both in the period when it's competitive and in the period when it's monopoly. People who want us to engage one more time in an anti-monopoly crusade are doing something that in the end evades the problem, which is the system – capitalism – not this or that form of that system, such as competition and monopoly.

We've come to the end of the first half of today's Economic Update. This gives me an opportunity to remind you, please, to sign up if you haven't already, to subscribe to our YouTube channel. It's a way easily for you to support us, doesn't cost any money, and it is a big help to us in terms of our reputation and what we can accomplish. Likewise, please make use of our websites. They are there for your communication with us. They are there for you to be able to, with a click of a mouse, to follow us on Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram. And finally, a special thanks goes, as always, to our Patreon community for their ongoing enthusiastic support. It means the world to us. My final, very final for this first half, is about a new book that we have just produced and released. It's a follow-up to an earlier volume I have spoken to you about that was called Understanding Marxism. For the same reason, we have now produced a brand-new book, just out, called Understanding Socialism. It is a response, as this program is, to issues, questions, comments you have sent to us in large numbers. It's an attempt to give an overview of the different interpretations of what socialism means, of what happened in countries like Russia and China that tried to create this – the strengths, the weaknesses, the lessons to be learned, what to do, and what not to do. Please, if you're interested and want to follow up, check us out, check the book out: lulu.com is how you find both books. And I will be right back; stay with us.

Welcome back, friends, to the second half of today's Economic Update. This program, as I explained, is devoted to the analysis of competition and monopoly as two interactive, sequential phases of capitalism as a system. The first part of the program was devoted mostly to competition, so let's turn now to monopoly. What is the basic definition and criticism of monopoly? Strictly speaking, monopoly is defined simply as a situation in which the producers of a particular commodity – shoes, software programs, haircuts, it doesn't matter – have been reduced to only one. Literally one seller – a monopolist. But in general language, it includes also situations where many producers who once competed with one another have been reduced to only a handful. The strict term for only a handful is "oligopoly," but we don't have to split hairs about this. "Monopoly" will be the word we use for either one or a very small number.

For example, there were once dozens of automobile companies, but very quickly their competition reduced them to basically three for much of the post-World War II period, and you know their names: Ford, General Motors, and Chrysler. And likewise there were once many cigarette producers, there were once many television-set producers, and they became very few, whose names, therefore, we all know.

What's the criticism of a monopoly or oligopoly situation? Again, very simple: The idea is, if there's only one seller of something, that seller can jack up the price way above what he might have otherwise because he doesn't have any competitor. If he had a competitor, if he raised the price, the competitor would get all the business because we'd all go to the competitor who hadn't raised the price rather than buy it at a higher price from the monopolist. So we don't like monopolies, because they can jack up their prices and their profits because they don't have a competitor. And if it's a few, a handful, well then we talk about things like cartels: arrangements when a few get together over dinner, or out on the golf course, and tell us what the price is. If you ever wondered why the prices of different cars, different cigarettes, and so on, are so close to one another – mm-hmm – that's because there are few sellers, and somehow they worked it all out. But the basic criticism is that a monopoly is a situation in which the seller of something jacks the price up way beyond what they could otherwise get because there are no more competitors.

So let's talk about this monopoly problem and where the monopolies come from. Well, the first and most important lesson is this: Competition produces monopoly. It's not something external, imposed on competition. It has nothing to do with human greed or anything else. Are people greedy? You betcha – some more, some less – but that's really a separate matter. It's competition that produces monopoly, and let me show you how that works. In competition, we have, by definition, a whole bunch of producers. They all produce the same thing. They compete with one another, hoping we, the consumer, will buy from one rather than the other. They compete in the quality of what they produce and in the price of what they produce. And we are supposed, as consumers, to go look for the best quality at the lowest price, and to patronize that one who offers that to us better than the others that we could buy from but choose not to.

Okay, that's a fair definition. Now let's follow the logic. Company A produces – however it manages it – a better quality and/or a lower price than Company B. So we all go to Company A. Company B can't find any buyers because it's not competitive. Or to say the same thing in other words, Company A outcompetes Company B. Here's what happens: Company B collapses. Because it can't sell its goods, we're all going to Company A. So Company B sooner or later declares bankruptcy. It can't continue. It lays off its employees, it stops buying inputs, because it can't compete. Good. Now what happens in Company A? Company A says hey, there's a whole bunch of workers that have just lost their job at Company B; they're trained in producing what we produce; let's go hire some of them. And likewise, Company A says, they're not using their computers, or their trucks, or their other inputs. They're going to have to sell them on the secondhand market. We can get some important inputs we need at a lower price than we would have to pay if we bought them new. So what begins to happen is, where before there were two companies, A and B, there's now one larger A, and B has disappeared. Or to say the same thing in simple English, A – the winner in the competitive struggle – eats, absorbs into itself, what's left of Company B.

And this process is repeated over and over, until 30, or 300, companies have become one, or two, or three. That's the result of competition. That's how competition is supposed to work. That's how competition does work. It's important to understand: Monopoly is where competition leads. And as if that weren't enough, let me make sure you understand this from the business point of view: It is the great dream of every entrepreneur to become the last one standing in the competition, to win the competition, not just because it makes you feel good you outmaneuvered your competitors, but because if you're the last one standing, you're the monopolist. The reward for having outcompeted the others is that you're now in a position to jack up the profits, and the prices, way beyond what you could have done before.

So we have a system that produces monopoly, and all the incentives for every entrepreneur in competition to work as hard as possible to become the monopolist. So why is anyone surprised that monopolies keep happening, because they're the whole point and purpose of capitalist competition. If you ever were – and we never have, but if you ever were – able to get rid of all the monopolies and re-establish competition, all you would be doing is setting this same process in motion again for the umpteenth historical time. In other words, fighting against monopoly is pointless as long as you have capitalism, because it is the endless reproducer of this problem – as it always has been.

Now, how do monopolies maintain themselves? If you're the only one standing, you're a monopolist. Or you're an oligopoly, you're a few, and you get together and jack up your prices together. The question becomes look, a monopolist makes very high profits – much higher than a competitor can achieve – and isn't that an enormous incentive for other capitalists to get in on that business? Because look at the profits they're earning, because they're the only one. Apple, Amazon, Google – the profits are staggering. Everybody wants to get in. So the way a monopolist has to think is, I've got to create obstacles that block other people from coming in to get a piece of the enormous profits my monopoly allows me to get. We call that in economics "barriers to entry." Monopolists need to create barriers. Let me give you a couple of examples.

The major soft drink makers in the United States – basically Coca-Cola and Pepsi Cola – they produce a drink that has sugar and coloring in it, and lots and lots of water. Let me assure you, there is nothing difficult or complicated about producing a mixture of sugar, color, and water. It doesn't take a genius; it never did. Pepsi and Coca-Cola make a fortune off of their product, as we know, and they have for decades. They have a virtual monopoly. Now, lots of other people could produce water, sugar, and color close to, if not identical with, whatever they produce, but they can't break through. They can't really get to that status. And you know why? Because Coca-Cola and Pepsi erected a barrier to entry. And the way they did that was with advertising. Every billboard, every magazine cover, every doorway of every institution you've ever been to has a picture of smiling, happy people drinking one or the other. You've learned: that's the drink, that's the drink. Another company might make a perfect substitute, but they can't afford the enormous cost of advertising. The advertising costs more than the water, and the sugar, and the color. What you pay for when you buy Pepsi and Coke is the advertising that got you to buy it. You're paying for being hustled. But it works, because it means other companies know that they can't get in there by cheaply producing an alternative, because you have to produce the advertising that goes with it, or else you can't do it. And so their monopoly is maintained.

Here's another way to maintain a monopoly: Get the government to step in. Here the famous example is the milk producers. Some years ago, there was a crisis with milk. There was contamination; people were getting sick. So the clever milk monopolies came in and said, we're going to support the enormously expensive, special equipment to guarantee pasteurization, and so on, of milk. Why did they support it? Because your small farmer, your small dairy producer, can't afford it, so they go out of business. Only the big, rich few that are left can afford the enormous equipment. They used governmental rules to create a barrier to entry.

Here's another way: corrupt public officials. President Trump denounces Huawei corporation because it compromises our national security. It denounces European car producers because somehow their shipping cars here compromises our security. Who cares? As long as the president blocks other companies from getting into the business that might compete with an American, a barrier to entry exists. Monopolists have been very creative in coming up with ways to preserve their monopolies.

I don't want to lose the basic point. The basic point is: Capitalism oscillates, back and forth between competition and monopoly – first this industry, then that one. For a while, Ford, General Motors, and Chrysler were the monopolies – or the oligopoly, if you like – in automobiles. But eventually, Toyota, and Nissan, and Peugeot, and Fiat broke the monopoly. In that case, it was foreigners who did it. And then we had some competition, and that, then, is now shrinking. The French – the last two producers in France – have just agreed to merge. You get the picture. Industry by industry, first this one, then that one, go through one phase or another.

The important point is: The phases are not our problem. They merge into, and incentivize, each other. Each provokes movement in the other direction. The point to understand is that the problems of a capitalist system are not about this oscillation of phases. We're not going to solve the problem of monopoly by getting rid of them and re-establishing competition. We've been there; we've done that; it reproduces monopoly; and it doesn't change the basic inequality, unsustainability, instability of capitalism. We need to get beyond that stale, old debate – competition versus monopoly – and face the underlying reality: Capitalism is the problem, and getting beyond it is the solution.

#### Capitalism drives extinction and structural violence.

Jamie Allinson et al 21. Senior Lecturer in Politics and International Relations at Edinburgh University and author of The Age of Counter-revolution. China Miéville is the author of a number of highly acclaimed and prize-winning novels including October: The History of the Russian Revolution. Richard Seymour is the author of numerous works of non-fiction, His writing appears in the New York Times, London Review of Books, Guardian, Prospect, Jacobin. Rosie Warren is an Editor at Verso and the Editor-in-Chief of Salvage. All are writing for the Salvage Collective. “The Tragedy of the Worker: Toward the Proletarocene.” Introduction. July 2021. Verso EBook. ISBN: 9781839762963 //shree

This is the question that vexed us as we set out to write The Tragedy of the Worker. From the vantage point of the present, the history of capitalist development is, as Marx expected, the history of the development of a global working class, the proletarianisation of the majority of the world’s population. But the very same process of that development has brought us to the precipice of climate disaster. Our position, to recall Trotsky’s rationalisation of War Communism in 1920, is in the highest degree tragic.

It is now clear that we will pass what scientists have long warned will be a tipping point of global warming, accelerating the already catastrophic consequences of capitalist emissions. How do we imagine emancipation on an at best partially habitable planet? Where once communists imagined seizing the means of production, taking the unprecedented capacities of capitalist infrastructures and using them to build a world of plenty, what must we imagine after the apocalypse has befallen us? What does it mean that as capitalism has become truly global, the gravediggers it has created dig not only capitalism’s grave, but also that of much organic life on earth?

Our answers to these questions remain rooted in the politics of revolutionary communism. Our stance is not based on the fantasy of a homeostatic nature that must be defended but on the critique of the capitalist metabolism – the Stoffwechsel- that must be overthrown. Earth scientists are accustomed to speak in terms of ‘cycles’ by which substances circulate in different forms: the water cycle, the rock cycle, the nitrogen cycle, the glacial-interglacial cycle, the carbon cycle, and others. One way of registering the catastrophe of climate change is to see these cycles – most of all, but not solely, the carbon cycle – as disordered, under- or over-accumulating. But this is to ignore the more fundamental circuit of which these now form epicycles, like Ptolemy’s sub-orbits of the heavenly bodies: the circuit of capital accumulation, M-C-M′.

This circuit accumulates profit and produces death. Neither is accidental. It is for this reason that the debates that capitalist ruling classes permit among themselves on ‘adaptation’ versus ‘mitigation’ take place on false premises. What is to be mitigated is the impact of climate change on accumulation, rendered through the ideology of ‘growth’ as something that benefits everyone. What we are to adapt to are the parameters of accumulation, sacrificing just enough islands, eco-systems, indigenous – and non-indigenous – cultures to maintain its imperatives for a period of time until new thresholds must be crossed, and new life sacrificed to the pagan idol of capital. Already, capitalist petro-modernity builds a certain quantum of acceptable death into its predicates: at the very least, the 8.7 million killed by fossil fuels each year according to Harvard University are considered a price worth paying for the stupendous advantages of fossil capital. And the sky can only keep going up, as deforestation, polar melt, ocean acidification, soil de-fertilisation and more intense wildfires and storms tear the web of life into patches. If the necropolitical calculus of the Covid-19 pandemic appears crass, just wait until its premises are applied to climate catastrophe.

#### Vote neg for anti-capitalist commons---collectives should refuse commitments to competitive principle and the straitjacket of what’s “realistic.”

Nick Rose 21. PhD in Political Ecology from RMIT University. Executive Director of Sustain: The Australian Food Network. From the Cancer Stage of Capitalism to the Political Principle of the Common: The Social Immune Response of “Food as Commons.” Int J Health Policy Manag 2021. 3-31-21. DOI: 10.34172/ijhpm.2021.20 //shree

Silvia Federici provides a longer historical perspective, noting that ‘commoning is the principle by which human beings have organised their existence for thousands of years;’ and that to ‘speak of the principle of the common’ is to speak ‘not only of small-scale experiments [but] of large-scale social formations that in the past were continent-wide.’87 Hence a commons-based society is neither a utopia or reducible to fringe projects, and the commons have persisted despite the many and continuing enclosures, ‘feeding the radical imagination as well as the bodies of many commoners.’87 Federici acknowledges that commons and practices of commoning are diverse, that many are susceptible to cooptation and many are consistent with the persistence of capitalism; indeed some, such as charities providing social services (including foodbanks) during the years of austerity budgets in the United Kingdom (2010-2015), reinforce and stabilise capitalism.87 What matters to Federici is the character and intentionality of the commons as anti-capitalist, as ‘a means to the creation of an egalitarian and cooperative society…no longer built on a competitive principle, but on the principle of collective solidarity [and commitments] to the creation of collective subjects [and] fostering common interests in every aspect of our lives.’87

Federici’s analysis resonates with the political thought and proposals developed by Dardot and Laval in their 2018 work, ‘On Common: Revolution in the 21st century.’11 For Dardot and Laval, the common is likewise understood as a principle of political struggle, a demand for ‘real democracy’ and a major driving force behind the emerging articulation of a political vision and programme that transcends and overcomes the straitjacket logic of neoliberal ideological hegemony and its ‘policy grammar’ which appears to foreclose all alternatives and lock us forever into a capitalist realism in which ‘it is easier to imagine the end of the world than it is to imagine the end of capitalism.’89 Eschewing Bollier’s ‘triarchy’ of a market/state/ commons coexistence, Dardot and Laval argue for a politics of the common based on an engaged citizenry that directly participates and deliberates in all decisions which impact it, and in the process not merely transforms the institutions responsible for the management of services and allocation of resources, but creates new institutions and new ways of being in the world.11

Dardot and Laval describe this form of politics as ‘instituent praxis’: the common, they argue, is ‘not produced but instituted.’11 This acknowledges the conventional understanding of Ostrom, Bollier and others of ‘the commons’ as residing in the rules – the laws – that a community establishes for the collective management and use of shared resources, but extends it much further and in a more radical direction. The essence of the commons, they argue, is not in the goods per se such as land or a forest or a seed bank ‘held in common,’ but rather in the process of their establishment as well as the ongoing negotiation that will surround their use and governance. Hence, Dardot and Laval distinguish the commons from the ‘rights’ tradition of property, arguing that ‘the commons are above all else matters of institution and government…the use of the commons is inseparable from the right of deciding and governing. The practice that institutes the commons is the practice that maintains them and keeps them alive and takes full responsibility for their conflictuality through the coproduction of rules.’90 To ‘institute’ in this context should not be misunderstood as ‘to institutionalise [or] render official;’ rather it is ‘to recreate with, or on the basis of, what already exists.’ 90 This messy, conflictual and evolving process is what Dardot and Laval insist will ultimately bring about a revolution, not in the form of a violent uprising or insurrection, but rather through the ‘reinstitution of society’ via the transformation of politics and economy from its current state of ‘representative oligarchy’ to full participatory and deliberative democracy.11 Such a vision is premised on a mass politicisation of society; in effect a return of mass popular political contestation and a turn away from the postpolitical era of the neoliberal consumer.91-92

### States CP---1NC

#### The 50 states, territories and DC Attorney generals should substantially increase prohibitions on anticompetitive business practices by the private sector by at least expanding the scope of its core antitrust laws by limiting procedural barriers to private antitrust.

#### States can pursue autonomous anti-trust enforcement even when conflicting with federal law.

Erik **Knudsen 20.** Erik G. Knudsen is a partner in the Corporate Department and Private Equity Buyouts & Investment Group. Erik focuses his practice on complex business transactions, including leveraged buyouts, strategic mergers, acquisitions, investments and joint ventures, reorganizations, growth equity and venture capital investments, and divestitures. He has led transactions in a wide variety of industries, including healthcare, internet, technology, real estate, distribution and manufacturing. "Trends In State Antitrust Enforcement: Colorado Expands Attorney General’s Authority To Challenge Transactions On Competition Grounds." JD Supra. 4-16-2020. https://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/trends-in-state-antitrust-enforcement-42950

At the federal level, the U.S. antitrust laws—including the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act, which governs mergers and acquisitions—are enforced by the FTC and DOJ. States also have antitrust laws, which are enforced by state AGs and are often patterned after their federal analogs, but can contain important differences. States frequently collaborate with the federal antitrust agencies and/or other states on merger investigations. However, the Supreme Court has recognized that states are not required to do so, and have the right to make enforcement decisions that differ from other federal and state authorities.[[3]](https://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/trends-in-state-antitrust-enforcement-42950/#_ftn3) States have sometimes exercised this authority in order to “fill the gap” of perceived under-enforcement at the federal level. For example, in June 2017, the California AG sued to block Valero Energy Partners LP’s acquisition of two petroleum terminals in Northern California, despite the FTC’s decision not to challenge the deal. Several months later, the parties abandoned the transaction. More broadly, in recent years, there has been a growing trend of robust and autonomous state antitrust enforcement, as illustrated by major investigations and enforcement actions by state coalitions in the healthcare, pharmaceutical, telecom, and technology sectors, among others. Consistent with this trend, Colorado AG Phil Weiser—who previously served as Deputy Assistant Attorney General in the DOJ Antitrust Division under the Obama administration—has affirmed his commitment to “protecting all Coloradans from anticompetitive consolidation and practices…whether or not the federal government acts to protect Coloradans.” In keeping with this mandate, the Amendment will bring Colorado increasingly in line with states such as California and New York that have demonstrated an appetite for aggressive, independent antitrust enforcement, even where it may depart (or conflict) with federal action.

### Antitrust PIC---1NC

#### The Supreme Court should overturn AT&T Mobility LLC v. Vincent Concepcion on the grounds that the Federal Arbitration Act does not preempt state laws on arbitration.

#### Solves the whole case (Emory GK = YELLOW)

Newton ’20 [Dawn; October 26; Business attorney who focuses on franchise law, intellectual property, and data privacy, J.D. from the Hastings College of the Law at the University of California; Donahue Fitzgerald, “Avoid Class Action Suits by Using Arbitration Agreements,” <https://donahue.com/resources/publications/avoid-class-action-suits-using-arbitration-agreements-2/>]

The U.S. Supreme Court paved the way for businesses to avoid class actions by using arbitration agreements.

On April 27, 2011, the U.S. Supreme Court issued a ruling in AT&T Mobility LLC v. Vincent Concepcion that barred a consumer class action and overturned prior California law that prohibited class action waivers in arbitration agreements. In doing so, the Court created a mechanism by which savvy businesses can avoid class actions in a number of different contexts, which may, in turn, dramatically impact the way companies resolve disputes with their customers, employees and contractors.

Underlying Facts and Procedure

In 2002, in response to a promotional advertisement, the plaintiffs in the case, Vincent and Liza Concepcion, entered into a cell phone contract with AT&T (Cingular Wireless at the time) that entitled them to two “free” phones. After the Concepcions signed the company’s mobile service agreement, they discovered that although AT&T’s advertisement promised that they would receive the phones for free, they were charged $30.22 as tax on the phones’ retail value.

In March 2006, the Concepcions sued AT&T in the United States District Court in the Southern District of California, alleging that it engaged in false advertising and fraud. The District Court later consolidated the case into a class action lawsuit.

AT&T challenged the lawsuit, arguing that its standard mobile service contract, signed by the Concepcions and all other customers, precluded a class action because of two key provisions in the agreement: a mandatory arbitration clause and a class action waiver that required consumers to bring claims only in their individual capacity. AT&T asked the court to send the matter to arbitration in each plaintiff’s individual capacity as was required by the contracts.

The plaintiffs opposed AT&T’s request, arguing that a well-established decision by the California Supreme Court–Discover Bank v. Superior Court, 36 Cal.4th 148 (2005)–had already determined that class action waivers in consumer contracts were unreasonable, or “unconscionable,” and therefore unenforceable. The District Court agreed with the Concepcions and denied AT&T’s request to compel arbitration, and the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed that decision. Critical to the decisions of both the District Court and the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals was the determination that the Federal Arbitration Act (“FAA”), the purpose of which is to ensure the enforcement of arbitration agreements according to their terms, did not override, or “preempt,” the California Supreme Court’s decision in Discover Bank.

The Supreme Court Ruling

In a remarkably broad 5-4 ruling, divided along ideological lines, the Supreme Court reversed the Ninth Circuit, holding that the Discover Bank rule is inconsistent with the FAA and is therefore preempted.

Writing for the majority, Justice Antonin Scalia stated that the purpose of the FAA was twofold: to ensure the enforcement of private agreements to arbitrate and to make dispute resolution more efficient. By essentially allowing the parties to re-write arbitration agreements after the fact, Scalia explained, the rule in Discover Bank “stands as an obstacle to the accomplishment and execution” of Congress’s purpose and objective in enacting the FAA.

Specifically, the Court found that allowing class arbitration under the Discover Bank rule is inconsistent with the FAA for three reasons: 1) when compared with two-party arbitration, class arbitration makes the process slow, expensive and procedurally difficult; 2) class arbitration requires a formality that was not envisioned by Congress when the FAA was passed; and 3) class arbitration greatly increases the risk to defendants because a single mistake by the arbitrator, multiplied by thousands of class members, could result in a “devastating loss.” As a result, according to the Court, the rule in Discover Bank is likely to dissuade companies from using arbitration as a means of resolving disputes, thereby undermining the FAA.

Implications

The implications of the ruling in AT&T Mobility are significant. Indeed, the ruling comes only a year after the Supreme Court’s decision in Stolt-Neilsen S.A. v. Animalfeeds International, Corp., 130 S. Ct. 1758 (2010), in which the Court held that if parties to an arbitration agreement did not intend to allow class claims, arbitrators have no power to impose class-wide arbitrations under agreements that are merely “silent” on the issue. Both decisions further the Court’s clear directive that the FAA, and its liberal policy favoring arbitration, should be given full effect.

Given the ubiquity of arbitration clauses in everything from cell phone plans to franchise agreements to employment contracts, the potential ramifications of the Court’s decision in AT&T Mobility are sweeping.

Impact on Franchisors & Distributors

Many franchisors with arbitration provisions in their franchise agreements have felt insulated from the threat of class-action suits since last year’s Stolt-Nielsen decision. However, some lingering doubt remained, since some California courts had allowed franchisee attempts to either avoid arbitration or force a class certification since Discover Bank was decided, citing that case as authority. The AT&T Mobility decision puts an end to this argument.

Franchisors or distributors that draft consumer contracts for use by others in their distribution chain should also pay close attention to this decision. By incorporating arbitration clauses into those consumer agreements, they can eliminate the threat of class actions, provided that the terms for the individual arbitration are not unfair. The majority opinion noted that AT&T’s arbitration policy prevented AT&T from seeking its own attorney’s fees if it prevailed in arbitration, but provided for payment of twice the plaintiff’s attorney’s fees if AT&T lost. In addition AT&T’s policy agreed to pay an additional $7,500 to any plaintiff who obtained a better arbitration award than AT&T’s last settlement offer. While the opinion does not require a consumer arbitration clause to match these terms, the FAA would not require the enforcement of an obviously unfair arbitration provision.

Impact on Employers

The Supreme Court’s ruling is also certain to have far-reaching consequences for employers that use arbitration agreements with their employees. In particular, it could dramatically change wage and hour litigation, which often relies on class actions as a vehicle to redress relatively small individual losses. Without being able to consolidate these claims into a large class action, it will likely become increasingly difficult for individual employees to secure legal representation. Indeed, if an employer’s arbitration agreement is drafted correctly, because of the ruling in AT&T Mobility, it can potentially eliminate the risks to employers of facing a wage and hour class action (or any other employment-based class actions).

### Japan DA---1NC

#### New antitrust is applied globally---offends allies---regs counterplan avoids it.

Herbert Hovenkamp 03. Ben V. & Dorothy Willie Professor of Law and History, University of Iowa. “Antitrust as Extraterritorial Regulatory Policy,” 48 Antitrust BULL. 629 (2003).

Today few of us are sympathetic with the view that the common law exists apart from and somehow transcends the jurisdiction of the courts that make it. Nevertheless, there is a powerful sense in which the rules of antitrust law are regarded as "natural," while explicitly regulatory rules are considered to be purely local, territorial, or political. This view is given considerable support by a powerful neoclassical economic model that views markets as natural, in the sense that they exist separate and apart from state policy making. 32

Within this model antitrust law is a kind of background umpire that does not make first instance choices about price, quantity, quality, new entry and the like, but that does limit the anticompetitive exercise of market power. Antitrust operates as a kind of "macro" version of contract law. The common law of contracts is designed to facilitate and protect the utility of individual private bargains; antitrust is designed to do much the same thing, but for markets as a whole. Under this conception a well defined set of antitrust principles always operates in the background, so to speak, permitting private bargaining to proceed without interference in the great majority of instances, but intervening when competitive processes go awry. Further, widespread agreement exists both inside and outside the United States on a set of core principles pertaining to such things as naked price fixing, market division agreements, and the like. Within this core, problems of extraterritoriality have largely been limited to the technical ones of devising appropriate jurisdictional rules and remedies.

In contrast, the power to regulate is different. Under the traditional view of regulation the power to set price, quantity, quality, or the right to enter a market emanates in the first instance from the government. Further, although there is widespread economic agreement on fundamental principles, regulatory design is much more specific to the sovereign-more likely to reflect the demographics, industrial or employment base, or politics of the particular state imposing the regulation.

For example, nearly all of the 50 states of the United States have an antitrust law. With relatively few exceptions, however, the substantive coverage of these antitrust laws is the same, and mimics federal law. Many states have court decisions or even legislative enactments stating that federal antitrust law should govern the interpretation of that particular state's antitrust law as well. 33 The result is that the coverage of state antitrust law is remarkably similar from one state to the next. But one can hardly say the same thing about each state's regulation of land use, power generation and distribution, taxicabs, liquor pricing, and the like. Whatever homogeneity regulatory theory might produce, the politics of regulation virtually guarantees jurisdiction-specific outcomes.

But homogeneity in antitrust policy also begins to break down when antitrust law moves beyond its fundamental neoclassical concern with cartels or well-defined exclusionary practices, and into areas where its role is more controversial or marginal. This is often the case when the antitrust laws are applied in recently deregulated markets. For example, a common antitrust problem that arises in deregulated industries falls under the general rubric of unilateral refusals to deal. In order to encourage competition, newly deregulated firms may be forced to share their facilities, information, intellectual property, or other assets with new rivals. Devising reasonable "nonregulatory" rules governing refusals to deal in such markets has always extended the antitrust laws to the margin of their competence.

Increasingly, American courts seem willing to apply antitrust law to markets regulated by foreign nations under circumstances where regulatory laws themselves would never reach. For example, neither Congress nor a state legislature would very likely attempt to regulate the customer service or information provision practices of a foreign national's telephone company. But both federal and state courts have done precisely that under the guise of antitrust enforcement.3 4

Antitrust policy makes this thinkable as a result of the confluence of two sets of doctrines. First is the expansive reach of our antitrust laws to practices that have a substantial effect on United States commerce. Second is the very narrow conception of comity that applies in antitrust cases.

As a general matter, comity concerns in the international conflict of laws requires the court to consider the competing interests of domestic and foreign sovereigns. 35 After a half century of debate over the meaning of comity in international Sherman Act adjudication, the Supreme Court gave the doctrine an extraordinarily narrow meaning in the Hartford Fire case.36 That case involved an alleged insurance boycott in which Lloyd's of London participated as reinsurer. Lloyd's conduct-agreeing with some United States insurers not to write reinsurance policies for other United States insurers who wanted to write policies with broader coverage-was neither forbidden nor compelled by British law. To the defendant's claim of comity the Supreme Court replied that the provisions of the Sherman Act governing jurisdiction over transactions in foreign commerce were mandatory. As a result, a federal court could not simply decline jurisdiction on the basis of some general balancing of interests. 37 Rather, "comity" permits a federal court to decline jurisdiction only when there was a "conflict" between the law of the foreign sovereign and United States law. Further, "conflict" was defined not under choice of law principles, but more absolutely, as occurring only when the foreign law compelled the conduct at issue. 38

Perhaps significantly, the activity of the London reinsurers was very likely reachable under United States antitrust law even under ordinary interest analysis principles. British law was found by the Supreme Court to be indifferent to what the London reinsurers were doing. Further, what they were doing was agreeing not to insure against liability for particular toxic pollution risks in the United States, and risk of liability is of course measured in relation to the physical environment and legal regime in which the injury occurs. 39 As a result, the London reinsurers were selling a product especially targeted for United States markets and allegedly participating in a boycott designed to keep broader coverage insurance policies out of that market.

But Hartford Fire's definition of comity is significantly problematic under deregulation. To the extent a foreign sovereign deregulates a public utility or common carrier, that firm enjoys greater discretion to make its own decisions. As a result, considerations of comity may no longer preclude a Sherman Act suit. What makes this especially problematic is the way that the Sherman Act has been used in the United States as a kind of replacement for the regulatory agency. Under comprehensive agency regulation a filed tariff plus regulatory oversight would have governed numerous acts by regulated firms, including pricing, entry into new markets, interconnection obligations and other duties to deal.40 Government relaxation of regulatory restrictions has given firms some discretion over these things but in the process has substituted the antitrust courts as governmental supervisor. In some situations this causes little difficulty because regulation may have been misapplied to a competitively structured industry to begin with.41 In other situations, such as long-distance telecommunication, a competitive environment has developed because of changes in technology, and topto-bottom price and product regulation is no longer necessary.42

But in a third class of situations the application of the antitrust laws is much more "regulatory" and more difficult to defend. These are the cases where unilateral conduct of the kind that was historically supervised by the regulatory agency now comes under antitrust jurisdiction. For example, under the essential facility doctrine a federal court of general jurisdiction may be asked to apply antitrust law to determine the scope of a formerly regulated firm's duty to interconnect with rivals. The circuit courts have applied the doctrine frequently in the telecommunications industry,43 but also to railroads" and natural gas pipelines.4 5 Problematically, supervising interconnection requirements involves the court in highly technical questions about the scope of the duty to deal and perhaps even about the price at which the deal must be made. In these cases we have not really "deregulated" at all; rather, we have simply substituted regulation by a government agency for regulation by a court, often through the highly inefficient and uncertain process of a jury trial. To do that in a purely domestic situation is ill-advised enough, but to do it abroad by taking advantage of the expansive jurisdictional reach of the Sherman Act is completely unjustified.

IV. Extraterritorial antitrust and foreign deregulation

As expansive as the regulatory power asserted by the United States sometimes becomes, it does not generally interfere directly into foreign governments' regulation of their own highly regulated industries. But to a large extent modem antitrust has inherited the regulatory attitude expressed by the Western Union decision discussed above. For several reasons, the idea that the United States Antitrust laws are jurisdictionally exceptional can produce overreaching that is offensive to foreign prerogatives. First, the United States antitrust laws are extremely general and make no distinction between ordinary competitive firms and public utilities or common carriers; the same rules purport to apply to all business firms. Second, the jurisdictional language of the antitrust laws is both mandatory and general to the same extent-that is, the "affecting foreign commerce" language of the basic Sherman Act and the export commerce language of the Foreign Trade Antitrust Improvement Act 6 do not distinguish between regulated and ordinary competitive firms. And third, the limiting doctrines of international law-namely Act of State, foreign sovereign compulsion, foreign sovereign immunity, and comity-do not distinguish among types of firms or types of antitrust complaints. They apply equally to both price fixing, which is at the core of antitrust concern, and to the essential facility doctrine, which lies at or outside its margin.

#### Ends the Japan economic alliance---they respond with diplomatic protest to new extraterritorial antitrust.

Takaaki Kojima 02. Fellow, Weatherhead Center for International Affairs, 2001-2002. “International Conflicts over the Extraterritorial Application of Competition Law in a Borderless Economy”. https://datascience.iq.harvard.edu/files/fellows/files/kojima.pdf

We are witnessing increasingly widespread and penetrating economic globalization today. As a result of trade liberalization, import restrictions or regulations on trade and investment have decreased substantially, and trans-border business activities face less barrier. At the same time, the role of trans-border business activities, especially those by so-called multinational or global enterprises, have become increasingly important and even dominant in some sectors.

As far as the territorial scope of business activities are concerned, state borders are more or less diminishing to become almost borderless; as for legal regimes, however, sovereign states retain in principle exclusive jurisdiction over their territories and nationals under international law. Business activities are regulated by the domestic laws of sovereign states or by international agreements concluded among sovereign states. The pertinent question is how to coordinate “borderless” business activities within the existing legal regimes governed by sovereign states. In the field of trade law, the measures of each state are restricted by international agreements, in particular under the GATT/WTO regime. In the field of competition law, such an international regime is lacking and the domestic laws of each state regulate private restraints of trade in the relevant markets.

Serious jurisdictional conflicts have transpired in the last several decades between the United States and other states over the so-called extraterritorial application of U.S. antitrust laws on anticompetitive conducts abroad. This problem has also caused diplomatic frictions between the United States and other states, as it concerns state sovereignty. In this essay, the author will review the historical development of international conflicts caused by the extraterritorial application of competition law and attempt to examine the options available to circumvent or solve these conflicts. The main focus will be U.S. antitrust law and its relation with other jurisdictions, mainly the European Union and Japan, considering the grave implications to competition law and policy as well as to the world economy. 2

II. Extraterritorial Application of U.S. Antitrust Laws

Problems concerning the extraterritorial application of U.S. antitrust laws have been discussed in many publications. Of the U.S. antitrust laws, the Sherman Act applies to “commerce … with foreign nations ” (Section 1) without qualifying provisions concerning its territorial scope as “within the United States” (Section 2) or “in any section of the country” (Section 3) as specified in the Clayton Act. In the past, U.S. courts interpreting the Sherman Act of 1890 and other antitrust laws commonly followed the traditional territorial principle with regard to its jurisdictional reach. In the American Banana case (213 U.S. 347 (1909)), where all the acts complained of were committed outside the territory of the United States, including the defendant’s alleged inducements of the Costa Rican government to monopolize the banana trade, the U.S. Supreme Court dismissed the complaint on the ground, inter alia, that acts committed outside of the United States are not governed by the Sherman Act. In this case, the territorial principle in the classic sense was applied.

In later decisions such as the American Tobacco case (221 U.S. 106 (1911)) and the Sisal case (274 U.S. 268 (1927)), jurisdiction was exercised over the defendants on the ground that although the agreements in question were concluded by foreigners outside the United States, jurisdiction was limited to what was performed and intended to be performed within the territory of the United States. In these cases, the territorial principle was applied more flexibly, but it has been observed that this application cannot be argued other than as a sensible and reasonable deployment of the objective territorial theory. 3

An entirely different approach was taken in the Alcoa case (148 F.2d. 416 (1944)), in which foreign companies outside the United States had concluded the agreements. The Court of Appeal for the Second Circuit held it settled law that any State may impose liabilities, even upon persons not within its allegiance, for conduct outside its borders that has consequences within its borders. It went on further to state that the agreements, although made abroad, were unlawful if they were intended to affect imports and did affect them.

This theory of the intended effect (the effects doctrine) elaborated in the Alcoa case was criticized by many as an excess of jurisdiction under public international law. For instance, R.Y. Jennings noted that “in this new guise it apparently comprehends the exercise of jurisdiction over agreements made abroad, by foreigners with foreigners provided only that the agreement was intended to have repercussions upon American imports or exports,” 4 while F.A. Mann argued that “the type of effect within the meaning of the Alcoa ruling has nothing in common with the effect which by virtue of established principles of international jurisdiction confers that right of regulation.” 5 Neverthele ss, since the Alcoa case, U.S. courts have continued to follow the new jurisdictional formula of the effects doctrine.

In response to excessive application of U.S. antitrust laws, especially with respect to courts’ orders to produce documents such as subpoena duces tecum located abroad, a considerable number of states have issued diplomatic protests. Australia, France, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, and New Zealand have even enacted blocking legislation. 6 The protesting states maintain that taking evidence abroad, including an order to produce documents, is an exercise of extraterritorial enforcement of jurisdiction that, under international law, requires the consent of the state where the evidence is located. The United Kingdom has been one of the strongest opponents to U.S. claims of extraterritorial jurisdiction. The U.K. government stated for instance that “HM Government considers that in the present state of international law there is no basis for the extension of one country’s antitrust jurisdiction to activities outside of that country of the foreign national.” 7 The Protection of Trading Interest law was enacted in 1980, which provides to extensively thwart the extraterritorial application of U.S. antitrust laws. The U.K. government invoked the provisions in the Laker Airways case (1983 W.L.R. 413) in 1983.

Having faced the antagonistic reactions of other states, U.S. courts began to show some restraint in assuming extraterritorial jurisdiction. In the Timberlane case (549 F.2d. 9 th Cir. (1976)), the court concluded that it had jurisdiction over alleged anticompetitive conducts in Honduras but refrained from asserting extraterritorial jurisdiction after having applied three tests: first, whether the challenged conduct had had some effect on the commerce of the United States; second, whether the conduct in question imposed a burden on U.S. commerce; and third, whether the complaint’s interests of and links to the United States were sufficiently strong vis-à-vis those of other nations to justify an assertion of extraterritorial authority. The Foreign Trade Antitrust Improvements Act enacted in 1976 applies to foreign conduct that has a direct, substantial and reasonably foreseeable effect on U.S. commerce, The U.S. enforcement agencies, the Department of Justice (DOJ) and the Federal Trade Commission (FTC), have adopted this jurisdictional rule of reason formula since the Enforcement Guidelines for International Operations of 1988. However, divergent views exist as to whether the third test of balancing the interests of other states is a rule of international law or just a comity. 8 Furthermore, not all U.S. courts have consistently applied the test of balancing interests. 9

In 1993, the Supreme Court decision in the Hartford Fire Insurance case (113 S. Ct. 2891 (1993)) reaffirmed the effects doctrine, stating that the Sherman Act applies to foreign conduct that was meant to produce and did in fact produce some substantial effect in the United States. The Court then took a restrictive view on the test of balancing interests, stating that the only substantial question is whether there is a true conflict between domestic and foreign law, and held that no such conflict seemed to exist because British law did not require defendants to act in a manner prohibited by U.S. law. 10

Japan maintains the territorial principle and rejects the effects doctrine, stating that the effects doctrine cannot be regarded as an established rule of international law. In the view of the Government of Japan, the extraterritorial application of U.S. domestic laws (including U.S. antitrust laws) based on the effects doctrine is not allowed under general international law. 11 In the Nippon Paper case, where a Japanese company was prosecuted under the Sherman Act, the Japanese government submitted a brief of amicus curiae where it stated, inter alia, that the extraterritorial application of the Sherman Act to a conduct of a Japanese company engaged in business in Japan is unlawful under international law. 12 Nonetheless, the U.S. Supreme Court affirmed the Court of Appeal decision, which assumed the extraterritorial application of the Sherman Act to a criminal case for the first time (118 S. Ct. 685 (1998)).

#### Economic alliance is key to Indo-Pacific cyber security---only coop allows them to leverage technology.

Patrick M. Cronin 4/15/21. Asia-Pacific Security Chair @ Hudson. "U.S.-Japan Alliance in Full Bloom". https://www.hudson.org/research/16835-u-s-japan-alliance-in-full-bloom

Even if seldom mentioned by name, China is the unmistakable fulcrum around which alliance policy on all issues turns. Competition with China is primarily economic and technological, but these issues often spill over into security and human rights.

Economically, a rebounding U.S. economy and Japan will collaborate to strengthen the resilience of vital supply chains. Semiconductor chips are essential for all electronics, and Suga and Biden are determined to ensure their availability. Equally, the U.S. and Japan have an opportunity to leverage their two-year-old digital trade agreement to help negotiate a multilateral accord and establish high international standards for finance and commerce in the cyber age.

As a dominant player in semiconductor manufacturing and a member of APEC and the World Trade Organization, Taiwanshould play a part in both supply chain security and digital trading standards. Indeed, bolstering Taiwan’s place in the global economy of other democracies is a far better means of thwarting Beijing’s intimidation strategy against Taiwan than just sailing near the Taiwan Strait with an aircraft carrier.

The commanding heights of the 21st century economy center on technology. So, while the United States and Japan retain a strong interest in economic cooperation with China, those relations become considerably sharper over leading-edge technologies such as 5G telecommunications, artificial intelligence and quantum computing. Biden and Suga should showcase their commitment, not against China, but in favor of technological innovation and secure connectivity.

An excellent way for the alliance to demonstrate a commitment to practical technology cooperation would be to work together to expand investment in 5G Open Radio Access Networks (ORAN). Given the concerns surrounding allowing China to dominate fifth-generation telecommunications infrastructure, the United States and Japan need to scale up a cloud-based software alternative. The good news is that Japan’s Rakuten is already a leader in demonstrating ORAN’s feasibility, and there is bipartisan support in Congress for increasing U.S. investment in modular 5G.

The alliance also requires deeper cooperation on cybersecurity. Of five issues highlighted at the recent 2 + 2 meeting between U.S. and Japan defense and foreign ministers, cyberspace was the most traditional national security issue. Japan is inching closer toward becoming a de facto sixth member of the Five Eyes intelligence-sharing arrangement, and the Biden administration should encourage that trajectory. A stronger digital alliance can, in turn, advance cyber resilience throughout the Indo-Pacific region.

#### Extinction---Indo-Pak nuclear war.

Ahyousha Khan 20. "Research Associate" at Islamabad Based Think-tank "Strategic Vision Institute". "Artificial Intelligence without Cyber Resilience in South Asia". South Asia Journal. 7-16-2020. http://southasiajournal.net/artificial-intelligence-without-cyber-resilience-in-south-asia/

With increased dependence on information technology and rapid digitization of systems, term cybersecurity gained momentum. However, these systems not only need to be securitized but they should be resilient against the threats. Cyber resilience is the ability of the system to operate during an attack and achieve a minimum level of operationalization while responding to an attack. It also enables the system to develop a back-up system that works in case of attack. Cyber resilience is a step forward from cybersecurity because it not only ensures the security of the system, but also identifies the threats to it and then proposes the system that could work amidst such attacks. Most military systems are resilient against kinetic attacks because resilience and survivability go hand in hand. But, with modernizations in the military, it is necessary that the state’s cyber networks which are working on artificial intelligence must be resilient against kinetic and non-kinetic attack.

Today states are in a race to use the AI in their military systems to achieve maximum military gains and denying their adversary the same. The situation is not so different in South Asia where two nuclear rivals of the region are paving the way towards the use of artificial intelligence for military purposes. India has developed the Center for Artificial Intelligence and Robotics (CAIR) in DRDO, with the aim to develop AI within the military systems to improve geographical information system technology, decision support systems, and object detection and mapping. Moreover, companies like Bharat Electronics Limited (BEL) are already in the process of developing and incorporating AI into military equipment. This includes an AI-enabled patrol robot developed by BEL built in the hope to be utilized by the Indian military. Moreover, in 2019 India’s Gen. Bipin Rawat said adversary in the north is spending a huge amount on AI and cyber warfare, so we cannot be left behind in this race. It is mostly projected by the Indian policymakers and many international scholars that India is facing adversaries at two fronts (China-Pakistan), to justify India’s military expenditure and modernization. However, recently, events like Galwan Valley clash evidently exposed that India’s military capabilities are mostly against Pakistan. Moreover, South Asia’s security dynamics are heavily characterized by the action-reaction chain. To avoid the security dilemma vis-à-vis India, Pakistan would also invest in AI. At the moment Pakistan has also started working towards achieving expertise in AI. In 2019 President of Pakistan launched PIAIC with a focus on the development of skills in AI to strengthen economy and defence systems. Moreover, there are centers like the National Center of Artificial Intelligence and the Department of Robotics and Intelligent Machine Learning in NUST, which are working to improve AI-based knowledge in Pakistan. Besides that Pakistan recently launched a program named “Digital Pakistan” to increase access and connectivity, digital infrastructure, e-government, digital killing, and training and introduce innovation and entrepreneurship.

There are many studies done on the implications of AI on nuclear deterrence and strategic stability in South Asia. These studies highlight that due to prevalent asymmetry in the conventional military build-up, the introduction of AI into military technology would worsen the already fragile deterrence stability of the region. This assumption is based on the argument that due to AI in reconnaissance systems, high-level intelligence collection would affect the survivability of nuclear weapons, which is based on diversification and concealment. However, AI would also enable both states to have more response options in a short time with the help of decision-making tools in case of a crisis, especially in aerial battles.

Moreover, both states are moving towards the massive digitalization of their military systems and society without building cyber-resilient systems. Resilience can be built against vulnerabilities like human factors, massive speed of the systems, protection, and storage of data and advanced persistent threats (ATPs). Artificial intelligence-based systems must be incorporated in societies and militaries along with mechanisms to strengthen the cybersecurity systems. A front runner in AI like the US has also expressed concerns over the need for modern equipment to operate on “internet-like networks” and subsequently increased vulnerabilities due to their applicability. Therefore, military modernization can happen effectively through cyber resiliency in military systems, network processes, and cyber architecture. A cyber-resilient system would enable the state to develop a system that would remain functional during a phishing attack. Steps like cyber deception, agility, and clone defense could increase resilience in the existing systems. This is important to understand in already lacking strategic stability, military systems based on artificial intelligence would be an ideal target of AI advanced persistent threats in South Asia.

Therefore, as the process of digitalization is increasing in the Pakistan-India equation, it is also becoming very important that both states should develop resilience in their cyber systems so that the technologies could give them an advantage rather than becoming a security peril for them.

### DOJ DA---1NC

#### DOJ’s focused on its Google lawsuit now.

NICO GRANT et al. 6/28/21. Technology Reporter at Bloomberg, with MARK BERGEN, NAOMI NIX, AND BLOOMBERG, “Google’s ad business faces heat as DOJ extends Trump-era probe.” https://fortune.com/2021/06/28/googles-ad-business-antitrust-probe/

Antitrust investigators at the U.S. Justice Department have stepped up scrutiny of Google’s digital ad market practices in recent months, according to people familiar with the matter, showing that the Biden administration is actively pursuing a probe that started under former President Donald Trump.

Staffers from the antitrust office have interviewed multiple Google competitors about its practices in the advertising technology market, putting a target on the company’s second-most important business, according to people familiar with the action, who asked not to be identified discussing the early stage probe.

The Justice Department already sued Google last year, saying the Alphabet Inc.-owned company was abusing its dominance in internet search, its biggest business. Any additional legal action, including whether to bring a second suit, will likely depend on whoever is chosen as the assistant attorney general of the antitrust division by U.S. President Joe Biden. It will be up to that person to decide whether to proceed, and it’s possible the government will bring no action against the company.

The government is also gathering evidence from existing lawsuits and probes in other jurisdictions, focusing on Google’s business that places ads on others’ websites, one of the people said. The Justice Department declined to comment.

“Our advertising technologies help websites and apps fund their content and enable small businesses to reach customers around the world,” Julie Tarallo McAlister, a Google spokeswoman, said in a statement. “The enormous competition in online advertising has made online ads more relevant,reduced ad-tech fees, and expanded options for publishers and advertisers.”

Google, which for many serves as the home page of the internet, has been under intense antitrust scrutiny from regulators around the world, who have opened a flurry of investigations into the company’s business practices. The antitrust division’s continued information-gathering on Google’s display business raises the specter of additional regulatory enforcement against the internet giant in the U.S., its largest market and home turf.

The news comes soon after the confirmation of tech critic Lina Khan as the new chair of the U.S. Federal Trade Commission, as well as the European Union’s announcement of a formal investigation into whether Google has abused its leading position in the ad tech market. The company this month made concessions to the French government to make its digital auctions fairer.

Google already faces three antitrust lawsuits at home, one led by the Justice Department and two brought by coalitions of U.S. state attorneys general.

The Mountain View, California-based company owns major pieces of the online ad market. It runs an ad-buying service for marketers and an ad-selling one for publishers, as well as a trading exchange where both sides complete transactions in lightning-fast auctions.

These exchanges operate like online stock-trading platforms with an automated bidding process. Competitors and publishers have complained that Google leverages parts of this vast network, like its ad exchange, to benefit other areas and kneecap rivals. Overall, these ad tech products generated $23 billion in gross revenue for the internet giant last year. Google has argued that it pays out much of these ad-tech sales to web publishers.

The Justice Department cast a wide net when it began investigating Google under Attorney General William Barr, speaking with longtime foes of the tech giant including News Corp., Oracle Corp., and Yelp Inc. on their varied concerns about Google, including claims related to ad tech. In October, the department sued Google on other grounds, alleging the company had taken anti-competitive steps to extend its search engine monopoly. Two months later, a group of U.S. states led by Texas sued Google, claiming it had rigged the digital ads market, at which point it was unclear if the Justice Department maintained an interest in investigating Google’s ad tech business.

#### DOJ resources are finite---the plan forces tradeoffs.

Brian Blais 21. Partner in the litigation and enforcement practice group @ Ropes & Gray LLP and a former federal prosecutor, 3/26/21. “Podcast: 2021 DOJ Enforcement Priorities Under U.S. Attorney General Merrick Garland.” Interview with Lisa Bebchick. https://www.ropesgray.com/en/newsroom/podcasts/2021/March/Podcast-2021-DOJ-Enforcement-Priorities-Under-US-Attorney-General-Merrick-Garland

Brian Blais: Well, as I referenced earlier, I think one real challenge for the Garland DOJ will be the many competing demands on the resources available to DOJ leadership. In addition to the many corporate-related priorities I just discussed, there are a large number of Biden administration priorities that implicate the DOJ, many of which represent a sharp break from the priorities of the Trump Department of Justice—so those include things like environmental justice and the prosecution of environmental cases; civil rights and voting act cases; the ongoing fight against domestic terrorism, including as we talked about earlier, the January 6th Capitol attack; immigration reform and potential shifts in immigration prosecution priorities; potentially heightened antitrust enforcement; and criminal justice reform writ large, just to name a few. And putting aside even all these priorities, there’s a huge backlog of cases in the Department more broadly due to pandemic-related shutdowns, including a substantial trial backlog. So there will be a significant amount of prosecutorial time and effort in the near-term devoted to resolving these already charged matters, as well as moving along already opened investigations, so that leaves reduced prosecutorial bandwidth to advance any new enforcement priorities. So all of that’s to say, one big question for the Garland DOJ is: Can it do it all, or will these various competing demands lead to a natural prioritization of certain enforcement priorities over others? We’ll certainly have a better sense in the coming weeks and months as the remaining DOJ leadership is confirmed, as priorities get communicated, and as the first round of investigations under the new leadership start to launch.

#### The case against Google will be the first to go.

CHRISTOPHER KOOPMAN 21. Executive director at the Center for Growth and Opportunity at Utah State University, with Caden Rosenbaum, 3/11/21. “Why Merrick Garland needs to rethink the Google antitrust case.” https://fortune.com/2021/03/11/merrick-garland-google-antitrust-lawsuit-big-tech-breakup/

During the first day of Merrick Garland’s Senate hearing last month, President Biden’s nominee for attorney general outlined what his priorities would be at the Department of Justice. From investigating the insurrection to immigration enforcement, Garland has promised to bring a change in direction from the last Justice Department. To accomplish this will require reassessing where the DOJ focuses its time, resources, and leadership. The first step is withdrawing from several initiatives that are dubious at best, politically motivated at worst.

In particular, now that he has been confirmed as attorney general, Garland should begin by closely scrutinizing the DOJ’s current lawsuit against Google. That case is an example of what happens when political pressures and intergenerational misunderstandings shape cases, rather than the law. In short, Attorney General William Barr’s decision to bring this case in the way he did was a literal embodiment of the “Old Man Yells at Cloud” meme.

#### Google case key to democracy---protects against concentrated private power.

Sarah Miller 20. executive director of the American Economic Liberties Project and a former Treasury official, 10/21/21. “A US antitrust suit might break up Google. Good – it's the Standard Oil of our day.” https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2020/oct/21/google-antitrust-monopoly-power-us-politics

The Google case is a good start, but we haven’t really enforced anti-monopoly laws for 20 years, so search distribution isn’t the only problematic area. Google has market power elsewhere, including the software underpinning online publishing and advertising. It is starving newspapers and publishers and killing rivals like Yelp and TripAdvisor. Fortunately, state attorneys general are likely to bring cases against other aspects of the company’s business. More fundamentally, this case is bigger than just one market or one company; it’s about protecting democracy itself against concentrated private power. As Cicilline put it a few months ago: “Our founders would not bow before a king. Nor should we bow before the emperors of the online economy.”

#### Democracy solves great power war.

Larry Diamond 19. PhD in Sociology, professor of Sociology and Political Science at Stanford University. “Ill Winds: Saving Democracy from Russian Rage, Chinese Ambition and American Complacency,” Kindle Edition

In such a near future, my fellow experts would no longer talk of “democratic erosion.” We would be spiraling downward into a time of democratic despair, recalling Daniel Patrick Moynihan’s grim observation from the 1970s that liberal democracy “is where the world was, not where it is going.” 5 The world pulled out of that downward spiral—but it took new, more purposeful American leadership. The planet was not so lucky in the 1930s, when the global implosion of democracy led to a catastrophic world war, between a rising axis of emboldened dictatorships and a shaken and economically depressed collection of selfdoubting democracies. These are the stakes. Expanding democracy—with its liberal norms and constitutional commitments—is a crucial foundation for world peace and security. Knock that away, and our most basic hopes and assumptions will be imperiled. The problem is not just that the ground is slipping. It is that we are perched on a global precipice. That ledge has been gradually giving way for a decade. If the erosion continues, we may well reach a tipping point where democracy goes bankrupt suddenly—plunging the world into depths of oppression and aggression that we have not seen since the end of World War II. As a political scientist, I know that our theories and tools are not nearly good enough to tell us just how close we are getting to that point—until it happens.

### Politics DA---1NC

#### Infrastructure passes now---PC is key.

David Leonhardt, 10-1-2021, "Democrats, Divided," New York Times, https://www.nytimes.com/2021/10/01/briefing/infrastructure-bill-democrats-divided.html

“It’s a serious setback,” Carl Hulse, The Times’s chief Washington correspondent, told me, “but I don’t think it’s the end of the effort.”

Perhaps the most surprising part of last night’s developments is that many analysts believe that congressional Democrats have made progress toward a deal over the past 24 hours — even if they are not there yet, and the talks could still collapse.

The background

The Senate has already passed the infrastructure bill, and Democrats overwhelmingly favor it. But House progressives have refused to vote for it without assurances that moderate Democrats also support the other major piece of Biden’s agenda — a larger bill (sometimes called a “safety net” bill) that would expand health care access and education, fight climate change and reduce poverty, among other measures.

Progressives are worried that if they pass the infrastructure bill, moderates will abandon the safety-net bill, which is a higher priority for many Democrats.

These are precisely the sort of disagreements that Democrats managed to surmount in recent years. During the debate over Obama’s health law, for example, moderates were worried about its size and ambition, while progressives were deeply disappointed about what it lacked (including an option for anybody to buy into Medicare). Yet nearly all congressional Democrats ultimately voted for the bill, seeing it as far preferable to failure.

This time, moderates and progressives are having a harder time coming to an agreement. The left, unhappy about the compromises it needs to make, has decided to use tougher negotiating tactics than in the past — thus the lack of an infrastructure vote last night. And the moderates, like Senator Joe Manchin of West Virginia and Senator Kyrsten Sinema of Arizona, have been publicly vague about what they are willing to support in the safety-net bill.

Encouragingly for Democrats, Manchin’s stance did become clearer yesterday, potentially allowing the party to come to a deal on both major bills. It is not out of the question that a deal could come together quickly and the House might vote on the infrastructure bill today or next week.

Manchin said yesterday that he favored a safety-net bill that cost about $1.5 trillion, rather than the $3.5 trillion many other Democrats, including Biden, favor. He also listed several policies that he could support in the bill, including higher taxes on the rich; a reduction in drug prices; and expansions of pre-K, home health care, clean energy and child tax credits.

These are many of the same priorities that progressives have, even if Manchin’s proposed cost means that the party will need to make hard choices about what to exclude from the bill. But the terms of the negotiations now seem clearer than they have been.

Manchin himself suggested as much. “We need a little bit more time,” he said yesterday, according to Chad Pergram of Fox News. “We’re going to come to an agreement.”

Several political analysts echoed that confidence:

Matt Glassman of Georgetown: “Oddly, now that the progressives have done their flex, I think the prospects for a deal increased a bit.”

Russell Berman, The Atlantic: “These setbacks are not final or fatal, and time is still on their side. The deadlines Democrats missed this week were largely artificial, and House leaders said a vote on the infrastructure bill could still happen as early as Friday.”

Karen Tumulty, Washington Post: “My theory: We are moving toward a deal. … What everyone is waiting for at this point is an announcement by Biden of a deal, and a call from the president for Democrats to rally around it.”

The Democrats have enormous incentives to come to agreement. If they fail, Biden’s domestic agenda is largely sunk, and the party will have forfeited a chance to pass major legislation while controlling the White House, the Senate and House — a combination that does not come along often. Democrats will also have to face voters in next year’s midterms looking divided if not incompetent.

All of that suggests they will find a path to an agreement. But it’s far from assured. The tensions within the party are more serious than they have been in years.

#### The plan costs PC and trades off.

Peter C. Carstensen 21, the Fred W. & Vi Miller Chair in Law Emeritus, University of Wisconsin Law School, February 2021, “THE “OUGHT” AND “IS LIKELY” OF BIDEN ANTITRUST,” https://www.concurrences.com/en/review/issues/no-1-2021/on-topic/the-new-us-antitrust-administration-en

14. Similarly, despite bipartisan murmurs about competitive issues, the potential in a closely divided Congress that any major initiatives will survive is limited at best. In part the challenge here is how the Biden administration will rank its commitments. If it were to make reform of competition law a major and primary commitment, it would have to trade off other goals, which might include health care reform or increases in the minimum wage. It is likely in this circumstance the new administration, like the Obama administration’s abandonment of the pro-competitive rules proposed under the PSA, would elect to give up stricter competition rules in order to achieve other legislative priorities.

15. Another key to a robust commitment to workable competition is the choice of cabinet and other key administrative positions. Here as well, the early signs are not entirely encouraging. In selecting Tom Vilsack to return as secretary of agriculture, the president has embraced a friend of the large corporate interests dominating agriculture who has spent the last four years in a highly lucrative position advancing their interests. Given the desperate need for pro-competitive rules to implement the PSA and control exploitation of dairy farmers through milk-market orders, the return of Vilsack is not good news. Who will head the FTC and who will be the attorney general and assistant attorney general for antitrust is still unknown, but if those picks are also centrists with strong links to corporate America the hope for robust enforcement of competition law will further attenuate!

16. In sum, this is a pessimistic prognostication for the likely Biden antitrust enforcement agenda. There is much that ought to be done. But this requires a willingness to take major enforcement risks, to invest significant political capital in the legislative process, and to select leaders who are committed to advancing the public interest in fair, efficient and dynamically competitive markets. The early signs are that the new administration will be no more committed to robust competition policy than the Obama administration. Events may force a more vigorous policy—I will cling to that hope as the Biden administration takes shape.

#### The bill is key to cybersecurity.

Cat Zakrzewski, 8-14-2021, "The Senate’s $1 trillion infrastructure bill includes funding to secure Americans’ water systems and power grids from cyberattacks," https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2021/08/14/cybersecurity-infrastructure-senate-legislation/

A Senate bill intended to shore up the nation’s roads, pipes and electric grid includes billions to protect that aging infrastructure from cyberattacks.

With a series of high-profile ransomware attacks fresh in their minds, U.S. Senate negotiators wove cybersecurity investments throughout the bipartisan $1 trillion infrastructure proposal, which passed the Senate in a 69-to-30 vote on Tuesday and now moves to the House for a vote. The allocations are a reflection of the growing realization in Congress that a computer attack could leave Americans without water, power or other essentials.

“This is an incredibly serious threat to this country that’s only growing more serious,” said Sen. Angus King (I-Maine).

The Colonial Pipeline ransomware attack in May was a wake-up call that gave lawmakers and the public “a taste of what is potentially in store,” King said. The attack disrupted fuel supplies in the eastern United States, prompting gasoline shortages and panicked buying that affected millions for days.

The Colonial hack was just one in a series of attacks on lawmakers’ minds. King said he is particularly wary of attacks on the more than 100,000 public water systems in the United States, especially after a hacker in February took control of a water treatment facility in Oldsmar, Fla. The intruder raised the levels of sodium hydroxide to a hazardous point that could have sickened residents. An operator noticed the rising levels and was able to quickly intervene, but the incident highlighted the broader weaknesses at the facilities responsible for ensuring Americans have clean drinking water.

To King, one of the Senate negotiators, these incidents underlined that cybersecurity has to be a part of any work the government does on infrastructure, from broadband to power grids.

The bill directs the Federal Highway Administration to create a new tool to help transportation authorities better detect and respond to cyber attacks, which could range from ransomware attacks on transportation departments or hacks of traffic lights and road signs. It makes emergency funding available to respond to digital attacks on public water systems and makes grants available that can be used to help some water systems increase their ability to deal with cyberattacks as well as natural hazards and extreme weather.

It also calls on the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to develop incentives to ensure that electric utilities are investing in cybersecurity and sharing data about potential threats.

The bill also authorizes nearly $2 billion in spending for specific cybersecurity initiatives, such as the creation of a $1 billion grant program to provide federal cybersecurity assistance to state and local governments, which experts say are among the most vulnerable institutions to ransomware attacks. The bill also would fund a new cyber director office, so that the federal government can better coordinate its response to major hacks, and would create a $100 million response and recovery fund, which the Department of Homeland Security could use to support both private companies and governments’ recoveries from cyberattacks.

The infusion of funding follows years of warnings from across the federal government of the vulnerability of U.S. critical infrastructure to cyberattacks. A year ago, the National Security Agency and the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency warned that critical infrastructure systems, including energy, transportation and water systems, make “attractive targets for foreign powers attempting to do harm to U.S. interests or retaliate for perceived U.S. aggression.”

#### Cyberattacks go nuclear.

Michael T. Klare 19. Professor emeritus of peace and world security studies at Hampshire College and senior visiting fellow at the Arms Control Association. “Cyber Battles, Nuclear Outcomes? Dangerous New Pathways to Escalation.” https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation

Another initiative incorporated in the strategy document also aroused concern: the claim that an enemy cyberattack on U.S. nuclear command, control, and communications (NC3) facilities would constitute a “non-nuclear strategic attack” of sufficient magnitude to justify the use of nuclear weapons in response.

Under the Obama administration’s NPR report, released in April 2010, the circumstances under which the United States would consider responding to non-nuclear attacks with nuclear weapons were said to be few. “The United States will continue to…reduce the role of nuclear weapons in deterring non-nuclear attacks,” the report stated. Although little was said about what sort of non-nuclear attacks might be deemed severe enough to justify a nuclear response, cyberstrikes were not identified as one of these. The 2018 NPR report, however, portrayed a very different environment, one in which nuclear combat is seen as increasingly possible and in which non-nuclear strategic threats, especially in cyberspace, were viewed as sufficiently menacing to justify a nuclear response. Speaking of Russian technological progress, for example, the draft version of the Trump administration’s NPR report stated, “To…correct any Russian misperceptions of advantage, the president will have an expanding range of limited and graduated [nuclear] options to credibly deter Russian nuclear or non-nuclear strategic attacks, which could now include attacks against U.S. NC3, in space and cyberspace.”1

The notion that a cyberattack on U.S. digital systems, even those used for nuclear weapons, would constitute sufficient grounds to launch a nuclear attack was seen by many observers as a dangerous shift in policy, greatly increasing the risk of accidental or inadvertent nuclear escalation in a crisis. “The entire broadening of the landscape for nuclear deterrence is a very fundamental step in the wrong direction,” said former Secretary of Energy Ernest Moniz. “I think the idea of nuclear deterrence of cyberattacks, broadly, certainly does not make any sense.”2

Despite such admonitions, the Pentagon reaffirmed its views on the links between cyberattacks and nuclear weapons use when it released the final version of the NPR report in February 2018. The official text now states that the president must possess a spectrum of nuclear weapons with which to respond to “attacks against U.S. NC3,” and it identifies cyberattacks as one form of non-nuclear strategic warfare that could trigger a nuclear response.

That cyberwarfare had risen to this level of threat, the 2018 NPR report indicated, was a product of the enhanced cybercapabilities of potential adversaries and of the creeping obsolescence of many existing U.S. NC3 systems. To overcome these vulnerabilities, it called for substantial investment in an upgraded NC3 infrastructure. Not mentioned, however, were extensive U.S. efforts to employ cybertools to infiltrate and potentially incapacitate the NC3 systems of likely adversaries, including Russia, China, and North Korea.

For the past several years, the U.S. Department of Defense has been exploring how it could employ its own very robust cyberattack capabilities to compromise or destroy enemy missiles from such states as North Korea before they can be fired, a strategy sometimes called “left of launch.”3 Russia and China can assume, on this basis, that their own launch facilities are being probed for such vulnerabilities, presumably leading them to adopt escalatory policies such as those espoused in the 2018 NPR report. Wherever one looks, therefore, the links between cyberwar and nuclear war are growing.

The Nuclear-Cyber Connection

These links exist because the NC3 systems of the United States and other nuclear-armed states are heavily dependent on computers and other digital processors for virtually every aspect of their operation and because those systems are highly vulnerable to cyberattack. Every nuclear force is composed, most basically, of weapons, early-warning radars, launch facilities, and the top officials, usually presidents or prime ministers, empowered to initiate a nuclear exchange. Connecting them all, however, is an extended network of communications and data-processing systems, all reliant on cyberspace. Warning systems, ground- and space-based, must constantly watch for and analyze possible enemy missile launches. Data on actual threats must rapidly be communicated to decision-makers, who must then weigh possible responses and communicate chosen outcomes to launch facilities, which in turn must provide attack vectors to delivery systems. All of this involves operations in cyberspace, and it is in this domain that great power rivals seek vulnerabilities to exploit in a constant struggle for advantage.

The use of cyberspace to gain an advantage over adversaries takes many forms and is not always aimed at nuclear systems. China has been accused of engaging in widespread cyberespionage to steal technical secrets from U.S. firms for economic and military advantages. Russia has been accused, most extensively in the Robert Mueller report, of exploiting cyberspace to interfere in the 2016 U.S. presidential election. Nonstate actors, including terrorist groups such as al Qaeda and the Islamic State group, have used the internet for recruiting combatants and spreading fear. Criminal groups, including some thought to be allied with state actors, such as North Korea, have used cyberspace to extort money from banks, municipalities, and individuals.4 Attacks such as these occupy most of the time and attention of civilian and military cybersecurity organizations that attempt to thwart such attacks. Yet for those who worry about strategic stability and the risks of nuclear escalation, it is the threat of cyberattacks on NC3 systems that provokes the greatest concern.

This concern stems from the fact that, despite the immense effort devoted to protecting NC3 systems from cyberattack, no enterprise that relies so extensively on computers and cyberspace can be made 100 percent invulnerable to attack. This is so because such systems employ many devices and operating systems of various origins and vintages, most incorporating numerous software updates and “patches” over time, offering multiple vectors for attack. Electronic components can also be modified by hostile actors during production, transit, or insertion; and the whole system itself is dependent to a considerable degree on the electrical grid, which itself is vulnerable to cyberattack and is far less protected. Experienced “cyberwarriors” of every major power have been working for years to probe for weaknesses in these systems and in many cases have devised cyberweapons, typically, malicious software (malware) and computer viruses, to exploit those weaknesses for military advantage.5

Although activity in cyberspace is much more difficult to detect and track than conventional military operations, enough information has become public to indicate that the major nuclear powers, notably China, Russia, and the United States, along with such secondary powers as Iran and North Korea, have established extensive cyberwarfare capabilities and engage in offensive cyberoperations on a regular basis, often aimed at critical military infrastructure. “Cyberspace is a contested environment where we are in constant contact with adversaries,” General Paul M. Nakasone, commander of the U.S. Cyber Command (Cybercom), told the Senate Armed Services Committee in February 2019. “We see near-peer competitors [China and Russia] conducting sustained campaigns below the level of armed conflict to erode American strength and gain strategic advantage.”

Although eager to speak of adversary threats to U.S. interests, Nakasone was noticeably but not surprisingly reluctant to say much about U.S. offensive operations in cyberspace. He acknowledged, however, that Cybercom took such action to disrupt possible Russian interference in the 2018 midterm elections. “We created a persistent presence in cyberspace to monitor adversary actions and crafted tools and tactics to frustrate their efforts,” he testified in February. According to press accounts, this included a cyberattack aimed at paralyzing the Internet Research Agency, a “troll farm” in St. Petersburg said to have been deeply involved in generating disruptive propaganda during the 2016 presidential elections.6

Other press investigations have disclosed two other offensive operations undertaken by the United States. One called “Olympic Games” was intended to disrupt Iran’s drive to increase its uranium-enrichment capacity by sabotaging the centrifuges used in the process by infecting them with the so-called Stuxnet virus. Another left of launch effort was intended to cause malfunctions in North Korean missile tests.7 Although not aimed at either of the U.S. principal nuclear adversaries, those two attacks demonstrated a willingness and capacity to conduct cyberattacks on the nuclear infrastructure of other states.

Efforts by strategic rivals of the United States to infiltrate and eventually degrade U.S. nuclear infrastructure are far less documented but thought to be no less prevalent. Russia, for example, is believed to have planted malware in the U.S. electrical utility grid, possibly with the intent of cutting off the flow of electricity to critical NC3 facilities in the event of a major crisis.8 Indeed, every major power, including the United States, is believed to have crafted cyberweapons aimed at critical NC3 components and to have implanted malware in enemy systems for potential use in some future confrontation.

Pathways to Escalation

Knowing that the NC3 systems of the major powers are constantly being probed for weaknesses and probably infested with malware designed to be activated in a crisis, what does this say about the risks of escalation from a nonkinetic battle, that is, one fought without traditional weaponry, to a kinetic one, at first using conventional weapons and then, potentially, nuclear ones? None of this can be predicted in advance, but those analysts who have studied the subject worry about the emergence of dangerous new pathways for escalation. Indeed, several such scenarios have been identified.9

The first and possibly most dangerous path to escalation would arise from the early use of cyberweapons in a great power crisis to paralyze the vital command, control, and communications capabilities of an adversary, many of which serve nuclear and conventional forces. In the “fog of war” that would naturally ensue from such an encounter, the recipient of such an attack might fear more punishing follow-up kinetic attacks, possibly including the use of nuclear weapons, and, fearing the loss of its own arsenal, launch its weapons immediately. This might occur, for example, in a confrontation between NATO and Russian forces in east and central Europe or between U.S. and Chinese forces in the Asia-Pacific region.

Speaking of a possible confrontation in Europe, for example, James N. Miller Jr. and Richard Fontaine wrote that “both sides would have overwhelming incentives to go early with offensive cyber and counter-space capabilities to negate the other side’s military capabilities or advantages.” If these early attacks succeeded, “it could result in huge military and coercive advantage for the attacker.” This might induce the recipient of such attacks to back down, affording its rival a major victory at very low cost. Alternatively, however, the recipient might view the attacks on its critical command, control, and communications infrastructure as the prelude to a full-scale attack aimed at neutralizing its nuclear capabilities and choose to strike first. “It is worth considering,” Miller and Fontaine concluded, “how even a very limited attack or incident could set both sides on a slippery slope to rapid escalation.”10

What makes the insertion of latent malware in an adversary’s NC3 systems so dangerous is that it may not even need to be activated to increase the risk of nuclear escalation. If a nuclear-armed state comes to believe that its critical systems are infested with enemy malware, its leaders might not trust the information provided by its early-warning systems in a crisis and might misconstrue the nature of an enemy attack, leading them to overreact and possibly launch their nuclear weapons out of fear they are at risk of a preemptive strike.

“The uncertainty caused by the unique character of a cyber threat could jeopardize the credibility of the nuclear deterrent and undermine strategic stability in ways that advances in nuclear and conventional weapons do not,” Page O. Stoutland and Samantha Pitts-Kiefer wrote in 2018 paper for the Nuclear Threat Initiative. “[T]he introduction of a flaw or malicious code into nuclear weapons through the supply chain that compromises the effectiveness of those weapons could lead to a lack of confidence in the nuclear deterrent,” undermining strategic stability.11 Without confidence in the reliability of its nuclear weapons infrastructure, a nuclear-armed state may misinterpret confusing signals from its early-warning systems and, fearing the worst, launch its own nuclear weapons rather than lose them to an enemy’s first strike. This makes the scenario proffered in the 2018 NPR report, of a nuclear response to an enemy cyberattack, that much more alarming.

# Case

## Class Action

### Court Clog---1NC

#### State and federal courts are open now; they’re working to diminish the backlog of cases.

US Courts, 21. “As COVID-19 Cases Fall, Juries Get Back to Work.” May 27, 2021. This is the sixth in a series of articles about how federal courts are working to recover from the COVID-19 crisis. https://www.uscourts.gov/news/2021/05/27/covid-19-cases-fall-juries-get-back-work

As coronavirus (COVID-19) case totals continue to decline in the United States, federal courts are rapidly expanding the number of jury trials and other in-person proceedings. But many court leaders remain uncertain about how quickly they can achieve a full return to pre-pandemic operations. While some courts say social distancing requirements and other COVID-related issues are likely to limit the number of jury trials, at least for the next few months, an increase in vaccinations and the recent relaxation of federal guidelines are raising the possibility of a more rapid reopening schedule. The Northern District of New York recently began its first criminal jury trial since March 2020, when the pandemic prompted many federal courts to scale back in-person hearings and trials. But the court is still assessing whether mask requirements and social distancing can be eliminated for jurors and the public after a year of pandemic restrictions. “The court is committed to taking a measured approach to relaxing the current restrictions,” said Clerk of Court John M. Domurad. “We want to be careful. We’ve gained so much, we don’t want to lose what we’ve gained by shedding restrictions too quickly.” For more than a year, federal courts have operated under a dynamic “gating” strategy, easing and tightening restrictions on courthouse procedures based on improvements or deterioration in local health conditions. Some courts resumed limited jury trials last summer, only to pull back during a winter resurgence of COVID. In recent months, as infection and hospitalization rates have fallen sharply, dozens of courts have reported changing their status from Phase 1 or 2, in which limited in-person proceedings are conducted, to Phase 3 or 4, in which jury trials can be conducted. Officials caution that future changes could tighten restrictions again. Even in districts where COVID numbers are falling most rapidly, some judges are reporting they still must overcome challenges to stage trials. “COVID numbers in our district are plummeting, and that’s wonderful,” said Chief Judge James K. Bredar of the District of Maryland. “But our detention facilities continue to lock down entire housing units when even a single inmate tests positive. That means the detainees on that housing unit cannot be transported to courts, or even to the areas within the detention facility used for video hearings. So, even with improving virus metrics and climbing vaccination statistics, we are still disrupted by COVID.“ Two of the biggest quandaries facing courts are whether vaccinations can or should be required of jurors and court staff, and whether strict social distancing is still necessary as more adults become vaccinated. In interviews, most court leaders say they are not requiring vaccinations, but that they are taking a wait and see approach on relaxing other COVID precautions. All say that assuring jurors they are safe is a top priority(link is external). “We believe that with the appropriate safety measures in place, the American public can feel safe to participate in jury trials as jurors, observers, or witnesses,” said Chief Judge Algenon L. Marbley, of the Southern District of Ohio, which resumed a full jury trial schedule on May 3. “The Court has not been asking about juror vaccination, but we may do so in the future.” Courts are still unclear how recent guidance from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention may alter their decision-making. Noting that those with vaccinations no longer need to wear masks, Chief Judge Philip A. Brimmer of the District of Colorado said that courts still face difficult choices. Chief Judge Philip A. Brimmer, District of Colorado Chief Judge Philip A. Brimmer, District of Colorado: “Social distancing imposes many limitations on a court’s ability to return to normal.” “To what extent should courts accommodate fully vaccinated jurors who want to be socially distanced?” Brimmer asked. “Social distancing imposes many limitations on a court’s ability to return to normal. But it seems harsh to tell people who just a few weeks ago were being praised for their precautions that they now need to get over their qualms about having someone sit right next to them.” Courtroom capacity also is affecting how quickly different districts can schedule jury trials. The Southern District of Ohio has enough courtrooms to conduct eight jury trials simultaneously—three each in its Cincinnati and Columbus courthouses and two more in Dayton. In addition to outfitting each juror’s chair with plexiglass, the court gives each juror a sealed plastic bag that contains a mask, gloves, hand sanitizer, writing pad and pen. The court has sufficient space to put the public in overflow courtrooms if needed, and to allow jurors to maintain social distancing. In the District of Minnesota, Chief Judge John R. Tunheim said, courthouses in Minneapolis and St. Paul each have only one courtroom fully retrofitted with plexiglass to protect jurors. As a result, only one jury trial at a time is being held in each city. A total of three courtrooms are needed for each trial, to accommodate social-distancing needs. Chief Judge John R. Tunheim, District of Minnesota Chief Judge John R. Tunheim, District of Minnesota: “We have done everything possible to make our facilities safe.” Beginning Aug. 1, all courtrooms in Minnesota will be authorized for civil trials, which can fit the required eight-member juries in a standard jury box, but at present, expanding the number of criminal jury trials would require additional installation of plexiglass barriers. “We still want to keep the number of people in the courthouses to a minimum to prevent spread,” Tunheim said. “We are using at least two other courtrooms for each trial - one for jury deliberations and the other for the public/media to watch the trial without being in the courtroom. I am anticipating utilizing the single courtroom plan for criminal trials through the end of the summer and then reassess.” Even a limited capacity to hold jury trials can have an additional benefit in completing court business. In the District of Colorado, listing cases as pilot trials or backup pilot trials has greatly facilitated settlement of cases. “Until a case gets on the calendar, it’s not going anywhere,” Brimmer said. “So **being able to hold** even some **jury trials is helping us reduce our backlog.”** Court officials emphasize that they are making every effort to protect jury and public safety. Courts, they say, are ready to deliver justice even as the COVID crisis winds down. “We have done everything possible to make our facilities safe and will continue to be vigilant about health and safety,” Tunheim said. “I would also say that our criminal justice system is vitally important. Defendants have a right to a fair and speedy trial, so despite the challenges, it is important that we move forward with trials and hearings.”

#### The plan wrecks the restoration process. Expanding the scope of antitrust law opens the floodgates of antitrust court cases, clogging the courts.

Geoffrey Manne, 18. International Center for Law & Economics president & founder, Congressional Documents and Publications, “Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights Hearing; "A Comparative Look at Competition Law Approaches to Monopoly and Abuse of Dominance in the US and EU."; Testimony by Geoffrey Manne, President and Founder, International Center for Law and Economics,” December 19, 2018. Lexis, accessed 6-1-21

II. The specious lure of excessively discretionary antitrust

Antitrust is an attractive regulatory tool for a number of reasons. As noted above, the vague, terse language of the Sherman Act readily lends itself to "interpretation" imbuing it with virtually limit-less scope. Indeed, the urge to treat antitrust as a legal Swiss Army knife capable of correcting all manner of social and economic ills is apparently difficult to resist. Conflating size with market power, and market power with political power, many recent calls for regulation of the tech indus-try are framed in antitrust terms, even though they are mostly rooted in nothing recognizable as modern, economically informed antitrust legal claims or analysis. But that attraction is precisely why we should care about the scope, process, and economics of anti-trust and the extent of its politicization. Antitrust in the US has largely resisted the relentless effort to politicize it. Despite being rooted in vague and potentially expansive statutory language, US anti-trust is economically grounded, evolutionary, and limited to a set of achievable social welfare goals. In the EU, by contrast, these sorts of constraints are far weaker. Whether or not that is suitable for the particular political and historical circumstances of the EU is a separate question. But, undoubt-edly, applying a controversial legal regime to the United States -- a markedly different jurisdiction with a unique governance structure -- and upsetting more than a century of legal, technological, and social development, is deeply problematic. This conclusion is in no way altered by the fact that US antitrust law has become the outlier of global antitrust enforcement, compared to the EU's more "consensual" approach. n26 What matters is a policy's actual results, not whether it is widely adopted; the world is full of debunked beliefs that were once widely shared. And it is far from certain that the widespread adoption of the EU model is in any way indicative of superior results. It is equally (or even more) plausible that this model has proliferated because it naturally accommodates politically useful populist narratives -- such as "big is bad," robin hood fallacies and robber baron myths -- that are constrained by the US's more evidence-based and rational antitrust decision-making. n27 America's isolation might thus be a testament to its success rather than an emblem of its failure. But even if by some chance the European approach proved to be optimal for many other countries in the world, it is still dubious that its adoption would lead to improved economic performance in the United States. As has already been alluded to, the unique features of the US legal regime make it unlikely that the best policy for the EU would also happen to be the best one for America. The EU's more aggressive pursuit of technology platforms under its antitrust laws demonstrates many of the problems with its approach in general. I urge this subcommittee to consider not just whether the EU approach seems to permit the government to reach a preconceived outcome -- i.e., placing large tech platforms under increased antitrust scrutiny -- but whether it is truly desirable at all to emulate the EU's approach and to try to reach the goals of EU competition policy under US antitrust law. Endorsing the European approach to antitrust, in a naive attempt to bring high-pro-file cases against large Internet platforms, would prioritize political expediency over the rule of law. It would open the floodgates of antitrust litigation and facilitate deleterious tendencies, such as non-economic decision-making, rent-seeking, regulatory capture, and politically motivated enforce-ment. Bringing US antitrust enforcement in line with that of the EU would thus unlock a veritable Pan-dora's box of concerns that are currently kept in check. Chief among them is the use of antitrust laws to evade democratically and judicially established rules and legal precedent. When consider-ing this question, it is important to see beyond any particular set of firms that enforcement offi-cials and politicians may currently be targeting. An antitrust law expanded to consider the full scope of soft concerns that the EU aims at will not be employed against only politically disfavored companies, companies in other jurisdictions, or in order to expediently "solve" otherwise political problems. Once antitrust is expanded beyond its economic constraints and imbued with political content, it ceases to be a uniquely valuable tool for addressing real economic harms to consumers, and becomes a tool for routing around legislative and judicial constraints**.**

#### Makes it difficult to address terror.

StuartTaylor, 99. Stuart Taylor, Jr. is an author and freelance writer focusing on legal and policy issues and a contributing editor for the National Journal. (“Irrational Excesses, Barbaric Penalties and Political Opportunism”, National Journal, 2-27, Lexis.)

So did another unhealthy trend, deplored in a Feb. 16 ABA task force report titled ''The Federalization of Criminal Law.'' The 16-member panel was headed by Meese, who is more used to being a punching bag for the liberal-leaning legal establishment than a spokesman for it. He lends bipartisan heft to the ABA report's long-overdue conclusions. There was only perfunctory media attention to the ABA report because this is bland stuff: no charges of racism or ''sexual McCarthyism,'' no summons to yet another war on drugs, no purple prose. Still, the message is worthwhile. Although crime rates have fallen, the ABA report explains, the proliferation of new federal criminal prohibitions deserves none of the credit: ''There is no persuasive evidence that federalization of local crime makes the streets safer for American citizens.'' This is because the properly limited (albeit rapidly expanding) number of federal law enforcement officials can conduct only about 5 percent of all prosecutions. At the same time, federalization does subtle but pervasive damage: It gives federal prosecutors too much inherently arbitrary and unreviewable discretion to focus on a tiny percentage of all possible targets; it clogs federal courts with garden-variety criminal cases, diverting them from national problems such as **international terrorism**, espionage, bribery of federal officials, **big antitrust cases**, white-collar fraud, and multistate drug conspiracies; it disrupts the federal-state balance; it moves the nation ''rapidly toward two broadly overlapping, parallel, and essentially redundant sets ofcriminal prohibitions, each filled with differing consequences for the same conduct.''

#### Nuclear terrorism causes global war.

Irma Arguello & Emiliano J. Buis 18. \*Founder and chair of the NPSGlobal Foundation, and head of the secretariat of the Latin American and Caribbean Leadership Network. \*\*Researcher and professor at the NPSGlobal Foundation. 3-4-2018. “The Global Impacts of a Terrorist Nuclear Attack: What Would Happen? What Should We Do?” Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, vol. 74, no. 2, pp. 114–119.

Making matters worse, there is evidence of an illicit market for nuclear weapons-usable materials. There are sellers in search of potential buyers, as shown by the dismantlement of a nuclear smuggling network in Moldova in 2015. There certainly are plenty of sites from which to obtain nuclear material. According to the 2016 Nuclear Security Index by the Nuclear Threat Initiative, 24 countries still host inventories of nuclear weapons-usable materials, stored in facilities with different degrees of security. And in terms of risk, it is not necessary for a given country to possess nuclear weapons, weapons-usable materials, or nuclear facilities for it to be useful to nuclear terrorists: Structural and institutional weaknesses in a country may make it favorable for the illicit trade of materials. Permeable boundaries, high levels of corruption, weaknesses in judicial systems, and consequent impunity may give rise to a series of transactions and other events, which could end in a nuclear attack. The truth is that, at this stage, no country in possession of nuclear weapons or weapons-usable materials can guarantee their full protection against nuclear terrorism or nuclear smuggling. Because we live in a world of growing insecurity, where explicit and tacit agreements between the relevant powers – which upheld global stability during the post- Cold War – are giving way to increasing mistrust and hostility, a question arises: How would our lives be affected if a current terrorist group such as the Islamic State (ISIS), or new terrorist groups in the future, succeed in evolving from today’s Manchester style “low-tech” attacks to a “high-tech” one, involving a nuclear bomb, detonated in a capital city, anywhere in the world? We attempted to answer this question in a report developed by a high-level multidisciplinary expert group convened by the NPSGlobal Foundation for the Latin American and Caribbean Leadership Network. We found that there would be multiple harmful effects that would spread promptly around the globe (Arguello and Buis 2016); a more detailed analysis is below, which highlights the need for the creation of a comprehensive nuclear security system. The consequences of a terrorist nuclear attack A small and primitive 1-kiloton fission bomb (with a yield of about one-fifteenth of the one dropped on Hiroshima, and certainly much less sophisticated; cf. Figure 1), detonated in any large capital city of the developed world, would cause an unprecedented catastrophic scenario. An estimate of direct effects in the attack’s location includes a death toll of 7,300-to-23,000 people and 12,600-to-57,000 people injured, depending on the target’s geography and population density. Total physical destruction of the city’s infrastructure, due to the blast (shock wave) and thermal radiation, would cover a radius of about 500 meters from the point of detonation (also known as ground zero), while ionizing radiation greater than 5 Sieverts – compatible with the deadly acute radiation syndrome – would expand within an 850-meter radius. From the environmental point of view, such an area would be unusable for years. In addition, radioactive fallout would expand in an area of about 300 square kilometers, depending on meteorological conditions (cf. Figure 2). But the consequences would go far beyond the effects in the target country, however, and promptly propagate worldwide. Global and national security, economy and finance, international governance and its framework, national political systems, and the behavior of governments and individuals would all be put under severe trial. The severity of the effects at a national level, however, would depend on the countries’ level of development, geopolitical location, and resilience. Global security and regional/national defense schemes would be strongly affected. An increase in global distrust would spark rising tensions among countries and blocs, that could even lead to the brink of nuclear weapons use by states (if, for instance, a sponsor country is identified). The consequences of such a shocking scenario would include a decrease in states’ self-control, an escalation of present conflicts and the emergence of new ones, accompanied by an increase in military unilateralism and military expenditures. Regarding the economic and financial impacts, a severe global economic depression would rise from the attack, likely lasting for years. Its duration would be strongly dependent on the course of the crisis. The main results of such a crisis would include a 2 percent fall of growth in global Gross Domestic Product, and a 4 percent decline of international trade in the two years following the attack (cf. Figure 3). In the case of developing and less-developed countries, the economic impacts would also include a shortage of high-technology products such as medicines, as well as a fall in foreign direct investment and a severe decline of international humanitarian aid toward low-income countries. We expect an increase of unemployment and poverty in all countries. Global poverty would raise about 4 percent after the attack, which implies that at least 30 million more people would be living in extreme poverty, in addition to the current estimated 767 million. In the area of international relations, we would expect a breakdown of key doctrines involving politics, security, and relations among states. These international tensions could lead to a collapse of the nuclear order as we know it today, with a consequent setback of nuclear disarmament and nonproliferation commitments. In other words, the whole system based on the Nuclear Non- Proliferation Treaty would be put under severe trial. After the attack, there would be a reassessment of existing security doctrines, and a deep review of concepts such as nuclear deterrence, no-firstuse, proportionality, and negative security assurances. Finally, the behavior of governments and individuals would also change radically. Internal chaos fueled by the media and social networks would threaten governance at all levels, with greater impact on those countries with weak institutional frameworks. Social turbulence would emerge in most countries, with consequent attempts by governments to impose restrictions on personal freedoms to preserve order – possibly by declaring a state of siege or state of emergency – and legislation would surely become tougher on human rights. There would also be a significant increase in social fragmentation – with a deepening of antagonistic views, mistrust, and intolerance, both within countries and towards others – and a resurgence of large-scale social movements fostered by ideological interests and easily mobilized through social media.

### Fails---1NC

#### Repetitive arbitration actions solves---civil action isn’t key.

#### Newton is about a 2011 Court ruling---the last 10 years thump.

#### Class action lawsuits can’t deter cartelization---empirics go our way.

Zygimantas Juska 17. Doctor of Law, Leiden University. The Effectiveness of Private Enforcement and Class Actions to Secure Antitrust Enforcement. The Antitrust Bulletin. 2017. 62(3): 629

A. Low Deterrence Value The core element of the class action lawsuit is the seeking of class certification. Due to the defendants’ aggressive defense, antitrust class actions may reach the certification stage and be denied on the basis of failing to meet the requirements under Rule 23. Most importantly, the courts utilize strict evidentiary standards for the class certification in antitrust cases. In the In Re Hydrogen Peroxide Antitrust Litigation, 179 the 3rd Circuit established that the class certification requires “rigorous analysis” of factual and legal evidence.180 This examination extends to assessing the testimony of both defendant’s and plaintiffs’ experts.181 In addition, the standards for meeting the requirements under Rule 23 must be met by a “preponderance” of evidence, rather than by a mere “threshold showing.”182 Therefore, there is a high chance that defendants may succeed in opposing the class certification. In such case, the class action rule serves no use. As mentioned before, if a court certifies a class action, the large majority of class action lawsuits are settled; very few certified class actions proceed to trial. Consequently, treble damages are typically removed from the negotiation process and, after all, defendants admit no liability for having violated antitrust laws. From this issue flows another concern: that the private attorney general mechanism is not the right tool to facilitate deterrence. Lawyers make huge investments in antitrust cases and are thus the ones who decide when and whether to settle the case.183 The individual damages caused by antitrust wrongdoers are typically very small, so few if any class members have an incentive to monitor the settlement negotiations. As a consequence, defendants are satisfied to “buy off” the attorney in exchange for a favorable settlement agreement.184 The opposite may also be true: the class counsel may coerce defendants to go into settlements out of fear, regardless of whether the claim has merit or not.185 Thus, the settled class action lawsuits undercut the deterrence of class litigation. From a cartel perspective, a majority of class actions follow successful government actions.186 Consequently, private attorneys use the efforts of public enforcers for their own benefit, for example, by reducing their own costs in expensive fact discovery proceedings.187 According to this view, private actions are unable to cure public shortcomings like, for example, a low detection rate. Another critical argument is that corporate managers (who should be foremost affected) are not deterred by private litigation. First, the time period between the beginnings of anticompetitive behavior until the judgment is considered the important deterrence criteria against corporate managers. In a typical antitrust case, the period may last from at least five years to more than ten years.188 It is highly unlikely that corporate managers and midlevel executives will still hold their positions at the time of the judgment.189 In case of settlement cases, the early deterrent impact is also improbable, because, even if the day of judgment is speeded up, the average time from the planning of anticompetitive conduct to any settlement payout is still more than five years.190 Second, corporate managers are unlikely to internalize the wrongdoing immediately after launching the antitrust claim. As mentioned before, empirical studies showed that government antitrust actions reduce the share value by 6% on average, and filling a private lawsuit by around 0.6%. 191 Thus, “[a] half-percent drop in market capitalization” is highly unlikely to cause negative impacts on corporate managers.192

### AT: Impact---1NC

#### COVID thumps growth.

#### The internal link in Oppenheimer is about trade wars---they don’t solve tariffs on other countries.

#### No econ decline impact.

**Walt 20** [Stephen M. Walt is the Robert and Renée Belfer professor of international relations at Harvard University. “Will a Global Depression Trigger Another World War?”, May 13th, <https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/05/13/coronavirus-pandemic-depression-economy-world-war/>

On balance, however, I do not think that even the extraordinary economic conditions we are witnessing today are going to have much impact on the likelihood of war. Why? First of all, if depressions were a powerful cause of war, there would be a lot more of the latter. To take one example, the United States has suffered 40 or more recessions since the country was founded, yet it has fought perhaps 20 interstate wars, most of them unrelated to the state of the economy. To paraphrase the economist Paul Samuelson’s famous quip about the stock market, if recessions were a powerful cause of war, they would have predicted “nine out of the last five (or fewer).”

Second, states do not start wars unless they believe they will win a quick and relatively cheap victory. As John Mearsheimer showed in his classic book Conventional Deterrence, national leaders avoid war when they are convinced it will be long, bloody, costly, and uncertain. To choose war, political leaders have to convince themselves they can either win a quick, cheap, and decisive victory or achieve some limited objective at low cost. Europe went to war in 1914 with each side believing it would win a rapid and easy victory, and Nazi Germany developed the strategy of blitzkrieg in order to subdue its foes as quickly and cheaply as possible. Iraq attacked Iran in 1980 because Saddam believed the Islamic Republic was in disarray and would be easy to defeat, and George W. Bush invaded Iraq in 2003 convinced the war would be short, successful, and pay for itself.

The fact that each of these leaders miscalculated badly does not alter the main point: No matter what a country’s economic condition might be, its leaders will not go to war unless they think they can do so quickly, cheaply, and with a reasonable probability of success.

Third, and most important, the primary motivation for most wars is the desire for security, not economic gain. For this reason, the odds of war increase when states believe the long-term balance of power may be shifting against them, when they are convinced that adversaries are unalterably hostile and cannot be accommodated, and when they are confident they can reverse the unfavorable trends and establish a secure position if they act now. The historian A.J.P. Taylor once observed that “every war between Great Powers [between 1848 and 1918] … started as a preventive war, not as a war of conquest,” and that remains true of most wars fought since then.

The bottom line: Economic conditions (i.e., a depression) may affect the broader political environment in which decisions for war or peace are made, but they are only one factor among many and rarely the most significant. Even if the COVID-19 pandemic has large, lasting, and negative effects on the world economy—as seems quite likely—it is not likely to affect the probability of war very much, especially in the short term.

#### Countries will exercise restraint.

Christina L. Davis & Krzysztof J. Pelc 17. \*Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton. \*\*Associate Professor of Political Science at McGill University. “Cooperation in Hard Times: Self-restraint of Trade Protection.” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 61(2): 398-429. Emory Libraries.

Conclusion Political economy theory would lead us to expect rising trade protection during hard times. Yet empirical evidence on this count has been mixed. Some studies find a correlation between poor macroeconomic conditions and protection, but the worst recession since the Great Depression has generated surprisingly moderate levels of protection. We explain this apparent contradiction. Our statistical findings show that under conditions of pervasive economic crisis at the international level, states exercise more restraint than they would when facing crisis alone. These results throw light on behavior not only during the crisis, but throughout the WTO period, from 1995 to the present. One concern may be that the restraint we observe during widespread crises is actually the result of a decrease in aggregate demand and that domestic pressure for import relief is lessened by the decline of world trade. By controlling for product-level imports, we show that the restraint on remedy use is not a byproduct of declining imports. We also take into account the ability of some countries to manipulate their currency and demonstrate that the relationship between crisis and trade protection holds independent of exchange rate policies. Government decisions to impose costs on their trade partners by taking advantage of their legal right to use flexibility measures are driven not only by the domestic situation but also by circumstances abroad. This can give rise to an individual incentive for strategic self-restraint toward trade partners in similar economic trouble. Under conditions of widespread crisis, government leaders fear the repercussions that their own use of trade protection may have on the behavior of trade partners at a time when they cannot afford the economic cost of a trade war. Institutions provide monitoring and a venue for leader interaction that facilitates coordination among states. Here the key function is to reinforce expectations that any move to protect industries will trigger similar moves in other countries. Such coordination often draws on shared historical analogies, such as the Smoot–Hawley lesson, which form a focal point to shape beliefs about appropriate state behavior. Much of the literature has focused on the more visible action of legal enforcement through dispute settlement, but this only captures part of the story. Our research suggests that tools of informal governance such as leader pledges, guidance from the Director General, trade policy reviews, and plenary meetings play a real role within the trade regime. In the absence of sufficiently stringent rules over flexibility measures, compliance alone is insufficient during a global economic crisis. These circumstances trigger informal mechanisms that complement legal rules to support cooperation. During widespread crisis, legal enforcement would be inadequate, and informal governance helps to bolster the system. Informal coordination is by nature difficult to observe, and we are unable to directly measure this process. Instead, we examine the variation in responses across crises of varying severity, within the context of the same formal setting of the WTO. Yet by focusing on discretionary tools of protection—trade remedies and tariff hikes within the bound rate—we can offer conclusions about how systemic crises shape country restraint independent of formal institutional constraints. Insofar as institutions are generating such restraint, we offer that it is by facilitating informal coordination, since all these instruments of trade protection fall within the letter of the law. Future research should explore trade policy at the micro level to identify which pathway is the most important for coordination. Research at a more macro-historical scope could compare how countries respond to crises under fundamentally different institutional contexts. In sum, the determinants of protection include economic downturns not only at home but also abroad. Rather than reinforcing pressure for protection, pervasive crisis in the global economy is shown to generate countervailing pressure for restraint in response to domestic crisis. In some cases, hard times bring more, not less, international cooperation.

## EU

### AT: Harmonization---1NC

#### Differences in enforcement and judiciary ensure divergence .

James Keyte 18. Director of the Fordham Competition Law Institute, an adjunct professor of Comparative Antitrust Law at Fordham Law School, and an Editor of ANTITRUST, Fall 2018. “Why the Atlantic Divide on Monopoly/Dominance Law and Enforcement Is So Difficult to Bridge.” <https://www.antitrustinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/fall18-keyte.pdf>

Setting the Stage

To start, there are simple differences that are not likely to change any time soon. Article 102 is both more specific and broader than Section 2 of the Sherman Act, and the enforce- ment and judicial systems also are quite distinct. Unlike in the U.S., in the EU’s administrative law system, the Commis- sion is the investigator, prosecutor, and decision maker; it does not have to go to court to impose penalties or other remedies. Moreover, in contrast to the U.S., the Commis- sion’s decisions are given significantly more discretion with respect to competition policy choices and the assessment of complex economic issues.2

#### No internal link---Ban says if Russia sends extra gas Europe will be fine---they don’t have evidence they won’t.

#### No modelling---divergences in implementation inevitable, especially with an arbitrary standard.

Ma. Joy V. Abrenica 18. Professor, School of Economics, University of the Philippines Diliman. BALANCING CONSUMER WELFARE AND PUBLIC INTEREST IN COMPETITION LAW. 13:2 Asian J WTO & Int'l Health L & Pol'y 443. 2018. Pg 448-449

The economic approach to antitrust enforcement has been embraced not only by the U.S. and European Commission (hereinafter "EC"), but also by developing countries whose antitrust laws were very much influenced by these two regimes. The OECD describes the convergence among antitrust regimes as follows: There is general consensus that the basic objective of competition law is to protect and preserve competition as the most appropriate means of ensuring the efficient allocation of resources . . . in free market economies. While countries differ somewhat in defining efficient market outcomes, there is general agreement that the concept is manifested by lower consumer prices, higher quality products and better product choice. 22 But the adoption of a common framework has not resulted in uniform implementation of competition principles. This is because most competition regimes are still conditioned by the zeitgeist of their own competition law, as well as by social and political realities in the domestic front. Two opposing philosophies are driving antitrust enforcement in different directions. One perspective presumes that unencumbered markets are vulnerable to abuse of dominance and collusion among competing producers; thus vigorous enforcement is necessary to preserve competition. Another perspective holds that market competition is robust and could prevail upon any private attempt to suppress it; therefore, rigid enforcement is counterproductive as it could undermine rivalry, hinder innovation and thus harm consumers in the long term. Most regimes would strive for the middle ground, i.e., neither intransigent nor too lenient. However, the effects of and intent behind market behavior are rarely apparent and often difficult to discern. This could result in a finding of infringement when in fact the conduct is a legitimate response to competitive pressure (type 1 error), or a failure to foil an anticompetitive conduct as it is mistaken for an innocuous pursuit of efficiency (type 2 error). Both types of error could ruin competition. Indeed, striking the right balance in enforcement is arduous and mature jurisdictions are not exempted from the challenge. One observes notable disagreements between the U.S. and EC on such issues as refusal to deal and reverse patent payments, for example, as well as flip-flopping of decisions on various forms of vertical restraints. The divergence in views and inconsistencies in decision is probably inevitable as the understanding of economic behavior and market processes continue to evolve. Boudreaux explained: Almost all of the original bases for antitrust intervention have been shattered by sound economics. Price-cutting is no longer an obvious means of monopolizing; bigness is no longer believed to be inevitable, inevitably harmful, or perpetual; and the myriad contracting arrangements devised by actual market participants are increasingly understood to enhance competition despite having been ignored by authors of textbooks. The advances that have occurred in economic theorizing are generally abstruse demonstrations of theoretical possibilities. Only when these theories have been supported by solid empirical findings should they serve as the basis for policy . . .. (emphases added)23 Against this perplexed environment in the backdrop, the meshing of public interest and competition objectives adds further complication, uncertainty and unpredictability in competition enforcement.

#### Don’t solve Russia war---the internal link is about info-ops Russia is engaged in---lower energy prices doesn’t reduce Russian cyber warfare.

#### Harmonizing competition policy fails – cultural and social costs

Cenuk Sayekti, 20. Lecturer in law at Universitas Lancang Kuning, Riau. Her bachelor's and master's degrees are in law from the Universitas Islam Indonesia. "COMPETITION LAW HARMONIZATION: WHAT ASEAN CAN LEARN FROM OTHERS?" Refleksi Hukum: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum 4, no. 2 (2020): 195-216.

CONCLUSION

There is a reason why some regional economic communities delay or avoid the process of harmonization stem from the perception of different treatment to market behavior. Another obstacle is the problem of legal culture and the effect of the history of a nation on its competition policy and law. The central point regarding this obstacle is that ASEAN member states legal differences often stem from different cultures and social preferences. Specific rules are often suited to local traditions and customs, and even if harmonization enhances foreign trade opportunities among the member states, it may impose quite substantial short-run adaptation costs. Accordingly, the chance to harmonize different competition policies and laws in the ASEAN member states cannot be ultimately seen as an uncontroversial positive effort or one that is free of conflict. The increased integration of trade and national laws also creates fault-lines of cultural dissonance.

#### Reuters evidence is not about antitrust at all---it’s about preventing company manipulation---doesn’t say aff is key.

### AT: Russia War---1NC

#### No impact---the idea that a limited US-Russia war would go nuclear is Western propaganda.

Dr. Kristin Ven Bruusgaard 2020. Ph.D., Kings College London, Defense Studies. M.A. Security Studies, Georgetown University. Certificate in Eurasian, Russian & Eastern European Studies. Norwegian Defense Intelligence & Security School. B.A. (Hons) Politics and International Studies, Warwick University. MacArthur Nuclear Security Postdoctoral Fellowship, Center for International Security and Cooperation (CISAC) Stanford University. Previous Research Fellow at the Norwegian Institute for Defense Studies (IFS), worked a senior security policy analyst in the Norwegian Armed Forces, at the Norwegian Defense Research Establishment (FFI) and at the Congressional Research Service (CRS) in Washington, D.C., and at NATO HQ. “Russian nuclear strategy and conventional inferiority” Routledge Taylor & Francis Group. Journal of Strategic Studies 2020, 1-33 <https://doi.org/10.1080/01402390.2020.1818070>

**Western debates on Russian nuclear strategy** picked up significantly after the invasion of Crimea in 2014. [11](https://www.tandfonline.com/reader/content/10.1080/01402390.2020.1818070/format/epub/EPUB/xhtml/index.xhtml#fn0011) The perception of changed Russian foreign policy intentions, a modernised nuclear arsenal, and a reduced Russian interest in preserving arms control produced renewed debate on the content of Russian nuclear strategy. Contemporary debates revolve around **whether Russia has a strategy that involves the early and limited use of sub-strategic nuclear weapons**: a doctrine that has been called ‘escalating to de-escalate’. [12](https://www.tandfonline.com/reader/content/10.1080/01402390.2020.1818070/format/epub/EPUB/xhtml/index.xhtml#fn0012) US nuclear policy officially diagnoses Russian nuclear strategy according to this thesis. [13](https://www.tandfonline.com/reader/content/10.1080/01402390.2020.1818070/format/epub/EPUB/xhtml/index.xhtml#fn0013) The key proposition is that Russia’s threshold of nuclear weapons use is low and that it would use nuclear weapons early and in a limited manner in conflict in order to ‘de-escalate’ it and bring it to an early and decisive end. [14](https://www.tandfonline.com/reader/content/10.1080/01402390.2020.1818070/format/epub/EPUB/xhtml/index.xhtml#fn0014) The potentially coercive utility of nuclear weapons may provide a temptation for Russian policymakers to **pursue aggressive or revisionist ambitions against NATO states**. [15](https://www.tandfonline.com/reader/content/10.1080/01402390.2020.1818070/format/epub/EPUB/xhtml/index.xhtml#fn0015) According to this school, Russia believes the West is risk-averse and would be unable to remain united in a severe crisis. [16](https://www.tandfonline.com/reader/content/10.1080/01402390.2020.1818070/format/epub/EPUB/xhtml/index.xhtml#fn0016) Russia could use nuclear weapons to uphold a changed status quo and to force a Western surrender. [17](https://www.tandfonline.com/reader/content/10.1080/01402390.2020.1818070/format/epub/EPUB/xhtml/index.xhtml#fn0017) Although this **interpretation has gained prominence in Western policy circles**, a closer examination of its logic and assumptions demonstrates **three key shortcomings**. First, it **mirrors Western Cold War theories** about the coercive utility of rapid nuclear escalation onto Russian strategy. It **assumes that Russian leaders believe that it is possible to control escalation** because the adversary would be unwilling or incapable of matching it. Yet, a closer examination of the **evidence conveys a sustained Russian debate on the problem of controlling escalation**. Russian strategists debate the utility and credibility of a lowered nuclear threshold and the appropriate criteria for when to use nuclear weapons in conflict. [18](https://www.tandfonline.com/reader/content/10.1080/01402390.2020.1818070/format/epub/EPUB/xhtml/index.xhtml#fn0018) This debate has **produced a push for improved conventional options as a supplement to limited nuclear options**. This debate about how conventional and nuclear capabilities combined convey deterrent credibility is crucial to understanding Russian nuclear strategy today. Second, this Western interpretation of Russian strategy fails to reflect how Russian planners conceptualise the utility of nuclear weapons differently based on different conflict types. [19](https://www.tandfonline.com/reader/content/10.1080/01402390.2020.1818070/format/epub/EPUB/xhtml/index.xhtml#fn0019) The interpretation takes cues from limited war scenarios and limited objectives, derived from Russia’s 2008 war with Georgia and 2014 war in Ukraine. The coercive fait accompli model from the Crimean annexation is taken as key evidence of Russian ambitions to coerce NATO. [20](https://www.tandfonline.com/reader/content/10.1080/01402390.2020.1818070/format/epub/EPUB/xhtml/index.xhtml#fn0020) However, this model of potential nuclear weapons use **disregards the context** in which Russian strategists debated early and limited nuclear weapons use: **a regional war in which Russia was threatened by large-scale conventional aggression**. [21](https://www.tandfonline.com/reader/content/10.1080/01402390.2020.1818070/format/epub/EPUB/xhtml/index.xhtml#fn0021) **Russian strategists never argued that Russia should employ nuclear de-escalation in limited wars that were about limited objectives**. **Yet, Western debates have fixated on Russian limited nuclear use in limited war.** [**22**](https://www.tandfonline.com/reader/content/10.1080/01402390.2020.1818070/format/epub/EPUB/xhtml/index.xhtml#fn0022)Third, this interpretation of Russian nuclear strategy applies a static and potentially **outdated model of how nuclear weapons compensate for conventional inferiority**. It fails to account for the significant evolution in Russian conventional capabilities in the post-Cold War period and for how this has affected Russia’s reliance on nuclear threats. Much of the evidence used to back up the **predominant Western interpretation** of Russian strategy is from strategy debates and official statements of the late 1990s and early 2000s. [23](https://www.tandfonline.com/reader/content/10.1080/01402390.2020.1818070/format/epub/EPUB/xhtml/index.xhtml#fn0023) In this period, Russia did signal a reduced nuclear threshold, due to its lack of conventional response options. But even then, Russian strategists identified the key vulnerability in nuclear de-escalation, that of credibility and escalation management, and sought improved conventional capabilities to remedy for this vulnerability. [24](https://www.tandfonline.com/reader/content/10.1080/01402390.2020.1818070/format/epub/EPUB/xhtml/index.xhtml#fn0024) In the twenty years since, Russian strategy has evolved conceptually in how conventional and nuclear tools can influence an adversary, and materially in the balance of nuclear and conventional capabilities. States that face a conventionally superior adversary do not necessarily lean back and rest on their nuclear laurels: some seek to rectify their conventional inferiority. This suggests a need to re-examine existing theories about how conventional and nuclear forces and strategy affect each other.

#### Their impact starts at 0.38%

Luisa Rodriguez 19, research fellow at the Forethought Foundation for Global Priorities Research, she also researched nuclear war at Rethink Priorities and as a visiting researcher at the Future of Humanity Institute, holds an M.A. from The Heller School for Social Policy and Management at Brandeis University, “How likely is a nuclear exchange between the US and Russia?”, https://forum.effectivealtruism.org/posts/PAYa6on5gJKwAywrF/how-likely-is-a-nuclear-exchange-between-the-us-and-russia

My previous posts address how bad a nuclear war is likely to be, conditional on there being a nuclear war (see [this post on the deaths caused directly by a US-Russia nuclear exchange](https://forum.effectivealtruism.org/posts/pMsnCieusmYqGW26W/how-bad-would-nuclear-winter-caused-by-a-us-russia-nuclear), and [this post on the deaths caused by a nuclear famine](https://forum.effectivealtruism.org/posts/dtQ5hpYjniYKWhmhx/would-us-and-russian-nuclear-forces-survive-a-first-strike)), but they don’t consider the likelihood that we actually see a US-Russia nuclear exchange unfold in the first place. In this post, I get a rough sense of how probable a nuclear war might be by looking at historical evidence, the views of experts, and predictions made by forecasters. I find that, if we aggregate those perspectives, there’s about a 1.1% chance of nuclear war each year, and that the chances of a nuclear war between the US and Russia, in particular, are around 0.38% per year.

A screenshot of a cell phone

Description automatically generated

## 2NC

### Cap K

#### The aff is utopian. Criticism is a prerequisite to formulating new solutions.

Paul Mason 7-17-15. Writer of Live Working or Die Fighting: How the Working Class Went Global and [PostCapitalism: A Guide to our Future](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/PostCapitalism:_A_Guide_to_our_Future). Culture and Digital Editor of Channel 4 News. Visiting Professor at the University of Wolverhampton. Bachelors in Music and Politics from the University of Sheffield. "The end of capitalism has begun," Guardian, https://www.theguardian.com/books/2015/jul/17/postcapitalism-end-of-capitalism-begun

The power of imagination will become critical. In an information society, no thought, debate or dream is wasted – whether conceived in a tent camp, prison cell or the table football space of a startup company. As with virtual manufacturing, in the transition to postcapitalism the work done at the design stage can reduce mistakes in the implementation stage. And the design of the postcapitalist world, as with software, can be modular. Different people can work on it in different places, at different speeds, with relative autonomy from each other. If I could summon one thing into existence for free it would be a global institution that modelled capitalism correctly: an open source model of the whole economy; official, grey and black. Every experiment run through it would enrich it; it would be open source and with as many datapoints as the most complex climate models. The main contradiction today is between the possibility of free, abundant goods and information; and a system of monopolies, banks and governments trying to keep things private, scarce and commercial. Everything comes down to the struggle between the network and the hierarchy: between old forms of society moulded around capitalism and new forms of society that prefigure what comes next. ... Is it utopian to believe we’re on the verge of an evolution beyond capitalism? We live in a world in which gay men and women can marry, and in which contraception has, within the space of 50 years, made the average working-class woman freer than the craziest libertine of the Bloomsbury era. Why do we, then, find it so hard to imagine economic freedom? It is the elites, cut off in their dark-limo world, whose project looks forlorn It is the elites – cut off in their dark-limo world – whose project looks as forlorn as that of the millennial sects of the 19th century. The democracy of riot squads, corrupt politicians, magnate-controlled newspapers and the surveillance state looks as phoney and fragile as East Germany did 30 years ago. All readings of human history have to allow for the possibility of a negative outcome. It haunts us in the zombie movie, the disaster movie, in the post-apocalytic wasteland of films such as [*The Road*](https://www.theguardian.com/film/movie/131971/road) or [*Elysium*](https://www.theguardian.com/film/2013/aug/22/elysium-review). But why should we not form a picture of the ideal life, built out of abundant information, non-hierarchical work and the dissociation of work from wages? Millions of people are beginning to realise they have been sold a dream at odds with what reality can deliver. Their response is anger – and retreat towards national forms of capitalism that can only tear the world apart. Watching these emerge, from the pro-Grexit left factions in Syriza to the [Front National](https://www.theguardian.com/world/marine-le-pen) and the isolationism of the American right has been like watching the nightmares we had during the [Lehman Brothers](https://www.theguardian.com/business/lehmanbrothers) crisis come true. We need more than just a bunch of utopian dreams and small-scale horizontal projects. We need a project based on reason, evidence and testable designs, that cuts with the grain of history and is sustainable by the planet. And we need to get on with it

#### Invert your standard for solvency. That’s enough to vote neg, even if the alt solves nothing.

Eugene McCarraher 19. Associate Professor of Humanities at Villanova University, PhD in US Cultural and Intellectual History from Rutgers University; The Enchantments of Mammon: How Capitalism Became the Religion of Modernity, 11/12/19, p. 15-18

Words such as “paradise” or “love” or “communion” are certainly absent from our political vernacular, excluded on account of their “utopian” connotations or their lack of steely-eyed “realism.” Although this is a book about the past, I have always kept before me its larger contemporary religious, philosophical, and political implications. The book should make these clear enough; I will only say here that one of my broader intentions is to challenge the canons of “realism,” especially as defined in the “science” of economics. As the master science of desire in advanced capitalist nations, economics and its acolytes define the parameters of our moral and political imaginations, patrolling the boundaries of possibility and censoring any more generous conception of human affairs. Under the regime of neoliberalism, it has been the chief weapon in the arsenal of what David Graeber has characterized as “a war on the imagination,” a relentless assault on our capacity to envision an end to the despotism of money.24 Insistent, in Margaret Thatcher’s ominous ukase, that “there is no alternative” to capitalism, our corporate plutocracy has been busy imposing its own beatific vision on the world: the empire of capital, with an imperial aristocracy enriched by the labor of a fearful, overburdened, and cheerfully servile population of human resources. Every avenue of escape from accumulation and wage servitude must be closed, or better yet, rendered inconceivable; any map of the world that includes utopia must be burned before it can be glanced at. Better to follow Miller’s wisdom: we already inhabit paradise, and we can never make ourselves fit to live in it if we obey the avaricious and punitive sophistry professed in the dismal pseudoscience. The grotesque ontology of scarcity and money, the tawdry humanism of acquisitiveness and conflict, the reduction of rationality to the mercenary principles of pecuniary reason—this ensemble of falsehoods that comprise the foundation of economics must be resisted and supplanted. Economics must be challenged, not only as a sanction for injustice but also as a specious portrayal of human beings and a fictional account of their history. As a legion of anthropologists and historians have repeatedly demonstrated, economics, in Graeber’s forthright dismissal, has “little to do with anything we observe when we examine how economic life is actually conducted.” From its historically illiterate “myth of barter” to its shabby and degrading claims about human nature, economics is not just a dismal but a fundamentally fraudulent science as well, akin, as Ruskin wrote in Unto This Last, to “alchemy, astrology, witchcraft, and other such popular creeds.”25 Ruskin’s courageous and bracing indictment of economics arose from his Romantic imagination, and this book partakes unashamedly of his sacramental Romanticism. “Imagination” was, to the Romantics, primarily a form of vision, a mode of realism, an insight into the nature of reality that was irreducible to, but not contradictory of, the knowledge provided by scientific investigation. Romantic social criticism did not claim the imprimatur of science as did Marxism and other modern social theories, yet the Romantic lineage of opposition to “disenchantment” and capitalism has proved to be more resilient and humane than Marxism, “progressivism,” or social democracy. Indeed, it is more urgently relevant to a world hurtling ever faster to barbarism and ecological calamity. I wrote this book in part out of a belief that many on the “left” continue to share far too much with their antagonists: an ideology of “progress” defined as unlimited economic growth and technological development, as well as an acceptance of the myth of disenchantment that underwrites the pursuit of such expansion. The Romantic antipathy to capitalism, mechanization, and disenchantment stemmed not from a facile and nostalgic desire to return to the past, but from a view that much of what passed for “progress” was in fact inimical to human flourishing: a specious productivity that required the acceptance of venality, injustice, and despoliation; a technological and organizational efficiency that entailed the industrialization of human beings; and the primacy of the production of goods over the cultivation and nurturance of men and women. This train of iniquities followed inevitably from the chauvinism of what William Blake called “single vision,” a blindness to the enormity of reality that led to a “Babylon builded in the waste.”26 Romantics redefined rather than rejected “realism” and “progress,” drawing on the premodern customs and traditions of peasants, artisans, and artists: craftsmanship, mutual aid, and a conception of property that harkened back to the medieval practices of “the commons.” Whether they believed in some traditional form of religion or translated it into secular idioms of enchantment, such as “art” or “beauty” or “organism,” Romantic anticapitalists tended to favor direct workers’ control of production; the restoration of a human scale in technics and social relations; a sensitivity to the natural world that precluded its reduction to mere instrumental value; and an apotheosis of pleasure in making sometimes referred to as poesis, a union of reason, imagination, and creativity, an ideal of labor as a poetry of everyday life, and a form of human divinity. In work free of alienation and toil, we receive “the reward of creation,” as William Morris described it through a character in News from Nowhere (1890), “the wages that God gets, as people might have said time agone.”27 Rendered gaudy and impoverished by the tyranny of economics and the enchantment of neoliberal capitalism, our sensibilities need replenishment from the sacramental imagination. As Americans begin to experience the initial stages of imperial sclerosis and decline, and as the advanced capitalist world in general discovers the reality of ecological limits, we may find in what Marx called the “prehistory” of our species a perennial and redemptive wisdom. We will not be saved by our money, our weapons, or our technological virtuosity; we might be rescued by the joyful and unprofitable pursuits of love, beauty, and contemplation. No doubt this will all seem foolish to the shamans and magicians of pecuniary enchantment. But there are more things in heaven and earth than are dreamt of on Wall Street or in Silicon Valley.

#### Any combination poisons the alt.

William Curran 16. Editor for the Antitrust Bulletin. Commitment and betrayal: Contradictions in American democracy, capitalism, and antitrust laws. Antitrust Bulletin. 2016. 61(2): 246

Scholars now link antitrust with distributional values. 11 Professor Anthony B. Atkinson wants antitrust to value the individual,1 12 recognizing as Hand did in Alcoa1 13 that "among the purposes of Congress in 1890 was a desire to put an end to great aggregations of capital because of the helplessness of the individual before them." 1 14 And it is the individual-rich and poor, but especially the poor-whom Atkinson wants to protect from the inequities of the marketplace.115 Atkinson sees as Senator John Sherman did in 1890 that the "problems that may disturb [the] social order ... none is more threatening than the inequality of condition of wealth, and opportunity that has grown within a single generation out of the concentration of capital into vast combinations to control production and trade to break down competition." 11 6 Sherman's and Hand's worries were certainly not Bork's. Hand said it best in Alcoa, "[W]e have been speaking only of the economic reasons which forbid monopoly ... [but] there are others, based upon the belief that great industrial consolidations are inherently undesirable, regardless of their economic results.",1 1 7 Bork-regardless of destructive results to democracy-would never find efficient economic results inherently undesirable. Bork would likely find democracy a "cornucopia of social values, all rather vague and undefined but infinitely attractive."iiS A definition that was surely meant to disparage, fails. What makes democracy attractive is its socially related values. 11 9 What makes it infinitely attractive are its regenerative capacities and potential for self-definition. 120 Bork blocked democracy's values so as not to tempt liberal judges. He worried needlessly. An antitrust solution to wealth's severe inequality is simply not plausible. 121 Antitrust has always been the heart of capitalism's ideology. 122 In truth, antitrust's distribution of wealth for the wealthy is more than ideology-it is heartless reality. So was Bork right? Are the fates of capitalism and antitrust intertwined? 123 And if antitrust were repealed? Professor Atkinson wants antitrust saved and used for citizens.124 But like Professors Stiglitz, Krugman, and Reich, he has fallen headfirst into antitrust's heartless ideological trap. And like the other three he would resurrect TR's trust-busting for the twenty-first century. Piketty avoids ideological traps. He learns the facts of history-unencumbered by ideologies like Bork's-and has an unobstructed vision 125 of the unequal and democratically destructive wealth of capitalism. Bork's antitrust is the wrong policy tool for a nation presumed to be dedicated to serving citizens equitably. 126

#### Neoliberalism is governmentality through conduct.

David Lebow 19. Lecturer on Social Studies at Harvard University and lawyer, “Trumpism and the Dialectic of Neoliberal Reason,” Perspectives on Politics 18(2):380-398, doi:10.1017/S1537592719000434.

I. Neoliberal Reason

As Michel Foucault and others have argued, neoliberalism entails far more than an economic doctrine favoring deregulated markets.4 It is a novel form of governmentality—a rationality linked to technologies of power that govern conduct, not just through direct state action but through liberty itself.5 Not isolated to the traditionally demarcated sphere of economics, neoliberal society entails a whole economic-juridical order.

The central program of neoliberal governmentality is the absolute generalization of competition as a universal behavioral norm. Whereas in liberal thought, the root principle of capitalism was exchange of equivalents, for neoliberal reason it is competition entailing inequality. The key result of market processes goes from specialization to selection. The competitive market is the exclusive site of rationality. It processes information, indicated by price, and is the only mechanism of producing knowledge, defined as what is profitably utilizable. Because consumers are free to refuse inferior goods or services, the price mechanism of the market system ensures optimal solutions and maximal satisfaction of preferences.

Liberal capitalism, as Karl Polanyi argued, required the construction of “fictitious” commodities like land and labor.6 These abstract, exchangeable factors of production had to be disembedded from concrete non-market social relations, norms, and values. Instead of merely disembedding commodities, neoliberalism intervenes to make competitive mechanisms regulate every moment and point in society. It strives to build an empire of market choice that invades every domain of life, and deposes all other social, political and solidaristic institutions and values.

Neoliberalism does not allege that markets are natural; competition must be constructed. Rather than endorsing laissez-faire overseen by a night watchman, it stipulates a strong state engaged in permanent vigilance, activity, and intervention to maintain artificial competition. It must not plan outcomes, which would upset the market’s innate rationality, and must be insulated from political disturbances. Economic interventionism leads down the road to serfdom; fascism and unlimited state power are its necessary results. A “minimum of economic interventionism” on the “mechanisms of the market” must be accompanied by “maximum legal interventionism” on the “conditions of the market.”7 Fixed, formal rules make up an economic constitution that inhibits planning, repulses political disruptions, and impartially safeguards competition. The state is the executor of the market and growth is the basis of public legitimacy. Governance depoliticizes public power, promotes ostensibly post-ideological technical problem-solving by experts, and relies on “best-practices” that dissolve the distinction between public and private organization.8

Unlimited generalization of competition yields an enterprise society in which calculations of supply/demand and cost/benefit become the model of all social relations. Neoliberal reason renders homo economicus, based on this model of the enterprise, the exhaustive figuration of human subjectivity. The center of economic thought shifts from labor and processes of production, exchange, and consumption to human capital and rational decision-making under conditions of scarcity. Capital is everything that can generate future income; wages are reconceived as income from capital. Labor is no longer comprehended as a commodity exchanged for a wage, but as a combination of human capital (the worker’s education and abilities) and the income stream it generates. This neoliberal subject is an aggregate of human capital who invests in his own income-generating abilities.

Neoliberalism replaces the invariant identity of the moral person as a rights-bearing citizen with a formally empty receptacle filled up through enterprising choices. It brushes aside models of freedom as self-rule achieved through moral autonomy or popular sovereignty.9 In the neoliberal “democracy of consumers,” individual consumers together constitute the sovereign that monopolizes the issuance of legitimate commands.10 Sovereign will is expressed not through political channels, but by choices in the “plebiscite of prices.”11 Whereas producers have particular interests like protectionism, consumers have a consensual and common interest; all favor the impartial functioning of market processes. In the neoliberal free society, consumers exercise their right to choose in complete independence.

II. From Keynesian State Capitalism to Neoliberal Deregulation

Situating the 2008 crisis in a historical account of American political and economic development clarifies its broader significance. The early twentieth-century Progressives were disdainful of what they took to be the chaos and waste of fin de siècle laissez-faire society. They strove to build a new American state that would replace the structural and rights-based formalisms of the nineteenth century with direct democracy and expert administration. It took the Great Depression and New Deal to bring into full bloom the Progressive commitment to pragmatic rationality. Thereafter, the “policy state” was authorized to pursue designated social goals and develop the means to accomplish them.12 The slew of New Deal innovations included state oversight of labor negotiations, invigorated antitrust, Keynesian countercyclical deficits to stimulate demand and increase purchasing power, an expansive public sector sheltered from the business cycle, aggressive banking regulation, and social insurance. Regulation and redistribution ensured the conditions necessary for an economic system based on capital accumulation, private property, and corporate profit to endure.

To many, the differences between the New Deal and Nazi political economies appeared less significant than their common response to monopoly capitalism. Both erased boundaries between state and society by politicizing the private sphere and authorizing public bureaucracies to rationalize crisis-prone economies. Frankfurt School member Friedrich Pollock suggested that this common “state capitalism” had solved the contradiction between the forces and relations of production, and thus overcome the economy’s crisis tendencies. It seemed to him that management had become merely technical and “nothing essential” had been “left to the laws of the market.”13 Worries abounded that the private law sphere of property and contract was necessary for individual freedom. Despite salient differences between Nazi and New Deal state capitalism, many feared that intervention into society was a waystation to domination. Unease about the specter of American despotism motivated development of mechanisms to ensure that interventionism did not devolve into arbitrary rule.14 Expertise was one justification and limitation of the policy state. Authority could be safely delegated to a new corps of public-spirited administrators because their scientific knowledge would not only make them effective, but also counsel restraint. Enduring misgivings led later to new laws of administrative process. The procedural state was legitimated by its defenders as being a substantively value-neutral and instrumentally rational machine serving goals set by society. Regulatory decision-making was shunted into the abstruse procedures of courtrooms and bureaucracies. Defenders of the state emphasized that its processes of allocating authority were neutral, impartial, and open to all. The balanced accommodation of all interest groups seeking to exercise influence would yield an equilibrium corresponding to the public interest.15

The intermeshing of state and society through interest groups, agencies, and professionalized parties marginalized the public. The sovereign public opinion that Progressives had hoped would rationalize government gave way to the rationality supposedly inherent in processes of public law, public-private negotiation, and regulated markets. The state was endowed with a diffuse legitimacy in exchange for a growing economy, broad distribution, and ongoing household capacity to consume.16 The Keynesian welfare settlement pacified the working class, protecting the market economy from more radical political pressures. Newly available, mass-produced commodities encouraged leveled-down notions of citizenship as welfare clientelism and privatistic consumption. As the state expanded and routinized, the initial politicization of private property relations through public intervention developed into depoliticized economic management by lawyers and social scientists organized by administrative and judicial processes.

The terms of the social contract preserving the coexistence of capitalism and democracy had been set. In exchange for a pacified citizenry and depoliticized regulatory authority, the policy state promised to deploy instrumental reason to sustain both capital accumulation and widely distributed capacity to consume (supported, always, by the exclusion of African Americans). During the decades of postwar growth, these twin responsibilities seemed attainable and compatible. Capitalism functioned smoothly enough and potentially delegitimating inequality was clipped by inflation, tax-based welfare, and collectively negotiated wages. But in the late 1960s and early 1970s, weakening growth, stagflation, trade deficits, and the collapse of Bretton Woods revealed that state capitalism had not solved the problems of economics. As the Great Depression had enabled construction of the instrumentally rational policy state, economic disturbances in the 1970s opened the breach into which neoliberal reason entered to reconfigure the political economy. Rather than shielding rational policy-making from political pressure and assuring broadly distributed welfare, neoliberalism promised growth driven by depoliticized markets freed from regulation and downwards redistribution. Believing in the optimal rationality of competitive markets, neoliberals sought to reinvigorate capital accumulation through deregulation, lowered taxes, financialization, privatization, and market expansion.

Liberating accumulation from the restrictions and obligations incurred under state capitalism might have imperiled capitalism’s peace treaty with democracy. For deregulation to proceed without impairing the system’s legitimacy, the quid pro quo—depoliticization for consumption—had to continue. Over the ensuing decades, as Wolfgang Streeck explains, the state “bought time” by finding new ways to generate illusions of widely distributed prosperity that prolonged the capacity of the lower and middle classes to consume.17 Each successive attempt exhausted itself, leading to new and escalating disturbances. In the 1970s, inflation safeguarded social peace by compensating workers for inadequate growth until stagflation ended this mode of buying time. A subsequent reliance on public debt enabled the government to pacify conflict with borrowed money. Rising debt and balking creditors delimited this phase, which was brought to a definitive close with the Clinton administration’s social spending cuts and balanced budgets. In a final stage that dawned in the 1980s but grew increasingly paramount over time, debt-based support of purchasing power was privatized. Household spending was financed through mortgages, student loans, and credit cards. This “privatized Keynesianism” buoyed consumption up through 2008, despite cuts to social spending, falling wages, and tightening employment markets.18

Each device for upholding spending maintained the legitimacy of the depoliticized political economy, even as liberalization continued to strip the wage-dependent population of regulatory and redistributive safeguards. The end of the inflation era brought structural unemployment and weakened trade unions. The passing of the public debt regime meant cuts to social rights, privatization of social services, and a trimmed public sector. Growing private debt enabled people to hold on despite lost savings, and rising under- and unemployment. At every step, the neoliberal project was “dressed up” as a consumption project.19 Continuing consumption ensured legitimacy long enough to enact total transformation of the political economy.

The state could not buy time indefinitely. The 1970s had already witnessed the beginning of the transition from a manufacturing, production-oriented economy that exported surpluses to an import-based, finance and services economy focused on consumption. As the United States went from creditor to debtor, a system of “balanced disequilibrium” took hold.20 With impunity granted as the world’s reserve currency, the United States ran mounting budget and trade deficits. To finance them, it absorbed surplus capital from abroad, much of which wended its way to Wall Street. Banks used these profits to extend credit to the working- and middle- classes. Household debt funded consumption of imported goods, returning the surplus capital abroad, and completing the circuit of global trade. This system depended on the unsustainable condition of ever-increasing debt-based consumption. Consumption was notoriously reinforced by secondary markets in what was essentially private money (securitized derivatives and collateralized debt obligation) that was much riskier than assumed. Because increasingly irresponsible lending was integral to continuing the consumption that stabilized the macroeconomic system, it became a sort of vicious collective good that progressively magnified the scale of the inevitable crash.21 When in 2008 the debt finally proved unserviceable and the housing bubble burst, the private money disappeared and the disequilibrated global economic system fell into crisis.

Consumption based on private debt had provided an unstable bridge over the yawning inequality brought about by deregulation, financialization, globalization, and the diminished welfare state. When the 2008 crisis dried up credit, it revealed a divided “dual economy.”22 On one side is the primary sector of elite, highly-educated professionals who are collected in coastal urban centers and tied in to corporate management, technological innovation and oversight of global capital flows. On the other is the secondary sector of low-skilled workers primarily fixed in the heartland, for whom deregulated competition has brought under- or unemployment, job instability, depressed wages, exploding debt, and diminished prospects.

Unable to buy more time, the state’s breach of the postwar social contract has been exposed. The neoliberal system of capital accumulation was entrenched at the expense of broad and sustainable consumption. The results have been the politicization of defrauded citizens and a political economy plunged into legitimation crisis. Time has belied the premature conclusion that contradiction and crisis potential had been overcome by state capitalism. Contradiction was relocated into cross-cutting imperatives for the state to enable capital accumulation and distribute consumption. In hindsight, we find only a window of stabilization of an enduring crisis potential built into capitalist political economy. As Nancy Fraser puts it “on the one hand, legitimate, efficacious public power is a condition of possibility for sustained capital accumulation; on the other hand, capitalism’s drive to endless accumulations tends to destabilize the very public power on which it relies.”23 The political fallout from the 2008 crisis marks the end of the postwar social contract that had established conditions ensuring the

#### Boom & Bust cycles make cartelization, slow growth, and devastated innovation in the chemical sector inevitable.

Alan Maass 21. Communications staff for Rutgers AAUP-AFT. Marxism Shows Us How Our Problems Are Connected. Jacobin. 1-5-2021. https://jacobinmag.com/2021/01/marxism-capital-socialism-capitalism-book-review

When Things Fall Apart

Marxist economics explains not only how capitalism works but why it regularly doesn’t — during the periodic economic busts that inevitably follow the booms. As Marx and Engels wrote:

Society suddenly finds itself put back into a state of momentary barbarism; it appears as if a famine, a universal war of devastation had cut off the supply of every means of subsistence; industry and commerce seem to be destroyed. And why? Because there is too much civilization, too much means of subsistence, too much industry, too much commerce.

Of course, in a world where billions go without enough food, there’s no such thing as “too much means of subsistence.” There’s only too much from the point of view of the capitalists — too much to sell their products at an acceptable profit.

Thier introduces the chapters on capitalist crisis by unpacking a long quotation from Engels that ends: “The contradiction between socialized production and capitalistic appropriation is reproduced as the antagonism between the organization of production in the single factory and the anarchy of production in society as a whole.”

Under capitalism, production within workplaces is generally highly regimented, but the economy as a whole is a free-for-all. Businesses make their investment decisions behind closed doors, each hoping to get a leg up on the competition — by introducing the most popular model, the new product, the next trend. Success means a greater share of the market and therefore more profits.

All the important questions for society as a whole — how much food should be produced, how many homes to build, what kind of drugs to research and manufacture, how to generate electricity — are decided by the free market.

In economic good times, success seems contagious. Companies make ambitious investments, produce more and more, and watch the money roll in. But when enough companies jump in, the market gets saturated, sales slump, debts grow, and the record profits start to sink. The effects spread from part of the economy to the next, as Thier explains, using the example of oil:

If refineries sit idle because there is an overproduction of oil, the workers are laid off, and the creditors, who financed the investment, are dragged down as well. But as future oil extraction and refining projects are pulled back, so too is demand for the raw materials (steel, concrete, plastics, electricity, etc.) and engineering necessary for the production of oil rigs, pipelines, and so on. The construction business and service and retail companies, which had benefited from the springing up of oil boomtowns, suffer as well.

Because of the complexity of the international capitalist economy, the boom-slump roller-coaster ride can look and feel different each time around. Thier devotes a chapter to analyzing the crash last time: the Great Recession of 2008–9. She explains why and how the parasitical realm of banking and finance was the detonator of this slump but looks beyond popular left explanations about “financialization” to reveal the underlying crisis of global overproduction.

Among Marxist economics writers, there are some disagreements about the details here, specifically about “which aspects of Marx’s writing — falling profitability, overproduction (or in some cases, underproduction), disproportionality among branches, the role of credit — are emphasized and how these pieces fit together,” Thier writes.

In her account, Thier tends to stress overproduction, to the disappointment of those who emphasize falling profit rates. This focus on overproduction crucially emphasizes how an organic mechanism of capitalism — inevitable in a system driven by exchange, exploitation, and competition — repeatedly causes crisis.

Regardless of their ideology or morality (or lack thereof), capitalists are inevitably driven to reduce costs, they inevitably see an advantage in producing more for less, and this inevitably leads to frantic overproduction that undermines profitability and ultimately slams the economy into reverse.

In other words, capitalism stops working not because of a mistake or failed policy, but because it’s been working the way it’s supposed to. As Thier writes:

Competition is the mainstay of capitalism. It can’t be made friendlier or softer because it requires an accumulation of capital at any cost, in order to get ahead or get left behind.… These same processes of accumulation necessarily lead to contradictions that threaten the very profits that capitalists seek. Every contradiction for capitalism is both a great hazard to our lives — since we are made to pay the price — and also an important crack in the system. Every periodic crisis is a potential point around which to organize.

#### Off-shoring.

Jerry Kopf et al 13 . Professor of Economics, Radford University. Charles Vehorn, Professor of Economics, Radford University. Joel Carnevale, Professor of Economics, Syracuse University. “Emerging Oligopolies in Global Markets: Was Marx Ahead of His Time?” Journal of Management Policy and Practice 14(3): 96-98. <http://www.m.www.na-businesspress.com/JMPP/KopfJ_Web14_3_.pdf>

With firms branching out into global competition and countries lowering their trade barriers to promote such competition, the absence of effective global regulation once again raises Marx concerns. Because of strong federal governments, national governments were able to pass and enforce, through the uses of military or police force where necessary, laws that regulated externalities, such as pollution, and antitrust. At the moment there is no strong federal government at the global level and, therefore, no one to pass and enforce laws that effectively regulate externalities or antitrust. Epstein and Greve raise a Marx like concern, “when firms have international market power, one would expect them to behave as monopolists just like domestic firms with market power” (2004). Therefore, without any dominant form of regulatory governance, industry concentration could very well replicate what was seen in the late 19th century, though, globally instead of nationally. Carstensen & Farmer discusses this tendency towards M&A’s: The transformation of formerly regulated or noncompetitive industries to competition is closely linked with merger movements. The historical record demonstrates that once faced with competition, leading firms in these industries began to merge. This has been the pattern in airlines, banks, railroads, electric and gas utilities, health care and, with great prominence, telecommunications (2008). While some may argue that reaching that level of concentration is unlikely, one should consider current industries that hold a considerable global market share. “Although it may be more difficult to establish and maintain market power internationally, there is no reason to believe that it is impossible or, for that matter, rare. Industries such as pharmaceuticals, passenger aircraft, and software illustrate the phenomenon” (Epstein & Greve, 2004). There are actually quite a few firms who have emerged into the global market that hold what can be considered a significant share within global industries, ranging from manufacturing, financial intermediation, and transport service along with other service industries. For example, The European Aeronautic Defense and Space Company and The Boeing Company combined hold more than 50% market share within the global civil aerospace products manufacturing industry. Goldman and Sachs hav2 20.20% market share within the global investment banking and brokerage industry and Vivendi holds 20.10% within the global music production and distribution industry. United Parcel Service holds 23.80%, within the global logistics – couriers industry (IBISW, 2011). We do not intend to imply that the monopolization that had plagued the United States in the late 19th century has emulated itself at the global level, creating one dominant firm controlling an entire global industry. However, it does appear that a number of industries are starting to exhibit Marx, “inevitable move toward a monopoly.” The increase in oligopoly power at the global level presents unprecedented challenges. Reaching a cross-country consensus on competition policy is a difficult. Epstein & Greve discuss some of the issues that arise when attempting to unite foreign and domestic competition policy. Competition policy embodies imprecise normative judgments that invite controversy and defection rather than consensus and commitment. Because its scope extends to such a wide range of economic activity, it has the potential to inflict significant costs on many transactors. In particular, competition policy tempts states both to impose nominally neutral policies that favor local producers and consumers at the expense of global welfare, and to administer their policies in a discriminatory fashion to similar ends” (2004). While more and more countries are adopting competition policies, this seemingly positive step towards unification of trust law has its negative effects. “Nearly one hundred jurisdictions now have antitrust laws” according to Epstein & Greve, this raises increasing issues of “jurisdictional overlaps” since many countries will assert their “jurisdiction over extraterritorial conduct that has a domestic impact” (2004). Antitrust enforcement agencies around the world have tried to cope with the increased power of global corporations by staying in regular and increasing contact with one another on individual merger cases as well as on general issues of mutual enforcement interest. Through instruments such as the 1995 Recommendation of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) that its 29 members cooperate with one another in antitrust enforcement and bilateral agreements like that which exists between the United States and the European Community, the antitrust agencies notify one another when a case under investigation affects another's important interests and they share what information they can and otherwise cooperate in the investigation and resolution of those cases (1999). Richard Parker, Senior Deputy Director of the Bureau of Competition FTC, presenting on global merger enforcement, discussed the implementation of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and concluded with examples of global merger enforcement. While attempts at unified standards of competition policy are underway, the efforts of the OECD are considered to have substantial limitations on enforcing global merger laws. Epstein and Greve state: Information sharing or “soft” cooperation has also been pursued at the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, which has generated several aspirational texts. None of these impose obligations on states, and they are not intended to do so. Their goals are modestly limited to improving communication on competition issues. History shows us that even with a strong federal government with the ability to enforce laws through the use of force where necessary, such as the United States federal government has on its states, firms are very good at ignoring or getting around antitrust laws. If the U.S. government did not have strong federal power over states, and it was up to the states to reach agreements on antitrust laws, one can easily imagine that there would likely be problems resulting in less strenuous competition policy. Take for example state control over age discrimination laws. When these laws originated, states chose whether to enact policies aimed at protecting workers rights. By 1960 only 8 states had age discrimination laws until the federal government enacted such regulations as the Age Discrimination Employment Act of 1967 (ADEA). This, along with the Department of Labor in 1979 giving administrative authority to the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), established unified laws protecting individual employment rights (Lahey, 2007). Without this dominant authority of the federal government, fair employment practices may still continue to be a regionally dependent right. In the current era of globalization, where industry’s actions domestically can be felt by all corners of the globe and vice versa, without a global entity with strong “federal” powers capable of monitoring and enforcing competition policy, it seems reasonable to conclude that Marx may in fact be proven correct: the inevitable result of the efficient market is increasing concentration of power resulting in global oligopolies or, eventually, monopolies.

#### We also have a link to their method---class action lawsuits fail. Judicial redress is the worst remedy to antitrust. Justices are corporate activists that defang anti-oligarchy efforts through court sanctioned union busting and violence.

Joseph Fishkin 21. Marrs McLean Professor in Law at the University of Texas, Austin. Courts And Constitutional Political Economy. 7-24-21. <https://lpeproject.org/blog/courts-and-constitutional-political-economy/> //shree

For most of American history, all sides in most major fights about the nation’s political economy agreed about one thing: the questions they were fighting about were constitutional in nature. In other words, they were fighting about constitutional political economy. This point is central to a book project that Willy Forbath and I have been working on for a few years, The Anti-Oligarchy Constitution: Reconstructing the Economic Foundations of American Democracy (forthcoming January 2022). We tell a story about rival visions of constitutional political economy stretching back to the Founding Era and how advocates of these visions fought out their differences both through politics and in court at different moments in American history. We are especially interested in what we call the “democracy of opportunity” tradition, which runs from the founding through the New Deal, whose (varied) advocates contended, by and large, that the Constitution required that we enact laws to disperse economic and political power, rather than letting it get concentrated in too few hands. We also explore various rival traditions, from the distinctive constitutional political economy arguments of the defenders of slavery to the anti-redistributive constitutional political economy arguments that crystallized a century ago into what we now call Lochnerism.

You’ll notice I said “through politics and in court.” A central theme of the book is that for most of American history there has not been much separation (if any) between the constitutional political economy arguments advocates make in the courtroom, in the legislative hearing room, at a protest rally, or on the stump as candidates for office. And yet there does seem to be a noticeable pattern, which is my topic in this blog post. For advocates of the democracy of opportunity tradition—the tradition holding that the Constitution required (among other things) crushing the landed Southern oligarchy of the Slave Power; breaking up the trusts and monopolies; taxing the incomes of the rich; distributing land, education, and opportunity to ordinary Americans; and enforcing workers’ rights to organize and strike—courts have generally been the least hospitable of the three branches of government.

The pattern is pretty striking. Painting with a bit of a broad brush—this is a blog post—it seems fair to say that American courts have, much more often than not, taken a particular side in fights about constitutional political economy. Courts have taken the side of holding that the Constitution protects the rights of aristocracy and oligarchy to maintain their outsized economic and political power. Many Americans have argued that the Constitution requires just the opposite, but they have found a more receptive audience, on the whole, in the democratically elected branches than in the courts. Over the course of American history, the elected branches have built a considerably more open and democratic political economy than the courts generally have wanted to allow. Today, as courts eviscerate voting rights and campaign finance laws, and take whacks at public employee unions and social safety net programs such as the Affordable Care Act, this particular alignment of the branches of government is with us again. But why? Why this alignment, so much more often than the reverse?

The pattern began in earnest with Reconstruction. To the Radical Republicans, it was obvious that racial inclusion was impossible without destroying the planter oligarchy and building a mass, multi-racial middle class in the South. As Thaddeus Stevens put it, “The whole fabric of southern society must be changed . . . [i]f the South is ever to be made a safe republic.” There can be no “republican institutions . . . in a mingled community of nabobs and serfs.” But as violent white supremacists undid Reconstruction, the Court abetted them by finding ways to eviscerate the Reconstruction Amendments, striking down key parts of the core civil rights statutes that Congress had enacted to enforce the Amendments. The Court’s gutting of those statutes left Black citizens unprotected from most discrimination, disenfranchisement, and even massacre by white terrorist mobs. However, the same Court was receptive to claims that the Reconstruction Amendments protected corporations and their freedom from various forms of government regulation.

The Supreme Court during this period—which was a long period, spanning much of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries—managed to surprise almost everyone by striking down an income tax on the highest earners as unconstitutional (a decision eventually overturned by constitutional amendment). Frequently, federal courts, including the Supreme Court, found ways to weaken the antitrust laws that Congress enacted. Courts attacked efforts to organize labor unions with sweeping injunctions, court-sanctioned state violence, and jail terms aimed at protecting employers’ rights to an uninterrupted flow of non-union workers. (These are just a few highlights; there are many more in the book.) When you read some of these decisions today, they barely read like what we recognize as law—the class politics is so raw and right on the surface. But the views of those judges were predictable. The early-twentieth-century Republican Party that dominated American politics and judicial appointments in that era was the party of big business; the federal courts were stacked with elite lawyers from the emerging corporate bar, whose jobs before they joined the bench mostly involved serving the railroads and the trusts and their owners, the oligarchs of the Gilded Age. It would have been surprising if these judges had not been activists bent on finding ways to thwart the democratic branches’ efforts to rein in oligarchy.

So what about when American politics turned? After President Franklin Roosevelt’s dramatic confrontation with the Lochner Court, the Court retreated and upheld the New Deal, ushering in a new constitutional regime. The Court reconceived its role, especially after World War II, as the nation’s protector of civil liberties and, eventually, civil rights. The Court upheld many laws parallel to the ones it had struck down after Reconstruction, such as the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. But that was the most important thing it did in its brief period of mid-20th-century liberalism: step out of the way. The Warren Court has a reputation for activism, and many of its decisions—Brown v. Board of Education, the criminal procedure revolution, one-person-one-vote—were indeed activist holdings. But when it came to economic inequality, the Warren Court was operating during the period of American history when inequality was at its most muted (the “great compression”). Restraining oligarchy, or building up the middle class as a bulwark of Republican government, was not on the Court’s docket. Some observers expected the Court to do more—to enlist the Constitution in the War on Poverty, set constitutional minimum welfare guarantees, or equalize school funding—but in the end, it didn’t. And then the Court took a long right turn, and now we are once again in a Gilded Age, with the Court playing the familiar role it played a century before, as the branch where efforts to build a democracy of opportunity can most readily expect to be crushed.

There is a lot of contingency in American history, perhaps especially when it comes to courts. But it seems to me non-coincidental that the Court has so consistently been the least dangerous branch to aristocrats and oligarchs and their efforts to concentrate economic and political power. The simplest reason is this: efforts to restrain concentrations of private power—whether it’s the landed aristocrats Jefferson worried about at the founding, their Slave Power successors, or the monopolist robber barons of the Gilded Age—require the exercise of public power in the form of legislation. There are supporting roles to be played here by executives executing legislation and by courts interpreting it. But fundamentally, courts are not equipped to initiate or lead the work—the constitutionally necessary work—of laws like the Sherman Antitrust Act, the National Labor Relations Act, the Social Security Act, the Civil Rights Act, the Voting Rights Act, or the Affordable Care Act (to name a few!). Courts can interpret these statutes in ways that further the statutes’ goals, or courts can try to thwart them. But courts are not equipped to move first or take the lead in advancing these statutes’ goals. On the other hand, courts are better equipped to recognize the anti-redistributive, so-called libertarian claims of property, contract, and so on that some of these statutes might be viewed as threatening. Those claims are of a form that we still teach in the first year of law school: an individual claimant, standing on old common law-ish rights, against the redistributive machinations of the progressive state.

#### Critique is prior---we must challenge neoliberal mindsets and constrictions on knowledge production before considering the role of policies. Decolonization of the mind is a prerequisite to developing alternatives

Mathieu HILGERS, Laboratory for Contemporary Anthropology, Université Libre de Bruxelles, and Centre for Urban and Community Research, Goldsmiths, University of London, 13 [“Embodying neoliberalism: thoughts and responses to critics,” *Social Anthropology*, Vol. 21, No. 1, February 2013, p. 75-89, Accessed Online through Emory Libraries]

The implementation of neoliberalism goes far beyond the mere appearance of its policies. It cannot be reduced to the application of a programme or to institutional changes. This implementation is deployed within a triangle constituted by policies, institutions and dispositions. This last component has remained at the margins of our debate. If we wish to grasp the depth of the changes that neoliberalism causes, we cannot neglect its effects on systems of dispositions. To analyse this impact, it is necessary to describe the symbolic operations that give rise to government-enabling representations as well as to categories that support neoliberalism and are propagated by it. This task requires accounting for the historicity of the spaces in which policies are put into action, the intentional constructions but also involuntary historical formations in which they become entangled, and the transactions, negotiations, associations, working misunderstandings and chains of translation that give them their flexibility and support their deployment.

Neoliberalism is embodied in the agents and representations through which it is put into action. Through a historical process, the dispositions that it generates become, as Bourdieu would say, durable and transposable, as well as increasingly autonomous from their initial conditions of production. As such, when these conditions disappear or transform, or when policies are modified or abandoned, some of them spread into other social spaces and contexts and take on new meanings. Therein lies the importance of broadening the notion of ‘implementation’, so that we may appreciate the role of culture in the dynamics of neoliberal expansion. It is precisely (but not only) because of the embodiment of neoliberalism emphasized in this paper that at the moment we are nowhere near the end of the neoliberal era. Thus I arrive, by a different path, at the same observation that Kalb (2012) formulated in this debate: today it is capitalism that is in crisis, not neoliberalism.

In some parts of the world, information that helps people to stabilize their perceptions, practices and activities is mainly produced within a neoliberal context, forms and procedures. The figures, statistics, norms, audits and discourses that I evoke in this paper are fashioned by a constellation of institutions; they condition, train and shape a mental and practical space. They impact the way in which one conceives and carries out research. Indeed, academia is not outside of this neoliberal world; on the contrary, it is a centre of development and support for neoliberalism. While many academics are critical of neoliberalism, this does not mean that they have a permanent deconstructionist relation to the world and to themselves. In many parts of academia, a neoliberal way of functioning has become common sense. If neoliberalism is so present in our mind and in the way in which academia is designed and works today, it appears more than necessary for researchers to consider how this shapes their relation to production of knowledge.

If we wish to avoid the eviction of critical perspectives in this time of crisis, if we hope to have some chance to think within but beyond the neoliberal age, if we want to develop alternatives and different horizons, one of the first things to do is to decolonize our mind by objectifying our own neoliberal dispositions. The reflexive return to the tools of analysis is thus ‘not an epistemological scruple but an indispensable pre-condition of scientific knowledge of the object’ (Bourdieu 1984: 94), if we are to prevent the object and its definition from being dictated to the researcher by non-scientific logics, such as the necessity of being visible and marketable in the academy. To achieve a break with neoliberal common sense, anthropologists could follow Bourdieu (2003) in his will to engage in a ‘participant objectivation’.14 It is clearly this kind of objectivation even if not phrased in such terms that has led some researchers to call for a radical change in the academy, supported by new arguments and put into practice through the initiation of a ‘slow science’ movement.15 In some places, academia is still a space of critiques and alternatives.

#### Mineral cycles---that’s Allinson---copper, lithium, manganese hit bottlenecks.

Nafeez Ahmed 20 M.A. in contemporary war & peace studies and a DPhil (April 2009) in international relations from the School of Global Studies at Sussex University. Capitalism Will Ruin the Earth By 2050, Scientists Say. Vice. 10-21-2020. https://www.vice.com/en/article/v7m48d/capitalism-will-ruin-the-earth-by-2050-scientists-say

Endless growth will generate minerals scarcity within decades

The EV transition is, in short, a massive industrial project. Electrification of roads and rail will require upgraded smart grids, complex routes connected to high power lines, and regular battery-swap stations. The paper explores several scenarios to explore how such a transition would take place.

In a continuing GDP growth scenario, the authors note that the economy begins to stagnate “due to peak oil limits at around 2025-2040,” but GDP is able to continue growing thanks to the EV transition. This shows that the reduction in liquid fuels in transportation can play a powerful role in avoiding “energy shortages in the economy as a whole.”

But then the economy hits the limits of mineral and material production to sustain this electric transition—in just three decades. And this is even with high levels of minerals recycling.

By 2050, in this scenario, the EV transition will “require higher amounts of copper, lithium and manganese than current reserves. For the cases of copper and manganese the depletion is mainly due to the demand from the rest of the economy,” but most lithium demand “is for EV batteries,” and this alone “depletes its estimated global reserves.”

Mineral depletion takes place even with “a very high increase in recycling rates” in a continuing GDP growth scenario.

In one such scenario, the authors apply what they consider to be realistic upper level recycling rates of 57 percent, 30 percent and 74 percent to copper, lithium and manganese respectively. These are based on extremely optimistic projections of recycling capabilities relative to their costs.

But still they find that even these high recycling rates wouldn’t prevent depletion of all current estimated reserves by 2050. The conclusion corroborates findings of other studies, estimating an expected bottleneck for lithium by 2042-2045 and for manganese by 2038-2050.

Actual bottlenecks could come even earlier because existing studies—including the MEDEAS model—don’t account for material requirements needed for internal wiring, the EV motor, EV chargers, building and maintaining the grid to connect and charge EV batteries, the catenaries to electrify the railways, as well as inherent difficulties in recycling metals.

#### Their data set relies on Domestic Material Consumption.

Jason Hickel 20. He holds a bachelor's degree in anthropology from Wheaton College. Received his PhD in anthropology from the University of Virginia in August 2011. Taught at the London School of Economics from 2011 to 2017, where he held a Leverhulme Early Career Fellowship. He is currently senior lecturer in anthropology at Goldsmiths, University of London and a Visiting Senior Fellow at the International Inequalities Institute at the London School of Economics. “A RESPONSE TO MCAFEE: NO, THE "ENVIRONMENTAL KUZNETS CURVE" WON'T SAVE US.” <https://www.jasonhickel.org/blog/2020/10/9/response-to-mcafee>.

A number of people have asked me to respond to a piece that Andrew McAfee wrote for Wired, promoting his book, which claims that rich countries - and specifically the United States - have accomplished the miracle of “green growth” and “dematerialization”, absolutely decoupling GDP from resource use. I had critiqued the book’s central claims here and here, pointing out that the data he relies on is not in fact suitable for the purposes to which he puts it.

In short, McAfee uses data on domestic material consumption (DMC), which tallies up the resources that a nation extracts and consumes each year. But this metric ignores a crucial piece of the puzzle. While it includes the imported goods an economy relies on, it does not include the resources involved in extracting, producing, and transporting those goods. Because the United States and other rich economies have come to rely so heavily on production that happens in other countries, that side of resource use has been conveniently shifted off their books.

In other words, what looks like “green growth” is really just an artifact of globalization. Given how much the U.S. economy relies on globalization, McAfee’s data cannot be legitimately compared to U.S. GDP, and cannot be used to make claims about dematerialization. If McAfee wants to compare GDP to domestic resource consumption, then he needs to first subtract the share of US GDP that is derived from production that happens elsewhere. He does not. Nor is this possible to do.

Ecological economists have been aware of this problem for a long time. To correct for it, they use a more holistic metric called “raw material consumption,” or Material Footprint, which fully accounts for materials embodied in trade. When we look at this data, the story changes. We see that resource use in the United States hasn’t been falling at all; in fact, it has been rising along with GDP. The same is true of all other major industrial economies. There has been zero dematerialization. No green growth. And indeed when it comes to excess resource use, rich countries are the biggest problem - not the saviours that McAfee suggests they are.

#### Leaks cause extinction.

Kyle Ash 15 Greenpeace’s Senior Legislative Representative. One of the most quoted sources during the Copenhagen Climate Conference] “Carbon Capture SCAM” July 23, 2015 (http://www.greenpeace.org/usa/research/carbon-capture-scam/

In order for CCS to deliver a lasting benefit to the climate, the vast majority of sequestered CO2 must remain underground permanently. Geological formations proposed are sub-seabed and saline aquifers. The IEA says that depleted oil and gas reservoirs would be the most likely candidates for initial storage operations because of both their geology and proximity to industrial development.

The problem with IEA’s assertion is it is too convenient for expanding CO2-EOR operations. In addition, the multiple bore holes and wells drilled in them to find and extract oil and gas further increase the risk of leakage. The IEA also admits that, “[t] he long-term storage integrity of oil fields that have been exploited with multiple wells has yet to receive serious scientific investigation.”108

The prominent Sleipner project, a CCS storage testing site off the coast of Norway injecting CO2 scrubbed from raw gas after extraction, was found in 2012 to have many nearby fractures, warranting increased expense toward surveying the geology of such sites.109 Some scientists say it’s not a matter of if the site will leak, it’s just a question of when.110 Researchers devoted to the promise of CCS remain unconcerned.111

However, undue confidence in understanding of the geology at Sleipner is not new.112 While offshore injection may be easier for the public to accept, deepsea sites will be more difficult to monitor. There are few studies to ascertain potential effects of undersea CO2 leakage, but scientists have concluded that it may be detrimental across the ocean food web.113 CO2 leakage from sequestration could exacerbate already rising ocean acidification, since the ocean absorbs about 25% of anthropogenic CO2 pollution. This is threatening a different type of planetary disaster altogether.114

#### It’s a system of pay to pollute.

Michael Schmidlehner 21. Research Nucleus on Work, Territory and Politics in Amazonia, Brazil. Analysing the Discourse of ‘Green’ Capitalism: The Meaning of Nature in ‘Nature-Based.’ World Rainforest Movement, Bulletin 255. 5-18-21. <https://wrm.org.uy/articles-from-the-wrm-bulletin/section1/analysing-the-discourse-of-green-capitalism-the-meaning-of-nature-in-nature-based/>

The discourse of ‘green’ capitalism

More recently new and somehow different discursive constructions have emerged. Twenty or thirty years ago terms such as sustainability, biodiversity or emission reduction were used to suggest a scientific foundation of projects. During the last ten years, however, more technically vague and audience-pleasing, business-friendly expressions have increasingly come to the fore.

‘Green economy’ was propagated ten years ago as a new economic model, including a huge range of technologies – from solar energy to carbon trade – conveying the general idea, that capitalist economy is not a problem, but the solution. (3) Likewise, the idea of ‘circular bioeconomy’ (4) evokes associations with the harmonic circle of life and promises to save the planet through valuation of ‘natural capital’ and a transition to the ‘butterfly economy.’ (5) Also recently, the idea of ‘nature-based solutions’ is intensively being promoted as a supposedly new model for combating climate change and providing “human well-being and biodiversity benefits.” (6) The massive introduction of such ecological-economical all-purpose terms indicates, that the ‘sustainable development’ discourse, as described by authors like Arturo Escobar in the 1990s, is now in a different new phase and that it would more aptly be described as the discourse of ‘green’ capitalism.

So what is the reason for this change? What are the new economic and power interests that demand the adaptation of the truth regime?

The typical sustainable development projects of the 1990s, following the motto “use it or lose it”, sought to make economic use of nature by physically extracting products from protected areas, like non-timber forest products (e.g. latex, brazil nuts) or ‘sustainably harvested’ timber. Projects in the last decade, by contrast, are increasingly driven by interests in environmental and climate compensation. By this logic, in protected areas, in order for them to serve as a pawn for destruction or pollution in other areas, any human interference with so-called ‘ecosystem services’ (e.g. carbon stockage, biodiversity preservation) that are to ‘compensate’ for destruction of the same ‘service’ elsewhere, must be minimised or interdicted. What distinguishes current projects from previous ones are new mechanisms of appropriation. Environmental and climate compensation extract commercial value from nature by ‘virtualizing’ it. The so-called ‘ecosystem services,’ once quantified, are considered interchangeable. By this means, without anything being physically extracted or produced, ‘financial assets’ are created from the land in the form of certificates.

The foundational logic of such projects is not only flawed (since pay-to-pollute is not a solution), (7) but also deeply inhumane, once it ultimately aims at the criminalization and eviction of traditional peoples from their land.

In order to conceal this hardly defensible underlying rationale and its flaws, the discursive production has to be split: On the one hand, there is the highly technical jargon in technical papers, largely incomprehensible to lay people, about assessing ‘anthropic impact’ (i.e. human-induced disturbances) in ecosystems, along with calculations of emissions or biodiversity losses supposedly reduced or avoided by a project. This discursive strand is understandable only for a small group of consultants and technicians tasked with making this new form of extraction happen.

On the other hand, for the broad public the superficial euphemistic discourse of ‘nature-based solutions’ is produced. Here, the romanticisation of untouched nature goes along with a happy talk about new solutions and ‘win-win’ situations. The win-win fantasy can easily be sustained for the general public, as long as the factual loss, the destruction of livelihoods that takes place, where the impacted subaltern communities are not in a position to make themselves heard, remains hidden.

An extensive study from Brazilian researchers (8) evidenced this kind of split in the context of a prominent REDD+ project in an Amazonian indigenous territory. (9) The technical descriptions of the project, in order to ‘prove’ that the project measures will avoid deforestation that otherwise would have taken place, depict the indigenous community as notorious forest-destroyers. This information is held on the back stage, or, as the authors put it, concealed in the ‘black box’ of expert language.

On the front stage – in popular YouTube videos, glossy brochures etc. – the narrative of the indigenous people as nature-loving forest guardians is exploited. While the forest-destroyer narrative is the technical requisite for selling ‘avoided emissions’ as carbon credits, the forest-guardian narrative is necessary in order to effectively greenwash the image of the buyer, in this case a large cosmetics industry.

The mechanisms of appropriation of nature for the purpose of environmental and climate compensation are so obscene and violent, and so far from contributing to the resolution of the crises, that the general public, if they were transparent, would not accept them.

Another effective strategy to hide something is to put it in a haystack. Terms like ‘green economy’ or ‘nature-based solutions’ cover a very wide range of initiatives, programmes and projects, blurring the distinctions between them. They function as an all-encompassing label that lumps predatory offset programmes together with initiatives such as urban building greening and small-scale agroecological projects. The use of a common label suggests that all these initiatives – despite some of them seem more ‘technically complex’ than others – strive in the same direction and must ultimately have the same goal, namely preservation of the environment and climate. The purely commercial interests that are driving the compensation projects and their exclusionary nature thus remain unrecognized by much of society.

The broadness of the new terms and the ‘positivity’ of the discourse serve to further neutralise critical voices. Those who reject these terms automatically fall into the disrepute of being against any constructive contribution and can therefore easily be excluded from the discussion as notorious ‘naysayers’.

The expression ‘nature-based’ conveys the idea that the supposedly new ‘solutions’ arise from a new relationship with nature, that humans are now coming to peace with nature and learning from it. Of course, the exclusionary and predatory character of the projects behind this term makes a mockery of this notion. But the expression ‘nature-based’ in the context of such projects reveals something more fundamental.

#### Consumption

John Gibbons 21. Environmental journalist and co-author of the Routledge International Handbook of Environmental Journalism. Resolving the paradox of satisfying the needs of all while using far less energy. Irish Times. 5-6-2021. https://www.irishtimes.com/news/science/resolving-the-paradox-of-satisfying-the-needs-of-all-while-using-far-less-energy-1.4542693

‘Drastic changes’

“Our intention is to imagine a world that is fundamentally transformed, where state-of-the-art technologies merge with drastic changes in demand to bring energy (and material) consumption as low as possible, while providing decent material conditions and basic services for all”, the authors state. Only through such a radical transformation, they add, can human needs be met within critical planetary boundaries.

At present, those daring to suggest alternatives to our current model of constant economic growth or promoting steady state economics are likely to be dismissed as new age cultists or “degrowth fetishists” trying to make everyone poor.

The new study, according to lead author, Joel Millward-Hopkins of the University of Leeds, “offers a response to the cliched populist objection that environmentalists are proposing that we return to living in caves”.

The paper points out that “inequality and especially affluence, are now widely recognised as core drivers of environmental damage”. Consider that in the year since the Covid-19 pandemic began, the collective wealth of the world’s billionaires has ballooned by some $3.9 trillion (€3.2 trillion) while hundreds of millions of the world’s poorest people were plunged deeper into poverty and financial insecurity as a result of the pandemic.

Trickle-down economics

This further debunks the concept known as trickle-down economics, the notion that tax breaks for the wealthy would somehow flow towards wider society. Resources are instead being rapidly siphoned upwards towards the already wealthy and economically powerful.

The paper points out that current levels of energy usage “underpin numerous existential crises, resource scarcity and the geopolitical instabilities these issues can catalyse, especially in a growth-dependent global economy”. While there have been significant improvements in energy efficiency, these have “largely served to boost productivity and enable further growth”.

Crucially, beyond a certain point, increases in energy use in a given society deliver little or no additional benefits to that society. The study envisages, with the aid of technologies, radical demand-side transformations that largely eliminate excessive consumption and focuses available resources instead on providing the conditions required for flourishing. These include basic physical health and safety, access to clean air and safe water, good quality (largely plant-based) nutrition, and the opportunity for social and political participation.

Resolving the paradox of how to satisfy the needs of all while using far less energy and fewer resources depends on sharp global reductions in meat-eating, down by some 85 per cent in rich countries. A massive expansion of public transport globally would greatly reduce energy and emissions while allowing people to meet their transport needs without the expense of owning and running resource-intensive private cars.

Globally, much of the existing housing stock needs to be replaced over time with modern buildings with very low heating and cooling energy requirements. This would be another vital step in achieving decent living conditions with far less energy than at present.

#### Only warrant is setting prices for innovation. Capitalism stifles them. Propriety rights, no incentive for R&D

Vanessa A .Bee 18 Senior Litigation Counsel at the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau with a JD from Harvard Law. Innovation Under Socialism. 10-24-2018. <https://www.currentaffairs.org/2018/10/innovation-under-socialism>

But prioritizing profit is a double-edged sword that can hamper innovation. Owning the proprietary rights allows private firms to block workers—through anti-competitive tools like non-compete agreements, patents, and licenses—who put labor into the innovation process from applying the extensive technical expertise and intimate understanding of the product to improve the innovation substantially. This becomes especially relevant once the workers leave the firm division in which they worked, or leave the firm altogether. Understandably, this lack of control and ownership will cause some workers, however passionate they may be about a project, to be less willing to maximize their contribution to the innovation.

Of course, the so-called nimbleness that allows firms to make drastic changes like mass layoffs is extremely harmful to the workers. This is no fluke. The capitalist economy thrives on a reserve army of labor. Inching closer to full employment makes workers scarcer, which empowers the labor force as a whole to bargain for higher wages and better work conditions. These threaten the firm’s bottom line. So, the capitalist economy is structured to maintain the balance of power towards the owners of capital. Positions that pay well (and less than well) come with the precariousness of at-will employment and disappearing union power. A constant pool of unemployed labor is maintained through layoffs and other tactics like higher interest rates, which the government will compel to help slow growth and thereby hiring. This system harms the potential for innovation, too.

The fear of losing work can dissuade workers from taking risks, experimenting, or speaking up as they identify items that could improve a taken approach—all actions that foster innovation. Meanwhile, thousands of individuals who could be contributing to the innovative process are instead involuntarily un-employed. This model also encourages monopolization, as concentrating market power gives private firms the most control over how much profit they can extract. But squashing competition that could contribute fresh ideas hurts every phase of the innovation process, while giving workers in fewer workplaces space to innovate.

Deferring to profit causes many areas of R&D to go unexplored. Private firms have less reason to invest in innovations likely to be made universally available for free if managers or investors do not see much upside for the firm’s bottom line. In theory, the slack in private research can be picked up by the public sector. In reality, however, decades of austerity measures  threaten the public’s ability to underwrite risky and inefficient research. Both the Democratic and Republican parties increasingly adhere to a neoliberal ideology that vilifies “big government,” promotes running government like a business, pretends that government budgets should mirror household budgets or the private firm’s balance sheet, and rams privatization under the guises of so-called public-private partnerships and private subcontractors.

In the United States, public investment in R&D has been trending downward. As documented in a 2014 report from the Information Technology & Innovation Foundation, “[f]rom 2010 to 2013, federal R&D spending fell from $158.8 to $133.2 billion … Between 2003 and 2008, state funding for university research, as a share of GDP, dropped on average by 2 percent. States such as Arizona and Utah saw decreases of 49 percent and 24 percent respectively.” Even if public investment in the least profitable aspect of research suddenly surged, in our current model, the private sector continues to be the primary driver of development, production, and distribution. Where there remains little potential for profit, private firms will be reluctant to advance to the next phases of the innovation process. Public-private projects raise similar concerns. Coordinated efforts can increase private investment by spreading some costs and risk to the public. But to attract private partners in the first place, the public sector has a greater incentive to prioritize R&D projects with more financial upsides.

This is how the quest for profits and tight grip over proprietary rights, both important features of the capitalist model, discourage risk. Innovations are bound for plateauing after a few years, as firms increasingly favor minor aesthetic tweaks and updates over bold ideas while preventing other avenues of innovation from blossoming. At the same time, massive amounts of capital continue to float into the hands of a few. The price of innovating under capitalism is then both decreased innovation and decreased equality. The idea that this approach to innovation must be our best and only option is a delusion.

#### Our alt solves all of their “transition bad” arguments---our alt isn’t economic collapse.

Jason Hickel 20. He holds a bachelor's degree in anthropology from Wheaton College. Received his PhD in anthropology from the University of Virginia in August 2011. Taught at the London School of Economics from 2011 to 2017, where he held a Leverhulme Early Career Fellowship. He is currently senior lecturer in anthropology at Goldsmiths, University of London and a Visiting Senior Fellow at the International Inequalities Institute at the London School of Economics. “A RESPONSE TO MCAFEE: NO, THE "ENVIRONMENTAL KUZNETS CURVE" WON'T SAVE US.” <https://www.jasonhickel.org/blog/2020/10/9/response-to-mcafee>.

We can either deny this evidence, or we can face up to it. Facing up to it means rethinking the extent to which we should pursue GDP growth. Now, this is where the good news comes in. McAfee says he wants to achieve “longer, healthier lives”, improving human well-being and flourishing. That’s the goal. And here too, we agree (that’s two goals we share). But for some reason McAfee assumes that in order to do this, even high-income nations, regardless of how rich they have already become, need to keep growing their GDP, exponentially, with no identifiable end point. This is an unexamined assumption; he provides no evidence for this claim.

I get it – I used to hold this assumption too. Most people do. But the good news is that it’s not true. At least 30 years of research in ecological economics has made it clear that high-income nations don’t need to keep growing in order to improve people’s lives. They can do it right now, without any additional growth at all, simply by sharing income, resources and opportunities more fairly and investing in universal public goods. These are the interventions that matter. That’s how Spain beats the USA in life expectancy by a solid five years, and outperforms the USA on virtually every social indicator, with half of the USA’s GDP per capita. The notion that the US needs to keep growing its GDP in order to improve social outcomes is simply not supported by evidence.

By the way, we need to keep the inequality problem in mind here. According to the World Inequality Database, the richest 5% capture 46% of total global GDP. That means that nearly half of all the resources we use, and half of all the emissions we emit, is done in order to make rich people richer. In what world does this make any ecological sense? And yet McAfee has never engaged with this question.

Once we realize that we don’t need growth in order to accomplish our social goals, this makes it much easier to reduce resource and energy use, accomplish a rapid transition to renewables, and bring our economy back into balance with the living world. We should see this as liberating. And this vision is not anti-tech. On the contrary, the point is to prevent our technological gains (efficiency improvements, renewable energy, etc) from being swamped by scale effect of growth (ever-rising resource and energy demand), so that they can deliver the benefits we want them to.

Now, to McAfee’s final point: “but that would be a recession!”. And recessions, as we all know, are terrible: people lose their jobs and homes, poverty and inequality goes up, etc. Nobody wants this; and here too McAfee and I agree (that’s three). Here’s what we need to grasp, however: recessions are what happen when growth-dependent economies fail to grow; it’s a disaster. This is where degrowth comes in - to solve precisely this problem. Degrowth calls for a different kind of economy altogether: one that doesn’t require growth in the first place; one where we can reduce resource and energy use while specifically preventing unemployment and reducing inequality. The idea is to allocate resources and energy more rationally, and more democratically, to enable everyone to live flourishing lives in balance with the ecosystems we depend on.

Instead of engaging with this literature, McAfee tries to dismiss degrowth as a recession. To be frank, this is a lazy, bad faith argument. We have different words for these phenomena because, as I explain here, they are, in every respect, fundamentally different things. You can only miss this fact if you’re not reading, or if you’re intentionally seeking to mislead; either way, it is irresponsible. So, while I welcome McAfee’s engagement, this kind of claim is not helpful, and does not advance our collective understanding. My appeal to McAfee: let’s try to get beyond this sort of thing and engage more honestly with the empirical and theoretical work that has been done, so we can have more meaningful conversations. If we are going to realise our shared goals, we can and must do better.

#### State power will back off. Desperation for public legitimacy and support fueled by social protests has left politicians open to concede market failures.

Silke Helfrich & David Bollier 19. Helfrich studied romance languages and pedagogy at the Karl-Marx-University in Leipzig, served as head of Heinrich Böll Foundation Thuringia and head of the regional office of Heinrich Böll Foundation for Central America, Cuba and Mexico. Bollier worked in policy advocacy with a Member of Congress, the auto safety regulatory agency, and public-interest organizations, and co-founded Public Knowledge, a Washington advocacy organization for the public’s stake in the Internet, telecom and copyright policy.“ Free, Fair, and Alive : The Insurgent Power of the Commons” July 2019.

Revamping State Power to Support Commoning We have outlined a general stance towards the state in moving forward, but we have not burrowed into the deeper questions: In what specific ways can state power itself be altered to support commoning? What openings in law and bureaucratic behavior, or in politics and local action, might be exploited to secure stable beachheads for commoning? The first priority is to convince state institutions to back off. Recall Elinor Ostrom’s wisdom in her seventh design principle for successful commons. She asserted that state authorities must recognize the right of commoners to govern themselves.42 External governmental authorities must not challenge the right of the users of common resources (or “appropriators,” in Ostrom’s language) to devise their own rules and governance regimes. This is our starting point and a minimal requirement. We could derive a principle of noninterference from it. The state must get out of the way so that commoners can engage in the value-generating activities that only they can do. Given the realities, however, commons may find that they need legal recognition to grow and flourish. In instances where state institutions regard sharing as a crime — e.g., seed sharing, software collaborations, information sharing — commoning must be decriminalized. This is part of normalizing commons and acknowledging that the moral and political legitimacy of commoning exists prior to and independent of modern states.43 Consider how state power has been used to let investors form corporations and limit their liability, ostensibly because such organizational forms serve the public good. Monarchs and, later, legislatures saw corporations as a way to encourage activities that the state itself could not or did not want to undertake. Early ventures such as the investor-owned British East India Company, for example, developed colonial trade regimes, extracted natural resources, exploited cheap labor, and built railroads and waterways. Why shouldn’t state power also recognize the immense value generated by commoners by granting their institutions legal standing? Such recognition will not come easily, of course. Political leaders and bureaucrats who bow down before the standard economic narrative have trouble seeing other modes of value. Moreover, some state institutions themselves are designed to depend on market revenues. For example, the European Patent Office — an interstate governance body that grants patents under the European Patent Convention — is designed to finance most of its one billion euro budget by collecting fees from patent applicants. Since the more patents it grants, the more money it collects, the Patent Office has a strong incentive to make more scientific and technical knowledge proprietary. While it is understandable to charge patent holders for services provided — and not, say, the general taxpayer — this mechanism is a disincentive to support a world in which we Share Knowledge Generously. Such a societal ideal tends to be regarded as aberrant, if not faintly ridiculous. So are any ambitions to achieve social harmony and intergenerational continuity and protect cultural heritage. As for the potential contributions that subsistence communities and nomadic tribes make to eco-sensitive choices, many moderns continue to depict them as primitive, uncivilized, and hopelessly backward.44 Thus, we are imprisoned within a progress narrative validated and reproduced by state institutions. We are told the economy must grow (to fulfill targets contrived by corporations) so that we can compete successfully on the global market. World leaders urge us not to fall behind. Being outpaced in technological innovation is considered by the business and political communities to be the worst fate of all. One innovation after another — driverless cars, synthetic biology, nanotechnology — is pushed through regulatory procedures, at times with too little time to consider the full societal costs and benefits. All this makes it difficult for people to embrace a shift to the commons. Moreover, guardians of state power understandably think: why should the state cede any authority to nonmarket, decentralized activities or provide funding support to things that have no market value? It would only enrage elites and disrupt internal political arrangements. In addition, letting people withdraw from the circuitry of the market/state system will only embolden the yearning for self-determination, goes the thinking … and that could be dangerous. It would only encourage unregulated activity, amateur experimentation, and perhaps demands for greater autonomy. The guardians of state power may understandably fear that if people decommodify their everyday lives and wean themselves away from dependencies on market/state systems, it will reduce the state’s moral standing, political authority, and tax revenues. Thus the challenge: if the commons is going to evolve as an alternative matrix of governance and provisioning, it must somehow overcome a deep-seated skepticism about commoning among many bureaucrats, politicians, and governments. This does not mean that no workarounds are possible. As stated earlier, the state is not a monolithic institution. State decision makers, despite their zeal in defending their authority, could find it advantageous to authorize and support commoning under the right circumstances. At the local level, this means: allocating land for community gardens and co-housing; facilitating the formation of community land banks and trusts; encouraging local agriculture and food systems; using open source software in public administration; providing free community Wi-Fi everywhere; using open educational resources (OER) in classrooms; providing space and support for timebanks, repair cafés, hackerspaces, and much more. This is not a quixotic agenda. Those who wield state power are mindful of the need for public support and legitimacy. Many politicians, feeling the heat from fierce social protests against extractivism and the international trade regime, are looking for credible ways to escape the iron cage of neoliberal capitalism. Some political leaders are willing to concede the failures of the market/progress narrative to address climate breakdown, inequality, poverty, and hunger; but on the other hand, they are also fearful of breaking from dogmas about free markets and national identity. Around the world, many authoritarians have seized upon the many failures of the market/state system to promote various forms of nationalism. Although a complicated and varied process, much of this political trend is fueled by a search for meaning, purpose, and belonging that the market/state is incapable of fulfilling. The political left and center, meanwhile, cling to conventional vehicles for change: new laws, policies, programs, and procedural reform. While sometimes significant, these approaches generally are carried out in distant state venues (courts, legislatures, government agencies) and fail to engage people personally. In the end, many liberals and social democrats remain tethered to the dominant narrative of progress and show little interest in bottom-up empowerment or social transformation. The cultural dimensions of commons-based initiatives such as agroecology, community land trusts, platform cooperatives, and cosmo-local production, are generally ignored or seen as too small and inconsequential to be taken seriously. Businesses, for their part, generally see them as threats to their market share and profits.
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#### It’s about DOJ prosecutions. Emory = yellow.

1AC Lande ’16 [Robert; Spring 2016; Venable Professor of Law at the University of Baltimore School of Law, Director of the American Antitrust Institute; Antitrust, “Class Warfare: Why Antitrust Class Actions Are Essential for Compensation and Deterrence,” vol. 30]

Our recent empirical studies demonstrate five reasons why antitrust class action cases are essential: (1) class actions are virtually the only way for most victims of antitrust violations to receive compensation; (2) most successful class actions involve collusion that was anticompetitive; (3) class victims’ compensation has been modest, generally less than their damages; (4) class actions deter significant amounts of collusion and other anticompetitive behavior; and (5) anticompetitive collusion is underdeterred, a problem that would be exacerbated without class actions.

Recent court decisions undermine class action cases, thus preventing much effective and important antitrust enforcement.1

Class Actions Are Virtually the Only Way for Most Victims of Federal Antitrust Violations to Receive Compensation

The antitrust statutes provide that violations result in automatic treble damages for the victims.2 The legislative history 3 and case law indicate that compensation of victims is a goal, perhaps the dominant goal, of antitrust law’s damages remedy.4 Class actions play an essential role in ensuring that the treble damages remedy serves its intended function of “protecting consumers from overcharges resulting from price fixing.”5 As the Supreme Court noted, “[C]lass actions . . . may enhance the efficacy of private [antitrust] actions by permitting citizens to combine their limited resources to achieve a more powerful litigation posture.”6 Accordingly, “courts have repeatedly found antitrust claims to be particularly well suited for class actions . . . .”7

Without class actions, cartels and other antitrust violators that inflict widespread economic harm would have little to fear from the treble damages remedy. This is because, as a practical matter, class action cases are virtually the only way for most victims of anticompetitive behavior to receive compensation.8 A 2013 study that Professor Joshua Davis and I conducted documents the benefits of private enforcement by analyzing 60 of the largest recent successful private U.S. antitrust cases (defined as suits resolved since 1990 that recovered at least $50 million in cash for the victims9 ). These actions returned a total of $33.8–$35.8 billion in cash to victims of anticompetitive behavior.10 These figures do not include products, discounts, coupons, or the value of injunctive relief or precedent—only cash.11 Consequently, these totals significantly understate the actual benefits of this litigation to the victims involved. And, of course, this study covered only 60 suits (albeit 60 of the largest private recoveries) out of the many hundreds of private cases filed in the United States during this period.

Of these 60 large private cases, 49 were class action suits.12 These cases recovered a total of $19.4–$21.0 billion—the majority of the amount analyzed in our study.13 Since these were among the largest private actions ever filed, specific conclusions based upon these results may not generalize perfectly to all class action cases. They do suggest, however, that without class action cases, effective and significant victim compensation would be reduced dramatically.

Most Successful Class Actions Involve Collusion that Was Anticompetitive

Almost every private antitrust case that results in a remedy does so through a settlement,14 so the underlying merits of the plaintiffs’ claims usually have not been definitively assessed by a court or jury. Critics sometimes use this fact to support assertions that class actions usually are meritless, that plaintiffs often receive huge sums from cases not involving anticompetitive conduct, and that private antitrust actions often amount to legalized blackmail or extortion.15

Antitrust class actions arise in widely varied market and factual settings, and views about the merits of specific cases and the litigation risks involved vary as well. This makes it extremely difficult to draw objective conclusions about the merits of settlements.

Nevertheless, there are good reasons to believe that the vast majority of class action cases in the Davis/Lande study involved legitimate claims. Forty-one of the 49 class actions involved allegations of collusion,16 and the same conduct supporting the settlements gave rise to criminal penalties in 20 cases; to civil relief by the FTC or DOJ in 8 cases; to civil relief by a state or other governmental unit in 9 cases; to a trial that the defendants lost and that was not overturned on appeal in 7 cases; to a class being certified in 22 cases; and to plaintiffs surviving or prevailing at summary judgment in 12 cases.17 Overall, 44 of the 49 class action suits (90 percent) exhibited at least one of these forms of legal validation as to their merits. (The 5 actions that did not have at least one of these indicia settled too early for a substantive evaluation of their merits).18

These results are broadly consistent with a finding that Professor John Connor derived from an analysis of 130 private recoveries worldwide in international cartel cases for which he could obtain the necessary data.19 He found that of the 50 largest worldwide settlements, measured by their monetary recoveries in constant dollars, 49 had been filed against international cartels.20 Of these, 51 percent were follow-ups to successful DOJ prosecutions, and another 8 percent were filed after fines by the EC or other non-U.S. antitrust authorities.21 Using a different data set, Connor and I found that 36 of 71 (also 51 percent) successful U.S. class action recoveries followed successful DOJ criminal cases.22

This data does not prove that these or any other specific class action cases involved anticompetitive conduct. But critics who assert that most antitrust class actions are little more than legalized blackmail rely only on anecdotes, hypotheticals, and opinions (often of defendants in the cases), without support from studies, and with no reliable empirical evidence that the actions lack merit or that settlement amounts are excessive compared to the anticompetitive harm.23 To be fair, one should compare the above indicia of validity to the absence of any systematic evidence underpinning the critics’ charges.

### Class Action

#### Turns the case.

**Rosenberg 18** Gerald N. Rosenberg, is Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Chicago Law School. Protecting Privilege: The Historic Role of the U.S. Supreme Court and the Great Progressive Misunderstanding. http://judicialpowerproject.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/Judicial-Power-and-the-Left-web-version.pdf

Perhaps nowhere has more progressive hope been placed in courts than in the United States. Starting in the mid-twentieth century, many political activists, progressives, legal academics, and law students came to view courts as powerful producers of progressive social change. Starting with the civil rights cases of the mid-twentieth century, and spreading to issues raised by women's groups, environmental groups, political reformers, gay rights supporters, and others, progressive forces in the United States have increasingly turned to courts to produce the changes they seek. And, in many cases, they have won. American courts seemingly have become important producers of political and social change. Cases such as Brown 2 (school desegregation), Roe 3 (abortion), and Obergefell 4 (marriage equality), to name just three, are heralded as having produced major progressive change. Interestingly, such litigation has often occurred when the other branches of government have failed to act. This suggests that courts can produce progressive change even when the other branches of government are inactive or opposed. Litigation holds out the possibility of protecting minorities and defending liberty in the face of opposition from the democratically elected branches.5

If only. As powerful as the belief in the progressive potential of courts to help the relatively disadvantaged may be, it is an historically odd idea. Traditionally, courts in the U.S. have protected privilege. Throughout U.S. history, until the second half of the twentieth century, progressives, for the most part, understood this and avoided litigation when possible. They understood that judges, and the courts in which they served, were dedicated to preserving the status quo, unequal, distribution of power, wealth, and privilege. They understood that progressive social change could only come from legislation and social movements. However, since roughly the mid-twentieth century, particularly during the Warren (1953-1969) and Burger (1969-1986) courts, this was forgotten. Progressives increasingly turned to litigation, and pointed to great victories in cases such as Brown as proof that the role of the courts in the U.S. political system had changed. They were wrong.

Lawyers are problematic allies for progressive movements. Part of the problem is that, through upbringing and education, many lawyers credit their success solely to meritocracy and hard work, not class privilege. They believe that the political and economic system, and the institutions that support them, are fundamentally fair and only need minor tweaks to empower more people. This means that lawyers are dedicated to working within the legal system. Their training disinclines them to see the need for systematic and institutional change. More importantly, lawyers are taught that all problems have legal solutions. A lawyer’s natural inclination is to identify a problem and then draft a law to ‘correct’ it. However, the more socially and culturally embedded the problematic practice is, the less likely it is that simply writing ‘better’ laws will overcome it. It is only through social movements and political victories that change will occur and lawyers are trained not to see this. Writing about lawyers in the U.S. in volume 1 of Democracy in America, but applicable more broadly, Tocqueville summarises the world view of many Anglo-American lawyers:

Some of the tastes and the habits of the aristocracy may consequently be discovered in the characters of lawyers. They participate in the same instinctive love of order and formalities; and they entertain the same repugnance to the actions of the multitude, and the same secret contempt of the government of the people […]6

In the pages that follow, I sketch out two arguments. First, I review the court’s historical record as a defender of privilege. Second, I show that the great legal victories to which progressives point as proof of the efficacy of litigation either didn’t, for the most part, produce the change they wanted, or did little more than reflect change that had already largely occurred. To make matters worse, such litigation mobilised opponents, creating additional obstacles for change. I conclude by suggesting that, forgetting the lessons of history, in the mid-twentieth century, the progressive agenda was hijacked by a group of elite, well-educated, and comparatively wealthy lawyers who uncritically believed that rights trump politics and that successfully arguing before judges is equivalent to building and sustaining political movements. I conclude that progressives have failed to understand the limits of litigation when they have litigated; have forgotten the historic role of the judiciary as a defender of the status quo, unequal, distribution of power, wealth, and privilege; and ignored the need for robust social movements. The political left’s flirtation with litigation is fundamentally flawed.

#### World War 3 is about trade. Emory = yellow.

1AC Oppenheimer ’21 [Michael; 2021; Clinical Professor, Center for Global Affairs, New York University. Senior Consulting Fellow, Scenario Planning at the International Institute for Strategic Studies. Former Executive Vice President, The Futures Group. Member, Council on Foreign Relations. Member, The Foreign Policy Roundtable at the Carnegie Council on Ethics and International Affairs. Member, The American Council on Germany; The Future of Global Affairs: Managing Discontinuity, Disruption and Destruction, “The Turbulent Future of International Relations,” Ch. 2]

Four structural forces will shape the future of International Relations: globalization (but without liberal rules, institutions, and leadership)1; multipolarity (the end of American hegemony and wider distribution of power among states and non-states2); the strengthening of distinctive, national and subnational identities, as persistent cultural differences are accentuated by the disruptive effects of Western style globalization (what Samuel Huntington called the “non-westernization of IR”3); and secular economic stagnation, a product of longer term global decline in birth rates combined with aging populations.4 These structural forces do not determine everything. Environmental events, global health challenges, internal political developments, policy mistakes, technology breakthroughs or failures, will intersect with structure to define our future. But these four structural forces will impact the way states behave, in the capacity of great powers to manage their differences, and to act collectively to settle, rather than exploit, the inevitable shocks of the next decade.

Some of these structural forces could be managed to promote prosperity and avoid war. Multipolarity (inherently more prone to conflict than other configurations of power, given coordination problems)5 plus globalization can work in a world of prosperity, convergent values, and effective conflict management. The Congress of Vienna system achieved relative peace in Europe over a hundred-year period through informal cooperation among multiple states sharing a fear of populist revolution. It ended decisively in 1914. Contemporary neoliberal institutionalists, such as John Ikenberry, accept multipolarity as our likely future, but are confident that globalization with liberal characteristics can be sustained without American hegemony, arguing that liberal values and practices have been fully accepted by states, global institutions, and private actors as imperative for growth and political legitimacy.6 Divergent values plus multipolarity can work, though at significantly lower levels of economic growth-in an autarchic world of isolated units, a world envisioned by the advocates of decoupling, including the current American president.7 Divergent values plus globalization can be managed by hegemonic power, exemplified by the decade of the 1990s, when the Washington Consensus, imposed by American leverage exerted through the IMF and other U.S. dominated institutions, overrode national differences, but with real costs to those states undergoing “structural adjustment programs,”8 and ultimately at the cost of global growth, as states—especially in Asia—increased their savings to self insure against future financial crises.9

But all four forces operating simultaneously will produce a future of increasing internal polarization and cross border conflict, diminished economic growth and poverty alleviation, weakened global institutions and norms of behavior, and reduced collective capacity to confront emerging challenges of global warming, accelerating technology change, nuclear weapons innovation and proliferation. As in any effective scenario, this future is clearly visible to any keen observer. We have only to abolish wishful thinking and believe our own eyes.10

Secular Stagnation

This unbrave new world has been emerging for some time, as US power has declined relative to other states, especially China, global liberalism has failed to deliver on its promises, and totalitarian capitalism has proven effective in leveraging globalization for economic growth and political legitimacy while exploiting technology and the state’s coercive powers to maintain internal political control. But this new era was jumpstarted by the world financial crisis of 2007, which revealed the bankruptcy of unregulated market capitalism, weakened faith in US leadership, exacerbated economic deprivation and inequality around the world, ignited growing populism, and undermined international liberal institutions. The skewed distribution of wealth experienced in most developed countries, politically tolerated in periods of growth, became intolerable as growth rates declined. A combination of aging populations, accelerating technology, and global populism/nationalism promises to make this growth decline very difficult to reverse. What Larry Summers and other international political economists have come to call “secular stagnation” increases the likelihood that illiberal globalization, multipolarity, and rising nationalism will define our future. Summers11 has argued that the world is entering a long period of diminishing economic growth. He suggests that secular stagnation “may be the defining macroeconomic challenge of our times.” Julius Probst, in his recent assessment of Summers’ ideas, explains:

…rich countries are ageing as birth rates decline and people live longer. This has pushed down real interest rates because investors think these trends will mean they will make lower returns from investing in future, making them more willing to accept a lower return on government debt as a result.

Other factors that make investors similarly pessimistic include rising global inequality and the slowdown in productivity growth…

This decline in real interest rates matters because economists believe that to overcome an economic downturn, a central bank must drive down the real interest rate to a certain level to encourage more spending and investment… Because real interest rates are so low, Summers and his supporters believe that the rate required to reach full employment is so far into negative territory that it is effectively impossible.

…in the long run, more immigration might be a vital part of curing secular stagnation. Summers also heavily prescribes increased government spending, arguing that it might actually be more prudent than cutting back – especially if the money is spent on infrastructure, education and research and development.

Of course, governments in Europe and the US are instead trying to shut their doors to migrants. And austerity policies have taken their toll on infrastructure and public research. This looks set to ensure that the next recession will be particularly nasty when it comes… Unless governments change course radically, we could be in for a sobering period ahead.12

The rise of nationalism/populism is both cause and effect of this economic outlook. Lower growth will make every aspect of the liberal order more difficult to resuscitate post-Trump. Domestic politics will become more polarized and dysfunctional, as competition for diminishing resources intensifies. International collaboration, ad hoc or through institutions, will become politically toxic. Protectionism, in its multiple forms, will make economic recovery from “secular stagnation” a heavy lift, and the liberal hegemonic leadership and strong institutions that limited the damage of previous downturns, will be unavailable. A clear demonstration of this negative feedback loop is the economic damage being inflicted on the world by Trump’s trade war with China, which— despite the so-called phase one agreement—has predictably escalated from negotiating tactic to imbedded reality, with no end in sight. In a world already suffering from inadequate investment, the uncertainties generated by this confrontation will further curb the investments essential for future growth. Another demonstration of the intersection of structural forces is how populist-motivated controls on immigration (always a weakness in the hyper-globalization narrative) deprives developed countries of Summers’ recommended policy response to secular stagnation, which in a more open world would be a win-win for rich and poor countries alike, increasing wage rates and remittance revenues for the developing countries, replenishing the labor supply for rich countries experiencing low birth rates.

Illiberal Globalization

Economic weakness and rising nationalism (along with multipolarity) will not end globalization, but will profoundly alter its character and greatly reduce its economic and political benefits. Liberal global institutions, under American hegemony, have served multiple purposes, enabling states to improve the quality of international relations and more fully satisfy the needs of their citizens, and provide companies with the legal and institutional stability necessary to manage the inherent risks of global investment. But under present and future conditions these institutions will become the battlegrounds—and the victims—of geopolitical competition. The Trump Administration’s frontal attack on multilateralism is but the final nail in the coffin of the Bretton Woods system in trade and finance, which has been in slow but accelerating decline since the end of the Cold War. Future American leadership may embrace renewed collaboration in global trade and finance, macroeconomic management, environmental sustainability and the like, but repairing the damage requires the heroic assumption that America’s own identity has not been fundamentally altered by the Trump era (four years or eight matters here), and by the internal and global forces that enabled his rise. The fact will remain that a sizeable portion of the American electorate, and a monolithically proTrump Republican Party, is committed to an illiberal future. And even if the effects are transitory, the causes of weakening global collaboration are structural, not subject to the efforts of some hypothetical future US liberal leadership. It is clear that the US has lost respect among its rivals, and trust among its allies. While its economic and military capacity is still greatly superior to all others, its political dysfunction has diminished its ability to convert this wealth into effective power.13 It will furthermore operate in a future system of diffusing material power, diverging economic and political governance approaches, and rising nationalism. Trump has promoted these forces, but did not invent them, and future US Administrations will struggle to cope with them.

What will illiberal globalization look like? Consider recent events. The instruments of globalization have been weaponized by strong states in pursuit of their geopolitical objectives. This has turned the liberal argument on behalf of globalization on its head. Instead of interdependence as an unstoppable force pushing states toward collaboration and convergence around market-friendly domestic policies, states are exploiting interdependence to inflict harm on their adversaries, and even on their allies. The increasing interaction across national boundaries that globalization entails, now produces not harmonization and cooperation, but friction and escalating trade and investment disputes.14 The Trump Administration is in the lead here, but it is not alone. Trade and investment friction with China is the most obvious and damaging example, precipitated by China’s long failure to conform to the World Trade Organization (WTO) principles, now escalated by President Trump into a trade and currency war disturbingly reminiscent of the 1930s that Bretton Woods was designed to prevent. Financial sanctions against Iran, in violation of US obligations in the Joint Comprehensive Plan Of Action (JCPOA), is another example of the rule of law succumbing to geopolitical competition. Though more mercantilist in intent than geopolitical, US tariffs on steel and aluminum, and their threatened use in automotives, aimed at the EU, Canada, and Japan,15 are equally destructive of the liberal system and of future economic growth, imposed as they are by the author of that system, and will spread to others. And indeed, Japan has used export controls in its escalating conflict with South Korea16 (as did China in imposing controls on rare earth,17 and as the US has done as part of its trade war with China). Inward foreign direct investment restrictions are spreading. The vitality of the WTO is being sapped by its inability to complete the Doha Round, by the proliferation of bilateral and regional agreements, and now by the Trump Administration’s hold on appointments to WTO judicial panels. It should not surprise anyone if, during a second term, Trump formally withdrew the US from the WTO. At a minimum it will become a “dead letter regime.”18

As such measures gain traction, it will become clear to states—and to companies—that a global trading system more responsive to raw power than to law entails escalating risk and diminishing benefits. This will be the end of economic globalization, and its many benefits, as we know it. It represents nothing less than the subordination of economic globalization, a system which many thought obeyed its own logic, to an international politics of zero-sum power competition among multiple actors with divergent interests and values. The costs will be significant: Bloomberg Economics estimates that the cost in lost US GDP in 2019- dollar terms from the trade war with China has reached $134 billion to date and will rise to a total of $316 billion by the end of 2020.19

Economically, the just-in-time, maximally efficient world of global supply chains, driving down costs, incentivizing innovation, spreading investment, integrating new countries and populations into the global system, is being Balkanized. Bilateral and regional deals are proliferating, while global, nondiscriminatory trade agreements are at an end. Economies of scale will shrink, incentivizing less investment, increasing costs and prices, compromising growth, marginalizing countries whose growth and poverty reduction depended on participation in global supply chains. A world already suffering from excess savings (in the corporate sector, among mostly Asian countries) will respond to heightened risk and uncertainty with further retrenchment. The problem is perfectly captured by Tim Boyle, CEO of Columbia Sportswear, whose supply chain runs through China, reacting to yet another ratcheting up of US tariffs on Chinese imports, most recently on consumer goods:

We move stuff around to take advantage of inexpensive labor. That’s why we’re in Bangladesh. That’s why we’re looking at Africa. We’re putting investment capital to work, to get a return for our shareholders. So, when we make a wager on investment, this is not Vegas. We have to have a reasonable expectation we can get a return. That’s predicated on the rule of law: where can we expect the laws to be enforced, and for the foreseeable future, the rules will be in place? That’s what America used to be.20

The international political effects will be equally damaging. The four structural forces act on each other to produce the more dangerous, less prosperous world projected here. Illiberal globalization represents geopolitical conflict by (at first) physically non-kinetic means. It arises from intensifying competition among powerful states with divergent interests and identities, but in its effects drives down growth and fuels increased nationalism/populism, which further contributes to conflict. Twenty-first-century protectionism represents bottom-up forces arising from economic disruption. But it is also a top-down phenomenon, representing a strategic effort by political leadership to reduce the constraints of interdependence on freedom of geopolitical action, in effect a precursor and enabler of war. This is the disturbing hypothesis of Daniel Drezner, argued in an important May 2019 piece in Reason, titled “Will Today’s Global Trade Wars Lead to World War Three,”21 which examines the preWorld War I period of heightened trade conflict, its contribution to the disaster that followed, and its parallels to the present:

Before the First World War started, powers great and small took a variety of steps to thwart the globalization of the 19th century. Each of these steps made it easier for the key combatants to conceive of a general war.

We are beginning to see a similar approach to the globalization of the 21st century. One by one, the economic constraints on military aggression are eroding. And too many have forgotten—or never knew—how this played out a century ago.

…In many ways, 19th century globalization was a victim of its own success. Reduced tariffs and transport costs flooded Europe with inexpensive grains from Russia and the United States. The incomes of landowners in these countries suffered a serious hit, and the Long Depression that ran from 1873 until 1896 generated pressure on European governments to protect against cheap imports.

…The primary lesson to draw from the years before 1914 is not that economic interdependence was a weak constraint on military conflict. It is that, even in a globalized economy, governments can take protectionist actions to reduce their interdependence in anticipation of future wars.

In retrospect, the 30 years of tariff hikes, trade wars, and currency conflicts that preceded 1914 were harbingers of the devastation to come. European governments did not necessarily want to ignite a war among the great powers. By reducing their interdependence, however, they made that option conceivable.

…the backlash to globalization that preceded the Great War seems to be reprised in the current moment. Indeed, there are ways in which the current moment is scarier than the pre-1914 era. Back then, the world’s hegemon, the United Kingdom, acted as a brake on economic closure. In 2019, the United States is the protectionist with its foot on the accelerator. The constraints of Sino-American interdependence—what economist Larry Summers once called “the financial balance of terror”—no longer look so binding. And there are far too many hot spots—the Korean peninsula, the South China Sea, Taiwan—where the kindling seems awfully dry.

Multipolarity

We can define multipolarity as a wide distribution of power among multiple independent states. Exact equivalence of material power is not implied. What is required is the possession by several states of the capacity to coerce others to act in ways they would otherwise not, through kinetic or other means (economic sanctions, political manipulation, denial of access to essential resources, etc.). Such a distribution of power presents inherently graver challenges to peace and stability than do unipolar or bipolar power configurations,22 though of course none are safe or permanent. In brief, the greater the number of consequential actors, the greater the challenge of coordinating actions to avoid, manage, or de-escalate conflicts. Multipolarity also entails a greater potential for sudden changes in the balance of power, as one state may defect to another coalition or opt out, and as a result, the greater the degree of uncertainty experienced by all states, and the greater the plausibility of downside assumptions about the intentions and capabilities of one’s adversaries. This psychology, always present in international politics but particularly powerful in multipolarity, heightens the potential for escalation of minor conflicts, and of states launching preventive or preemptive wars. In multipolarity, states are always on edge, entertaining worst-case scenarios about actual and potential enemies, and acting on these fears—expanding their armies, introducing new weapon systems, altering doctrine to relax constraints on the use of force—in ways that reinforce the worst fears of others.

The risks inherent in multipolarity are heightened by the attendant weakening of global institutions. Even in a state-centric system, such institutions can facilitate communication and transparency, helping states to manage conflicts by reducing the potential for misperception and escalation toward war. But, as Waheguru Pal Singh Sidhu argues in his chapter on the United Nations, the influence of multilateral institutions as agent and actor is clearly in decline, a result of bottom-up populist/nationalist pressures experienced in many countries, as well as the coordination problems that increase in a system of multiple great powers. As conflict resolution institutions atrophy, great powers will find themselves in “security dilemmas”23 in which verification of a rival’s intentions is unavailable, and worst-case assumptions fill the gap created by uncertainty. And the supply of conflicts will expand as a result of growing nationalism and populism, which are premised on hostility, paranoia, and isolation, with governments seeking political legitimacy through external conflict, producing a siege mentality that deliberately cuts off communication with other states.

Finally, the transition from unipolarity (roughly 1989–2007) to multipolarity is unregulated and hazardous, as the existing superpower fears and resists challenges to its primacy from a rising power or powers, while the rising power entertains new ambitions as entitlements now within its reach. Such a “power transition” and its dangers were identified by Thucydides in explaining the Peloponnesian Wars,24 by Organski (the “rear-end collision”)25 during the Cold War, and recently repopularized and brought up to date by Graham Allison in predicting conflict between the US and China.26

A useful, and consequential illustration of the inherent challenge of conflict management during a power transition toward multipolarity, is the weakening of the arms control regime negotiated by the US and the Soviet Union during the Cold War. Despite the existential, global conflict between two nuclear armed superpowers embracing diametrically opposed world views and operating in economic isolation from each other, the two managed to avoid worst-case outcomes. They accomplished this in part by institutionalizing verifiable limits on testing and deployment of both strategic and intermediate-range nuclear missiles. Yet as diplomatically and technically challenging as these achievements were, the introduction of a third great power, China, into this twocountry calculus has proven to be a deal breaker. Unconstrained by these bilateral agreements, China has been free to build up its capability, and has taken full advantage in ramping up production and deployment of intermediate-range ground-launched cruise missiles, thus challenging the US ability to credibly guarantee the security of its allies in Asia, and greatly increasing the costs of maintaining its Asian regional hegemony. As a result, the Intermediate Nuclear Force treaty is effectively dead, and the New Start Treaty, covering strategic missiles, is due to expire next year, with no indication of any US–Russian consensus to extend it. The US has with logic indicated its interest in making these agreements trilateral; but China, with its growing power and ambition, has also logically rejected these overtures. Thus, all three great powers are entering a period of nuclear weapons competition unconstrained by the major Cold War arms control regimes. In a period of rapid advances in technology and worsening great power relations, the nuclear competition will be a defining characteristic of the next decade and beyond. This dynamic will also complicate nuclear nonproliferation efforts, as both the demand for nuclear weapons (a consequence of rising regional and global insecurity), and supply of nuclear materials and technology (a result of the weakening of the nonproliferation regime and deteriorating great power relations) will increase.

Will deterrence prevent war in a world of several nuclear weapons states, (the current nuclear powers plus South Korea, Iran, Saudi Arabia, Japan, Turkey), as it helped to do during the bipolar Cold War? Some neorealist observers view nuclear weapons proliferation as stabilizing, extending the balance of terror, and the imperative of restraint, to new nuclear weapons states with much to fight over (Saudi Arabia and Iran, for example).27 Others,28 examining issues of command and control of nuclear weapons deployment and use by newly acquiring states, asymmetries in doctrines, force structures, and capabilities between rivals, the perils of variable rates in transition to weapons deployment, problems of communication between states with deep mutual grievances, the heightened risk of transfer of such weapons to non-state actors, have grave doubts about the safety of a multipolar, nuclear-armed world.29 We can at least conclude that prudence dictates heightened efforts to slow the pace of proliferation, while realism requires that we face a proliferated future with eyes wide open.

The current distribution of power is not perfectly multipolar. The US still commands the world’s largest economy, and its military power is unrivaled by any state or combination of states. Its population is still growing, despite a recent decline in birth rates. It enjoys extraordinary geographic advantages over its rivals, who are distant and live in far worse neighborhoods. Its economy is less dependent on foreign markets or resources. Its political system has proven—up to now—to be resilient and adaptable. Its global alliance system greatly extends its capacity to defend itself and shape the world to its liking and is still intact, despite growing doubts about America’s reliability as a security guarantor. Based on these mostly material and historical criteria, continued American primacy would seem to be a good bet, if it chooses to use its power in this way.30

So why multipolarity? The clearest and most frequently cited evidence for a widening distribution of global power away from American unipolarity is the narrowing gap in GDP between the US and China. The IMF’s World Economic Outlook forecasts a $0.9 trillion increase in US GDP for 2019–2020, and a $1.3 trillion increase for China in the same period.31 Many who support the American primacy case argue that GDP is an imperfect measure of power, that Chinese GDP data is inflated, that its growth rates are in decline while Chinese debt is rapidly increasing, and that China does poorly on other factors that contribute to power—its low per capita GDP, its political succession challenges, its environmental crisis, its absence of any external alliance system. Yet GDP is a good place to start, as the single most useful measure and long-term predictor of power. It is from the overall economy that states extract and apply material power to leverage desired behavior from other states. It is true that robust future Chinese growth is not guaranteed, nor is its capacity to convert its wealth to power, which is a function of how well its political system works over time. But this is equally the case for the US, and considering recent political developments is not a given for either country.

As an alternative to measuring inputs—economic size, political legitimacy, technological innovation, population growth—in assessing relative power and the nature of global power distribution, we should consider outputs: what are states doing with their power? The input measures are useful, possibly predictive, but are usually deployed in the course of making a foreign policy argument, sometimes on behalf of a reassertion of American primacy, sometimes on behalf of retrenchment. As such, their objectivity (despite their generous deployment of “data”) is open to question. What is undeniable, to any clear-eyed observer, is a real decline in American influence in the world, and a rise in the influence of other powers, which predates the Trump administration but has accelerated into America’s free fall over the last four years. This has produced a de facto multipolarity, whether explainable in the various measures of power—actual and latent—or not. This decline results in part from policy mistakes: a reckless squandering of material power and legitimacy in Iraq, an overabundance of caution in Syria, and now pure impulsivity. But more fundamentally, it is a product of relative decline in American capacity—political and economic—to which American leadership is adjusting haphazardly, but in the direction of retrenchment/restraint. It is highly revealing that the last two American presidents, polar opposites in intellect, temperament and values, agreed on one fundamental point: the US is overextended, and needs to retrench. The fact that neither Obama nor Trump (up to this point in his presidency) believed they had the power at their disposal to do anything else, tells us far more about the future of American power and policy—and about the emerging shape of international relations—than the power measures and comparisons made by foreign policy advocates.

Observation of recent trends in US versus Russian relative influence prompts another question: do we understand the emerging characteristics of power? Rigorously measuring and comparing the wrong parameters will get us nowhere at best and mislead us into misguided policies at worst. How often have we heard, with puzzlement, that Putin punches far above his weight? Could it be that we misunderstand what constitutes “weight” in the contemporary and emerging world? Putin may be on a high wire, and bound to come crashing down; but the fact is that Russian influence, leveraging sophisticated communications/social media/influence operations, a strong military, an agile (Putin-dominated) decision process, and taking advantage of the egregious mistakes by the West, has been advancing for over a decade, shows no sign of slowing down, and has created additional opportunities for itself in the Middle East, Europe, Asia, Latin America, the Arctic. It has done this with an economy roughly the size of Italy’s. There are few signs of a domestic political challenge to Putin. His external opponents are in disarray, and Russia’s main adversary is politically disabled from confronting the problem. He has established Russia as the Middle East power broker. He has reached into the internal politics of his Western adversaries and influenced their leadership choices. He has invaded and absorbed the territory of neighboring states. His actions have produced deep divisions within NATO. Again, simple observation suggests multipolarity in fact, and a full explanation for this power shift awaiting future historians able to look with more objectivity at twenty-first-century elements of power.

When that history is written, surely it will emphasize the extraordinary polarization in American politics. Was multipolarity a case of others finding leverage in new sources of power, or the US underutilizing its own? The material measures suggest sufficient capacity for sustained American primacy, but with this latent capacity unavailable (as perceived, I believe correctly, by political leadership) by virtue of weakening institutions: two major parties in separate universes; a winnertake-all political mentality; deep polarization between the parties’ popular bases of support; divided government, with the Presidency and the Congress often in separate and antagonistic hands; diminishing trust in the permanent government, and in the knowledge it brings to important decisions, and deepening distrust between the intelligence community and policymakers; and, in Trump’s case, a chaotic policy process that lacks any strategic reference points, mis-communicates the Administration’s intentions, and has proven incapable of sustained, coherent diplomacy on behalf of any explicit and consistent set of policy goals.

Rising Nationalism/Populism/Authoritarianism

The evidence for these trends is clear. Freedom House, the go-to authority on the state of global democracy, just published its annual assessment for 2020, and recorded the fourteenth consecutive year of global democratic decline and advancing authoritarianism. This dramatic deterioration includes both a weakening in democratic practice within states still deemed on balance democratic, and a shift from weak democracies to authoritarianism in others. Commitment to democratic norms and practices—freedom of speech and of the press, independent judiciaries, protection of minority rights—is in decline. The decline is evident across the global system and encompasses all major powers, from India and China, to Europe, to the US. Right-wing populist parties have assumed power, or constitute a politically significant minority, in a lengthening list of democratic states, including both new (Hungary, Poland) and established (India, the US, the UK) democracies. Nationalism, frequently dismissed by liberal globalization advocates as a weak force when confronted by market democracies’ presumed inherent superiority, has experienced a resurgence in Russia, China, the Middle East, and at home. Given the breadth and depth of right-wing populism, the raw power that promotes it—mainly Russian and American—and the disarray of its liberal opponents, this factor will weigh heavily on the future.

The major factors contributing to right-wing populism and its global spread is the subject of much discussion.32 The most straightforward explanation is rising inequality and diminished intergenerational mobility, particularly in developed countries whose labor-intensive manufacturing has been hit hardest by the globalization of capital combined with the immobility of labor. Jobs, wages, economic security, a reasonable hope that one’s offspring has a shot at a better life than one’s own, the erosion of social capital within economically marginalized communities, government failure to provide a decent safety net and job retraining for those battered by globalization: all have contributed to a sense of desperation and raw anger in the hollowed-out communities of formerly prosperous industrial areas. The declining life expectancy numbers33 tell a story of immiseration: drug addition, suicide, poor health care, and gun violence. The political expression of such conditions of life should not be surprising. Simple, extremist “solutions” become irresistible. Sectarian, racial, regional divides are strengthened, and exclusive identities are sharpened. Political entrepreneurs offering to blow up the system blamed for such conditions become credible. Those who are perceived as having benefited from the corrupt system—long-standing institutions of government, foreign countries and populations, immigrants, minorities getting a “free ride,” elites—become targets of recrimination and violence. The simple solutions of course, don’t work, deepening the underlying crisis, but in the process politics is poisoned. If this sounds like the US, it should, but it also describes major European countries (the UK, France, Italy, Germany, Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic), and could be an indication of things to come for non-Western democracies like India.

We have emphasized throughout this chapter the interaction of four structural forces in shaping the future, and this interaction is evident here as well. Is it merely coincidence that the period of democratic decline documented by Freedom House, coincides precisely with the global financial and economic crisis? Lower growth, increasing joblessness, wage stagnation, superimposed on longer-term widening of inequality and declining mobility, constitute a forbidding stress test for democratic systems, and many continue to fail. And if we are correct about secular stagnation, the stress will continue, and authoritarianism’s fourteen-year run will not be over for some time. The antidemocratic trend will gain additional impetus from the illiberal direction of globalization, with its growth suppressing protectionism, weaponization of global economic exchange, and weakening global economic institutions. Multipolarity also contributes, in several ways. The former hegemon and author of globalization’s liberal structure has lost its appetite, and arguably its capacity, for leadership, and indeed has become part of the problem, succumbing to and promoting the global right-wing populist surge. It is suffering an unprecedented decline in life expectancy, and recently a decline in the birth rate, signaling a degree of rot commonly associated with a collapsing Soviet Union. While American politics may once again cohere around its liberal values and interests, the time when American leadership had the self-confidence to shape the global system in its liberal image is gone. It may build coalitions of the like-minded to launch liberal projects, but there will be too much power outside these coalitions to permit liberal globalization of the sort imagined at the end of the Cold War. In multipolarity, the values around which global politics revolve will reflect the diversity of major powers, their interests, and the norms they embrace. Convergence of norms, practices, policies is out of the question. Global collective action, even in the face of global crises, will be a long shot. To expect anything else is fantasy

Unbrave New World and Future Challenges

At the outset of this chapter we described these structural forces as interacting to produce more conflict and diminished prosperity. We also predicted a world with shrinking collective capacity to address new challenges as they arise. What specifically will such a world look like? We address below three principal challenges to global problem solving over the next decade.

Interstate Conflict

In the world experienced by most readers of this volume, conflict is observed within weak states, sometimes promoted by regional competitors, by terrorist groups, or by great powers, acting through surrogates or by indirect means. Sometimes, as in Syria, this conflict spills over to contiguous states and contributes to regional instability, and challenges other regions to respond effectively, a challenge that Europe has not met. Much of this will continue, but the global significance of such local conflicts will be greatly magnified by increasing great power conflict, which will feed—rather than manage or resolve—local instabilities and will in turn be exacerbated by them. Great powers will jockey for advantage, support their local partners, escalate preemptively. Conflicts initially confined to failing states or unstable regions will be redefined by great powers as global in scope and significance.

This tendency of states to view local conflicts in the context of a zero-sum, global struggle for power is familiar to students of the Cold War, but now with the additional challenges to collective action, expanded uncertainty and worst-case thinking associated with the power transition to multipolarity. We can easily observe increased conflict in US–China relations, as we will in US–Russia relations as future US administrations try to make up for ground lost during the Trump presidency, especially in the Middle East. We can observe it among powerful states with mutual historical grievances, now with a weakening presence of the hegemonic security guarantor and having to consider the renationalization of their defense: Japan-South Korea, Germany-France. We can observe it among historical rivals operating in rapidly changing security landscapes: India-China. We can observe it within the Middle East, as internal rivalries are appropriated by regional powers in a contest for regional dominance. We can observe it clearly in Syria, where the regime’s violent suppression of Arab Spring resistance led to all-out civil war, attracted outside support to proxy forces by aspiring regional hegemons Saudi Arabia and Iran, enabled the rise of ISIS, and eventually to great power intervention, principally by Russia. In a world of effective great power collaboration or American primacy, the Syrian civil war might have been settled through power sharing or partition, or if not, contained within Syria. The collapse of Yugoslavia, occurring during a period of US “unipolarity” and managed effectively, demonstrates the possibilities. Instead, with the US retrenching, Middle East rivals unconstrained by great powers, and great power competition rising, the Syria civil war was fed by outside powers, then metastasized into the region, and—in the form of refugee flows—into Europe, fundamentally altering European politics. Libya may be at the early stages of this scenario.

This is not the end of the Syria story. Russia has established itself as a major player in Syria and the Middle East’s power broker, the indispensable country with leverage throughout the region. China is poised to reap the financial and power benefits of Syrian reconstruction. The US has just demonstrated, in its act of war against the Iranian regime, its willingness, without consultation, to put its allies’ security in further jeopardy, accentuating the risks of security ties with Washington and generating added opportunities for Russia and China. The purpose here is not to critique US policy, but to point out the dramatically shifting power balance in a critical region, toward multipolarity. The dangers of such a shift will become apparent as some future US president attempts to reassert US influence in the region and finds a crowded playing field.

Can a multipolar distribution of power among several states whose interests, values, and political practices are divergent, all experiencing bottom-up nationalist pressures, all seeking advantages in the oversupply of regional instability, be made to work? I think not. Will this more dangerous world descend into direct military confrontation between great powers, and could such confrontation lead to use of nuclear weapons? Here the question becomes, what will this more dangerous world actually look like; what instruments of coercion will be available to states as technology change accelerates; how will states employ these instruments; how will deterrence work (if at all) among several states with large but unequal levels of destructive capacity, weak command, and control, disparate— or opaque—strategies and simmering rivalries; can conflict management work in a world of weak institutions? The collapse of the Cold War era nuclear arms control regime, the threat to the Non-Proliferation Treaty represented by the demise of the JCPOA, and multiple indications of an accelerating nuclear arms race among the three principle powers, augurs badly. Given the structural forces at play, and without predicting the worst, we are indeed entering perilous times.

Global Poverty and Inequality

Despite the challenges of volatility and disruptive change inherent in globalization, the world under American liberal leadership has managed a dramatic reduction of extreme poverty. According to World Bank estimates, in 2015, 10 percent of the world’s population lived on less than $1.90 a day, down from nearly 36 percent in 1990.34 In fact, as of September 2018, half the world is now middle class or wealthier.35 The uneven success of the UN Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) exemplifies this achievement, and demonstrates what is possible when open markets are managed through strong global institutions, effective leadership and interstate collaboration. What this liberal hegemonic system did not achieve, however, was a fair distribution of the gains from globalization within states, and among those states that for various reasons were not full participants in this system.

This record of partial achievement leaves us with a full agenda for the next fifteen years, but without the hegemonic leadership, strong institutions, ascendant liberalism or robust global growth that enabled previous gains. There are powerful reasons to question the sustainability of these poverty reduction gains, leading to doubts about the realization of the Sustainable Development Goals, which have replaced the MDGs as global development targets.36 (See Jens Rudbeck’s chapter and Sidhu’s UN chapter for SDGs). Skeptics have pointed to slowing global growth, specifically in China, whose demand for imported commodities was a major factor in developing country growth and job creation; growing protectionism in developed country markets, fueled by bottom-up forces of nationalism, and from top-down by a weakened global trading regime and increased geopolitical rivalry; the effects of accelerating climate change on agriculture, migration and communal conflict in poor countries; and the growth burst among poor countries from the rapid transition to more efficient use of resources, a transition that is now slowing down.37

Perhaps the greatest concern in this scenario is a general deterioration in the developing country foreign investment climate. Foreign direct investment (FDI) has been a major contributor to growth, job creation, and poverty alleviation among poor countries. It has incentivized growthfriendly policies, reduced corruption, introduced technology and effective management practices, and linked poor countries to foreign markets through global supply chains.38 It has stimulated growth of indigenous manufacturing and service companies to supply new foreign investments.

It has been the major cause of economic convergence between rich and poor countries. From 2000 to 2009, developing economies’ growth rates were more than four percentage points higher than those of rich countries, pushing their share of global output from just over a third to nearly half.39 However, FDI flows into poor countries are imperiled by the structural forces discussed here. Political instability arising from slower growth and environmental stress will increase investors’ perception of higher risk, reinforcing their developed country bias. Protectionism among developed countries will threaten the global market access upon which manufacturing investment in developing countries is premised, causing firms to pare back their global supply chains. As companies retrench from direct investment in poor countries, the appeal to those countries of Chinese debt financed infrastructure projects, under the Belt-Road Initiative with little or no conditionality, but at the risk of “debt traps,” will increase.

Global Warming

The question posed at the beginning of this section is whether the international system, evolving toward multipolarity and rising nationalism, will find the collective political capital to confront challenges as they arise. Global warming is the mother of all challenges, and the weakness in the system’s capacity to respond is clear. With the two major political/economic powers and greenhouse gas emitters locked in deepening geopolitical conflict (and with one of them locked in climate change denial, possibly through 2024), the chances of significantly slowing global warming or even ameliorating its effects are very slim. We are reduced to the default option, nation-specific adaptation to climate change, which will impose rising human, political and economic costs on all, and will widen the gap between rich countries with adaptive capacity (of varying degrees), and the poor, who will suffer deteriorating economic, political, and social conditions. (For a contrary, optimistic view see Michael Shank’s chapter, which credits new actors—like cities—as playing a more constructive role in climate mitigation.) This would bring to a close liberal globalization’s greatest achievement; the raising of 1.1 billion people out of extreme poverty since 1990,40 with all its associated gains in quality of life (in the WHO Africa region, for example, life expectancy rose by 10.3 years between 2000 and 2016, driven mainly by improvements in child survival and expanded access to antiretrovirals for treatment of HIV).41

Several forces are at work here. The problem itself is graver—in magnitude and in rate of worsening—than predicted by climate scientists. The UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the major source of information on global warming, has consistently underpredicted the rate of climate deterioration. This holds true even for its “worst-case scenarios,” meaning that what was meant as a wake-up call has in fact reinforced complacency.42 (see Michael Shank’s chapter for further discussion of climate change). The IPCC, in its 2019 report, has tried to undo the damage by emphasizing the acceleration in the rate of warming and its effects, the only partially understood dynamic of climate change, and—given wide uncertainty—the possibility of unpleasant surprises yet to come. This strengthens the scientific case for urgency—to both severely limit greenhouse gas emissions, and to increase investment in ameliorating the effects.

Unfortunately, the crisis comes at a moment when the climate for collective action is ice cold. Geopolitical competition incentivizes states to out produce each other, regardless of the environmental effects. Multipolarity complicates collective action. Economic stagnation mandates job creation, making regulation politically toxic. Bottom-up nationalism/populism causes states to pursue “relative gains,” meaning that if the nation is seen as gaining in a no-holds-barred economic competition with others, the negative environmental effects can be tolerated. A post-Trump presidency would help, with the US rejoining the Paris Agreement, and lending its weight to tighter regulation, increased R and D, and stronger economic incentives to reduce carbon emissions. Keep in mind, however, that President Obama was fully behind such efforts, but in a deeply polarized America was unable to implement measures needed to fulfill the Paris obligations through legislation, and his executive orders to do this were swiftly overturned by Trump.

Conclusion

It may be tempting to hope that post-Trump, the US can regain its global leadership and exert its considerable power in a liberal direction, but with enough self-awareness of its relative decline to share responsibility with others. This was, I believe, the broad direction of the Obama strategy, evidenced by the JCPOA and the Trans-Pacific Partnership: liberal, collective solutions to global problems, as US dominance receded.

This would constitute an optimistic scenario, and it confronts two major problems: can US internal politics support it (can, for example, the country legislate controls on carbon, essential for the global credibility and durability of such commitments); and is the world ready to reengage with American leadership, given the damage to its reputation and the structural forces discussed in this chapter?

My educated guess is no, on both counts. The rot within is extensive, the concrete evidence clear in the economic inequality/immobility numbers, the life expectancy numbers, the deep political polarization, between the two major parties, between regions, between cities and rural areas. We are in fact a long way from fitness for global leadership, and the recognition of this by others will accelerate the decline of American influence. The rest of the world is well on its way toward adjusting to post-American hegemony, some by renationalizing their defense, or by cutting deals with adversaries, by building new alliances or by seizing new opportunities for influence in the vacuum left by American retrenchment. The evidence for this will accumulate. Observe the current and emerging Middle East, where all these post-hegemonic strategies are visible.

#### The other impact is also about trade. Emory = yellow.

1AC Kampf ’20 [David; June 16; PhD Fellow at the Center for Strategic Studies at The Fletcher School, MA in International Affairs from Columbia University; World Politics Review, “How COVID-19 Could Increase the Risk of War,” https://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/28843/how-covid-19-could-increase-the-risk-of-war]

Other theories posit that economic bonds between countries have limited wars in recent decades. Dale Copeland, a professor of international relations at the University of Virginia, has argued that countries work to preserve ties when there are high expectations for future trade, but war becomes increasingly possible when trade is predicted to fall. If globalization brought peace, the recent wave of far-right nationalism and populism around the world may increase the chances of war, as tariffs and other trade barriers go up—mostly from the United States under President Donald Trump, who has launched trade wars with allies and adversaries alike.

The coronavirus pandemic immediately elicited further calls to reduce dependence on other countries, with Trump using the opportunity to pressure U.S. companies to reconfigure their supply chains away from China. For its part, China made sure that it had the homemade supplies it needed to fight the virus before exporting extras, while countries like France and Germany barred the export of face masks, even to friendly nations. And widening economic inequalities, a consequence of the pandemic, are not likely to enhance support for free trade.

This assault on open trade and globalization is just one aspect of a decaying liberal international order, which, its proponents argue, has largely helped to preserve peace between nations since World War II. But that old order is almost gone, and in all likelihood isn’t coming back. The U.N. Security Council appears increasingly fragmented and dysfunctional. Even before Trump, the world’s most powerful country ratified fewer treaties per year under the Obama administration than at any time since 1945.

Trump’s presidency only harms multilateral cooperation further. He has backed out of the Paris Agreement on climate change, reneged on the Iran nuclear deal, picked fights with allies, questioned the value of NATO and defunded the World Health Organization in the middle of a global health crisis. Hyper-nationalism, rather than international collaboration, was the default response to the coronavirus outbreak in the U.S. and many other countries around the world.

It’s hard to see the U.S. reluctance to lead as anything other than a sign of its inevitable, if slow, decline. The country’s institutionalized inequalities and systemic racism have been laid bare in recent months, and it no longer looks like a beacon for others to follow. The global balance of power is changing. China is both keen to assert a greater leadership role within traditionally Western-led institutions and to challenge the existing regional order in Asia. Between a rising China, revanchist Russia and new global actors, including non-state groups, we may be heading toward an increasingly multipolar or nonpolar world, which could prove destabilizing in its own right.

Finally, the pacifying effect of nuclear weapons could be waning. While vast nuclear arsenals once compelled the United States and the Soviet Union to reach arms control agreements, old treaties are expiring and new talks are breaking down. Mistrust is growing, and the chance of an unwanted U.S.-Russia nuclear confrontation is arguably as high as it has been since the Cuban missile crisis.

The theory of nuclear peace may no longer hold if more countries are tempted to obtain their own nuclear deterrent. Trump’s decision to abandon the Iran nuclear deal, for one thing, has only increased the chance that Tehran will acquire nuclear weapons. It’s almost easy to forget that, just a few short months ago, the United States and Iran were one miscalculation or dumb mistake away from waging all-out war. And despite Trump’s efforts to negotiate nuclear disarmament with Kim Jong Un’s regime in Pyongyang, it is wishful thinking to believe North Korea will give up its nuclear weapons. At this point, negotiators can only realistically try to ensure that North Korea’s nuclear menace doesn’t get even more potent.

In other words, by turning inward, the United States is choosing to leave other countries to fend for themselves. The end result may be a less stable world with more nuclear actors.

If leaders are smart, they will take seriously the warning signs exposed by this global emergency and work to reverse the drift toward war.

If only one of these theories for peace were worsening, concerns would be easier to dismiss. But together, they are unsettling. While the world is not yet on the brink of World War III and no two countries are destined for war, the odds of avoiding future conflicts don’t look good.

The pandemic is already degrading democracies, harming economies and curtailing international cooperation, and it also seems to be fostering internal instability within states. Rachel Brown, Heather Hurlburt and Alexandra Stark argue that the coronavirus could in fact sow more civil conflict. If this proves accurate, the increase in civil wars is likely to lead to more external meddling, and these next proxy wars could soon precipitate all-out international conflicts if outsiders aren’t careful. With the usual deterrents to conflict declining around the world, major wars could soon return.

#### They don’t solve trade.

Steve Chapman 21. A former columnist and editorial writer for the Chicago Tribune. “Column: The damaging protectionism of Trump — and Biden” Chicago Tribune. 05-28-21. https://www.chicagotribune.com/columns/steve-chapman/ct-column-biden-trade-trump-tariffs-chapman-20210528-qqq5giqswvc6rocjrw7bg5ie5e-story.html

When he became president, Joe Biden summarily reversed his predecessor’s policies on a range of issues, including climate change, immigration, taxes, social welfare and police reform. But on international trade, it’s **almost like Donald Trump never left.** Trump had a primitive view of this issue. Good, in his view, were exports, trade surpluses, tariffs and trade wars. Bad were imports, trade deficits and multilateral trade agreements. He saw global commerce as a zero-sum game, in which anything that benefited another country must come at our expense, and vice versa. He was unable to grasp that exchanges of goods and services across national borders could — and do — make people in every nation better off. So Trump **slapped tariffs on steel, aluminum**, solar panels and washing machines. He put tariffs on some $360 billion worth of Chinese apparel, appliances, machinery, shoes and more. He threatened to impose import taxes on cars made abroad. He **pulled out of the Trans-Pacific Partnership**, a free-trade accord with 11 other countries. He ended talks on the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, a major effort to lower trade barriers between the U.S. and the European Union. He **nullified the World Trade Organization, which resolves trade disputes**, by blocking the appointment of new members to the body that hears those cases. But his efforts accomplished nothing worthwhile. They raised prices for American consumers while punishing American companies that use steel and aluminum. What the Tax Foundation described as “one of the largest tax increases in decades” now costs the typical American family more than $1,200 a year. His tariffs failed to create jobs in the steel industry, which shrank even before the pandemic, and produced only a tiny boost in aluminum jobs. But a study by economists at the consulting firm The Trade Partnership estimated they would eliminate some 145,000 jobs in other sectors. Our trading partners **retaliated against U.S. companies** with tariffs of their own. American farmers were hit so hard that Trump had to come up with $23 billion to cushion the blow. Nor did his strategy reduce our trade deficits. The overall U.S. trade deficit last year was the biggest since 2008. China has not given up the practices Trump was trying to stop. In March, Gallup found that 63% of Americans — including 79% of Democrats — have a positive view of trade, with only 32% disagreeing. Biden was part of the Obama administration, which negotiated the Pacific trade deal and pressed hard to reach an agreement with the EU. But the Democratic Party has somehow **fallen under the sway of protectionists**, and he’s shown little interest in resisting. **He’s left most of Trump’s tariffs in place**, and his trade representative, Katherine Tai, said removing them would be a bad idea. She vowed a **“worker-centric” trade policy** focused on raising wages, omitting such goals as expanding commerce and fostering competition. Her stance fits the prevailing progressive superstition that **commerce with the world makes us poorer.**

#### Protectionism now.

Anne O Krueger 21. “US should re-engage as a constructive world leader” The Business Times. 09-28-21. https://www.businesstimes.com.sg/opinion/us-should-re-engage-as-a-constructive-world-leader

DESPITE the cantankerous, polarised atmosphere in Washington, DC, there seems to be **bipartisan agreement** on one thing at least: that China is a problem, and that the United States must respond to the competitive challenge it poses. With military and economic strength as its main components, the Sino-American rivalry has come to be seen as a contest to determine who will lead the regional and global order. Economic dynamism is a necessary condition for establishing military strength. For the US to maintain and strengthen its leadership role in the world economy, it must have both allies and a vibrant domestic economy. Why, then, is US President Joe Biden's administration sponsoring policies that will help China reduce America's own economic advantage? Instead of asking how the US can improve its economic performance, the administration is imitating China by letting the government pick winners and losers among technologies and industries. In doing so, it is **abandoning traditional US support for the open multilateral trading system**, the rule of law, and private enterprise within an appropriate governance framework. In any competition, there are always two basic strategies from which to choose. The more resources and attention that are directed towards one option, the less will be available for the other. The first strategy is offensive and consists of strengthening one's own capabilities; the second is defensive and consists of trying to weaken the competitor. With respect to China, the US has already tried a defensive strategy without success. This was the approach taken by former president Donald Trump, who **launched a "trade war" by imposing tariffs and sanctions on China.** Despite those actions, China averaged over 6 per cent annual GDP growth in 2017-19, dwarfing the US economy's 2.5 per cent average annual growth during that period. In 2020, the year of the Covid-19 shock, the Chinese economy grew 2.3 per cent, while US GDP fell by more than 3.5 per cent. In the International Monetary Fund's most recent forecast for 2021, China is expected to grow by 8.1 per cent, compared to around 7 per cent for the US. PERPETUATING FAILURE Though Mr Trump's protectionist strategy clearly failed, the Biden administration is nonetheless **perpetuating it by leaving the previous administration's tariffs in place and adopting "buy American" policies of its own**. By acting unilaterally, Mr Trump weakened the open multilateral system and harmed the US economy, along with those of its allies. Yet even if the US under Mr Biden secures the backing of most of its allies, it is not large or strong enough to do more than slow China's rise moderately. Since the end of World War II, no country has erected high protectionist walls and achieved satisfactory economic growth over any significant length of time. For decades, the US led much of the world down a better path. But instead of adopting an offensive strategy based on strengthening this role and leading by example, the US is now **pursuing the kind of policies that have long failed in many other countries.**

#### No impact to economic decline – countries respond with cooperation not conflict.

Christopher Clary 15. PhD in Political Science, MIT; Postdoctoral Fellow, Brown’s Watson Institute for International and Public Affairs. “Economic Stress and International Cooperation: Evidence from International Rivalries.” *MIT Political Science Department*. Research Paper 8: 4.

Economic crises lead to conciliatory behavior through five primary channels. (1) Economic crises lead to austerity pressures, which in turn incent leaders to search for ways to cut defense expenditures. (2) Economic crises also encourage strategic reassessment, so that leaders can argue to their peers and their publics that defense spending can be arrested without endangering the state. This can lead to threat deflation, where elites attempt to downplay the seriousness of the threat posed by a former rival. (3) If a state faces multiple threats, economic crises provoke elites to consider threat prioritization, a process that is postponed during periods of economic normalcy. (4) Economic crises increase the political and economic benefit from international economic cooperation. Leaders seek foreign aid, enhanced trade, and increased investment from abroad during periods of economic trouble. This search is made easier if tensions are reduced with historic rivals. (5) Finally, during crises, elites are more prone to select leaders who are perceived as capable of resolving economic difficulties, permitting the emergence of leaders who hold heterodox foreign policy views. Collectively, these mechanisms make it much more likely that a leader will prefer conciliatory policies compared to during periods of economic normalcy. This section reviews this causal logic in greater detail, while also providing historical examples that these mechanisms recur in practice.

#### The scenario they sent out after the 1AC---it’s just a theoretical description of cartels in chemical firms---it says there have been thirty different chemical cartels spanning “at least three decades”---the past 30 years thump. It attributes this to the failure of anti-cartel law. The last line also that the EU is already going after these cartels, which takes out modeling on advantage 2. Emory = yellow.

**Kovacic et al. ’21**[William, Robert Marshall, and Michael Meurer; 2021; Global Competition Professor of Law and Policy at George Washington University Law School; Distinguished Professor of Economics at Pennsylvania State University; Professor of Law at Boston University; Boston University School of Law Research Paper Series, “Patents and Price Fixing by Serial Colluders,” No. 21]

In a recent article on price fixing, we coined the term “**serial colluder**” to designate multi-product firms that have participated in **many cartels**, involving a range of participants, and initiated at different dates.15 Several **chemical firms** meet this definition because of their participation in at least **thirty different** chemical cartels spanning at least three decades.16 Our earlier article also addressed the business model of serial colluders and the failure of anti-cartel law to deter such behavior. In some cases, weak monitoring and high-powered incentive payments to product division managers may have fostered multiple cartels without encouragement from, or even contrary to the instructions of, upper management. This “rogue manager” explanation of serial collusion is often invoked by corporate directors seeking a story that deflects blame away from them. A more troubling explanation for serial collusion is that price fixing is an **integral** part of the **business model** of certain firms, and high-level managers advocate for and assist with collusion throughout the firm. We believe serial colluders in certain industries have run “**portfolios** of **cartels**.” In support of this “business model” explanation, in previous work we presented various kinds of indirect evidence that serial colluders in the chemical industry have indeed run a portfolio of cartels.17 Unaddressed in that previous work is an examination of how serial colluders may use patents and patent licensing schemes to initiate or maintain a cartel.

In Section I of this paper, we find that serial colluders increased patenting during the duration of their cartels, which is consistent with the theory that these firms use **new patents** to support **cartelization**. The **magnitude** of this increase is **above and beyond** incremental increases in patenting over time. We also find that “core” serial colluders (but not other major serial colluding chemical firms) increased patenting on products that they did not produce but that were being cartelized by their fellow colluders, which is consistent with the view that serial colluders engage in reciprocal practices across distinct markets.18 On the whole, our analysis of patenting practices for serial colluders in the **chemical space** suggests ongoing use of patents to initiate or maintain cartels, a practice that may apply to other industries with serial colluders as well.

Finding that the **empirical data** support our hypothesis of **serial colluders** using patents to create and maintain cartels, we next probe in Sections II and III reasons for why this conduct might **evade** agency enforcement and effectively help to **coordinate cartels**. Unlike the older cartels that openly used patents to directly restrain output, modern serial colluders running a portfolio of cartels potentially use patents in ways that are indirect and less likely to be noticed by private plaintiffs and government enforcers. We then explore how cartel participants in the modern era (excepting pay-for-delay cases like Actavis) appear to use patents to deter entry into cartelized markets, facilitate intrafirm communications and actions in support of collusive conduct, and communicate with other serial colluders about their portfolio of cartels under the guise of discussing their portfolio of patent licenses.

For the remainder of the Article, we discuss how the existing **antitrust jurisprudence** regarding patents and price fixing requires **major upgrades** to account for the dramatic modern improvements in our understanding of the economics of **collusion**. In older cases, judges recognized that firms could use patent licenses directly to restrict output, raise prices, or boost competitors’ marginal costs, 19 but they may not have appreciated the many indirect ways that patents can increase cartel stability and profitability. As discussed in greater detail below, patents provide an avenue for ongoing communication among rivals about output and pricing. Patent pools and cross-licensing arrangements are especially useful for organizing cartels across product types. Furthermore, licensing regimes may permit a firm to organize supportive resources within the firm without raising legal compliance concerns.

Anticipating these benefits to cartel formation and maintenance, this Article goes on to suggest that serial colluders may engage in strategic patenting. That is, they procure patents to advance **cartel goals** rather than to promote **innovation**. We present **data** on global patent procurement by **price fixers** in the **chemical industry** that is consistent with this view. Importantly, firms managing a portfolio of cartels can use patents in a reciprocal way to stabilize cartels across markets where not all firms participate as producers in each market. Within the network of **chemical cartels**, for example, we see evidence that certain firms use patents to promote cartels in markets for products they do **not produce**. Firms may use the **threat** of a **patent lawsuit** to punish deviators and **discourage outsiders** from attempting to enter a cartelized market. They may also use patent licenses to audit licensee sales and monitor compliance with cartel rules. One firm might perform such a service for other firms in the collusive network with the expectation that the non-participant would get similar help managing their own portfolio of cartels from other serial colluders in the future.

Further, in this Article, we probe deeply into the ways serial colluders can coordinate their patent practices to enhance cartel profits and stabilize their cartels. Our previous work on serial collusion documented that modern anti-collusion **enforcement** has not **adequately deterred** massive, prolonged **multi-market price-fixing** schemes.20 We also explained how various forms of reciprocity among serial colluders increased their cartel profits and made cartels more resilient.21 We expand on this topic with respect to the use of patents for cartelization, which we touched on only briefly in previous work.

This Article also describes gaps in existing antitrust enforcement and scholarly analysis of patenting practices. Recognition of serial collusion helps us to identify further flaws in the conventional treatment of patent licenses that allegedly facilitate price fixing. As one example, case law favors vertical patent licenses by applying rule of reason analysis to restrictions that could earn per se condemnation if organized as horizontal licenses.22 Such deference stems partly from worries that anti-collusion enforcement could weaken returns to patents and discourage research and innovation, as well as concerns that there may be legitimate reasons for suppliers, manufacturers, retailers to coordinate some activities. Yet, past practice of serial colluders show that firms can and do evade per se condemnation by simply organizing a middle man to stand as an upstream patent pool organizer. Thus, we reject such deference for vertically organized patent licenses in the context of serial colluders that are managing a portfolio of cartels, because what appears to be a vertical relationship is often part of the network of connections among serial colluders. Similarly, the leading scholarly commentary on patents and price fixing suggests that socially desirable licenses can be sorted from socially harmful licenses by determining whether significant rents flow to the licensor.23 This test may be effective in the context of an isolated cartel affecting a single market.24 As we explain in Section IV, this test has little or no value in the context of serial collusion where the firms are managing a portfolio of cartels.

Finally, in this Article, we provide additional policy recommendations tailored to the abuse of patents by serial colluders. Our earlier work lays out various reforms to anti-collusion policy that could mitigate the harms of serial collusion. In Section V, we go further and explain how certain patent-related behaviors by firms that do not participate directly in cartelizing a particular market can be used to infer collusion in that market (when the outsider is part of a network of serial colluders). We also discuss **penalties** and **liability** that antitrust and patent agencies should **impose on firms** that use their patents to facilitate collusion by others. Specifically, we argue for generous application of the patent misuse defense to render unenforceable patents used to facilitate price fixing.25 Entry would be easier and patent-based cartel punishments would be eliminated if cartel patents are left unenforceable. Finally, we identify possible adjustments in the institutional arrangements by which the federal antitrust enforcement agencies address the use of patents and patent licensing to facilitate collusion.

This Article is organized as follows. Section I presents empirical evidence that serial collusion is a serious problem, that serial colluders in the chemical industry use the patent system intensively in ways that suggest strategic patenting, and that their patenting behavior is consistent with their use of patents to enhance multi-market price fixing. Section II considers the evolution of antitrust doctrine and policy related to patent assertion and licensing as collusive devices. Notwithstanding existing strictures, this section reviews how patent practices can facilitate cartelization. Section III turns to the role that patents can play in supporting serial collusion. Section IV discusses the modernization of doctrines related to patents and price fixing in response to the threat of serial collusion. Section V offers policy recommendations and additional concluding comments.

I. Serial Collusion and Patents: Case Study in the Global Chemical Industry

**Serial collusion** in the **chemical industry** dates back to the 1880s and has reappeared in most decades since then.26 German chemical firms have been prominent price-fixers and often cartel ring-leaders, but they have been **joined** by chemical firms from the **U**nited **S**tates, England, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Canada, Switzerland, South Korea, and Japan.27 **Dozens** of different chemical products have been affected by **price fixing** at some point.28 Historically, some of these collusive agreements were regional; others were global. Some were short-lived; others spanned decades. This history, and the specific role of patents to instituting and maintaining cartels in the global chemicals market, is described below.

A. Historical and Modern Cartelization of the Global Chemical Industry

Patents played a **significant role** in **chemical cartels** during the first half of the twentieth century. 29 Margaret Levenstein observes that “[d]uring most of the **30 years** preceding World War I, bromine producers in the **U**nited **S**tates and Europe **colluded**, pooling output, **dividing** up markets, and **raising prices**.”30 In the period leading up to World War II, German chemical firms engaged in a variety of practices that Heinrich Kronstein has called “**monopolizing** by patents.” 31 One technique employed by the “combine” of chemical companies was to direct the **research arm** of each participant to procure as **many patents** as **possible**, to use them for strategic ends.32 From his study of patents and cartelization in 1920s Germany, Kronstein reported that “[m]ore and more the chemical industry began to apply for patents on **practically everything**. The research laboratories of the few remaining chemical works, connected among themselves by cartel and working agreements, systematically studied entire fields and closed them by a large number of patents.”33 In fields such as plastics and pharmaceuticals, “[e]ach publication in any chemical review or each patent application of any applicant in any country was given to the staff of the research laboratory to find anything that could be patented, no matter if the patent was a patent of evasion or supplement or protection against other inventors.”34 This phenomenon Kronstein described resembles the pattern of recent patenting behavior in the chemical sector we document below—where patenting activity by cartel participants increases **dramatically** during the period of **illegal collaboration** for the purpose of **consolidating** market share for **existing firms** and **keeping out** entrants.35

A second method documented by Kronstein and other researchers involves the extensive use of patent licensing agreements among major U.S. and foreign chemical producers and their subsidiaries to establish effective **networks** for **global cartelization**.36 Kronstein reports that in the decades leading up to World War II, “[t]he participation of an American enterprise in a world cartel chiefly through the device of patent exchange became very common.”37 In 1946, George Stocking and Myron Watkins reported “that a division of market territories for products coming within the scope of [cartel] patents and secret processes in a given field usually entail[ed] a **complete division** of territories for all related products.”38

A third method of cartelization involved the use of multiple licensing arrangements to cartelize **entire domestic markets**. In the late 1930s, the DOJ successfully challenged Ethyl Gasoline Company for creating an elaborate system of licensing arrangements for the production and use of tetra-ethyl lead to stabilize prices for motor fuel. 39 In another prominent American example of the technique applied outside the chemical sector, in the 1940s, the DOJ prosecuted United States Gypsum for using minimum price terms in patent licenses to cartelize the gypsum wallboard industry.40 For about a decade, Gypsum had granted licenses with largely identical price restrictions to nearly all of the industry’s numerous firms.41 In upholding the government’s challenge to Gypsum’s licensing terms, the Supreme Court observed, “the industry is completely **regimented**, the production of competitive unpatented products **suppressed**, a class of distributors **squeezed out**, and prices on unpatented products stabilized.”42

The **rash** of **chemical industry cartelization** has continued to **modern times**. In the **three decades** since 1980, the European Commission (EC) prosecuted chemical producers for collusion in **32 separate markets**. 43 Notable American antitrust cases brought against chemical producers during this period ended cartels in the markets for lysine, citric acid, and vitamin C. 44 Since 2010, the Korean Fair Trade Commission (KFTC) fined participants in a chemical additives cartel. 45 Today, the EC is investigating an ethylene cartel, 46 and a massive investigation of **serial collusion** by generic **drug companies** is ongoing in the **U**nited **S**tates.47 Whereas the scope of these investigations has not focused on what role patents may have played in helping to facilitate these cartels, we suspect that patents did play a role.48 We explore this conjecture by examining the patenting behavior of colluding firms before, during, and after agency enforcement to explore whether these firms may have pursued patents for strategic ends.

### EU

#### The aff doesn’t change procedural differences that ensure divergence.

James Keyte 18. Director of the Fordham Competition Law Institute, an adjunct professor of Comparative Antitrust Law at Fordham Law School, and an Editor of ANTITRUST, Fall 2018. “Why the Atlantic Divide on Monopoly/Dominance Law and Enforcement Is So Difficult to Bridge.” <https://www.antitrustinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/fall18-keyte.pdf>

Much of this divergence stems from the U.S. courts’ con- cern with “false positives”—erroneously condemning pro- competitive or neutral conduct—as well as a reluctance to undertake judicial intervention (and, effectively, oversight) of complex, unilateral business practices. Given these procedur- al and substantive differences, it is fair to observe that, absent a unifying process and analytical framework, the Atlantic divide on monopoly/dominance policy and law will persist.

#### Divergence in the judicial systems trigger the advantage.

James Keyte 18. Director of the Fordham Competition Law Institute, an adjunct professor of Comparative Antitrust Law at Fordham Law School, and an Editor of ANTITRUST, Fall 2018. “Why the Atlantic Divide on Monopoly/Dominance Law and Enforcement Is So Difficult to Bridge.” <https://www.antitrustinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/fall18-keyte.pdf>

DG Comp Has More Discretion than U.S. Enforcers. An often-overlooked distinction between the US and the EU is that the Commission does not have to go to court to impose a penalty or other remedy on a party. Moreover, on complex economic issues or policy choices, the reviewing courts in the EU grant the Commission broad discretion (although the EU courts have much broader powers to assess the appropriateness of fines).8 In sharp contrast, the DOJ and FTC cannot unilaterally “impose” any relief on a party, but instead must first seek and obtain that relief from a federal judge who, in turn, is charged with following case law both on the substance of the alleged violation and the scope of the remedy. Moreover, the common law system gives US. courts, including the Supreme Court, significant latitude to interpret Section 2 of the Sherman Act and to delve deeply into com- plex economic issues that often are determinative.

The natural consequences of these systemic differences are subtle, but far reaching. The EU Commission is relative-ly free to pursue whatever substantive policy or theory of lia—bility it chooses, subject only to later review (with the limi-tations noted above). That ﬂexibility also applies to what competition policies to pursue through Article 102, a concept that in the US. would be limited by what realistically could be achieved in court. Another key difference between the two jurisdictions is that, in the EU, there is not the same constant feedback from the courts that we find in the US. common law system, which might otherwise help clarify the scope and application of Article 102. For example, without that ﬂow of case-law guidance, the Commission may find itself interpreting Intel for years without further clarification from EU courts. The simple point is that any opportunity for convergence driven by case law is made more complicated by the different processes of the two systems. These differences can be exac-erbated by rapidly changing markets that can make any case law pronouncements themselves seem immediately outdated.

#### Harmonization is impossible.

Logan Breed & Falk Schoning, 18. Both authors are partners at the law firm Hogan Lovells. They handle antitrust reviews of mergers and acquisitions since as well as numerous nonmerger conduct investigations and antitrust litigation matters. “Exploring the contrasting views about antitrust and big data in the U.S. and EU.” September 27, 2018. <https://www.hoganlovells.com/en/publications/exploring-the-contrasting-views-about-antitrust-and-big-data-in-the-us-and-eu> Accessed: 9/28/21 3:00pm

What’s your perspective as to why Europe and the U.S. have such different approaches to big data and antitrust enforcement?

Schöning: I think some Europeans are more concerned with data in the hands of companies than in the hands of the State. This is very different from the understanding of freedom in the United States, which is more about ensuring that your data is not in the hands of the state. That’s very different, and it triggers why the EU has things like GDPR, which basically regulates how private companies can deal with your data, but not what the state can do with it.

#### They don’t have a modeling card. Their Knight evidence says that the EU had recognized the need for harmonization WITHIN it, not that they’ll model the US. Emory = yellow.

1AC Knight ’19 [Thomas; Department of Economics at the University of Florida; Working Paper, “RECONCILING THE CONFLICT: ANTITRUST LENIENCY PROGRAMS AND PRIVATE ENFORCEMENT,” https://people.clas.ufl.edu/thomasknight/files/KnightSteClaire.pdf]

Price-fixing cartels are often viewed as the most egregious of all antitrust violations. These conspiracies involve a concerted effort to restrict competition to the detriment of consumer welfare and market efficiency. It is difficult, if not impossible, to identify an economic justification for allowing such agreements. Simply put, “if a country were to have only one type of antitrust violation, surely it would be against horizontal cartels” (Lande and Davis, 2011). Accordingly, these agreements are per se violations of Section 1 of the United States’ Sherman Act, and of Article 101 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.1 Cartel policy – and antitrust law, more generally – may be enforced by public antitrust authorities, private antitrust suits, or a combination of both. Antitrust law in the United States is jointly enforced by public antitrust authorities (e.g., the Department of Justice’s Antitrust Division and state attorneys general) and private plaintiffs; the latter accounts for 90-95% of total antitrust enforcement. 2 In contrast, European antitrust law, or “competition policy,” has been primarily enforced by public antitrust authorities alone – namely, the European Commission and the national competition authorities of the 28 member states. Private suits have, until now, played a minimal role. The European Court of Justice, in its 2001 Courage Ltd. v. Crehan decision, identified a right by European citizens to seek compensation for harm suffered due to competition violations.3 This ruling paved the way for the development of a private enforcement mechanism in European competition policy, but it left the details of implementation largely to the EU member states and their national courts. Consequently, substantial policy differences emerged among the member states, and most subsequent private antitrust suits took place in a small number of member states. There is concern that this is the result of “forum shopping,” the practice of filing suit in jurisdictions that are believed to be more plaintiff-friendly. Acknowledging a need for harmonization within the EU, the European Commission adopted Directive 2014/104/EU (“The Directive”) into law in November 2014. The Directive aims to develop a common private enforcement mechanism across member states by committing them to a standard set of legal practices. The objective is to develop a well-functioning private enforcement mechanism that complements public enforcement activity. Private antitrust suits offer a number of potential benefits to the overall efficacy of the European competition policy regime. They raise the probability that an antitrust violation is uncovered and raise the sanction applied to ones that are.4 There are myriad reasons that these private suits may even be superior to public enforcement – or at least, always complement it. First, public antitrust authorities may be limited by an administrative budget constraint (Motta and Polo, 2003; Aubert, Rey, and Kovacic, 2006; and Chen and Rey, 2013). Private enforcement can expand overall enforcement activity when public agencies are resource constrained. Related to this is the possibility that plaintiffs possess information of violations that the government may not have access to. Without private enforcement in these instances, such violations may go unpunished—and more importantly, these cartels may persist.

#### The card they screenshotted says it won’t happen.

1AC Russell ’10 [Tiana; Spring; Associate at Arnold & Porter LLP, J.D. New York University, and B.A. Duke University; Boston University International Law Journal, “EXPORTING CLASS ACTIONS TO THE EUROPEAN UNION,” 28 B.U. Int'l L.J. 141, lexis]

In the past, Europe has predominantly punished corporate misconduct with regulatory action, rather than through private enforcement. As the European Commission and European national authorities look for ways to deal with a growing enforcement workload, private litigation may take a more prominent role, particularly within the field of competition law. Within Europe, consensus is emerging that competition law requires private enforcement if it is to be effective. More European countries are interested in incentivizing private litigation in order to better deter potential corporate malfeasance and compensate victims' losses. With interest in private enforcement on the rise, the European Union is currently considering how best to encourage it. Central to this ongoing debate is the question of the proper role of class actions within the European Union. Proponents argue that class actions can significantly enhance a victims' ability to obtain compensation, contribute to the overall efficiency in the administration of justice, and provide a strong deterrent to corporate malfeasance. 2 However, class action litigation is not without its critics. Their possible introduction in the European Union has been met with arguments that they are an inefficient, costly and unproven way of achieving the twin public policy goals of compensation and deterrence. Class actions have not traditionally been part of Europe's legal landscape and many in Europe remain exceedingly wary of them due to the potential expense to both plaintiffs and defendants. 3