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Advantage 1 is Platforms

#### Platform companies facilitate transactions between two sets of users – the *Amex* decision made it extremely difficult to challenge anticompetitive conduct in those markets

Hovenkamp, James G. Dinan University Professor, University of Pennsylvania Carey Law School and The Wharton School, ‘21

(Herbert, “Antitrust and Platform Monopoly,” 130 Yale L.J. 1952)

A. Against Platform Exceptionalism

In *Amex*, the Supreme Court disregarded a basic principle about markets, which is that they consist of close substitutes.212 Instead, it lumped production complements into the same market, and in the process, it stymied coherent economic analysis of the problem. To be sure, power in one side of a two-sided market cannot be assessed without determining what is occurring on the other side. But one does not need to group the two sides into the same “market.” Rather, a relevant market should be determined by reference to the side where anticompetitive effects are feared. Then, assessing power requires the fact finder to consider offsetting effects, some of which may occur on the other side.213

Second, the Court ignored an important distinction between fact and law. Disputes about market boundaries involve questions of fact. Nevertheless, the majority wrote—as a matter of law—that two-sided platforms compete exclusively with other two-sided platforms. These dicta have already produced mischief in lower-court decisions. For example, it led one court to conclude that a merger between a two-sided online flight-reservation system and a more traditional system could not be a merger of competitors.214

Third, without argument or evidence, the Court required litigants to show market power indirectly in vertical restraints cases by reference to a relevant market, even though superior techniques are available. Direct measures are particularly useful in digital markets, where the necessary data are easy to obtain and product differentiation makes traditional market definition unreliable.215 This was another breach of the boundary between fact and law.

Fourth, the Court misunderstood the economics of free riding, ignoring the fact that when a firm is able to recover the value of its investments through its own transactions, free riding is not a problem.

Fifth, the Court failed to perform the kind of transaction-specific factual analysis that has become critical to economically responsible antitrust law. Rather, it simply assumed, without examining the actual transactions before it, that losses on one side of a two-sided market are inherently offset by gains on the other side.216 Amex’s antisteering rule produced immediate losses for both the affected cardholder and the affected merchant. The only beneficiary was Amex, the operator of a platform able to shelter itself from competition. That competition, in turn, would have benefitted both cardholders and merchants.

Markets differ from one another.217 This is why we apply mainly antitrust law to some markets, regulation to others, and some mixture of the two to yet others. It is also why antitrust is so fact intensive, particularly on issues pertaining to market power or competitive effects. Indeed, the biggest advantage that antitrust has over legislative regulation is its fact-driven methodology. Antitrust courts do and should avoid speaking categorically about market situations that are not immediately before them and avoid making cursory conclusions based on inadequate facts. Within the antitrust framework, there is no reason to think that digital platforms are unicorns whose rules as a class differ from those governing other firms. Every market has its distinct features, but the ordinary rules of antitrust analysis are adequate to consider them. The *Amex* decision is a cautionary tale about what can happen when a court is so overwhelmed by a market’s idiosyncrasies that it makes grand pronouncements, abandoning well-established rules for analyzing markets in the process.

#### *Amex* set high burdens for Plaintiffs—forcing them to prove harm to users on both sides of the platform

Krikwood, Professor of Law, Seattle University School of Law; American Law Institute; Executive Committee, AALS Antitrust and Economic Regulation Section; Advisory Board, American Antitrust Institute, ‘20

(John, “Antitrust and Two-Sided Platforms: The Failure of *American Express*,” Cardozo L. Rev. Vol. 41)

In sum, the Court's most fundamental error in *American Express* was its ruling that in a two-sided platform case, the plaintiff must show, in the first step of the rule of reason, that the defendant's conduct caused net harm to customers on both sides of its platform combined. This requirement, unprecedented in the Court's decisions, is not only substantively wrong, it will force plaintiffs in two-sided platform cases to address market power, anticompetitive effects, and justification all at once, at the beginning of their cases. This is inefficient and will result in more false negatives.75 To take advantage of this new framework, moreover, numerous defendants are likely to claim that they operate twosided platforms, further inhibiting antitrust enforcement.76

[Begin fn76]

76 See Hovenkamp, supra note 9, at 48 ("[U]nder the AmEx standard, we can expect an

outpouring of defendants emphatically claiming to be two-sided .... ).

[End fn76]

The Court overlooked all of these problems. 77

#### Amex’s platform rule is theoretical nonsense—that spills over to stymie enforcement in numerous sectors

Rozga, JD, Counsel, Davis Wright Tremaine LLP, former Federal Trade Commission attorney, Guest Lecturer, Boston University School of Law, ‘20

(Kaj, “Antitrust After American Express: Down a Competitive Effects Rabbit Hole,” September 21, <https://techlawdecoded.com/antitrust-after-american-express-down-the-competitive-effects-rabbit-hole/>)

What does make American Express unique, and the reason it has pushed the trajectory of antitrust even further into a competitive effects abyss, are the implications on the modern tech-based economy of the Supreme Court’s views on the proof that is required in cases involving two-sided markets.

Two-sided platforms are at the core of wide swaths of the online ecosystem, including retail (Amazon’s marketplace), social media (Facebook), online advertising (Google Ads), the internet of things (Apple’s HomePod), search (Microsoft’s Bing), and the gig economy (Uber), to name a few examples. The American Express decision has significantly raised the evidentiary bar for proving up an antitrust case in such markets. It will no longer be enough to show that a platform harmed competition on one side of the market—as difficult and burdensome as that task already is. Now “substantial anticompetitive effects” must be shown across both sides of the market, accounting for all the participants and users of a multi-sided platform in something akin to the “credit card transactions” market proposed in American Express.

But the logic underlying the American Express decision does not stop at multi-sided platforms. It is not difficult to imagine how creative defendants and laissez faire-inclined judges could spin a web of ever-increasing complexity in any case about a sprawling market with interconnections and interrelationships among different users, partners, and participants. This is a natural consequence of falling down the competitive effects rabbit hole. If it is not reined in, the competitive effects machinery tends towards entropy, especially in complex digital markets where a single player can be interacting with various segments of a broader digital ecosystem.

#### Inability to effectively contest platform conduct kills innovation

Allensworth, Professor of Law at Vanderbilt Law School, ‘21

(Rebecca, “Antitrust’s High-Tech Exceptionalism,” 130 Yale L.J. 588)

American competition policy has a big problem. Actually, it has four big problems: Amazon, Apple, Facebook, and Google. What was once a dynamic pool of smaller start-ups, the high-tech sector has now coalesced around just four companies that together reported over $773 billion of revenue in 2019.1 Each reigns over its own segment of the high-tech marketplace: Amazon controls the retail sector, Apple dominates devices and apps, Facebook owns social media, and Google virtually governs the internet itself. To the extent Silicon Valley still churns out a steady stream of startups, it is more to feed these beasts by acquisition than to produce meaningful rivals to their empires.2

Of course, not everyone agrees that this state of affairs is a problem at all. To some, the size of these firms is merely a symptom of their success. Relentless innovation, a customer-is-king mentality, network effects that benefit consumers, and economies of scale have made these firms ever larger and their products ever better for American consumers. Some even contest the idea that they are large at all by arguing that in a properly defined market, each firm faces significant rivalry and thus lacks market power. Some think that American antitrust law should pat itself on the back for fostering the competitive conditions that let these innovative companies thrive.3

However, this view is increasingly unpopular, and for good reason. Each of these companies, in its own way, holds the keys to competitive entry in many important online markets. To bring an app to market, a developer must deal with Apple; to reach online shoppers, retailers must use Amazon, and so on. Without a meaningful choice between platforms, independent sellers, developers, and websites must pass through a privately maintained bottleneck often on unfavorable terms. These restrictions on competition harm consumers by reducing the output and raising prices for goods that must pass through the bottleneck, and by reducing firms’ incentives to innovate—if they know a large portion of their profits will be appropriated by the platform, they have less incentive to bring new products to market. And by controlling the throttle of technological innovation, each dominant firm can stave off the possibility that one of these nascent companies will build a rival network—a platform that can break the bottleneck itself.4 Long-term, stable platform dominance means consumers likely will not see the kind of Schumpterian innovation associated with great technological leaps forward.5 Rather, consumer welfare depends on these platforms’ internal incentives to innovate, which are weakened in the absence of true rivalry.6 In short, there is a growing recognition that as much as these companies have innovation to thank for their success, their current tactics are making it hard for the next generation of disruptive innovators to take over. If antitrust law continues to stand by, consumers will pay the price.

#### Only nascent firms foster transformative tech innovation

Hemphill, Moses H. Grossman Professor of Law, New York University School of Law, and Wu, Julius Silver Professor of Law, Science and Technology, Columbia Law School, ‘20

(C. Scott, and Tim, “Nascent Competitors,” 168 U. Penn. L. Rev. 1879)

Over the last century and a half, small, innovative firms have played a particularly important role in the process of innovation and competition. This is not to discount the important history of innovation at big firms with large research laboratories, such as Bell Labs, Xerox PARC, and research labs at General Electric and Merck.30 However, over the same period, a significant number of disruptive innovations—those that transform industry—have come out of very small firms with new technologies unproven at the time: examples include the Bell Telephone Company, RCA, MCI, Genentech, Apple, Netscape, and dozens of others.31

There is a particular competitive significance of the big innovations at the smaller firms, for they also represent competitive entry, and sometimes completely transform the industry.32 New, unproven innovators are a key source of disruptive innovation.33 Consider that Bell’s telephone did not improve the telegraph, but replaced it, or the impact of Apple’s personal computer on the computing industry. As this suggests, nascent competitors can hold the promise of offering fresh competition for the market, not just in the market. They have the capacity to displace an incumbent through a paradigm shift—for example, a new platform for developing software or decoding a genome. Nascent competition tends to be important in industries marked by rapid innovation and technological change. Software, pharmaceuticals, mobile telephony, e-commerce, search, and social network services are leading examples.

Future potency. Second, a nascent competitor is relevant due to its promise of future innovation. Its potency is not yet fully developed and hence unproven. Whether that innovation will make a difference in the marketplace is subject to significant uncertainty. That is due to the unpredictable rate and direction of technological change. This uncertainty stems from the same forces of technological progress that make innovation so valuable. The nascent competitor may fail in various ways: the unproven cure, despite highest hopes, may flunk its clinical trials; the technologies thought to be the future might, in fact, be overrated. This uncertainty may not be a quantifiable risk, like the odds in a casino, but closer to Knightian true uncertainty—in other words, not readily susceptible to measurement.34 The unpredictable path of innovation often results in product plasticity, in which products evolve and are used for purposes different than the original. For example, in the 1990s, mobile telephones gained popularity as a complement to a wired telephone, as a means for making calls on the go.35 Today, they compete with land lines, cameras, computers, televisions, and credit cards. General purpose technologies such as computing and Internet connectivity act as powerful fuel for unpredictable change.36 Uncertainty about what products the incumbent and the nascent competitor will actually offer in the future has a further consequence—uncertainty about the degree to which those products will actually compete.

#### Key to out-compete China—targeted remedies are key

Wheeler, visiting fellow in Governance Studies at The Brookings Institution, Chairman of the Federal Communication Commission (FCC) from 2013 to 2017, ‘20

(Tom, “Digital Competition With China Starts With Competition At Home,” <https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/FP_20200427_digital_competition_china_wheeler_v3.pdf>)

The United States and China are engaged in a technology-based conflict to determine 21st-century international economic leadership. China’s approach is to identify and support the research and development efforts of a handful of “national champion” companies. The dominant tech companies of the U.S. are de facto embracing this Chinese policy in their effort to maintain domestic marketplace control. Rather than embracing a China-like consecration of a select few companies, America’s digital competition with China should begin with meaningful competition at home and the allAmerican reality that competition drives innovation.

America’s dominant tech companies have seized upon the competition with China as a rationale for why their behavior should not be subject to regulatory oversight that would, among other things, promote competition. “China doesn’t regulate its companies” has become a go-to policy response. When coupled with “of course, we support regulation, but it must be responsible regulation,” it throws up a smokescreen that allows the dominant tech companies to make the rules governing their marketplace behavior.

At the heart of digital competition — both at home and abroad — is the capital asset of the 21st century: data. Initiatives such as machine learning and artificial intelligence are data-dependent, requiring a large data input to enable algorithms to reach a conclusion. China’s immense population of almost 1.5 billion gives it an advantage in this regard. By definition, a population that approaches five times the size of the U.S. population produces more data. The previously “backward” nature of the Chinese economy has resulted in another Chinese data advantage: New smartphone-based apps, created in place of the digital integration that China previously lacked, produce a richer collection of data. This bulk and richness of Chinese data creates an inherent digital advantage when compared to the United States.

If the United States will never out-bulk China in the quantity and quality of data, it must out-innovate China. Here, the United States has an advantage, should it choose to take it. The centralized control of the Chinese digital economy is an anti-entrepreneurial force. In contrast, innovation is the hallmark of a free and open market. But the domestic market must, indeed, be free, open, and competitive.

Currently, the American digital marketplace is not competitive. A handful of companies command the marketplace by hoarding the data asset others need to compete. As innovative as America’s tech giants may be, they represent a bottleneck that starves independent innovators of the mother’s milk of digital competition. If America is to out-innovate China, then American innovators need access to the essential data asset required for that innovation.

The nation’s response to Chinese competition must not be the adoption of China-like national champions, nor the “China doesn’t regulate its companies that way” smokescreen. American public policy should embrace the all-American concept of competition-driven innovation. This begins with breaking the bottleneck that withholds data from its competitive application. This does not necessarily mean breaking up the dominant companies, but it does mean breaking open their mercenary lock on the assets essential for competition-driven innovation.

#### Maintaining our innovative lead solves nuclear war

Kroenig and Gopalaswamy 18 – Associate Professor of Government and Foreign Service at Georgetown University and Deputy Director for Strategy in the Scowcroft Center for Strategy and Security at the Atlantic Council; Director of the South Asia Center at the Atlantic Council

Matthew Kroenig and Bharath Gopalaswamy, "Will disruptive technology cause nuclear war?," Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, 11-12-2018, <https://thebulletin.org/2018/11/will-disruptive-technology-cause-nuclear-war/>

Rather, we should think **more broadly** about how new technology might affect global politics, and, for this, it is helpful to turn to scholarly international relations theory. The dominant theory of the causes of war in the academy is the “bargaining model of war.” This theory identifies rapid shifts in the balance of power as a primary cause of conflict.

International politics often presents states with conflicts that they can settle through peaceful bargaining, but when bargaining breaks down, war results. Shifts in the balance of power are problematic because they undermine effective bargaining. After all, why agree to a deal today if your bargaining position will be stronger tomorrow? And, a clear understanding of the military balance of power can contribute to peace. (Why start a war you are likely to lose?) But shifts in the balance of power muddy understandings of which states have the advantage.

You may see where this is going. New technologies threaten to create potentially destabilizing shifts in the balance of power.

For decades, stability in Europe and Asia has been supported by US military power. In recent years, however, the balance of power in Asia has begun to shift, as China has increased its military capabilities. Already, Beijing has become more assertive in the region, claiming contested territory in the South China Sea. And the results of Russia’s military modernization have been on full displayin its ongoing intervention in Ukraine.

Moreover, China may have the lead over the United States in emerging technologies that could be decisive for the future of military acquisitions and warfare, including 3D printing, hypersonic missiles, quantum computing, 5G wireless connectivity, and artificial intelligence (AI). And Russian President Vladimir Putin is building new unmanned vehicles while ominously declaring, “Whoever leads in AI will rule the world.”

If China or Russia are able to incorporate new technologies into their militaries before the United States, then this could lead to the kind of rapid shift in the balance of power that often causes war.

If Beijing believes emerging technologies provide it with a newfound, local military advantage over the United States, for example, it may be more willing than previously to initiate conflict over Taiwan. And if Putin thinks new tech has strengthened his hand, he may be more tempted to launch a Ukraine-style invasion of a NATO member.

Either scenario could bring these nuclear powers into direct conflict with the United States, and once nuclear armed states are at war, there is an inherent risk of nuclear conflict through limited nuclear war strategies, nuclear brinkmanship, or simple accident or inadvertent escalation.

This framing of the problem leads to a different set of policy implications. The concern is not simply technologies that threaten to undermine nuclear second-strike capabilities directly, but, rather, any technologies that can result in a meaningful shift in the broader balance of power. And the solution is not to preserve second-strike capabilities, but to preserve prevailing power balances more broadly.

When it comes to new technology, this means that the United States should seek to maintain an innovation edge. Washington should also work with other states, including its nuclear-armed rivals, to develop a new set of arms control and nonproliferation agreements and export controls to deny these newer and potentially destabilizing technologies to potentially hostile states.

These are no easy tasks, but the consequences of Washington losing the race for technological superiority to its autocratic challengers just might mean nuclear Armageddon.

#### Fintech’s disruptive startups have been squashed by large financial institutions

Loo ’18 – Associate Professor at BU Law [Rory Van; Associate Professor, Boston University School of Law and Affiliated Fellow, Yale Law School Information Society Project; 2018; "Making Innovation More Competitive: The Case of Fintech"; UCLA Law Review; https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/uclalr65&div=7&g\_sent=1&casa\_token=&collection=journals; accessed 8-18-2021]

Fintechs can be of any size. Four of the ten largest U.S. companies, Google, Apple, Amazon, and Facebook, all have built payment systems and made other inroads into finance.36 Despite the participation of large technology companies, the main drivers of fintech innovation have been the thousands of startups attracting billions of dollars in investment each year. Startup business models are novel, diverse, and shifting. One of the earliest fintech areas was peer-topeer lending, in which companies link individuals who have money to those who want it.37 Most of the original peer-to-peer companies have already grown beyond their origins and now engage in more familiar "marketplace lending."38 They receive money from banks to lend to individuals, and their innovations have spread to other areas, such as sophisticated analytic tools for estimating borrowers' creditworthiness.39

Unlike the other categories of consumer fintechs, advisory fintechs do not need to directly receive any money from consumers to offer their basic product. The goal of Credit Karma, NerdWallet, Mint, and other advisory fintechs is to help people make all of their financial decisions through a single app.4" These companies learn about users-with permission-by accessing personal bank accounts, credit scores, credit card records, tax returns, and other similar sources of financial information. Users then receive recommendations about credit cards or mortgages with lower fees, savings accounts that pay higher rates, and other products that better meet their needs.41

While the term "fintech" is used here to exclude traditional banks, all major financial institutions have become highly technological. The leading banks are each purchasing fintech startups, forming strategic partnerships, or internally building whiz teams to design new products.42 JP Morgan Chase's Intelligent Solutions Group has over 200 analysts and data scientists and produced about fifty technologies in 2015 alone.43 Goldman Sachs, which has more engineers than Facebook or Twitter, is launching an online lender.44 In light of Wall Street's increasing launch of digital products and adoption of artificial intelligence,45 regulating fintech amounts to regulating the future of finance.

B. Private Sector Institutional Dynamics

Fintechs could in theory pose a threat to traditional banks. Almost threequarters of millennials say they would prefer to receive their financial services from technology companies such as Google and Amazon, rather than big banks.46 Convenience, trust, and price all could play important roles in driving customer switching. Individual users, including small businesses, increasingly find dealing with big banks to be time-consuming and frustrating compared to the ease of tailored startup apps.47 In recent years, consumers have grown distrustful of large financial institutions, whose reputations have been battered by subprime mortgage lending, the financial crisis, the LIBOR scandal, and Wells Fargo opening millions of fake accounts in customers' names. 48

Innovation helps explain why publicly traded companies are disappearing at a faster rate today than ever before-six times as fast as forty years ago.49 Online startups have even thrived in other heavily regulated industries, such as transportation and gambling." Convenience and lower costs have driven some of this success, and many fintechs offer similar advantages.51 Furthermore, unlike some industries that Silicon Valley has invaded, finance lacks a meaningful physical component. This makes the base products inherently vulnerable to digital competition. Traditional banks' infrastructures-including their legacy information systems and physical branches-inhibit their ability to rapidly respond to disruption.

Since Dimon's 2015 warning, however, the dynamics between fintech and traditional firms appear to have shifted. Entrepreneurs who started out wanting to do to banks what Amazon did to retail have wound up licensing their technology to banks.52 As one industry observer puts it: "What was once perhaps an adversarial relationship has warmed .... Many no longer see an existential threat in fintech. Instead, they believe that "[i]t is most likely that the small fintech companies will be subsumed" by large financial institutions. 4

Ii. The Competition Shortcomings

A given fintech's decision of whether to challenge or join banks will depend in part on whether regulations and market dynamics give it a real chance to compete. Competition is extremely difficult to measure, and economic models inadequately consider important factors, such as innovation.5 To assess the hypothesis that a lack of competition inhibits fintech, this Part surveys the evidence related to entry barriers, customer switching, anticompetitive prices, and the relative pace of U.S. innovation.

A. Entry Barriers

When firms face excessive barriers to entering a market, competition can stagnate, raising prices and lowering innovation. 6 Although part of the problem is simply the large amount of regulation, 7 fintech has faced two further entry barriers: traditional firms' ability to block market access and the difficulty in obtaining a federal bank license.

Legacy financial institutions can limit some fintechs' operations through control of data. Most notably, advisory fintechs rely on access to both personal and general product data. 8 Some banks' response has been to block or limit fintechs' access to customer accounts, thereby making it harder for fintechs to provide tailored advice. 9 Legacy institutions can also block fintechs from collecting online product information by using laws never intended for such a purpose, including trespass to chattel, the Digital Millennium Copyright Act,6 " and the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act.61 As a result, advisory fintechs cannot on their own provide comprehensive financial advice to their users. In order to access crucial data, fintechs may need to prioritize big banks' interests over helping consumers switch.

Some legacy firms can also limit market access through their dominant market positions. Over 99 percent of all credit card transactions run through the Visa, American Express, Mastercard, and Discover networks.62 Many commentators have documented credit card companies' ability to engage in exclusionary conduct, such as vertical restraint clauses that prevent merchants from using other payment methods.63 Although credit card companies may not be able to use those same tactics against payment fintechs, their strong market positions could enable them to deploy other tactics. They have, for instance, instituted "Honor All Cards" rules requiring merchants to accept their contactless payments as a condition of accepting plastic cards. These rules arguably "foreclose entry to those digital wallets that.., do not use the credit card networks for payments. 64

#### That means US fintech will lose to international competitors.

Loo ’18 – Associate Professor at BU Law [Rory Van; Associate Professor, Boston University School of Law and Affiliated Fellow, Yale Law School Information Society Project; 2018; "Making Innovation More Competitive: The Case of Fintech"; UCLA Law Review; https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/uclalr65&div=7&g\_sent=1&casa\_token=&collection=journals; accessed 8-18-2021]

C. International Competitiveness

Less efficient and innovative U.S. financial services are problematic not only in isolation, but also from an international perspective. Scholars and regulators have inconclusively debated whether banks need to be big to maintain their international competitiveness. 12' Less well-recognized is how a lack of domestic competition may undermine U.S. financial firms' global competitiveness. Foreign financial firms may gain an edge by being subject to greater competition in their home markets, thereby being forced to innovate more and operate leanly. This creates two potential problems. First, reduced domestic competitiveness may make the United States less able to enter foreign markets. The U.S. economy has benefited in recent years from billions of dollars in revenues earned abroad by Google and other leading digital companies. 126 Given the growing portion of the global economy taken up by finance, the fintech lag could constitute a large-scale missed opportunity for U.S. firms to strengthen the economy by bringing in revenues earned abroad.

Second, in the long term, American financial firms may become more vulnerable to international competition even in domestic markets. Although U.S. licenses can shield banks from foreign fintech challengers today, distributed ledger technologies may change this. Americans are already increasingly using Bitcoin, Ethereum, and other unregulated virtual currencies based on blockchain technology.127 Much is unknown about how such technologies will develop, and the trust offered by a governmentally overseen financial system may prove difficult to replicate. 128 If, however, an era of wide-open global finance arrives, U.S. financial institutions could find themselves suddenly exposed to international competition as never before. Without U.S. regulators to insulate them, U.S. financial institutions made soft by lesser competition would be more prone to lose significant market share to foreign financial institutions than they would be if domestic markets were more competitive.

#### Fintech innovation is key to the effectiveness of U.S. economic sanctions

Harrell and Rosenberg 19 – Peter E. Harrell is an adjunct senior fellow at the Center for a New American Security; former Deputy Assistant Secretary for Counter Threat Finance and Sanctions at the U.S. State Department. Elizabeth Rosenberg is a senior fellow and director and director of the Energy, Economics, and Security Program at the Center for a New American Security.

Peter E. Harrell and Elizabeth Rosenberg, “Economic Dominance, Financial Technology, and the Future of U.S. Economic Coercion,” *Center for a New American Security*, 2019, pp. 25-26, http://files.cnas.org.s3.amazonaws.com/documents/CNAS-Report-Economic\_Dominance-final.pdf.

Developments in financial technology also have the potential to affect the availability and strength of coercive economic measures over the longer term. The movement to develop blockchain-based, decentralized payments platforms and new digital currencies or tokenized assets that feature anonymity can undermine the strength of coercive economic measures. However, financial technology developments, such as the development of artificial intelligence/machine learning (AI/ML) compliance technologies, also present potential means to better detect and stop evaders and avoiders of U.S. economic coercion throughout global chains of financial interconnectivity.

Financial technologies are not themselves the drivers of potential future changes to the sources of coercive economic leverage. However, they may enable foreign governments to develop better tools to insulate transactions from U.S. jurisdiction. And, regardless of the actions of foreign governments as they spread commercially, they may help evaders duck U.S. coercive economic power in limited but meaningful ways. Conversely, new AI/ML or other technologies may help U.S. policymakers implementing economic coercion to better do their job.

Financial technology can be a facilitator of rapid transformation in the financial services sector. Importantly, financial technology developments will not happen just in the United States; a number of other countries, from China to Singapore to Switzerland, are promoting themselves as financial technology leaders. There is no guarantee that financial technology innovators and investors will be centered in the United States in the future—which represents a vulnerability to U.S. economic prominence.

Maintaining U.S. Leverage

The extent to which the United States will maintain coercive economic leverage in a world where financial technology disrupts aspects of the traditional financial architecture will depend to a significant degree on the extent to which U.S. firms, and large global firms, continue to play a dominant role in the development of the technology. To put it bluntly, a blockchain-based clearing mechanism that enables trade between foreign countries without financial transactions touching the dollar would likely undermine U.S. leverage if the technology were developed and operated by a foreign company that had no need to adhere to U.S. law. The United States would maintain at least some leverage if the technology were developed or operated by a U.S. company obliged to adhere to U.S. sanctions, technology-export restrictions, and other relevant laws, or a foreign company with significant U.S. exposure.

#### Iran’s an emerging global hub for Bitcoin mining. Absent our internal link, they’ll obviate the role of financial institutions and effectiveness of sanctions.

**Erdbrink 19** --- Dutch journalist who is the Northern Europe bureau chief for The New York Times

Thomas, 1-29-2019, "How Bitcoin Could Help Iran Undermine U.S. Sanctions,” New York Times, https://www.nytimes.com/2019/01/29/world/middleeast/bitcoin-iran-sanctions.html

Iran’s economy has been hobbled by banking sanctions that effectively stop foreign companies from doing business in the country. But transactions in Bitcoin, difficult to trace, could allow Iranians to make international payments while bypassing the American restrictions on banks.

In the past, the threat of United States sanctions has been enough to squelch most business with Iran, but the anonymous payments made in Bitcoin could change that. While Washington could still monitor and intimidate major companies, countless small and midsize companies could exploit Bitcoin and other cryptocurrencies to conduct business under American radar.

The United States Treasury, well aware of the threat, is attempting to bring Bitcoin and the others into line. In recent weeks, in response to an internet fraud case originating from Iran, the Treasury imposed sanctions on two Iranians and the Bitcoin addresses, or ‘‘wallets,’’ they had used for trading in the currency.

The Treasury also has warned digital marketplaces that buy and sell Bitcoin and companies that sell computers used to process Bitcoin transactions that they should not provide services to Iranians. Several well-known trading sites are now blocking buyers and sellers from Iran. Some have confiscated money belonging to clients based in Iran.

“Treasury will aggressively pursue Iran and other rogue regimes attempting to exploit digital currencies,” the department said in a statement.

But by their nature, cryptocurrencies are uncontrolled by any person or entity. At best, efforts to regulate or monitor trade in them are episodic, whack-a-mole affairs. With Bitcoin and other cryptocurrencies, there is simply no way to duplicate the banking sanctions that have proved so damaging to the Iranian economy.

Bitcoin transactions are recorded on a digital ledger or database known as the blockchain, maintained communally by many independent computers. The system is designed explicitly to avoid central banks and large financial institutions. Like emails delivered without going through a central postal service, the computer network maintaining Bitcoin records enables the movement of money without going through any central authority.

The Iranian government has been slow to recognize the potential sanctions-evading possibilities of Bitcoin. But it is now considering the establishment of exchanges to facilitate trading, one official, Abdolhassan Firouzabadi, said recently. Despite the failure of Venezuela’s state-backed cryptocurrency, the Petro, Iran’s central bank said recently that it was seriously considering creation of something similar, possibly called the Crypto-Rial, named after the national currency, the rial.

Still, Iran’s venture into Bitcoin pales in comparison to what has been happening the former Soviet republic of Georgia, where thousands of people have jumped into the cryptocurrency business.

At the computerized processing operation in the Iranian desert, no one seemed particularly concerned with the geopolitical implications of Bitcoin.

The operation consisted of 2,800 computers from China, fitted into eight containers, which when linked are called a farm. It makes intense mathematical calculations, known as mining, needed to confirm Bitcoin transactions. Miners collect fees in Bitcoin for their services.

Ignoring the rain, the European visitor used the calculator on his mobile phone to determine how much money could be made from this particular farm, multiplying computer power and deducting electricity and operational costs.

He estimated about five Bitcoins a month, which at roughly $4,000 per Bitcoin at current price levels, would be about $20,000.

“Not too bad,” he said.

The currency fluctuates like any other, though it has proved particularly volatile, sinking to slightly less than $4,000 a unit from nearly $20,000 about a year ago.

“We’ll have two engineers on site to keep everything running, that’s it,” said Behzad, the chief executive of IranAsic, the company running the site. He, like the European investor, did not want to provide his family name, out of fear of penalties from the United States.

The Chinese computers, called Antminer V9s, were regarded as outdated by the European visitor. Still, he said, “I guess this is the last place on earth where they are still profitable.”

That helps explain why Iran seems to be taking its first baby steps toward becoming a global center for mining Bitcoins. Because of generous government subsidies, electricity — the energy for the computers needed to process cryptocurrency transactions — costs little in Iran. It goes for about six-tenths of a cent per kilowatt-hour, compared with an average of 12 cents in the United States and 35 cents in Germany.

In recent months, dozens of foreign investors from Europe, Russia and Asia have considered moving their mining operations to Iran and other low-cost countries like Georgia. “We have to be flexible in this industry and go where prices are the lowest in order to survive,” said the European investor.

#### Tracking solves Iranian evasion – US lead key.

**Robinson 21** --- Ph.D., Co-founder and Chief Scientist discusses cryptocurrency forensics, investigations, compliance, and sanctions.

Tom, "How Iran Uses Bitcoin Mining to Evade Sanctions and “Export” Millions of Barrels of Oil," Elliptic, <https://www.elliptic.co/blog/how-iran-uses-bitcoin-mining-to-evade-sanctions>

The Iranian state is therefore effectively selling its energy reserves on the global markets, using the Bitcoin mining process to bypass trade embargoes. Iran-based miners are paid directly in Bitcoin, which can then be used to pay for imports - allowing sanctions on payments through Iranian financial institutions to be circumvented.

This has become all but an official policy, with a think tank attached to the Iranian president’s office recently publishing a report highlighting the use of cryptoassets to avoid sanctions.

Many of those making the Bitcoin transactions and paying the fees to Iran-based miners will be located in the United States - the very country spearheading the sanctions. As the US government considers whether to lift some sanctions on Iran in exchange for a return to a nuclear deal, it will need to consider the role that Bitcoin mining plays in enabling Iran to monetise its natural resources and access financial services such as payments.

In the meantime, financial institutions should consider the sanctions risk they are exposed to due to Iranian Bitcoin mining - particularly those that are beginning to offer cryptoasset services. If 4.5% of Bitcoin mining is based in Iran, then there is a 4.5% chance that any Bitcoin transaction will involve the sender paying a transaction fee to a Bitcoin miner in Iran. Financial institutions should also be on the lookout for crypto deposits originating from Iranian miners that are seeking to cash-out their earnings.

Solutions for Sanctions Risks

However as we discuss in more detail our new sanctions guide, solutions to these challenges exist and are already used by financial institutions engaging in cryptoasset activity.

For example, blockchain analytics solutions such as those provided by Elliptic can be used by regulated financial institutions to detect and block cryptoasset deposits from Iran-based entities including miners. Techniques can also be employed to ensure that transaction fees are not paid to miners in high risk jurisdictions.

#### Effective sanctions key to prevent Iranian nuclear acquisition.

**Morrison 21** --- Master of Arts of Political Science, University of Waterloo.

Kallen, 2021, “Economic Sanctions and Nuclear Non-proliferation: A Comparative Study of North Korea and Iran, “University of Waterloo, Fulfilment of the thesis requirement for the degree of Master of Arts, https://uwspace.uwaterloo.ca/bitstream/handle/10012/16666/Morrison\_Kallen%20.pdf?sequence=3

Economic sanctions have been successful in stopping Iran from pursuing their nuclear program thus far. Iran has conceded multiple times to the United States and the international community to halt the enrichment of uranium and the advancement of their nuclear program. The most notable example of Iran’s concessions has been the signing of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action in which Iran agreed to halt and greatly reduce their nuclear program in return for substantial easing of economic sanctions. The second criteria has been met as Iran’s economy has significantly worsened due to continued economic pressure from the United States and the international community. Iran’s economy has significantly worsened due to continued economic pressure from the United States and the international community. Continued economic pressure has been paramount to bringing Iran to the negotiating table. While the United States and its regional allies do pose a military threat to Iran, that is unlikely a sufficient factor in dissuading Iran.

We have established that the level of political contestation in the targeted countries, their economic and security vulnerabilities, and the degree of international cooperation are important factors in determining if economic sanctions are effective at limiting nuclear proliferation. In Iran’s case the regime, while authoritarian, allows for limited political contestation. The general public gets to elect the president (even if candidates are handpicked by the supreme leader). Iranians have been able to protest against the government. One goal of economic sanctions is to galvanize the general public against the government and their policy decisions. Iranians have indeed been frustrated by the sanctions and voiced their discontent with the government policies targeted by the sanctions.

Iran’s international environment is also conductive for economic sanctions to be effective. Iran is a regional power with an impressive arsenal of missiles and extensive network of proxy forces. Therefore, nuclear weapons are not imperative for Iran’s defence. On the other end, Iran’s economy is largely based on oil and gas exports. Integration into the global market is very important for Iranians and a vital source of revenue for the government. Economic sanctions have hurt the Iranian economy and therefore have hurt Iranians. The economic squeeze has brought Iran to the negotiating table in the past and will likely do so in the future. The international approach to Iran has been encompassing with the European Union and the United Kingdom taking a common stand with the United States in preventing Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. Even after the United States left the JCPOA the EU and UK have attempted to develop mechanisms to provide Iran with economic incentives to keep Iran abiding to the JCPOA. Even though China has given Iran an economic lifeline there is tension within Iran over concerns of becoming too economically dependent on China.

#### Israel would preempt before the nukes come online. Sparks a wider regional conflict that draws in all the major powers.

Scheinman 18 – Security Studies Chair, Nat’l War College; Nuclear Nonprolif Rep. for Obama

Adam M. Scheinman, What if Iran leaves the NPT?, 8 June 2018, <https://thebulletin.org/2018/06/what-if-iran-leaves-the-npt/>

Not to diminish the immensity of North Korea’s nuclear challenge, but Iran’s withdrawal from the NPT carries weightier risks. It would likely mean that Iran’s Supreme Leader had given the green light to an Iranian nuclear weapon, opening the floodgates to NPT withdrawals by other Arab states—Saudi Arabia, the UAE, and Egypt head that list. These and possibly other Sunni governments, none of whom can rely on a major power for defense, may conclude that they require their own nuclear weapon to check Iran’s rise. The Saudis are very clear and public on this point.

More immediately, Israel may feel compelled to strike Iranian nuclear facilities before they become fully operational. This raises the specter of a regional war that may draw in several of the nuclear weapon states—the United States, the UK, France, and Russia—and reshape the Middle East in ways we cannot predict. Whether the NPT could survive such a shock is another unknown.

#### Loss of economic leverage alone is sufficient to trigger the impact.

**Zilber 21** --- Journalist covering Middle East politics and an adjunct fellow at the Washington Institute for Near East Policy.

Neri, 9-14-2021, "Israel Can Live With a New Iran Nuclear Deal, Defense Minister Says," Foreign Policy, https://foreignpolicy.com/2021/09/14/israel-iran-nuclear-deal-defense-minister-gantz/

TEL AVIV, Israel—Israel would be willing to accept a return to a U.S.-negotiated nuclear deal with Iran, Defense Minister Benny Gantz told Foreign Policy—but Israeli officials are also pressing Washington to prepare a serious “demonstration of power” in case negotiations with Tehran fail.

The remarks, made during an exclusive interview last week, appear to reflect a shift in policy for Israel, which under the leadership of former Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu loudly opposed the 2015 nuclear agreement and worked to undermine it.

Former U.S. President Donald Trump pulled the United States out of the agreement in 2018, but the Biden administration has renewed the diplomacy—even as Iran moves closer to enriching enough uranium to make a nuclear weapon.

Gantz, asked about efforts by the Biden administration to get back to an agreement with Iran, said: “The current U.S. approach of putting the Iran nuclear program back in a box, I’d accept that.”

He added that Israel would want to see a “viable U.S.-led plan B” that includes broad economic pressure on Iran in case the talks fail. And he gestured at Israel’s own “plan C,” which would involve military action.

Gantz estimated that Iran was two to three months away from having the materials and capabilities to produce one nuclear bomb. Iran has steadily ramped up its nuclear work since the United States withdrew from the deal, despite a so-called maximum pressure campaign advanced by Trump and Netanyahu that included sanctions and sabotage efforts.

#### Can’t stay contained—multiple pathways to global nuclear war.

Avery 13 – Lektor Emeritus & Associate Professor, U of Copenhagen

John Scales Avery, Lektor Emeritus, Associate Professor, at the Department of Chemistry, University of Copenhagen, since 1990 he has been the Contact Person in Denmark for Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs, An Attack On Iran Could Escalate Into Global Nuclear War, 11/6/13, http://www.countercurrents.org/avery061113.htm

Despite the willingness of Iran's new President, Hassan Rouhani to make all reasonable concessions to US demands, Israeli pressure groups in Washington continue to demand an attack on Iran. But such an attack might escalate into a global nuclear war, with catastrophic consequences. As we approach the 100th anniversary World War I, we should remember that this colossal disaster escalated uncontrollably from what was intended to be a minor conflict. There is a danger that an attack on Iran would escalate into a large-scale war in the Middle East, entirely destabilizing a region that is already deep in problems. The unstable government of Pakistan might be overthrown, and the revolutionary Pakistani government might enter the war on the side of Iran, thus introducing nuclear weapons into the conflict. Russia and China, firm allies of Iran, might also be drawn into a general war in the Middle East. Since much of the world's oil comes from the region, such a war would certainly cause the price of oil to reach unheard-of heights, with catastrophic effects on the global economy. In the dangerous situation that could potentially result from an attack on Iran, there is a risk that nuclear weapons would be used, either intentionally, or by accident or miscalculation. Recent research has shown that besides making large areas of the world uninhabitable through long-lasting radioactive contamination, a nuclear war would damage global agriculture to such an extent that a global famine of previously unknown proportions would result. Thus, nuclear war is the ultimate ecological catastrophe. It could destroy human civilization and much of the biosphere. To risk such a war would be an unforgivable offense against the lives and future of all the peoples of the world, US citizens included.

#### Saudi will follow them across the nuclear threshold---nuclear war.

Robb et. al 12 (Senator Charles S. – Virginia, General Charles Wald – Former Deputy Commander of U.S. European Command, Dr. Daniel Ahn – Senior Economist and Head of Portfolio Strategy for CitiBank New York, John Hannah – Former Assistant for National Security Affairs to the Vice President, Stephen Rademaker – Former Assistant Secretary of State for Arms Control and Nonproliferation, Christopher Carney – former U.S. Representative from Pennsylvania, Ed Husain – Senior Fellow for Middle Eastern Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations, Ambassador Dennis Ross – Counselor for the Washington Institute for Near East Policy, Ambassador Eric Edelman – Former Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, Reuben Jeffrey III – Former U. S. Under Secretary of State for Economic, Business, and Agricultural Affairs, John Tanner – Former U.S. Representative from Tennessee, Secretary Dan Glickman – Senior Fellow at the Bipartisan Policy Center, Admiral Gregory Johnson – Former Commander of U.S. Naval Forces, Europe, Mortimer Zuckerman – CEO and Chairman of the Board of Directors for Boston Properties, Inc., Larry Goldsetin – Founder of Energy Policy Research Foundation, Inc., and General Ron Keys – Former Commander of the Air Combat Command, The Price of Inaction: Analysis of Energy and Economic Effects of a Nuclear Iran, Bipartisan Policy Center, p. 24)

Saudi Arabia would be very likely to try to follow Iran across the nuclear threshold. Should it do so, the world would face the possibility of an Iran-Saudi nuclear exchange—a catastrophic humanitarian event that would threaten the entirety of Gulf oil exports for an extended period of time. In early 2008, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee concluded: “If Iran obtains a nuclear weapon, it will place tremendous pressure on Saudi Arabia to follow suit.”19 By 2012, some experts believe it has already begun to do so. Two main factors could drive Saudi Arabia to pursue a nuclear weapon: (1) a decades-long Saudi-Iran cold war waged along sectarian, religious, ethnic, and geopolitical lines and (2) a deep-seated competition over the energy policies that form the lifeblood of both regimes. The Sunni Saudi monarchy and Shiite Iranian theocracy each claim leadership of the Islamic world. This sectarian competition for primacy is reinforced by ethnic differences: Saudi Arabia is the largest and most populous Arab country astride the Gulf, but it is dwarfed by Iran’s much larger Persian-majority population. These competing claims have pitted the two countries in an enduring cold war and proxy conflict spanning from Lebanon to Iraq and the Arabian Peninsula. Iran—under both the Shah and the ayatollahs—has routinely sought to use its conventional military capabilities, large population, geostrategic position, expansive resources, and ties to armed groups to shift the balance of power in the Persian Gulf in its favor and at the expense of its Sunni Arab neighbors.20 As a result, Saudi Arabia has made it clear it views a nuclear-capable Iran as an existential threat. In 2008, King Abdullah urged the United States to “cut off the head of the snake,” one instance of his “frequent exhortations [to] the United States to attack Iran to put an end to its nuclear weapons program,” according to U.S. diplomatic cables revealed by Wikileaks.21 With uncertain prospects for a halt to Iran’s nuclear program—peaceful or otherwise—in 2009, the King informed a senior American official, “If [Iran] gets nuclear weapons, we will get nuclear weapons.” This year, senior Saudi officials reiterated that “it would be completely unacceptable to have Iran with a nuclear capability and not the kingdom [of Saudi Arabia].”22 Rather than lose time developing an indigenous nuclear program, it is likely the Saudi kingdom would seek to obtain a nuclear warhead from Pakistan ready to mount on its CSS-2 ballistic missiles. Close Saudi-Pakistani security ties date back to shared Cold War–era interests, and it is widely believed that Riyadh bankrolled Islamabad’s nuclear weapons program with the stipulation that Pakistan would sell nuclear devices to Saudi Arabia in an emergency; in the words of a senior Saudi official, “within weeks.”23 Pakistan would benefit by receiving much-needed cash and could demand in return dual-key authority over missile launches, both to control Saudi policy and to bolster its own secondstrike capability against India. At best, this would create a nuclear-armed standoff between the two most powerful and mutually antagonistic countries in the Persian Gulf. At worst, it could devolve into atomic warfare. Iran’s and Saudi Arabia’s small arsenals, lack of durable communication channels, poor civilian oversight of command-and-control systems, erratic intelligence, proximity to each other, religious ardor, and sectarian divide would all distinguish this scenario from the Cold War balance between the United States and the Soviet Union. Any such conflict would likely be extremely devastating. Each country would have natural incentives to cripple its opponent’s oil facilities in any nuclear conflict. Crudeoil exports are both regimes’ political and economic lifeblood, and thus the basis for their military power. Also, each country’s oil infrastructure and export terminals are concentrated along the Gulf, within range of the other’s nuclear-weapons delivery vehicles. Moreover, a nuclear war in this region would likely not only destroy a large portion of the Gulf’s oil infrastructure but also render the entire Gulf unavailable to shipping for some period of time. This could come directly through radioactive fallout, atmospheric pollution, and environmental destruction, or indirectly through prohibitively high insurance rates and other risk factors for tankers transiting the region.24 Therefore, even if a nuclear exchange did not spread into a region-wide war, the transit of Hormuz-bound oil exports would be halted by such a conflict.

#### The United States federal government should increase prohibitions on anticompetitive business practices which cause net-harm on one side of platforms.

New plan:

The United States federal government should remove plaintiffs’ heightened burden of proof for antitrust cases in two-sided platform markets. ????

#### The aff solves – it enables tailored remedies that promote competition but maintain efficiency

Hovenkamp, James G. Dinan University Professor, University of Pennsylvania Carey Law School and The Wharton School, ‘21

(Herbert, “Antitrust and Platform Monopoly,” 130 Yale L.J. 1952)

More Creative Alternatives

Frequently, neither simple injunctions nor simple breakups will be good solutions for platform monopoly. Injunctions may be inadequate to restore competition, and breakups may impair efficient operation and harm consumers in the process.

The case for a breakup is strongest when noncompetitive performance or conduct seems to be inherent in a firm’s current structure. Even then, however, there is no guarantee that the firm, once dismantled, will perform any better than before. For example, how do we break up Facebook without harming the constituencies that it serves?

The approaches discussed briefly in this Section do not require the breakup of assets or the spinoff of divisions or subsidiaries other than some that have been acquired by merger. Rather, they alter the nature of ownership, managerial decision making, contracts, intellectual-property licenses, or information management. Instead of attempting to force greater competition between a dominant platform and its rivals, we might do better to leave the firm intact but encourage more competition within it. Alternatively, we might increase interoperability by requiring more extensive sharing of information or other inputs. While the current antitrust statutes grant the courts equitable power sufficient to accomplish these remedies,299 the proposals are novel and could provoke resistance.

These remedies can be applied to entities other than structural monopolies, and for offenses under both section 1 and section 2 of the Sherman Act. While less intrusive than asset breakups, however, they can be more intrusive than simple conduct injunctions. As a result, they should be limited to situations where prohibitory injunctions alone are unlikely to be adequate. Occasional uses of unlawful exclusive dealing, most-favored-nation agreements,300 or other anticompetitive contract practices deserve an injunction, but ordinarily would not merit a breakup of the entire firm or fundamental alteration of its management structure.

The traditional way that antitrust law applies structural relief is to break up firms’ various physical assets, through such devices as forcing selloffs (divestiture) of plants, products, or subsidiaries.301 To the extent these breakups interfere with a firm’s production and distribution, they can produce harmful results such as increased costs or loss of coordination. This is particularly true of integrated production units, such as single digital platforms. The D.C. Circuit noted this concern in Microsoft when it refused the government’s request for a breakup.302

a. Enabling Competition Within the Platform

One alternative to divestiture is to leave a platform’s physical assets and range of participants intact but change the structure of ownership or management so as to make it more competitive internally. A platform or other organization can itself be a “market” within which competition can occur. In that case, antitrust law can be applied to its internal decisions, improving competition without limiting the extent of scale economies or beneficial network effects.

Ordinarily, agreements among subsidiaries or other agents within a firm are counted as unilateral and so are attributed to the firm itself.303 That rule is a direct consequence of the separation of ownership and control. The all-important premise, however, is that the firm’s central management is the only relevant economic decisionmaker. When that is not the case, even agreements among the various constituents within the firm can be treated as cartels.

There is plenty of precedent on this issue. The history of antitrust law is replete with examples of incorporated firms that are owned or managed by distinct and often competing entities. The courts have treated these firms as cartels or joint ventures, even for practices that, from a corporate law perspective, appeared to be those of a single firm. If properly managed, the result can be to force entities within the same incorporated organization to behave competitively vis-à-vis one another.

Firms whose ownership is reorganized in this fashion can still be very large and retain most of the attributes of large firms. On the one hand, this will satisfy those concerned that the breakup of large firms can result in the loss of economies of scale or scope, or of other synergies that generally lead to high output and lower prices. On the other hand, it will not satisfy those who believe that “big is bad” for its own sake.304

Joint management of unified productive assets has a storied history that goes back to the Middle Ages. Farmers, ranchers, and fishermen produced cattle, sheep, and fish on various “commons,” or facilities that were shared among a large number of owners and subjected to management rules.305 Many of these operated on a mixed model that involved individual production for stationary products such as crops, but a commons for grazing cattle or other livestock. For mobile products such as cattle or fish, the costs of shared management were lower than the costs of creating or maintaining boundaries. That was not the case for radishes or wheat. So rather than cutting a large pasture or bay into 100 fenced-off plots, participating property owners operated it as a single economic unit, substituting management costs for fencing costs. Just as for any firm, size and shape are determined by comparing the costs and payoffs of alternative forms of organization.306

So while a commons can be a very large firm, it can be operated by a collaboration of competing entities rather than a single one. Output reductions and price setting by a single firm are almost always out of reach of the federal antitrust laws. On the other hand, if a market is operated by a joint venture of

active business participants, their pricing is subject to the laws against collusion. Their exclusions also operate under the more aggressive standards that antitrust applies to concerted, as opposed to unilateral, refusals to deal.307 The fact that this joint venture is a corporation organized under state law, as many ventures are, does not make any difference. It is still a collaboration as far as antitrust law is concerned.

The theory of the firm precludes claims of an antitrust conspiracy between a corporation and its various subsidiaries, officers, shareholders, or employees. This preclusion is an essential corollary to the proposition that a corporation is a single entity for most legal purposes and not simply a cartel of its shareholders or other constituent parts. This is how corporate law preserves the boundary between firms and markets.308

But important exceptions exist. While a corporation is a single entity for most antitrust purposes, if it is operated by its shareholders for the benefit of their own separate businesses, its conduct is reachable under section 1 of the Sherman Act. A cartel is still a cartel even if it organizes itself into a corporation.

The classic antitrust example of such a collaborative structure is in the 1918 Chicago Board of Trade case, which first articulated the modern rule of reason for antitrust cases.309 As Justice Holmes had described the Board thirteen years previously, 310 it was an Illinois state-chartered corporation whose 1600 members were themselves traders for their own individual accounts, and with individual exclusive rights to do business on the Board’s trading floor.311 The “call rule,” which prevented collaborative price making among the members except during exchange hours, could not have been challenged under the antitrust laws as unilateral conduct. A single firm may set any nonpredatory price it wishes. Further, all of the relevant participants were inside the firm. Nevertheless, they were regarded as independent actors for the purpose of trading among themselves.

Thus the United States challenged the call rule as price fixing among competitors. 312 Not only is the substantive law against such collaborative activity more aggressive than that against unilateral actions, but the remedial problems are less formidable. If a firm acting unilaterally should set an unlawful price, the court must order it to charge a different price, placing it in the awkward position of a utility regulator. By contrast, price fixing by multiple independent actors operating in concert is remedied by a simple order against price fixing, requiring each participant to set its price individually without dictating what the price must be. The Supreme Court ultimately found the Chicago Board’s call rule to be lawful. If it had not, however, the remedy would have been an injunction against enforcement of the rule, leaving the members free to set their own prices. In fact, the United States’ requested relief was precisely that.313

The same thing applies to refusals to deal. If a firm is acting unilaterally, its refusal to deal is governed by a strict standard under which liability is unlikely, particularly if there has not been an established history of dealing.314 Further, in many circumstances a court can enforce a dealing order only by setting the price and other terms. By contrast, if the entity that refuses to deal is operated by a group of active business participants, its collective refusal to deal is governed by section 1 of the Sherman Act. A court usually need do no more than issue an injunction against the agreement not to deal. This is true even if the actors have incorporated themselves into a single business entity, as in the Associated Press case, which involved a New York corporation whose members were 1200 newspapers. 315 The government charged the Association with “combining cooperatively” to prohibit news sales to nonmembers or making it more difficult for a newspaper to enter competition with an existing newspaper.316 The Court upheld an injunction against the restrictive rules under the Sherman Act.317

The modern business world provides many analogies to this structural situation. For example, each of the NCAA’s 1200 member schools operates as a single entity in the management of education, student housing and discipline, and financing of its own operations, including athletic departments. By contrast, the rules for recruiting and maintaining athletic teams, their compensation, as well as the scheduling, operation, and playing rules of games, are controlled through rulemaking by the collective group.318 While the schools compete with one another in recruiting athletes and coaches, in obtaining both live and television audiences, and in the licensing of intellectual property, all of these things fall within NCAA rulemaking and are reachable by antitrust law. Specifically, decisions to restrict the number of televised games;319 to limit the compensation of coaches320 or players;321 or to limit licensing of students’ names, images, and likenesses322 all fall within section 1 of the Sherman Act. When a violation is found, the antitrust remedy is an injunction permitting each team to determine its choices individually.

The same analysis drove the American Needle litigation, a refusal-to-deal case that involved the National Football League (NFL).323 The NFL is an unincorporated association controlled by thirty-two individual football teams, each of which is separately owned. NFL Properties (NFLP) is a separate, incorporated LLC in New York, controlled by the NFL. The individual teams are members, and they also collectively control the licensing of the teams’ substantial and individually owned intellectual-property rights. In this case, the team members voted to authorize NFLP to grant an exclusive license to Reebok to sell NFLlogoed headwear (i.e., helmets and caps) for all thirty-two teams.324 The plaintiff, American Needle, was a competing manufacturer that the agreement excluded.325

The issue for the Supreme Court was whether NFLP’s grant of an exclusive license should be addressed as a “unilateral” act of NFLP or as a concerted act by the thirty-two teams acting together, and the Court unanimously decided the latter.326 As a matter of corporate law, the refusal to deal appeared to be unilateral. NFLP, the licensing party, was an incorporated single entity. The lower court had relied on earlier Seventh Circuit decisions holding that professional sports leagues should be treated as single entities under these circumstances.327

The Supreme Court’s decision to the contrary was consistent with its earlier cases Sealy328 and Topco.329 In both of those cases, the Court held that even if an entity is incorporated, it can be addressed as a collaboration of its competing and actively participating shareholders. In Sealy, each member was a shareholder, and collectively the members owned all of Sealy’s stock.330 In Topco, each of the twenty-five members owned an equal share of the common stock, which had voting rights. They also owned all of the preferred stock, which was nonvoting, in proportion to their sales.331

Agreements among the active members or shareholders on incorporated real-estate boards are treated in the same way. Acting as a single entity, the board organizes the listing of properties for sale, formulates listing rules, promulgates standardized listing forms and sales agreements, and controls much of the conduct of individual brokers. Acting individually, the shareholder-brokers show properties to clients and obtain commissions from sales. Each real-estate office acts as not only a shareholder or partner in the overall organization, but also a competitor for individual real-estate sales.

Without discussing single-entity status, in 1950 the Supreme Court held that price fixing among real-estate agents who were members of an incorporated board was an unlawful conspiracy.332 A leading subsequent decision involved Realty Multi-List, a Georgia corporation organized and owned by individual real-estate brokers.333 Under the corporation’s arrangement, one shareholder member could show properties listed by a different shareholder member.334 The Fifth Circuit concluded that both the agreements among the members fixing commission rates and setting exclusionary and disciplinary rules for brokers who deviated from these rates were unlawful under section 1 of the Sherman Act.335

In the 2000s, the government and private plaintiffs sued several multiplelisting services, challenging their decisions to exclude real-estate sellers.336 The Fourth Circuit eventually applied American Needle, rejecting the contention that concerted action was lacking because the parties making the decision were acting as “agents of a single corporation.”337 Several other decisions have arrived at similar results reaching both price fixing and concerted exclusion.338

Hospital-staff-privileges boards also provide an analogy. Hospitals regularly use such boards to decide which physicians can be authorized to practice at the hospital. If physician-board members with independent practices deny staff privileges to someone, they may be treated as a conspiracy rather than a single actor.339

Even an incorporated natural monopoly can be subject to section 1 of the Sherman Act if it is controlled by its shareholders for their separate business interests. That issue arose in the 1912 Terminal Railroad decision.340 The railroadbridge infrastructure across the Mississippi was very likely a natural monopoly, given it operated as a bottleneck through which all traffic across the river had to pass.341 However, the facility was incorporated, and its shareholders were a group of thirty-eight firms and natural persons organized by railroad financier Jay Gould.342 The venture constituted a single corporation under Missouri law, but it was actively managed by its shareholder participants, all of whom had separate businesses. They were mainly individual railroads, a ferry company, bridges, a “system of terminals,” and several individuals.343 The venture thus controlled an extensive collection of railroad transportation, transfer, and storage facilities at a point at which all east-west traffic in that part of the country had to cross the Mississippi River.344

The Court’s order is both interesting and pertinent to platforms. It rejected the government’s request for dissolution. It noted that dissolving the corporation would do nothing to eliminate the bottleneck.345 Rather, it ordered the district court to fashion a “plan of reorganization” that permitted all shippers, whether or not they were members of the organization, to have access on fair and reasonable terms, with the goal of “plac[ing] every such company upon as nearly an equal plane as may be with respect to expenses and charges as that occupied by the proprietary companies.”346 Dissolution would be mandated only if the parties failed to agree on these terms.347

The *Terminal Railroad* decree suggests a way to remedy anticompetitive behavior by large digital platforms representing several sellers without sacrificing operational efficiencies. Rather than requiring divestiture of productive assets, which almost always leads to higher prices, we could restructure ownership and management. A large firm such as Amazon can attain economies of scale and scope that rivals cannot match. Further, Amazon benefits consumers, most suppliers, and labor, by selling its own house brands and the brands of third-party merchants on the same website. This is how a seller of house brands can break down the power of large name-brand sellers.348

The problem is not that Amazon sells too much, but rather that Amazon’s ownership and management make it profitable for Amazon to discriminate in favor of its own products and against those of third-party sellers, or to enter other anticompetitive agreements with independent sellers. Breaking up Amazon or forcing a physical separation of own-product and third-party sales would mean giving up a great deal of brand rivalry that benefits consumers.

Suppose a court required Amazon to turn important commercial decisions over to a board of active Amazon participants who made their own sales on the platform, purchased from Amazon, or dealt with it for ancillary services. Acting collaboratively, they could control product selection, distribution and customer agreements, advertising, internal product development, and pricing of Amazon’s own products. Their decisions would be subject to antitrust scrutiny under section 1 of the Sherman Act.

Such an approach could be particularly useful in situations involving refusals to deal. To illustrate, an important focus of the EU’s November 2020 Statement of Objections Against Amazon is on claims that Amazon “artificially favour[s] its own retail offers” in product areas where it sells both its own and third-party merchandise.349 Under current United States antitrust law, a firm acting unilaterally would not be prevented from discriminating between its own and thirdparty sales. That was the very issue in Trinko—namely, that monopolist Verizon discriminated against third-party carriers and favored its own.350

If decision making in this area were entrusted to a board of active sellers, including both Amazon itself and third parties, the section 1 standard would reach the conduct. Justice Scalia’s Trinko opinion, citing Terminal Railroad, observed that the Supreme Court had imposed nondiscrimination obligations under similar circumstances, but only when the government was attacking concerted rather than unilateral conduct.351 Further, when such conduct is concerted, it is “amenable to a remedy that does not require judicial estimation of free-market forces: simply requiring that the outsider be granted nondiscriminatory admission to the club.”352 The number and diversity of participants could vary, but they should be sufficiently numerous and diverse to make anticompetitive collusion unlikely. That could include individual merchants who sell on Amazon, principal shareholders, and perhaps customers and others. The Board should be subject to rules setting objective standards for product selection.

Numerosity should not interfere with effective operation. The Chicago Board of Trade had 1800 trading members and decisionmakers in 1918, when organizational rules and procedures were still being managed with pencil and paper.353 The NCAA has more than 1200 member schools,354 and the Associated Press had more than 1200 member newspapers in 1945.355 The Terminal Railroad Association had 38 shareholder members, but the decree contemplated nondiscriminatory sharing with any non-shareholder who wished to participate. 356 One large real-estate board, the Chicago Association of Realtors, has

over 15,500 members.357

The designated decisionmakers need not be Amazon shareholders, as long as they have independent business interests and operate on Amazon. In fact, the details of state corporate law or organization would not ordinarily affect the federal antitrust issue. For example, in some of these cases—such as Terminal Railroad, 358 Sealy,359 and Topco360—the relevant decisionmakers owned shares in the corporation. In American Needle, the organization in question was NFL Properties, an LLC,361 which does not have shareholders but rather owner-members similar to a partnership. Similarly, in Associated Press, the Court probed a cooperative association incorporated under the Membership Corporation Laws of New York.362

Whether the court applies the per se rule or the rule of reason in such cases would depend on the offense. In NCAA, the Supreme Court concluded that the rule of reason should apply to all restraints undertaken by the association because cooperation was necessary to the creation of the product: intercollegiate sports.363 That is not the case with product sales on Amazon. Rather, the traditional distinction between naked and ancillary restraints would work well. Price fixing or unjustified limitations on output would be strongly suspect.364 On the other hand, rules establishing uniform practices governing distribution and resolution of customer complaints could certainly be reasonable and thus lawful. Concerted refusals to deal can cover a range of practices from naked boycotts motivated by price (per se unlawful)365 to reasonable standard setting (rule of reason),366 and should be addressed accordingly.

Such an approach would notably not aim at size *per se*. An Amazon with competitively restructured management could be just as large as it is now. Indeed, it could be even larger. Cartels and monopolies function by restricting output, and facilitating internal competition could serve to increase it. Amazon would likely retain the efficiencies that flow from its size and scope. We would have effectively turned the internal workings of its platform into a market. It still might be in a position to undersell other businesses or to exclude products that its members and rules disapprove. If it did so in an anticompetitive manner, however, section 1 of the Sherman Act could be applied.

#### The aff is goldilocks – it remedies type II errors because it is POSSIBLE for plaintiffs to win, but caps type I error because frivolous cases would still be dismissed

Hovenkamp, Assistant Professor, USC Gould School of Law, ‘19

(Erik, “Platform Antitrust,” 44 J. Corp. L. 713)

Most rule of reason cases resolve before reaching the balancing stage. 198 However, this is in part due to the fact that a large majority of cases end at the first stage, with plaintiffs failing to make a prima facie case. 199 Michael Carrier finds that, between 1999 and 2009, plaintiffs fail at the first stage in 97% of rule of reason cases. 2 0 Further, 'there was only one final judgment issued in a plaintiff's favor over that period (out of 222 total judgments). Thus, given that the burden of establishing a prima facie case *without* balancing is already highly demanding, we would hardly stack the deck against defendants by continuing to reserve the balancing analysis for the final stage.

Everyone agrees that platform economics makes matters more complicated, which does indeed increase the concern that courts might err in attempting to resolve the balance of countervailing effects. But the maximal possible number of type 1 errors is capped by the number of judgments issued in plaintiffs' favor. And that number is already miniscule under the traditional burden shifting rules. As such, there simply isn't any room for a large swath of plaintiff-favoring errors, because plaintiffs almost never win in the first place.

### 1AC – Conduct Adv

Advantage 2 is cyber

#### The full scope of *Amex* is unclear—companies will exploit it to misuse their platforms—that’s effectively impossible to police

Khan, JD, FTC Chair, former director of legal policy with the Open Markets Institute, former professor at Columbia Law, ‘18

(Lina, “The Supreme Court just quietly gutted antitrust law,” July 3, <https://www.vox.com/the-big-idea/2018/7/3/17530320/antitrust-american-express-amazon-uber-tech-monopoly-monopsony>)

Antitrust laws have never permitted monopolistic firms to wield their market power against one set of customers so long as they benefit another set of players. Yet this kind of “balancing” is exactly what the Second Circuit ratified. Consider: Under the logic the appeals court used, an anticompetitive scheme by Uber to suppress driver income would not be considered illegal unless those bringing the suit showed that riders were also harmed.

What’s more, the court said, plaintiffs have to meet this new burden at the very earliest stage of litigation.

Last Monday, a 5-4 majority on the Supreme Court upheld that approach. Not only does the decision show stunning disregard for core elements of antitrust law, it carelessly mangles long-accepted legal rules along the way to establishing its position. Perhaps most strikingly, it overrides or ignores facts established by the district court.

For example, the Supreme Court states that AmEx’s increased merchant fees reflect “increases in the value of its services,” even though the lower court expressly found that AmEx’s price hikes exceeded the value of the cardholder rewards.

In practice, the Court has shielded from effective antitrust scrutiny a huge swath of firms that provide services on more than one side of a transaction — and, in today’s digital economy, there are many (as Justice Stephen Breyer noted in a dissent he read from the bench to emphasize his concerns).

Worse yet, the Court left unclear what kinds of businesses actually qualify for this new rule. As the Open Markets Institute, for which I work, explained in an amicus brief, deciding an antitrust case using the amorphous concept of a “two-sided” market will incentivize all sorts of companies to seek protection under this bad new theory.

What kinds of companies might have more freedom to exert pressure on customers, as a result of this decision? Not newspapers, the Court said: Readers are “largely indifferent” to the number of advertisements on newspaper pages, even though advertisers are looking to reach readers. So someone suing a newspaper on antitrust grounds (say, for prohibiting advertisers from doing business with other newspapers) would not have to prove that a newspaper’s conduct harmed both readers and advertisers.

On the surface, the Court’s language suggests that the special rule would apply to Amazon’s marketplace for third-party merchants, to eBay, and to Uber — but not to Google search or Facebook. Indeed, the Justice Department’s antitrust division chief, Makan Delrahim, has also come to this conclusion about the scope of the decision. But the Court’s opinion hardly delivers a clear and workable standard for judges to go by.

One can imagine the reams of studies Google would commission to show that targeting users with advertising did indeed amount to a “transaction” with users that users highly valued — a showing that, if successful, would likely qualify it for the shield of the special rule. If so, Google might be able to impose exclusionary contracts on advertisers and significantly boost the prices it charges them. Amazon, meanwhile, can continue to squeeze the suppliers and retailers reliant on its platform with little worry about being charged with the abuse of monopsony power.

Federal judges generally lack the expertise needed to independently assess the hyper-complex economic studies that this new rule will spur. Rather than focusing on the conduct between a company and one set of its customers, the new rule requires a much more involved showing.

#### This is accelerating—recent Circuit decisions doubled down on *Amex* – to expand it to new sectors, and mergers

Rozga, JD, Counsel, Davis Wright Tremaine LLP, former Federal Trade Commission attorney, Guest Lecturer, Boston University School of Law, ‘20

(Kaj, “Antitrust After American Express: Down a Competitive Effects Rabbit Hole,” September 21, <https://techlawdecoded.com/antitrust-after-american-express-down-the-competitive-effects-rabbit-hole/>)

These are no longer just predictions, but lived realities. Since American Express came down, parties opposing government antitrust enforcement actions have taken that decision and run with it.

Antitrust in tech markets after American Express

In the two years since the American Express decision, courts have already relied on it to toss out two more major antitrust cases brought by the government, both involving tech markets.

Sabre/Farelogix

The first of these cases involved the DOJ’s effort to block a merger. Sabre was seeking to acquire Farelogix, its competitor in offering booking services to airlines. Sabre operates a two-sided transaction platform that connects airlines to travel agencies (or travelers) for the sale of tickets and other services. Farelogix provides IT solutions to airlines that are used to sell tickets to travel agencies (or travelers).

The DOJ concluded that the deal would harm competition. It believed that Farelogix acted as a competitive constraint on Sabre to the extent that it provided an alternative for airlines that rely on such third-party services to sell tickets to travel agencies and end customers. The evidence at trial—including company documents and testimony from airlines—showed that the two viewed each other as competitors and that some airlines were able to use this to seek lower commission fees from Sabre. The court hearing the case found that “it is logical to conclude that part of Sabre’s interest in acquiring Farelogix is to mitigate the risk” resulting from the fact that its technology enables airlines to bypass Sabre’s transaction platform.4

Nevertheless, the court ruled that the DOJ failed to meet its burden of proof to “show that this purchase will harm competition on both sides of the two-sided market” for travel services provided to airlines and travel agencies. Citing the American Express decision, the court said: “As a matter of antitrust law, Sabre, a two-sided transaction platform, only competes with other two-sided platforms, but Farelogix only operates on the airline side of Sabre’s platform.” Therefore, it was not enough to prove that the merger would harm competition on only the one side of the two-sided market that Farelogix is active on.

And so despite the extensive evidence of competition between the companies, the court had to conclude that, as a matter of law, “Sabre and Farelogix do not compete in a relevant market.” To succeed in blocking the merger, the DOJ would have had to “produce evidence that the anticompetitive impact of the merger on the airline side of the [transaction] platform would be so substantial that it would sufficiently reverberate throughout the [platform] to such an extent as to make the two-sided [transaction] platform market, overall, less competitive.”

Qualcomm

The second case that shows how American Express left its mark on antitrust is a monopolization (abuse of a dominant position) case brought by the Federal Trade Commission against Qualcomm. The case involved modem chips used in smart phones. Qualcomm made the chips, but it also held important patents for the technology. Rival chip makers licensed that technology from Qualcomm to produce their own competing chips.

The FTC alleged that Qualcomm had abused a dominant market position when it refused to sell its chips to smartphone manufacturers unless they also entered into a patent license (which required making a royalty payment) for any chips that they acquired from not only Qualcomm but also any of its rival chip makers. This practice, the FTC argued, imposed an anti-competitive surcharge on rivals’ chips which raised the barriers for competing with Qualcomm. This, in turn, hurt the phone manufacturers by inflating the price they paid for chips.

The court hearing the case in the first instance agreed, and ruled for the FTC. But an appeals court overturned the decision. On the main antitrust theory of the case, the appeals court reasoned that the FTC had failed to prove that Qualcomm’s “no license, no chip” policy harmed the “area of effective competition.”5 Although its evidence had shown how the policy could have increased costs for Qualcomm customers (phone makers) who buy the chips, it had not shown how the policy harmed competition by directly impacting Qualcomm competitors (rival chip makers). It pointed to the ruling in American Express that the DOJ in that case had failed to meet its burden of proof because it did not show how restrictions imposed on merchants “have anticompetitive effects that harm consumers” (italics my own).

The analogy to the Qualcomm case seems to have been that the FTC needed to connect all the dots—customers and competitors alike—in proving anticompetitive effects. Showing that the “all-in” (royalty plus sales) price charged to customers might have been inflated by Qualcomm’s licensing practices was not enough because it “falls outside the relevant antitrust markets” at issue.

Down the competitive effects rabbit hole

The *American Express*, *Sabre/Farelogix* and *Qualcomm* cases share three traits in common that show how the half-century transformation of antitrust into an Economism-driven, predictive framework is undermining enforcement, especially in tech markets.

First, the cases show how the government agencies bringing an antitrust case and the courts rendering the decisions in them must undertake a massive burden. They have to dissect the inner workings of a market and then make predictions or conjectures about actual competitive effects in the market that result from the conduct at issue. In American Express and Sabre/Farelogix, it was proving lower output and higher overall “net” (or “two-sided”) prices on multi-sided transaction platforms. In *Qualcomm*, it meant proving “an anticompetitive surcharge on rivals’ modem chip sales” by directly linking up proof of harm to customers with proof of hindering competitors.

In all three instances, the burden imposed by the courts for proving these so-called “actual anticompetitive effects” was simply too high for the government to meet. *Qualcomm* arguably went even further in raising the evidentiary bar for tech cases. The influential appeals court issuing that decision went so far as to declare that “novel business practices—especially in technology markets—should not be ‘conclusively presumed to be unreasonable and therefore illegal without elaborate inquiry as to the precise harm they have caused or the business excuse for their use’” (italics my own). Requiring “elaborate” and “precise” proof would seem to doom all but the slam-dunk government actions against tech.

Second, the trio of cases shows how proof of actual anticompetitive effects depends heavily on economic theory and models. The Supreme Court sets the pace in American Express by relying entirely on a string of academic articles by economists—citing nothing from the fact record of the case before it—to construct its “two-sided transaction platform” market and reach the critical conclusion that “[e]valuating both sides of a two-sided transaction platform is [] necessary to accurately assess competition.”

Sabre/Farelogix picks up the baton and runs with it, relying on that theory-based legal holding in American Express to ignore an exhaustive factual record of company documents, executive testimony, and third-party complaints showing close competition between the merging companies. Qualcomm then carries the baton across the finish line when it frames the case with a skepticism of “novel” theories of competitive harm by citing blanket assertions in two academic article about how antitrust cases of technology markets skew towards over-enforcement.6 When it comes to economic theory and a predictive antitrust that requires proof of actual anticompetitive effects, the tail wags the dog.

Third, these three cases rest on a critical assumption—arguably bordering on a blind faith—that economics is up to the task of proving actual competitive effects. Baked into the courts’ reasoning is that economics can be used to understand and predict complex market environments that change in real-time in often unexpected ways. Yet, as discussed in my recent article, it has yet to be empirically proven—or seriously tested—that economics can perform the sort of analyses and predictions that would justify its having become the foundational underpinning of the enforcement of the antitrust laws. If anything, real-world experience in competition law practice combined with general research on uncertainty and decision-making suggest that expert judgments are poor predictors in complex environments like those at issue in antitrust cases.

And as they push antitrust further down an Economism-driven path, the courts provide little guidance on how plaintiffs are to meet their super-sized burden for proving actual anticompetitive effects. In American Express and Sabre/Farelogix, the government’s case is thrown out because it failed to prove an increase in the “net” or “two-sided” prices on a multi-sided transaction platform. But such a thing exists only as a figment of a court’s imagination. It does not exist in the real world. No one pays it, and no one charges it. And it’s unclear how an antitrust plaintiff is to go about the precarious exercise of weighing benefits to one side of a market against the harms to another. In American Express, for example, would it mean weighing the swipe fees charged to merchants against the rewards points earned by shoppers? In the absence of any guidance, it can safely be assumed that economic theories and models are expected to conjure such “net” prices into existence.

The trio of cases, therefore, reflects and even propels a broader trend that has eviscerated antitrust enforcement—especially in tech—by erecting high barriers for plaintiffs to prove actual anticompetitive effects using dubious economic tools.

A modern antitrust in peril

With the Sabre/Farelogix and Qualcomm cases, the American Express decision has rounded out its influence on the three main pillars of US antitrust law: mergers, monopolization, and contracts in restraint of trade.

None of the three cases sets out groundbreaking new law. Their significance lies rather in accelerating a trend, half of a century in the making, among policymakers, academics, and judges to require antitrust plaintiffs to take on an ever-increasing burden of proof in using economic tools to show how market conduct harms competition. Each such case is an individual brick in a rising wall—reaching its tallest heights in tech markets that are especially difficult to understand and predict—that plaintiffs must scale to bring a successful antitrust case.

The consequence is not just an intellectual failing about humankind’s ability to make accurate predictions in unpredictable markets. It also means lax antitrust enforcement and the mass-consolidation of economic power across the economy.

#### Scope of AmEx is nearly limitless – creates a de facto antitrust exemption for two-sided platforms

Salop, Professor of Economics & Law, Georgetown University Law Center and Senior Consultant, Charles River Associates, ‘21

(Steven, “Dominant Digital Platforms: Is Antitrust Up to the Task?” yalelawjournal.org/pdf/SalopEssay\_rnon2ejq.pdf)

This most recent agency loss involved an acquisition by a dominant digital platform. Sabre is a digital platform that permits airlines to post schedules, fares and seat availability and allows travel agents to access this information, make travel bookings and pay for them. Sabre proposed to acquire Farelogix, which provides technology to airlines. This technology allows an airline to disintermediate Sabre by allowing the airline to connect directly to travel agencies and provide travel agencies with information and ticket-booking services itself. Thus, this acquisition was analytically like a vertical merger, where Farelogix sells a critical input (i.e., its technology) to airlines, which they use to compete with Sabre for the business of travel agents. The competitive concern is that Sabre would foreclose airlines’ ability to acquire the Farelogix technology input.

Perhaps attempting to exploit the horizontal-merger structural presumption and avoid the difficulties they faced in AT&T/Time Warner, the DOJ did not litigate the case as a vertical merger. Instead, the complaint alleged that Sabre and Farelogix competed in the provision of booking services for airline tickets sold through travel agencies. This competition is indirect, resulting from Farelogix working with the individual airlines to disintermediate Sabre. However, the trial court did not miss the point. It observed that “Sabre and Farelogix view each other as competitors” and found that “the record reflects competition between Sabre’s and Farelogix’s direct connection solutions for airlines.”94

Having concluded that competition was reduced by the merger, the trial court nonetheless rejected the DOJ’s complaint on the grounds that Farelogix and Sabre do not compete in the two-sided platform market.95 While Sabre provides services to customers on both sides (i.e., to both airlines and travel agencies), Farelogix provides services to only one side (i.e., to airlines, but not to travel agencies). The travel agency services are provided by the airlines themselves, using the Farelogix technology.

This approach was both defective and unnecessary because Sabre competed with the combination of Farelogix and the airlines.96 Yet the court thought that American Express compelled the opposite result, despite its own fact-finding and the vertical nature of the transaction. If other U.S. courts similarly follow this same defective approach, the result will be underdeterrence of anticompetitive acquisitions by digital platforms.97 Indeed, this approach would lead to ludicrous results. Under this reasoning, Microsoft could have legally ended the competitive threat from Netscape and Java simply by acquiring them instead of trying to destroy them.

#### First, platform misuse—that enables a host of bad practices—undermines cyber security

Stucke is a co-founder of The Konkurrenz Group and a law professor at the University of Tennessee, ‘18

(Maurice, “Here Are All the Reasons It’s a Bad Idea to Let a Few Tech Companies Monopolize Our Data,” <https://hbr.org/2018/03/here-are-all-the-reasons-its-a-bad-idea-to-let-a-few-tech-companies-monopolize-our-data>)

So, the divergence in antitrust enforcement may reflect differences over these data-opolies’ perceived harms. Ordinarily the harm from monopolies are higher prices, less output, or reduced quality. It superficially appears that data-opolies pose little, if any risk, of these harms. Unlike some pharmaceuticals, data-opolies do not charge consumers exorbitant prices. Most of Google’s and Facebook’s consumer products are ostensibly “free.” The data-opolies’ scale can also mean higher quality products. The more people use a particular search engine, the more the search engine’s algorithm can learn users’ preferences, the more relevant the search results will likely be, which in turn will likely attract others to the search engine, and the positive feedback continues. As Robert Bork argued, there “is no coherent case for monopolization because a search engine, like Google, is free to consumers and they can switch to an alternative search engine with a click.” How Data-opolies Harm But higher prices are not the only way for powerful companies to harm their consumers or the rest of society. Upon closer examination, data-opolies can pose at least eight potential harms. Lower-quality products with less privacy. Companies, antitrust authorities increasingly recognize, can compete on privacy and protecting data. But without competition, data-opolies face less pressure. They can depress privacy protection below competitive levels and collect personal data above competitive levels. The collection of too much personal data can be the equivalent of charging an excessive price. Data-opolies can also fail to disclose what data they collect and how they will use the data. They face little competitive pressure to change their opaque privacy policies. Even if a data-opoly improves its privacy statement, so what? The current notice-and-consent regime is meaningless when there are no viable competitive alternatives and the bargaining power is so unequal. Surveillance and security risks. In a monopolized market, personal data is concentrated in a few firms. Consumers have limited outside options that offer better privacy protection. This raises additional risks, including: Government capture. The fewer the number of firms controlling the personal data, the greater the potential risk that a government will “capture” the firm. Companies need things from government; governments often want access to data. When there are only a few firms, this can increase the likelihood of companies secretly cooperating with the government to provide access to data. China, for example, relies on its data-opolies to better monitor its population. Covert surveillance. Even if the government cannot capture a data-opoly, its rich data-trove increases a government’s incentive to circumvent the data-opoly’s privacy protections to tap into the personal data. Even if the government can’t strike a deal to access the data directly, it may be able to do so covertly. Implications of a data policy violation/security breach. Data-opolies have greater incentives to prevent a breach than do typical firms. But with more personal data concentrated in fewer companies, hackers, marketers, political consultants, among others, have even greater incentives to find ways to circumvent or breach the dominant firm’s security measures. The concentration of data means that if one of them is breached, the harm done could be orders of magnitude greater than with a normal company. While consumers may be outraged, a dominant firm has less reason to worry of consumers’ switching to rivals. Wealth transfer to data-opolies. Even when their products and services are ostensibly “free,” data-opolies can extract significant wealth in several ways that they otherwise couldn’t in a competitive market: First, data-opolies can extract wealth by getting personal data without having to pay for the data’s fair market value. The personal data collected may be worth far more than the cost of providing the “free” service. The fact that the service is “free” does not mean we are fairly compensated for our data. Thus, data-opolies have a strong economic incentive to maintain the status quo, in which users, as the MIT Technology Review put it, “have little idea how much personal data they have provided, how it is used, and what it is worth.” If the public knew, and if they had viable alternatives, they might hold out for compensation. Second, something similar can happen but with the content users create. Data-opolies can extract wealth by getting creative content from users for free. In a competitive market, users could conceivably demand compensation not only for their data but also their contributions to YouTube and Facebook. With no viable alternatives, they cannot. Third, data-opolies can extract wealth from sellers upstream. One example is when data-opolies scrape valuable content from photographers, authors, musicians, and other websites and post it on their own platform. In this case, the wealth of the data-opolies comes at the expense of other businesses in their value chain. Fourth, data-opolies can extract our wealth indirectly, when their higher advertising fees are passed along in the prices for the advertised goods and services. If the data-opolies faced more competitors for their advertising services, ads could cost even less — and therefore so might the products being advertised. Finally, data-opolies can extract wealth from both sellers upstream and consumers downstream by facilitating or engaging in “behavioral discrimination,” a form of price discrimination based on past behavior — like, say, your internet browsing. They can use the personal data to get people to buy things they did not necessarily want at the highest price they are willing to pay. As data-opolies expand their platforms to digital personal assistants, the Internet of Things, and smart technologies, the concern is that their data advantage will increase their competitive advantage and market power. As a result, the data-opolies’ monopoly profits will likely increase, at our expense. Loss of trust. Market economies rely on trust. For online markets to deliver their benefits, people must trust firms and their use of the personal data. But as technology evolves and more personal data is collected, we are increasingly aware that a few powerful firms are using our personal information for their own benefit, not ours. When data-opolies degrade privacy protections below competitive levels, some consumers will choose not “to share their data, to limit their data sharing with companies, or even to lie when providing information,” as the UK’s Competition and Markets Authority put it. Consumers may forgo the data-opolies’ services, which they otherwise would have used if privacy competition were robust. This loss would represent what economists call a deadweight welfare loss. In other words, as distrust increases, society overall becomes worse off. Significant costs on third parties. Additionally, data-opolies that control a key platform, like a mobile phone operating system, can cheaply exclude rivals by: steering users and advertisers to their own products and services to the detriment of rival sellers on the platform (and contrary to consumers’ wishes) degrading an independent app’s functionality reducing traffic to an independent app by making it harder to find on its search engine or app store Data-opolies can also impose costs on companies seeking to protect our privacy interests. My book with Ariel Ezrachi, Virtual Competition, discusses, for example, Google’s kicking the privacy app Disconnect out of its Android app store. Less innovation in markets dominated by data-opolies. Data-opolies can chill innovation with a weapon that earlier monopolies lacked. Allen Grunes and I call it the “now-casting radar.” Our book Big Data and Competition Policy explores how some platforms have a relative advantage in accessing and analyzing data to discern consumer trends well before others. Data-opolies can use their relative advantage to see what products or services are becoming more popular. With their now-casting radar, data-opolies can acquire or squelch these nascent competitive threats. Social and moral concerns. Historically, antitrust has also been concerned with how monopolies can hinder individual autonomy. Data-opolies can also hurt individual autonomy. To start with, they can direct (and limit) opportunities for startups that subsist on their super-platform. This includes third-party sellers that rely on Amazon’s platform to reach consumers, newspapers and journalists that depend on Facebook and Google to reach younger readers, and, as the European Commission’s Google Shopping Case explores, companies that depend on traffic from Google’s search engine. But the autonomy concerns go beyond the constellation of app developers, sellers, journalists, musicians, writers, photographers, and artists dependent on the data-opoly to reach users. Every individual’s autonomy is at stake. In January, the hedge fund Jana Partners joined the California State Teachers’ Retirement pension fund to demand that Apple do more to address the effects of its devices on children. As The Economist noted, “You know you are in trouble if a Wall Street firm is lecturing you about morality.” The concern is that the data-opolies’ products are purposefully addictive, and thereby eroding individuals’ ability to make free choices. There is an interesting counterargument that’s worth noting, based on the interplay between monopoly power and competition. On the one hand, in monopolized markets, consumers have fewer competitive options. So, arguably, there is less need to addict them. On the other hand, data-opolies, like Facebook and Google, even without significant rivals, can increase profits by increasing our engagement with their products. So, data-opolies can have an incentive to exploit behavioral biases and imperfect willpower to addict users — whether watching YouTube videos or posting on Instagram. Political concerns. Economic power often translates into political power. Unlike earlier monopolies, data-opolies, given how they interact with individuals, possess a more powerful tool: namely, the ability to affect the public debate and our perception of right and wrong. Many people now receive their news from social media platforms. But the news isn’t just passively transmitted. Data-opolies can affect how we feel and think. Facebook, for example, in an “emotional contagion” study, manipulated 689,003 users’ emotions by altering their news feed. Other risks of this sort include: Bias. In filtering the information we receive based on our preferences, data-opolies can reduce the viewpoints we receive, thereby leading to “echo chambers” and “filter bubbles.” Censorship. Data-opolies, through their platform, can control or block content that users receive, and enforce governmental censorship of political or religious information. Manipulation. Data-opolies can promote stories that further their particular business or political interests, instead of their relevance or quality. Limiting the Power of Data-opolies Upon closer examination, data-opolies can actually be more dangerous than traditional monopolies. They can affect not only our wallets but our privacy, autonomy, democracy, and well-being. Markets dominated by these data-opolies will not necessarily self-correct. Network effects, high switching costs for consumers (given the lack of data portability and user rights over their data), and weak privacy protection help data-opolies maintain their dominance. Luckily, global antitrust enforcement can help. The Reagan administration, in espousing the then-popular Chicago School of economics beliefs, discounted concerns over monopolies. The Supreme Court, relying on faulty economic reasoning, surmised that charging monopoly prices was “an important element of the free market system.” With the rise of a progressive, anti-monopoly New Brandeis School, the pendulum is swinging the other way. Given the emergence of data-opolies, this is a welcomed change.

#### Platform monopoly allows attackers to zap critical infrastructure in one hit—competition key

Geer et al., PhD, Chief Technology Officer and co-founder of AtStake, ‘03

(Daniel, Rebecca Bace, Peter Gutmann, Perry Metzger, Charles P. Pfleeger, John S. Quarterman, Bruce Schneier, CyberInsecurity: The Cost of Monopoly, <https://cryptome.org/cyberinsecurity.htm>)

Computing is crucial to the infrastructure of advanced countries. Yet, as fast as the world's computing infrastructure is growing, security vulnerabilities within it are growing faster still. The security situation is deteriorating, and that deterioration compounds when nearly all computers in the hands of end users rely on a single operating system subject to the same vulnerabilities the world over.

Most of the world’s computers run Microsoft’s operating systems, thus most of the world’s computers are vulnerable to the same viruses and worms at the same time. The only way to stop this is to avoid monoculture in computer operating systems, and for reasons just as reasonable and obvious as avoiding monoculture in farming. Microsoft exacerbates this problem via a wide range of practices that lock users to its platform.

The impact on security of this lock-in is real and endangers society. Because Microsoft's near-monopoly status itself magnifies security risk, it is essential that society become less dependent on a single operating system from a single vendor if our critical infrastructure is not to be disrupted in a single blow. The goal must be to break the monoculture. Efforts by Microsoft to improve security will fail if their side effect is to increase user-level lock-in. Microsoft must not be allowed to impose new restrictions on its customers – imposed in the way only a monopoly can do – and then claim that such exercise of monopoly power is somehow a solution to the security problems inherent in its products. The prevalence of security flaw in Microsoft’s products is an effect of monopoly power; it must not be allowed to become a reinforcer.

Governments must set an example with their own internal policies and with the regulations they impose on industries critical to their societies. They must confront the security effects of monopoly and acknowledge that competition policy is entangled with security policy from this point forward.

#### Ensures cyberattacks go nuclear

Sagan and Weiner ’21 – Stanford Professors [Scott D.; Caroline S.G. Monroe professor of political science and senior fellow at the Center for International Security and the Freeman Spogli Institute at Stanford University; Allen S.; senior lecturer in law and director of the program in international and comparative law at Stanford Law School; 7-9-2021; "The U.S. says it can answer cyberattacks with nuclear weapons. That’s lunacy."; The Washington Post; https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2021/07/09/cyberattack-ransomware-nuclear-war/; accessed 8-15-2021]

Over the July 4 weekend, the Russian-based cybercriminal organization REvil claimed credit for hacking into as many as 1,500 companies in what has been called the largest ransomware attack to date. In May, another cybercriminal group, DarkSide, also apparently located mainly in Russia, shut down most of the operations of Colonial Pipeline, which supplies nearly half the diesel, gasoline and other fuels used on the East Coast — setting off a round of panic buying that ended only when the company handed over a ransom. These incidents were bad enough. But imagine a much worse cyberattack, one that not only disabled pipelines but turned off the power at hundreds of U.S. hospitals, wreaked havoc on air-traffic-control systems and shut down the electrical grid in major cities in the dead of winter. The grisly cost might be counted not just in lost dollars but in the deaths of many thousands of people.

Under current U.S. nuclear doctrine, developed during the Trump administration, the president would be given the military option to launch nuclear weapons at Russia, China or North Korea if that country was determined to be behind such an attack.

That’s because in 2018, the Trump administration expanded the role of nuclear weapons by declaring for the first time that the United States would consider nuclear retaliation in the case of “significant non-nuclear strategic attacks,” including “attacks on the U.S., allied, or partner civilian population or infrastructure.” The same principle could also be used to justify a nuclear response to a devastating biological weapons strike.

But our analysis suggests that using nuclear weapons in response to biological or cyberattacks would be illegal under international law in virtually all circumstances. Threatening an illegal nuclear response weakens deterrence because the threat lacks inherent credibility. Perversely, this policy could also wind up committing a president to a nuclear attack if deterrence fails. While the American public would indeed be likely to want vengeance after a destructive enemy assault, the law of armed conflict requires that some military options be taken off the table. Nuclear retaliation for “significant non-nuclear strategic attacks” is one of them.

The Biden administration is now conducting its own review of the U.S. nuclear posture. The 2018 Trump change is an urgent candidate for reevaluation, but people have generally ignored it up to now. As officials work on this process, they have the chance to take full account of what could be called the “nuclear law revolution” — a growing recognition that international-law restrictions on warfare, and especially those that protect civilians, apply even to nuclear war.

#### Second, Google’s self-preferencing flagrantly violates the Sherman Act---decimates small tech firms and forecloses competition.

**Hanley 7/8** --- Senior Legal Analyst with the Open Markets Institute. His research focuses on the relationship between technology platforms and antitrust. Before joining Open Markets, Daniel honed his legal experience by working for several organizations including the Connecticut Department of Consumer protection by being award a Janet D. Steiger Fellowship in 2017 from the American Bar Association and as a legal intern with the Honorable Vanessa Lynne Bryant of the U.S. District Court for the District of Connecticut.

Daniel, 7/8/21, “How Self-Preferencing Can Violate Section 2 of the Sherman Act,” Competition Policy International, https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=3868896

With this framing, Google’s conduct exemplifies how a dominant firm can use self-preferencing to monopolize a market and violate Section 2 of the Sherman Act. Numerous government reports and anecdotal accounts detail the exclusionary effects Google’s conduct has on market participants and consumers.23

Google’s market share in search far exceeds required thresholds for monopoly power under the Sherman Act.24 Multiple comprehensive investigations into the company’s operations found that Google’s market share in search is almost 90 percent.25 Other evidence also shows that Google is an “indispensable medium” and essential for a firm’s success.26 For example, Google is the top referral site for internet traffic; thus, if a site is not on Google, it is close to not existing at all on the internet for most consumers.27 Multiple accounts show that the corporation also has monopoly power in several other markets.28

Google has also engaged in “willful acquisition or maintenance of its monopoly” that harms the competitive process. In multiple instances, comprehensive reports show that Google obtained its dominant position by engaging in a surfeit of exclusionary conduct that includes the use of self-preferencing, making hundreds of acquisitions, and imposing many restrictive contracts on third parties rather than as a consequence of a “superior product, business acumen, or historic accident.”29 Specifically, concerning Google’s use of self-preferencing, two cases are particularly illustrative.

In 2011, the Federal Trade Commission investigated Google for self-preferencing its comparison shopping and local shopping sites.30 Google decided to explicitly demote the search rankings of rival sites like Yelp to promote and advantage its own digital properties, such as Google Maps and Google Shopping.31 Google effectively used its horizontal monopoly in general search (i.e. Google.com) to extend its market power into vertical search services (i.e. restaurant ratings and reviews).

In another instance, starting around 2015, Google wanted to maintain its dominant position in digital images. To do this, Google changed its search ranking algorithm and entered into agreements with Shutterstock and Getty Images to supply it with high-quality stock photos. Google’s changes and agreements significantly demoted the search ranking of Dreamstime, a rival stock photo provider. Since Google relegated Dreamstime’s site to the back pages of its search results, it effectively made Dreamstime’s site and other similarly situated sites that do not have an agreement with Google invisible to consumers and depriving consumers of an alternative service.32 Dreamstime even tried to increase their spending by millions of dollars on Google’s advertising platform, hired advertising and search consultants, and implemented a series of changes recommended by Google to improve their search ranking, all to no avail.

Both of these instances provide an adequate basis for a violation of Section 2 of the Sherman Act. In both examples, Google used self preferencing derived from its “dominant economic power” to “foreclose competition, to gain a competitive advantage, or to destroy a competitor” and harm the competitive process, — as opposed to succeeding on account of “superior service, lower costs, and improved efficiency.”34 Since Google is indispensable to third parties,35 an artificially lower search ranking from self-preferencing can be devastating for a firm’s competitive position. As such, self-preferencing not only leads to substantial foreclosure of a rival site, but it also can raise the costs to dependent firms because a firm may have to either enter into a special deal with Google or pay for advertising on Google’s search platform to ensure they are at a higher search position.36 All of this has the effect of raising a rival’s costs or forcing a dependent firm to operate in a significantly weaker bargaining position as a direct result of the firm’s market power and self-preferencing.

Google’s actions are similar to those in a previous Supreme Court case that affirmed a finding of monopolization and a violation of Section 2 of the Sherman Act in 1973.38 Like Google, Otter Tail Power Company was a vertically integrated corporation (in this case, an electrical utility) that had monopoly power in its relevant market.39 Like Google’s search engine, Otter Tail’s electrical generation and distribution infrastructure were not easily replicable by rivals.40 Like Google’s actions toward Dreamstime, Yelp, and others, Otter Tail used its “strategic dominance” and control of its infrastructure to disadvantage and foreclose municipal rivals by refusing to transmit power over its own power lines from generators to municipal utilities to protect its distribution monopoly.

The primary rationale for the Supreme Court’s decision that Otter Tail violated Section 2 of the Sherman Act is because the company “[used its] monopoly power to destroy threatened competition[.]”42 Importantly, the Court also distinguished Otter Tail’s conduct from fair competition principles in which firms, including monopolists, succeed through “superior service, lower costs, and improved efficiency” rather than the use of unfair or exclusionary tactics.

In addition to Google’s monopoly power and exclusionary tactics, other aggravating factors increase the likelihood that the corporation is seeking to maintain its monopoly in violation of the Sherman Act. First, similar to other exclusionary monopolization offenses (like exclusive dealing or tying), self-preferencing does not need to be used against every possible competitor or cause full foreclosure of a rival or dependent firm to obtain the desired adverse effect.44 For example, Google does not need to demote the search rankings of every rival vertical search engine or even remove a rival firm like Yelp or Dreamstime from their site entirely. Detailed analysis shows that less than 1 percent of users clicked on a link on the second page of a Google search result, and most user clicks are confined to the first few search results.45 Thus, getting demoted even slightly would effectively relegate a site to digital jail. Similar effects exist across other sites like Amazon.46 In fact, selective manipulation, exclusion, or demotion of a site like Yelp or Dreamstime may actually be just as, if not more of, an effective indicator to determine whether a firm is intending to exclude a rival to leverage into a market or attempting to succeed in the marketplace by providing “superior service, lower costs, and improved efficiency.”47 Additionally, excluding individual firms by self-preferencing may also prove to be an easier path to maintain a firm’s dominance.48 As the Supreme Court stated in 1959, violations of the Sherman Act are “not to be tolerated merely because the victim is just one merchant whose business is so small that his destruction makes little difference to the economy. Monopoly can as surely thrive by the elimination of such small businessmen, one at a time, as it can by driving them out in large groups.

Along similar lines, since self-preferencing needs to be only applied selectively to obtain significant exclusion of a rival or dependent firm, consumers would generally be unable to know or discover that such actions are taking place.50 The founders of Google admitted this and were acutely aware that self-preferencing would also be “very difficult to detect” and have “a significant effect on the market.

Second, many technology industries, like internet search, have high barriers to entry and the GAFA corporations have durable and persistent monopoly power.52 In Google’s case, no competitor has meaningfully challenged its dominant position in almost two decades. Such a situation increases the presumption that antitrust action is warranted.

Third, self-preferencing facilitates other kinds of predatory and exclusionary behavior condemned by the antitrust laws, including tying.54 Self-preferencing can operate as a form of tying since a company like Google, by preferencing its own services (or the services of other companies) and demoting rivals, encourages users to adopt its products and services together, potentially locking them in. Thus, self-preferencing can raise barriers to entry such that a rival service is unfairly inhibited from obtaining a sufficient number of users to be a viable market participant.

Lastly, while benign forms of self-preferencing exist, such as a non-dominant grocery store changing the shelving placement of food items to favor its own in-store brands,56 there are critical differences that distinguish that conduct from Google’s and similarly situated digital giants.57 Unlike an individual grocery store, Google has monopoly power.

Also, as opposed to the physical world, in the digital realm, users confine their searches to the first set of results they are shown. In the digital realm, searching for a particular website or product is a nearly endless process. There will always be more results than a user can review. Thus, in part, there is a “paradox of choice” that exists, and consumers feel that it is not worth their time to endlessly explore options they are presented with.58 As such, users, across multiple technology platforms, confine their search to the first page they are presented with rather than engage in a more scrupulous search as they likely would for a product if they were at a physical retail outlet.59 Thus, self-preferencing in the digital realm can have significant foreclosure effects that are not analogous to physical retailers. All these aggravating factors can just as easily apply to the conduct or industries of the other digital giants.

#### Erodes local businesses---ending self-preferencing necessary and sufficient to solve.

Pat **Garofalo 20** [director of state and local policy at the American Economic Liberties Project; former reporter at U.S. News and World Report], 8-30-2020, "Close to Home: How the Power of Facebook and Google Affects Local Communities," American Economic Liberties Project, https://www.economicliberties.us/our-work/close-to-home-how-the-power-of-facebook-and-google-affects-local-communities/#

Google Undermines Local Businesses:

For a local business to operate and be successful, local residents must be able to find it. There’s a long history of enabling such matchmaking between customers and businesses through newspapers, radio, TV, directories, and local advertising channels. Today, one of the key mechanisms filling this critical function is local search. Local search is the single largest category of search on Google, the world’s dominant search engine. In 2018, Google said local search grew by 50 percent over the year before, outpacing the overall search market.[18] More than 80 percent of cell phone users report searching for businesses “near me.”[19]

And yet, Google’s search properties, either general search or via its Maps subsidiary, often hurt local businesses and residents by allowing scammers to infiltrate its listings. For instance, Florida locksmith Rafael Martorell explained that the name of his business, A-Atlantic Lock and Key, was stolen by scammers on Google who pretended to be him and would charge customers five or six times what he normally charged. “One of the scammers put the name of my company, and the address that he put was my own house,” he said, alleging that such practices are an epidemic in the locksmith industry.[20]

“90 percent of our advertising, most of that for years was the Yellow Pages,” Martorell said. “Then suddenly Google came, without us noticing. And then we figured it out, we knew we had to go to Google and that is when the issues began. Because the local listings, most of them are fraudulent. Completely phony, fraudulent.”[21] The Wall Street Journal noted several other sectors in which similar scams have occurred.[22]

Since Google is so dominant in search, merchants have little alternative to battling the corporation endlessly, trying to buy ads for which they can’t ascertain the true value – and where a substantial amount of clicks can be fraudulent[23] – or simply vanishing from the vast majority of internet searches when they are either not listed or when their listing has incorrect information. (Facebook can create similar issues for small businesses via fraud, driving up costs for businesses running ads and opaque algorithm changes that limit small businesses ability to ensure their customers actually see their content.)[24][25]

Google’s size and scale leads to neglect of local needs. The corporation has eight products with more than a billion users, so the ability of a top executive to focus on any one town, or even a major city, is virtually nil. Google is slow to correct misinformation and has allowed whole neighborhoods to be renamed thanks to user mistakes. In other instances, Google has decided that an entire sector of the economy, such as third-party tech repair shops, is simply too difficult to validate, so it excludes them from search results entirely.[26]

Google’s power is immense, and in some ways, more significant than that of the government. As one businessperson told the Wall Street Journal, “if Google suspends my listings, I’m out of a job. Google could make me homeless.”[27]

Poor-quality results can even be profitable for Google. Legitimate businesses often pay for ads on Google in order to rise back above fraudulent listings. Martorell, for instance, spent $115,000 on Google ads between 2008 and 2015, before giving up on the platform and relying on local referrals.[28]

Local search is not an inherently concentrated business. There are competitors, such as Yelp, TripAdvisor, and other specialized vertical search engines that can compete over quality. And yet Google is a virtual monopoly. That’s because dominance didn’t occur naturally or through differentiating based on quality. It happened through the exercise of power and capital.

For example, Google pays to be the default search option on Safari on the iPhone. Google also provides its Android operating system and its app store Google Play to cell phone makers for free so that they make Google search the default on Android phones.[29]

This search dominance also allows Google to preference its own products providing local information over those of its competitors, even when its own organic search results indicate that Google content is of worse quality.[30]

Google’s search results have evolved over time. While the company once simply provided a list of hyperlinks to other websites, saying that it’s goal was to get consumers into Google and then out to their preferred web destination as quickly as possible, it now provides answers to specific queries and makes suggestions for content that can be accessed through Google directly, through its use of information boxes.

These include answers to factual questions, like offering that Thomas Jefferson was the third president without having to send the user to an online encyclopedia. But these boxes also allow Google to make a judgment call to preference its own content and products in harmful ways.

For example, a search for a local Thai restaurant will provide links to restaurant websites, but above the hyperlinked search results Google provides direct links to restaurants on Google Maps and Google’s restaurant reviews, as shown below:

Placement on a Google results page is critical because more than a quarter of users click the very first result of a search, while just 2.5 percent click on the tenth. Barely any users venture onto the second page of results.[31] As of 2019, less than half of Google searches result in a user clicking away from Google.[32]

Google’s ability to exclude competitors leads to the quality degradation in results, and so users end up more susceptible to fraudulent listings than they would otherwise, undermining the relationship between local businesses and local customers.

As one study on Google’s self-preferencing noted, “The easy and widely disseminated argument that Google’s universal search always serves users and merchants is demonstrably false.”[33] The European Union in 2017 fined Google €2.4 billion euros for similar self-preferencing of its Google comparison shopping products, which it placed above those of other third-party sales platforms or direct vendors.[34]

According to at least two studies, users prefer the content that Google’s algorithm would naturally show them to that shown when Google circumvents its algorithm to preference its own content. In 2015, Michael Luca, Tim Wu, Sebastian Couvidat, and Daniel Frank found that users are 40 percent more likely to engage with local search content produced by Google’s organic algorithm than they are with the content Google instead preferences in local search. (Yelp, a Google competitor, provided funding for the study.)

“Google is degrading its own search results by excluding its competitors at the expense of its users,” they wrote. “In the largest category of search (local intent-based), Google appears to be strategically deploying universal search in a way that degrades the product so as to slow and exclude challengers to its dominant search paradigm.”[35]

In a 2018 paper, Luca and Hyunjin Kim also found that users preferred organic search results to Google’s preferenced results. Furthermore, they found that other, more specialized search engines saw a fall in traffic as a result of Google’s actions tying its reviews product to its search engine.[36] “Our findings suggest early evidence that dominant platforms may, at times, be degrading products for strategic purposes, such as excluding competitors in adjacent markets that they are looking to enter or grow in,” they wrote.

The Federal Trade Commission in 2013 concluded that such behavior was anti-competitive, though it closed the investigation without action. According to documents from that investigation that were accidentally leaked to the Wall Street Journal, Google engaged in this conduct because it feared competition from specific search verticals such as Yelp and TripAdvisor. One executive in an email explicitly pointed to the threat such specific verticals posed to Google’s traffic, and therefore revenue.[37]

An inability for customers and local businesses to find each other, whether because there are too many scam listings to wade through or because Google is pushing an inferior product, hurts local economies – first, by potentially driving legitimate businesses under via depriving them of customers, and second by exposing customers to fraudulent businesses charging excessive rates. Changing Google’s business model so that it doesn’t have incentives to self-deal or tolerate scam artists will begin to rectify these problems.

#### Determines SMEs growth.

**Graef 19** --- Assistant Professor at Tilburg University, affiliated to the Tilburg Law and Economics Center (TILEC) and the Tilburg Institute for Law

Inge, 11-12-2019, "Differentiated Treatment in Platform-to-Business Relations: EU Competition Law and Economic Dependence," OUP Academic, https://academic.oup.com/yel/article/doi/10.1093/yel/yez008/5622729

The relationship between platforms and businesses is at the core of various ongoing competition investigations. Online platforms provide significant benefits to businesses by enabling them to target a wide audience that typically exceeds the territory of individual Member States and even beyond. In the absence of platforms which act as intermediaries between business users and consumers, small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) in particular would not have had equally effective opportunity to reach consumers. In this regard, platforms often constitute the main entry points for businesses to access certain markets. At the same time, platforms rely on the presence of businesses in order to create value for consumers. Even though platforms and businesses are thus dependent on each other in order to operate their respective services, platforms typically have a superior bargaining position in relation to their business users. This may result in an imbalance between the interests of platforms and businesses, potentially leading to unfair practices. The scope for such issues is particularly present when platforms both act as intermediaries by facilitating market access for businesses and compete with these businesses by offering their own products to consumers on their marketplaces.1

#### SMEs key to economic strength and quick recovery from decline.

**Longley 21** --- U.S. government and history expert with over 30 years of experience in municipal government and urban planning.

Robert, 7-26-2021, "How Small Business Drives U.S. Economy," ThoughtCo, https://www.thoughtco.com/how-small-business-drives-economy-3321945

What really drives the U.S. economy? No, it is not war. In fact, it is small business -- firms with fewer than 500 employees -- that drives the U.S. economy by providing jobs for over half of the nation's private workforce.In 2010, there were 27.9 million small businesses in the United States, compared to 18,500 larger firms with 500 employees or more, according to the U.S. Census Bureau. These and other statistics outlining small business' contribution to the economy are contained in the Small Business Profiles for the States and Territories, 2005 Edition from the Office of Advocacy of the U.S. Small Business Administration (SBA). The SBA Office of Advocacy, the "small business watchdog" of the government, examines the role and status of small business in the economy and independently represents the views of small business to federal government agencies, Congress, and the President of the United States. It is the source for small business statistics presented in user-friendly formats and it funds research into small business issues. "Small business drives the American economy," said Dr. Chad Moutray, Chief Economist for the Office of Advocacy in a press release. "Main Street provides the jobs and spurs our economic growth. American entrepreneurs are creative and productive, and these numbers prove it." Small Businesses Are Job Creators SBA Office of Advocacy-funded data and research shows that small businesses create more than half of the new private non-farm gross domestic product, and they create 60 to 80 percent of the net new jobs. Census Bureau data shows that in 2010, American small businesses accounted for: 99.7% of U.S. employer firms; 64% of net new private-sector jobs; 49.2% of private-sector employment; and 42.9% of private-sector payroll Leading the Way Out of the Recession Small businesses accounted for 64% of the net new jobs created between 1993 and 2011 (or 11.8 million of the 18.5 million net new jobs). During the recovery from the great recession, from mid-2009 to 2011, small firms -- led by the larger ones with 20-499 employees -- accounted for 67% of the net new jobs created nationwide. Do the Unemployed Become Self-Employed? During periods of high unemployment, like the U.S. suffered during the great recession, starting a small business can be just as hard, if not harder than finding a job. However, in March 2011, about 5.5% -- or nearly 1 million self-employed people – had been unemployed the previous year. This figure was up from March 2006 and March 2001, when it was 3.6% and 3.1%, respectively, according to the SBA. Small Businesses Are the Real Innovators Innovation – new ideas and product improvements – is generally measured by the number of patents issued to a firm. Among firms considered “high patenting” firms – those being granted 15 or more patents in a four-year period -- small businesses produce 16 times more patents per employee than large patenting firms, according to the SBA. In addition, SBA research also shows that increasing the number of employees correlates with increased innovation while increasing sales does not.

#### Sustained economic crisis causes war – unequal recovery guarantees lashout

Sundaram and Popov 19 – Jomo Kwame Sundaram is a former economics professor and former UN Assistant Secretary-General for Economic Development. Vladimir Popov is a former economics researcher for the UN Secretariat.

Jomo Kwame Sundaram and Vladimir Popov, “Economic Crisis Can Trigger World War,” *Inter Press Service*, 12 February 2019, http://www.ipsnews.net/2019/02/economic-crisis-can-trigger-world-war/.

Economic recovery efforts since the 2008-2009 global financial crisis have mainly depended on unconventional monetary policies. As fears rise of yet another international financial crisis, there are growing concerns about the increased possibility of large-scale military conflict.

More worryingly, in the current political landscape, prolonged economic crisis, combined with rising economic inequality, chauvinistic ethno-populism as well as aggressive jingoist rhetoric, including threats, could easily spin out of control and ‘morph’ into military conflict, and worse, world war.

Crisis responses limited

The 2008-2009 global financial crisis almost ‘bankrupted’ governments and caused systemic collapse. Policymakers managed to pull the world economy from the brink, but soon switched from counter-cyclical fiscal efforts to unconventional monetary measures, primarily ‘quantitative easing’ and very low, if not negative real interest rates.

But while these monetary interventions averted realization of the worst fears at the time by turning the US economy around, they did little to address underlying economic weaknesses, largely due to the ascendance of finance in recent decades at the expense of the real economy. Since then, despite promising to do so, policymakers have not seriously pursued, let alone achieved, such needed reforms.

Instead, ostensible structural reformers have taken advantage of the crisis to pursue largely irrelevant efforts to further ‘casualize’ labour markets. This lack of structural reform has meant that the unprecedented liquidity central banks injected into economies has not been well allocated to stimulate resurgence of the real economy.

From bust to bubble

Instead, easy credit raised asset prices to levels even higher than those prevailing before 2008. US house prices are now 8% more than at the peak of the property bubble in 2006, while its price-to-earnings ratio in late 2018 was even higher than in 2008 and in 1929, when the Wall Street Crash precipitated the Great Depression.

As monetary tightening checks asset price bubbles, another economic crisis — possibly more severe than the last, as the economy has become less responsive to such blunt monetary interventions — is considered likely. A decade of such unconventional monetary policies, with very low interest rates, has greatly depleted their ability to revive the economy.

The implications beyond the economy of such developments and policy responses are already being seen. Prolonged economic distress has worsened public antipathy towards the culturally alien — not only abroad, but also within. Thus, another round of economic stress is deemed likely to foment unrest, conflict, even war as it is blamed on the foreign.

International trade shrank by two-thirds within half a decade after the US passed the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act in 1930, at the start of the Great Depression, ostensibly to protect American workers and farmers from foreign competition!

Liberalization’s discontents

Rising economic insecurity, inequalities and deprivation are expected to strengthen ethno-populist and jingoistic nationalist sentiments, and increase social tensions and turmoil, especially among the growing precariat and others who feel vulnerable or threatened.

Thus, ethno-populist inspired chauvinistic nationalism may exacerbate tensions, leading to conflicts and tensions among countries, as in the 1930s. Opportunistic leaders have been blaming such misfortunes on outsiders and may seek to reverse policies associated with the perceived causes, such as ‘globalist’ economic liberalization.

Policies which successfully check such problems may reduce social tensions, as well as the likelihood of social turmoil and conflict, including among countries. However, these may also inadvertently exacerbate problems. The recent spread of anti-globalization sentiment appears correlated to slow, if not negative per capita income growth and increased economic inequality.

To be sure, globalization and liberalization are statistically associated with growing economic inequality and rising ethno-populism. Declining real incomes and growing economic insecurity have apparently strengthened ethno-populism and nationalistic chauvinism, threatening economic liberalization itself, both within and among countries.

Insecurity, populism, conflict

Thomas Piketty has argued that a sudden increase in income inequality is often followed by a great crisis. Although causality is difficult to prove, with wealth and income inequality now at historical highs, this should give cause for concern.

Of course, other factors also contribute to or exacerbate civil and international tensions, with some due to policies intended for other purposes. Nevertheless, even if unintended, such developments could inadvertently catalyse future crises and conflicts.

Publics often have good reason to be restless, if not angry, but the emotional appeals of ethno-populism and jingoistic nationalism are leading to chauvinistic policy measures which only make things worse.

At the international level, despite the world’s unprecedented and still growing interconnectedness, multilateralism is increasingly being eschewed as the US increasingly resorts to unilateral, sovereigntist policies without bothering to even build coalitions with its usual allies.

Avoiding Thucydides’ iceberg

Thus, protracted economic distress, economic conflicts or another financial crisis could lead to military confrontation by the protagonists, even if unintended. Less than a decade after the Great Depression started, the Second World War had begun as the Axis powers challenged the earlier entrenched colonial powers.

#### Aff solves – the squo prior to Amex evaluated conduct on a case-by-case basis and created clear, enforceable guidelines

Rozga, JD, Counsel, Davis Wright Tremaine LLP, former Federal Trade Commission attorney, Guest Lecturer, Boston University School of Law, ‘20

(Kaj, “How tech forces a reckoning with prediction-based antitrust enforcement,” August 31, <https://techlawdecoded.com/how-tech-forces-a-reckoning-with-prediction-based-antitrust-enforcement/>)

Such a framework for monopolization claims could also draw from case law experience with “unreasonable restraints of trade”, which are collusive agreements among competitors that are subject to another subset of the antitrust laws. Certain such agreements are treated as so pernicious as to render them strictly “per se” illegal (unlawful without any regard for their actual competitive effects), and others as so benign as to subject them to a highly permissive “rule of reason” (usually lawful under a full-blown competitive effects analysis). But a “truncated” rule of reason lying in a Goldilocks middle between these two extremes causes certain agreements to be presumed unlawful without delving into its actual competitive effects, while still allowing the parties to the agreement to rebut that presumption with adequate proof. This framework could be roughly imported into a presumption-based structuralist approach to monopolization cases.

One major hurdle for monopolization cases under the new framework would be in determining whether, in a particular case, the monopolist has engaged in a preset category of problematic conduct. This would not always be obvious (a lesson learned from courts grappling with when to apply the truncated rule of reason in restraints of trade cases). But in keeping with the goal of a simple, formulaic approach that avoids slipping into the competitive effects quagmire, an objective screen could be used. This screen would look at certain nonpredictive indicators—market conditions or circumstances present and not present—which would function as a checklist or be summed up to formulaically determine whether the monopolist’s conduct falls within the pre-determined list of presumptively unlawful activities.

Fine-tuning the proper aims of a nonpredictive antitrust

Although the proposed frameworks for monopolization and merger cases differ in some ways, both rely on an objectively-determined presumption of unlawfulness on the front-end which pushes any Economism-based, predictive analysis of actual competitive effects to the back-end, where the opposing party faces a high evidentiary burden for rebuttal.

This approach, while seeking to minimize the role of subjective judgment in antitrust decisions, does not eliminate it, which means still having to grapple with the issue of what the proper aim of antitrust ought to be. In either the merger or monopolization context, the presumption (whether facing the party bringing the case or the one defending it) can be rebutted with sufficient proof regarding actual competitive effects. Naturally, a question therefore arises about what types of effects are fair game for argument.

As discussed above, the current consumer welfare approach which focuses entirely on prices and output ignores various harmful effects from the concentration of economic power that would seem otherwise within the reach of antitrust laws. But how much broader ought the goals of antitrust be under the new proposed enforcement frameworks? Harm to competitors (exclusion), laborers (wage suppression), and suppliers (price squeezes) might be the low hanging fruit for inclusion in a broader welfare standard. The same might be said of loss of redundancies in the supply chain, or consolidation of control over user data. Harm to the environment and concentration of political power may be tougher to incorporate. While hate speech and the polarization of public discourse would almost certainly fall outside of the proper purview of antitrust.

Wherever the line is ultimately drawn by policymakers, it need not be inclusive to an extreme. After all, broader societal concerns about concentration of private markets can be left to the protection of a very strong presumption on the front-end of the new enforcement framework. But other than to say that it is intended to be the rare case where a competitive effects analysis is performed on the back-end, it must be acknowledged that more work would need to be done to figure out its proper boundaries.

Questions surrounding how to define the proper aims of antitrust would also seep into the judgment calls that need to be made about what triggers the presumptions of illegality on the front-end. That is because the threshold levels of concentration and additional objective factors triggering the structural presumption in merger cases, as well as the categories of conduct deemed presumptively unlawful in monopolization cases, would be determined according to their tendencies to result in market conditions conducive to bad competitive outcomes. But what is a “competitive outcome” is in the eye of the beholder, and so difficult questions would arise in formulating the front-end presumptions in both merger and monopolization cases.

Difficult as that task may be, there is much benefit to working out those difficulties at a policy level. Those who in the last half-century have—through their influence over academia, the courts, and government officials—reined in merger and monopolization enforcement by shifting its focus to price-output effects have done so with little say from lawmakers. A reset of the antitrust enforcement framework would be an opportune moment to refocus competition policy on the broader detrimental effects of allowing markets to persist in conditions of concentrated economic power.

Where the lines are drawn would have a huge impact on the reach of antitrust laws under the new enforcement regime. The debate would be especially fraught and consequential in the digital context, where existing enforcement of the merger and monopolization laws has been particularly controversial and prone to disappointing results (the latter discussed here and here in the context of investigations of Google). Difficult cuts would have to be made, and the results would ultimately reflect not only ideology about the proper role of antitrust, but also pragmatic factors such as the likelihood and ability of other regulations to fill the gaps (covered here).

Nonpredictive antitrust enforcement in practice

The formulaic, nonpredictive approaches outlined above are guided by a simple principle: that antitrust enforcement ought to be put on a sounder intellectual footing that acknowledges the limits of the human mind in making predictions amidst complexity.

The practical effects of the proposed changes would be to improve clarity and certainty for everyone involved—companies, government agencies, courts—in distinguishing lawful from unlawful market activities. They would also ease the burden for bringing such cases, and in the process free up resources for more enforcement of the antitrust laws. At the same time, some of the changes—such as adding new objective factors to the structural presumption in merger cases, employing a clear-cut list of presumptively unlawful monopolistic conduct, and subjecting enforcers to reverse presumptions of lawfulness—would probably tip the balance the other way, scaling back certain types of enforcement.

Still, it seems self-evident that the net result of the proposed changes would be more active enforcement of the merger and monopolization laws. The specific make-up of the resulting cases—which types would increase versus decrease, which industries or players would see the biggest changes, etc.—is less clear. But the aim in reforming competition policy should be more accurate enforcement, targeting the right mergers and monopolistic conduct, for its own sake. Then let the chips fall where they may.

As for the day-to-day enforcement of the antitrust laws, the major implications could be summarized as follows.

First, there would be the lowering of the barrier currently put in front of enforcers and courts that requires the lawfulness of market activities to be determined by performing the difficult task of predicting and conjecturing about actual competitive effects.

Second, the simple, formulaic framework put in its place would de-emphasize the role of predictions in the decision-making process, streamlining antitrust enforcement for those activities which are empirically known to perpetuate the structural market conditions associated with bad competitive outcomes.

Third, at the same time, it would leave some wiggle room for nuanced expert judgments to soften the blunt force of a trial-by-formula in those rare instances when unique circumstances justify diving back into the lion’s den of analyzing actual competitive effects.

Fourth, by relying on objective criteria about market structure or conduct instead of subjective judgments about market effects, the new framework would empower antitrust to reach various other important kinds of harm—beyond just price and output effects—that can flow from the concentration of economic power. That is, by targeting the roots of harmful concentration instead of just cutting off a few branches that have grown out of its trunk, antitrust would protect various interests in society other than just the consumer who wants to buy more for less.

#### The aff removes *Amex*’s increased burdens for platform challenges – that solves because well-plead cases go forward and courts will reject anticompetitive conduct

Hovenkamp, Assistant Professor, USC Gould School of Law, ‘19

(Erik, “Platform Antitrust,” 44 J. Corp. L. 713)

That is no longer the case, however, as the Supreme Court recently confronted platform commerce head-on in AmEx 111.13 In June of 2018, the Court issued its first decision on how antitrust's rule of reason 14 is to be applied in cases involving platform defendants. 15 It was superficially a question of how to define the "relevant market" for purposes of an antitrust adjudication. 1 6 In particular, the question was whether the market definition must include both groups of users, which would require a plaintiff to prove a net injury to competition across both user groups-not just to win on the merits, but simply to carry its initial burden. The Supreme Court held that it does. 17

Most of the important complexities arising under two-sided competition center on the juxtaposition of countervailing effects-that is, pro and anticompetitive effects-arising within the separate sides of the market. In fact, even outside the platform context, such a juxtaposition of plausible effects is very common in antitrust disputes. And the rule of reason ordinarily divides the burdens of establishing them; it bifurcates them into separate stages, delaying the need for potential balancing or "netting out" of the effects (which is notoriously difficult) until the final stage of the adjudication. By evaluating the effects carefully and independently, a court is better equipped to determine whether such balancing is genuinely necessary; and, if so, the court is at least in a better position to compare the relevant effects. However, the Court's AmEx III decision largely abandoned this burdenshifting framework, effectively collapsing the entire rule of reason analysis-and all of its intermediate inquiries-into the plaintiffs initial burden.

Whether or not one agrees with its holding, the AmEx III decision is inarguably a watershed moment for platform antitrust. Against this backdrop, this Article considers how antitrust ought to accommodate the distinctive features of platforms and platform competition. It focuses principally on conduct evaluated under the rule of reason, 18 with emphasis on vertical restraints and unilateral conduct. 19 The analysis is organized as follows: I begin by providing an overview of the distinctive features of platforms and platform competition, as reflected within the platform economics literature. Part III then explains how such factors may bear on the analysis of various restrictive practices that are already familiar within antitrust, but whose effects may become more or less concerning when undertaken by two-sided defendants. In Part IV, I address the economic effects of an important category of restraints that are unique to platform markets. Finally, Part V turns to the broad question of law that was at issue in AmEx III.

One of the important competitive dynamics arising in platform markets is known as "steering." 21 This refers to any efforts aimed at inducing users to opt for one platform over another. The restraint at issue in AmEx IIIwas an example of this: it prohibits its merchants from offering AmEx cardholders a better price at checkout if they agree to switch to an alternative card (e.g. Visa), since competing cards generally charge lower network usage fees to merchants. 22 But, more generally, steering restraints take many different forms, and arise in many platform markets. 3 In general, steering strategies are usually procompetitive, as they typically act as a vehicle for price competition among rival platforms. Restraints on steering should therefore be regarded as a potential source of serious antitrust concerns. However, as discussed in detail in Part III, many research articles suggest that such restraints may be necessary to maintain adequate participation, and thus regard their welfare effects as highly ambiguous. 24 The AmEx III opinion cites these commentaries copiously. Importantly, however, these arguments stem primarily from economic models involving a platform monopolist, with the operative restraint merely precluding efforts to steer users toward a nonpla'fform alternative (e.g. toward cash rather than using a monopolist's payment card platform). 25 But this is not a good representation of how such restraints usually operate in real-world commerce. In practice, most of the relevant restraints seek to prevent steering toward competing platforms, rather than a nonplatform alternative that lacks the same transactional efficiencies.

As I argue below, when a restraint merely prevents steering toward competing platforms, there is substantially less reason to presume that it might be justified for reasons relating to the market's two-sidedness. Instead, the more likely result is simply that it prevents users from switching to rival platforms that would provide them with better jointvalue. That would suggest the restraint does not enhance the market-wide volume of trade. Rather, at best, it merely reallocates transactions among platforms, albeit in a way that leaves transacting parties with diminished welfare on average. At worst, it affirmatively reduces the overall volume of trade by undermining price competition generally. This can occur for two reasons. First, the restraint may extinguish rival platforms' incentive to make competitive price offerings, as it may prevent transacting parties from switching to the competitor's platform in response to its price cut. Second, the restraint may induce sellers who transact over the platform to set higher retail prices for their own wares, which injures all consumers, whether or not they take advantage of the platform's transaction service.

The question of law addressed in AmEx III is extremely broad in scope, as it bears on the application of antitrust law to all kinds of restrictive practices that might be undertaken by transaction platforms. As noted above, while facially a holding about market definition, the Supreme Court's decision is in fact a major alteration of the rule of reason's burden shifting framework. The Court's analysis was guided principally by a number of antitrust academics that focus most of their attention on a simple point-in effect that "both sides matter," and that it would be inappropriate to focus on one side myopically. 26 While correct, this point was actually never in dispute. Even the district court, whose market definition was formally limited to the merchant side of the market, 27 expressly emphasized the importance of accounting for the market's two-sidedness. 28 Indeed, its analysis gives substantial attention to cardholders, and it even concluded that they were likely injured in addition to merchants. 2 9 Despite this, the AmEx III majority chastised the district court's approach as "looking at only one side of the platform in isolation."' 30

It is indeed true that a platform's conduct may have countervailing effects within the two sides, and that this requires courts to take the market's two-sidedness into account. 31 But it does not follow that the appropriate way to deal with this is to require a plaintiff to "net out" all such considerations merely in order to support its prima facie case-before the defendant has substantiated its asserted efficiency defense. This approach is also a substantial deviation from precedent. Most difficult cases evaluated under the rule of reason involve potential countervailing pro- and anticompetitive effects. 32 And the courts developed a multi-stage burden shifting framework precisely to deal with this difficulty. By construction, this framework contemplates that a plaintiff can carry its initial burden without having shown that the defendant's conduct is definitively anticompetitive on the whole; that is why it is merely the first stage among several.

Far from providing any necessary reform, the AmEx III decision merely developed a "law of the horse": a needless construction of new legal principles when the old ones would do just fine (and likely much better).33 It is true that platform economics has important implications for antitrust policy and practice; this Article gives substantial attention to that fact. But such considerations can already be accounted for-both more practicably and more reliably-within the rule of reason's existing structure. To that end, a much better approach would be to maintain careful consideration of platform economics throughout the established burden shifting framework, which is designed to work through complex cases in incremental steps and to cast light on countervailing effects through an efficient allocation of burdens.

#### Aff is the least intrusive mechanism – it only punishes anticompetitive practices and allows innovative conduct to continue – regulation worse

Hovenkamp, James G. Dinan University Professor, University of Pennsylvania Carey Law School and The Wharton School, ‘21

(Herbert, “Antitrust and Platform Monopoly,” 130 Yale L.J. 1952)

Antitrust today suffers from an antienforcement bias that is scientifically obsolete and produces too many false negatives. This will hopefully pass as courts become more familiar with the economics of digital platforms and networks. Decisions such as Amex in the Supreme Court and Qualcomm in the Ninth Circuit indicate that development still has far to go. The rule of reason in particular has become much too burdensome for plaintiffs. Antitrust policy would perform better if plaintiffs had a lighter burden in establishing a prima facie case, with a heavier answering burden on defendants, who typically have better control of the relevant facts.436

Antitrust’s fact-specific, individual approach to intervention is usually superior to regulation. A few problems, such as management of consumer information, cut across all markets and regulation can be effective. Most other failures are specific to the firm, however. Calls for categorical treatment often amount to regulation by another name. It is easy to speak universally about these markets as winner-take-all, as having high barriers to entry, or as unnecessarily harmful to competitors or consumers. An example is broad statements of the nature that the big digital platforms must be broken up. These overly generalized conclusions frustrate rather than further reasonable competitive analysis. Platforms differ from one another by almost as wide a range as firms differ in general.

Market-power inquiries in cases involving platforms do produce some unique factual issues. When market power is assessed by conventional marketshare methods, a single relevant market should be defined with reference to one side. Effects on the other side must be considered to the extent that they strengthen or weaken any inference to be drawn from market shares. Direct economic measures will usually produce better results, although effects on the other side of two-sided platforms must be considered even when power is measured directly. Finally, the threat of competitive harm in networked markets can occur at lower market shares than the level required in conventional markets.

Antitrust’s fact-specific approach is also essential for the construction of appropriate remedies. The goal of a remedy should be consistent with the output-expanding goals of the antitrust laws themselves. Simple injunctions should always be considered. Often they can correct discrete problems while doing little to no damage to the efficiency and integrity of the firm or the market in which it operates. In addition, results are typically easier to predict.
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#### Non-unique—platform monopoly is a structural limit on high-tech innovation

Newman, Associate Professor, University of Miami School of Law, ‘19

(John, “Antitrust in Digital Markets,” 72 Vand. L. Rev. 1497)

Despite the fact that digital markets frequently exhibit high barriers to entry, skeptics of antitrust enforcement have one card left to play: they portray digital markets as nonetheless being characterized by intense innovative rivalry.135 As a result, the argument runs, antitrust would move too slowly to correct any problems and is unnecessary because the relevant markets will quickly correct themselves.136 Under this view, the lure of monopoly profits will inevitably attract disruptive upstarts seeking to replace dominant incumbents—and monopoly is actually good and desirable because it is necessary to spur technological progress.137 This unorthodox vision traces its roots to Schumpeter’s decades-old invocation of “creative destruction,”138 which became a favorite trope among those associated with the Austrian and Chicago schools.139

For empirical support, proponents of this digital creative destruction narrative commonly point to Facebook’s “disruption” of MySpace and Google’s “disruption” of Yahoo.140 Thus, for example, Robert Bork and Gregory Sidak argued that Google should not face antitrust liability because “[i]t surpassed Yahoo, just as Yahoo surpassed others before it.”141 Put another way, if Facebook and Google could supplant their predecessors, they must themselves face the constant risk of disruption—their perch at the top is a precarious one.

Let us pause to revisit these two commonly cited examples of digital disruption. It is true that Facebook supplanted MySpace as the largest social network—in April 2008.142 That was, to put it rather mildly, some time ago.143 Facebook’s reach continuously expanded during the following decade. As of 2018, Facebook, Inc. controlled the three largest mobile social networking apps in the United States144 and boasted a combined user base over five times larger than that of its nearest rival.145 With each passing year, the creative-destruction narrative becomes ever less credible.

The Google example fares even worse. Google was already the world’s second most popular search provider by 2000.146 That same year, Yahoo (previously the most popular provider) announced that Google would begin serving as the search engine for Yahoo’s web portal,147 effectively making Google the dominant global search provider.148 As with Facebook, Google’s stranglehold over search only increased with the passage of time—as of 2018, after nearly two decades of dominance, Google still controlled more than 90% of the global market for general search results.149

The anecdotes of MySpace and Yahoo, still commonly cited by those who argue that digital markets are epicenters of creative destruction,150 look increasingly creaky with age. The relevant markets have been characterized not by the “gale” of creative destruction described by Schumpeter, but by entrenched and unchecked dominance. It is high time to abandon the “romantic but naïve Schumpeterian [notion] that giant” monopolists and concentrated oligopolies are necessary for technological progress.151 In fact, a more sophisticated reading of Schumpeter suggests that he was not nearly so opposed to government intervention—particularly in the form of antitrust enforcement—as his modern-day adherents tend to be.152 An antitrust enterprise that somehow came to view monopoly as good and necessary has rather clearly lost its way.153

Durable market power is the precise evil antitrust laws are meant to prevent. Far from being self-correcting, digital markets often facilitate such power. This suggests that the orthodox position rests in part upon a flawed assumption about the balance of error costs in this context. The societal cost from false negatives is substantially higher than pro-defendant analysts have previously assumed. Normatively, this militates in favor of an invigorated approach to digital markets.

#### Two-sided market concept is unlimited and unworkable – most recent decisions prove

Guggenberger, Executive Director, Yale Information Society Project, Research Scholar & Lecturer in Law, Yale Law School, and Affiliate, Berkman Klein Center for Internet &

Society, ‘21

(Nikolas, “Essential Platforms,” 24 Stan. Tech. L. Rev. 237)

While the Supreme Court’s ruling in American Express creates further obstacles to antitrust enforcement in general, thus far, it is unclear to what extent the Court’s conceptualization of two-sided markets applies to digital platforms.355 Earlier this year, the District Court for the District of Delaware rejected the Department of Justice’s argument that the reasoning in American Express was limited to the credit card industry.356 Though in American Express, the Supreme Court expressly singled out “two-sided transaction platforms”357 and distinguished between markets on which “the impacts of indirect network effects and relative pricing in that market are minor.”358 For example, the court notes that markets with minor network effects include newspapers that rely on advertising revenue, suggesting that American Express might not apply to markets for newspapers. Tim Wu rightly suggests that this can only be understood to mean that the major advertisement financed communication platforms do not fall under the Court’s approach in American Express. 359 Building on Wu’s notion of advertisement-financed Big Tech as Attention Merchants,360 John Newman provides a helpful alternative conceptualization: one might understand the entire market as a vertical distribution system for attention.361 Thus, it can be inferred that the Court’s holding in American Express cannot apply to advertising-based digital platforms by its own economic logic.

For e-commerce platforms, however, these limitations of American Express offer limited solace. Consider two examples. On the one hand, Amazon Marketplace brings buyers and sellers together and, at its core, represents the prototype of a two-sided transaction platform under American Express. 362 On the other hand, Google’s general search engine and Facebook’s social media platforms should clearly fall out of American Express’ scope as it is mainly funded through contextual and behavioral advertisement. The case is less clear for paid ad placements on Google’s site that are displayed as search results. In this context, courts might argue that Google, in fact, directly facilitates transactions between end users and advertisers. The application of the court’s approach to app stores appears equally unclear. Both the Google Play store and the Apple App Store feature elements of two-sided transaction platforms and the type of advertisement funded markets that the Court distinguished in American Express. Some apps are offered for “sale” or as a subscription model and some are free of monetary charges. For the former, the app stores facilitate transactions in the sense of American Express. The latter rely on advertisements. Moreover, Apple, charges app providers up to a 30% commission for individual transactions conducted through the Apple ecosystem,363 for example, which further complicates matters, when combined with advertisement-based funding structures.

#### Market definition shouldn’t matter – should prefer context-specific inquiries instead of categorical pronouncements

Panner 21 – Partner at Kellogg, Hansen, Todd, Figel & Frederick, PLLC, where he practices antitrust law.

Aaron M. Panner, “Market Definition and Anticompetitive Effects in *Ohio v. American Express*,” *The Yale Law Journal Forum*, vol. 130, 18 January 2021, pp. 610, https://www.yalelawjournal.org/pdf/PannerEssay\_8qgt26i3.pdf.

This Essay addresses whether the Court’s determination that the credit-card market is two-sided was necessary to the outcome in American Express. It is not immediately clear why the question whether a relevant market is one-sided or multi-sided should control the plaintiff’s prima facie burden of demonstrating anticompetitive effects. The Court’s conclusion that the market for credit-card services is two-sided served as shorthand for its conclusion that the plaintiffs could not establish that the challenged practice harmed competition and consumers simply by showing that it resulted in higher merchant fees, without accounting for the impact on cardholders at the front end. But the determination that the market is two-sided does not provide a satisfying answer to the question why, in general, the presence of significant indirect network effects—which the Court cited as the basis for its two-sided market definition—demands a showing of net harm.

Despite the broad and categorical tenor of parts of the Court’s opinion, American Express is best understood in the context of the vertical restraints at issue and the market context. The Court’s market-definition conclusion reflects the (in my view sound) determination that to accept proof of higher merchant fees as prima facie evidence of harm to competition from the challenged restraints would be to favor the interests of merchants over those of cardholders, without an adequate competition-policy justification. But the Court’s market-definition conclusion is best treated as dicta—the Court’s discussion of anticompetitive effects does not depend on it. Moreover, even in the context of two-sided platforms with strong indirect network effects, evidence of market effects on a single side of a two-sided platform may provide a sufficient basis for antitrust concern. What is required is careful consideration of competitive context and the nature of the challenged practice, not an approach that allocates burdens based on a categorical determination that the market is one-sided or two-sided.

#### Aff’s framework accounts for countervailing effects on both sides – court can conclude that the benefits on one side outweigh the harm on the other side, but it should be the defendant’s burden to establish those benefits – that’s Hovenkamp – here’s more ev

Panner 21 – Partner at Kellogg, Hansen, Todd, Figel & Frederick, PLLC, where he practices antitrust law.

Aaron M. Panner, “Market Definition and Anticompetitive Effects in *Ohio v. American Express*,” *The Yale Law Journal Forum*, vol. 130, 18 January 2021, pp. 618-619, https://www.yalelawjournal.org/pdf/PannerEssay\_8qgt26i3.pdf.

In many cases involving vertical restraints, a plaintiff will proceed by indirect proof: that is, by establishing that the defendant has market power in a relevant market and that the challenged restraint is of a type that will significantly restrain competition in that market. In making out such a case, market definition is appropriately treated as very important—often determinative—because, in that context, the market-definition exercise will identify relevant competitors. This is a necessary step in understanding the relative market dominance (or lack thereof) of the defendant and the likely competitive impact of a restraint. In that context, however, ignoring competitors that operate on only one side of a two-sided market would generally be a mistake, even if there are strong indirect network effects. Using market power to exclude competitors through exclusive dealing agreements, for example, should be treated as unlikely to be justifiable on the ground that preserving the ability to charge supracompetitive prices on one side of a two-sided platform (because no competitors can enter) is necessary to provide benefits to consumers on the other side.48 At the same time, the two-sided nature of the platform should mean that the possibility that the harm to competition on one side of the platform is outweighed by the benefit to competition and consumers on the other should not be categorically ruled out. But the burden of establishing those countervailing benefits is appropriately placed on the defendant in that circumstance.

#### Uniqueness goes aff – netting makes it effectively impossible to challenge practices – that’s Salop – here’s more ev

Panner, partner at Kellogg, Hansen, Todd, Figel & Frederick, PLLC, where he practices antitrust law and appellate litigation, ‘21

(Aaron M., “Market Definition and Anticompetitive Effects in Ohio v. American Express,” January 18, <https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/market-definition-and-anticompetitive-effects-in-ohio-v-american-express>)

The majority’s conclusion that the market is two-sided is no response to the dissent’s objection. Characterizing the market as two-sided does not supply a satisfying answer to the question whether restraints that are proven to impede competition on one side of the platform should be subject to condemnation for that reason in the absence of proof—which the defendant has the burden ’to provide—that the benefit on the other side outweighs that harm. Putting the burden of establishing net harm on the plaintiff will, as a practical matter, insulate many practices from challenge, because proving what prices would be charged to one set of consumers in a but-for world is hard enough, let alone consumers on both sides of the platform.31 It is a fair criticism that the majority did not offer a satisfying reason that all two-sided platforms that display strong indirect network effects—or even all two-sided transaction platforms—should be protected by this net-harm requirement, irrespective of the nature of the challenged practice.

Furthermore, the Court did not explain why resolving the market-definition issue was necessary to the conclusion that a showing of net harm was required. The dissent contended that it was enough to show actual effects—higher merchant fees.32 The majority responded that defining the relevant market was necessary because the government was challenging a vertical restraint, and “[v]ertical restraints often pose no risk to competition unless the entity imposing them has market power, which cannot be evaluated unless the Court first defines the relevant market.”33 But the Court’s decision did not, in any obvious way, rest on a determination that American Express lacked market power. Furthermore, if the absence of market power was sufficient, as a matter of law, to foreclose liability for the challenged vertical restraint, any evidence of increased prices would have been beside the point.34

#### Uniqueness goes aff – netting makes it effectively impossible to challenge practices – that’s Salop – here’s more ev

Panner, partner at Kellogg, Hansen, Todd, Figel & Frederick, PLLC, where he practices antitrust law and appellate litigation, ‘21

(Aaron M., “Market Definition and Anticompetitive Effects in Ohio v. American Express,” January 18, <https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/market-definition-and-anticompetitive-effects-in-ohio-v-american-express>)

The majority’s conclusion that the market is two-sided is no response to the dissent’s objection. Characterizing the market as two-sided does not supply a satisfying answer to the question whether restraints that are proven to impede competition on one side of the platform should be subject to condemnation for that reason in the absence of proof—which the defendant has the burden ’to provide—that the benefit on the other side outweighs that harm. Putting the burden of establishing net harm on the plaintiff will, as a practical matter, insulate many practices from challenge, because proving what prices would be charged to one set of consumers in a but-for world is hard enough, let alone consumers on both sides of the platform.31 It is a fair criticism that the majority did not offer a satisfying reason that all two-sided platforms that display strong indirect network effects—or even all two-sided transaction platforms—should be protected by this net-harm requirement, irrespective of the nature of the challenged practice.

Furthermore, the Court did not explain why resolving the market-definition issue was necessary to the conclusion that a showing of net harm was required. The dissent contended that it was enough to show actual effects—higher merchant fees.32 The majority responded that defining the relevant market was necessary because the government was challenging a vertical restraint, and “[v]ertical restraints often pose no risk to competition unless the entity imposing them has market power, which cannot be evaluated unless the Court first defines the relevant market.”33 But the Court’s decision did not, in any obvious way, rest on a determination that American Express lacked market power. Furthermore, if the absence of market power was sufficient, as a matter of law, to foreclose liability for the challenged vertical restraint, any evidence of increased prices would have been beside the point.34

#### No internal link—long-term cost of intervention uncertain and offset by anticompetitive conduct

Greene, Professor of Law, University of Connecticut School of Law; 2013-2014 Senior Visiting Scholar, UC Berkeley School of Law & Visiting Scholar, UC Berkeley College of Engineering, ‘15

(Hillary, “Muzzling Antitrust: Information Products, Innovation and Free Speech,” 95 B.U. L. Rev. 35)

Workability and Chilling Innovation. The judgment that *any* level of innovation should trump *any* anticompetitive effect reflects two debatable premises. First, the courts always have great difficulty distinguishing between very small innovations and larger innovations. Second, the overall effect on innovation decreases when one moves towards balancing and away from completely favoring innovation over any anticompetitive effect.

The first premise raises questions regarding the availability and reliability of evidence underlying key decision inputs. Innovation, as defined herein, includes product changes that may not embody technological advances, and one should be careful not to think of innovation solely in terms of such advances. Firms routinely redesign products and undertake marketing studies predicting the effects of such redesigns. Some of these changes are substantial, others are clearly incremental, and some may be so marginal that they would not seem worthy of special treatment. Internal documents as well as expert assessments can guide the court in making these distinctions. Furthermore, the difficulties in making such assessments may be overstated: administrative agencies, for example, have been making many such judgments in this and related contexts.257

The second premise raises questions regarding the full range of long-term effects, including chilling effects on future innovation. One concern is that antitrust interventions in these settings are counterproductive, because they reduce the global ex ante incentives for innovation.258 While antitrust interventions reduce a potential monopolist’s incentive to innovate in theory, questions remain regarding the size and overall impact of the interventions in practice. Many observers, for example, believe that the effect of small antitrust policy changes has no appreciable effect on innovation incentives and, in any event, has not been empirically established.259 Furthermore, anticompetitive effects also affect the innovation by their rivals, either by suppressing rivals’ actual innovation or by reducing rivals’ incentives to innovate.260 The innovation embodied in the product redesign, therefore, is not the only innovation effect at issue. Thus the link between anticompetitive conduct and rival innovation suggests that assessments regarding innovation effects that focus solely upon the defendant’s innovations may be incomplete.261

## Conduct Adv
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## T – Per Se

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

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

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

#### By LOWERING the threshold for plaintiffs, the aff makes MORE CONDUCT illegal

Popofsky, Antitrust Partner at Ropes and Gray, Served as Senior Counsel to DOJ Antitrust Division, Adjunct Professor of Advanced Antitrust Law and Economics at Harvard Law School and the Georgetown University Law Center, ‘06

(“Defining Exclusionary Conduct: Section 2, The Rule Of Reason, and the Unifying Principle Underlying Antitrust Rules,” Antitrust Law Journal , 2006, Vol. 73, No. 2 (2006), pp. 435-482)

The first step in detecting an underlying principle for crafting Section 2 legal tests is to examine the comparatively few circumstances in which the legality of conduct under Section 2 is relatively clear.30 What is striking is that courts do not implement Section 2 through a single legal test. Rather, Section 2 courts often apply different liability tests to different conduct. Moreover, these liability tests (either express or implied) are "interventionist" to varying degrees. Certain conduct is unlawful only in very specific circumstances or not at all; the applicable doctrine is relatively less interventionist. For other conduct, the applica- ble test allows for illegality in a broader set of circumstances, and the test is more interventionist. At the extreme, certain conduct is virtually per se illegal under Section 2.

## Adv CP

#### Government R&D fails – market is key

Valverdea & Pisanib 16 - Chair Jean Monnet of EU Law & International Federation of Pharmaceutical Manufacturers and Associations

Jose Luis Valverdea, and Eduardo Pisanib, “The Globalisation of the Pharmaceutical Industry,” Pharmaceuticals Policy and Law, Volume 18, 2016, https://www.ifpma.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/The-Globalisation-of-the-Pharmaceutical-Industry-Monograph.pdf#page=51

While some proposed measures have their theoretical and/or practical merits, and can complement the current privately funded R&D model, they cannot replace it. From a pragmatic point of view, charitable R&D initiatives, state-directed R&D, and/or public-private partnerships could not sufficiently finance the development of needed innovative medicines in an efficient and sustainable way as through the current capital-market based R&D model (Fig. 1). No alternative R&D models could replace the private pharmaceutical R&D model with its functioning patent system, without severely affecting the development of new life-saving medicines. The often discussed “de-linkage” of the price for a medicine and R&D costs remains academic as none of the suggested models could provide the continued supply of resources for research as the financial markets do. Especially with regard to NTDs, where market incentives are not available, the further fostering of collaboration between WHO, industry, national authorities and other stakeholders – complementing rather than replacing private-sector funded research – can be expected to continue to produce encouraging results in the future. New models should therefore be seen as complementary, as add-ons to current collaborations, rather than as radical changes to the current innovation ecosystem.

#### Passive defenses fail and link to the net benefit

Craig et al 15 – Senior cybersecurity strategist at the Microsoft Corporation.

Amanda N. Craig, Scott J. Shackelford, and Janine S. Hiller, “Proactive Cybersecurity: A Comparative Industry and Regulatory Analysis,” *American Business Law Journal*, 6 March 2015, pp. 9-10, https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=2573787.

A. The Evolution of Active Cyber Defense

As cyber attacks have become progressively more troublesome and as governments and legal structures have oftentimes proven unhelpful to companies, the concept of active defense has increasingly entered the mainstream of private sector cybersecurity strategies. 26 The potential utility of proactive cybersecurity for the private sector started to gain traction in scholars’ and companies’ consciousness in the late 1990s and early 2000s. For instance, researchers began to explore the role of tools like honeypots, which are decoy servers or systems set up to gather information about intruders,27 as supplements to traditional network security since at least 2003. 28 By 2005, more researchers were arguing that passive defense was inadequate in cyberspace because it allowed attackers’ perceived risks to remain “nearly nil,” creating a cost-benefit imbalance that significantly favored attackers.29 Moreover, “[e]ven when passive defense technologies work correctly, they do not neutralize the costs incurred by an attack,”30 meaning that firms often must double pay—for both the defensive technologies and for the costs of a successful attack. And as Robert Anderson, Brian Lum, and Bhavjit Walha have argued, the applicable U.S. “law provides little recourse” because it operates and adapts relatively slowly, is jurisdictional, and requires the involvement of under-resourced enforcement agencies as is further discussed below. 31 These factors began to incentivize firms to seek a more effective “deterrent”—like proactive cybersecurity. 32.

#### U.S. antitrust action invigorates global leadership – spurs a digital alliance with the EU that counters Russian/Chinese fragmentation of the internet

Wheeler 21 – Visiting fellow in governance studies at the Brookings Institution. Former FCC chairman.

Tom Wheeler, “Time for a U.S.-EU digital alliance,” *The Brookings Institution*, 21 January 2021, https://www.brookings.edu/research/time-for-a-us-eu-digital-alliance/.

The global open internet is splintering as nation-states such as China and Russia wall themselves from the free flow of information while repurposing digital technology to their economic and ideological benefit. Liberal democracies are facing the threat that the future of the most powerful network in the history of the planet could be defined by others.

The European Union—which has led in the attempt to establish oversight of the dominant digital companies—is also leading in the effort to build a democratic alliance. Lost in the attention paid to the EU’s proposed sweeping rules for the regulation of online platforms, is its proposal for a “specific dialog with the US on the responsibilities of online platforms and Big Tech” as part of a post-inauguration summit with President Biden.

Such strategic discussions should be the beginning of an alliance of liberal democracies to protect the open and free values, as well as the economic strengths, of those societies. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) was created as a military alliance in the sharply divided world of the 20th century. Now is the time for a Western digital alliance for the interconnected yet increasingly splintered 21st century.

Such an alliance could embrace two broad categories: protecting supply chains and protecting consumers and competition. Robert Knake, writing for the Council on Foreign Relations, has proposed a Western “digital free trade zone” to insulate democratic nations from autocratic regime control over hardware and software. This paper addresses the creation of an alliance of Western democracies—beginning with the U.S. and EU—to focus on the power of autocratic corporate empires and their effects on competition and consumers.

A DIGITAL ALLIANCE

In 1865, the French government assembled representatives of other European nations with state-owned telegraph networks. The attendees formed the International Telegraph Union (ITU) and agreed to a common set of standards for their activities. As the first supranational organization, it was a step toward today’s European Union.

A century and a half later, common technical standards are again at the heart of a new network. Beyond those technical standards, however, is a void in the establishment of behavioral standards for the network of the 21st century. It is no longer sufficient to allow dominant digital companies to act as pseudo-governments and make their own set of self-serving behavioral rules.

The telegraph transmitted data at about three bits per second, approximately 100 times faster than a mounted courier.[1] That speed ate away at the time buffer that allowed borders on the map to have relevance. Today, networks operating at gigabit speeds eliminate such distinctions altogether—including the continental distinction between the United States and Europe. This seamless and speedy interconnection has created shared digital realities for the U.S. and EU that require shared policy solutions while respecting national sovereignty.

These common digital policy issues organize themselves into three broad classifications: the dissemination of misinformation and hate, the distortion of markets to become non-competitive, and the exploitation of consumers. While there is little international debate surrounding the identification of such problems, the interconnections that make these problems possible have taxed the ability of individual nation-states to respond.

The challenges of internet capitalism are common to both sides of the Atlantic. The capital asset of digital information is inexhaustible, non-rivalrous and applied at near-zero marginal costs (“build once, sell everywhere”) to feed expansion through network effects.[2] These characteristics have created a new 21st century economic reality as surely as 19th century industrial capitalism replaced agricultural mercantilism.

In the 19th and early 20th centuries the new industrial economy necessitated the creation of regulatory oversight. Such regulation not only protected consumers and competition, but also had the effect of protecting industrial capitalism itself. We stand at a similar juncture with internet capitalism: to protect the public interest while continuing the best aspects of an innovative digital economy.

Yet governments have struggled to keep pace with the effects of the new digital economic model and the speed at which it operates. One consequence of the “move fast and break things” mantra is that the dominant digital companies have been able to define market behaviors before policymakers can catch up. Too often these behaviors are oblivious to their anticompetitive consequences and the public interest.

The real time nature of an interconnected globe cries out for nations with common values to develop shared oversight concepts for the marketplace results of those interconnections. The network effects that allow companies to scale rapidly would also allow for the rapid dissemination of these common policies.

In her September State of the Union address, European Commission President Ursula von der Leyen was quite direct: “Europe must now lead the way on digital—or it will have to follow the way of others who are setting these standards for us.” At the same time, she proactively asserted, “we are ready to build a new transatlantic agenda,” including in digital technology issues.

To date, the European Union has been the world leader in establishing such behavioral expectations. Until the recent antitrust actions, the United States has been largely absent from the field. The failure of the U.S. to develop domestic regulatory policies has cost it a leadership role in the interconnected world. “A common refrain among European officials,” Politico reports, “is that they’re being forced to take actions because the U.S. hasn’t.”

The result is an anomaly: U.S. companies have a global leadership position in digital technology, products and services—but the United States has shown little policy leadership. It would American companies and policymakers to recognize that in the interconnected world, failure in the latter undermines continued success in the former. Similarly, it would all liberal democracies to eschew the temptation to seek a regulation-imposed competitive advantage that itself accelerates splintering.

In early December, the EU proposed sweeping new oversight of the digital economy. The Digital Services Act deals with online content issues. The Digital Markets Act establishes behavioral expectations for the digital platforms judged to be market gatekeepers.

The EU’s new proposals continue efforts to find the right regulatory oversight of the digital giants. The speed with which digital technology imposes change has, however, outpaced the traditional oversight tools of government. As EU Executive Vice President Margrethe Vestager explained, “It is painful that in digital markets the harm that can be done in that marketplace can happen very fast but the recovery of that marketplace can be very, very difficult.”

The challenges of regulation in the digital era were highlighted by a report of the European Court of Auditors. That review concluded the EU’s digital oversight “has not yet fully addressed the complex new enforcement challenges in digital markets, the ever-increasing amount of data to be analysed or the limitations of existing enforcement tools.”

This situation is not unique to the EU. Just like the network that stimulated concerns in the first place, the issues created by such connections do not respect national boundaries. Oversight of the digital marketplace would be greatly enhanced by the cooperative efforts of a digital alliance. Consideration of such an alliance can follow the three issues raised by the EU auditors: the complexities of enforcement; the amount of data to be analyzed; and the limitations of existing enforcement tools.

#### Fragmented internet causes extinction – prevents collaboration to solve global threats

Merrill and Komaitis 21 – Nick Merrill is the director of the Daylight Lab at the UC Berkeley Center for Long-Term Cybersecurity. Konstantinos Komaitis is the senior director for Policy Strategy and Development at the Internet Society.

Nick Merrill and Konstantinos Komaitis, “The consequences of a fragmenting, less global internet,” *The Brookings Institution*, 17 December 2020, https://www.brookings.edu/techstream/the-consequences-of-a-fragmenting-less-global-internet/.

But the global internet is now under existential threat from fragmentation. And the problem with fragmentation is that it puts global cooperation at risk, as differences in the internet across borders are predictive of international trade and military relations, according to research conducted as part of the University of California, Berkeley Daylight Security Research Lab.

Such findings should recast discussions about internet fragmentation. Internet fragmentation does not concern narrowly the “free” movement of information (an ideal that has never been fully accomplished), nor does it merely challenge the internet’s “distributed” design, another ideal whose implementation has only ever been partial. Rather, a fragmenting internet is representative of and has the possibility of contributing to a fragmenting world order.

Such analysis of a fragmented internet looks at different layers of the internet “stack”—the building blocks that cobbled together comprise the internet—to quantify, for example, how similar France’s internet is to that of Germany, Canada, or Thailand. Using these country-to-country comparisons, we produce a network graph, with each country related to every other in a web of national internets that are, more or less, interoperable with one another. The graph reveals clusters that correlate with everything from military alliances to trade agreements—even to political principles such as freedom of speech. For example, content blocking patterns in European Union countries are significantly more similar to one another than they are to non-EU countries. The same is true of NATO countries.

Notably, these findings do not indicate that blocking policies cause, for example, freedom of speech to decline. Nor that restrictions on free speech cause a country to block websites. Rather, they indicate that website blocking patterns—the types of websites a country blocks—reveal information about a country’s position on the global stage.

In one sense, the strength of that relationship is unsurprising. The internet is, and has always been, both a product and a driver of political realities on the ground. From the role it played during the Arab Spring in 2012 to the way it has been used as a tool to interfere with the U.S. elections in 2016, the internet is a powerful tool for driving political change.

Internet fragmentation has always existed, but the fact that the internet has evolved the way it has, becoming global, is evidence that interoperability is more than just aspirational. World-scale collaboration, while difficult, is possible. It is as possible now as it was in the late 20th century.

Interoperability opens doors to participation and invites collaboration. To this end, the internet, and the threats to its operation as a global system, are a continuous invitation to work together. Not to agree, per se, but to agree to continue talking. To continue speaking the same proverbial language. Interoperability is not an end in itself. It is a means toward achieving shared goals. As cross-border goals emerge, from containing COVID-19 to battling climate change, interoperable ways of observing and discussing the world become more crucial.

Moving forward, policymakers must safeguard the fundamental interoperability of the global internet. Rules and legislation should prevent fragmentation, enshrining the principles of a decentralized network made from open, interoperable components. As our research shows, the rewards for doing so come in trade, military alliance and social freedoms.

To get to these regulations, policymakers must understand the internet’s ecosystem. Climate change provides an illustrative example: Cooperation is necessary, but action is impossible without understanding.

## States CP

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

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

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

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

#### States can’t do the plan – they’re bound by federal decisional precedent

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

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

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

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

State Levels of Adherence

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

## Con Con CP

**Con con will be unlimited and captured by special interests – that links to innovation AND politics**

**Leachman 17**

Michael Leachman, Director of State Fiscal Research at the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, David R. Super, Professor of Law at Georgetown University Law Center, “States Likely Could Not Control Constitutional Convention on Balanced Budget Amendment or Other Issues,” Center on Budget & Policy Priorities, January 18, 2017, https://www.cbpp.org/research/states-likely-could-not-control-constitutional-convention-on-balanced-budget-amendment-or

State lawmakers considering such resolutions should **be skeptical** of claims being made by groups promoting the resolutions (such as the American Legislative Exchange Council, or ALEC) that states **could control the** actions or **outcomes of a constitutional convention.** A convention likely would be **extremely contentious** and **highly politicized**, and its results impossible to predict.

A number of prominent jurists and legal scholars have warned that a constitutional convention could open up the Constitution to **radical** **and harmful changes.** For instance, the late Justice Antonin Scalia said in 2014, “I certainly would not want a constitutional convention. Whoa! Who knows what would come out of it?”[2] Similarly, former Chief Justice of the United States Warren Burger wrote in 1988:

[T]here is no way to **effectively limit** or muzzle the actions of a Constitutional Convention. The Convention could make its own rules and set its own agenda. Congress might try to limit the Convention to one amendment or one issue, but there is no way to assure that the Convention would obey. After a Convention is convened, it will be **too late to stop** the Convention if we don’t like its agenda.[3]

Such serious concerns are justified, for several reasons:

A convention could **write its own rules**. The Constitution provides no guidance whatsoever on the ground rules for a convention. This leaves wide open to political considerations and pressures such fundamental questions as how the delegates would be chosen, how many delegates each state would have, and whether a supermajority vote would be required to approve amendments. To illustrate the importance of these issues, consider that if every state had one vote in the convention and the convention could approve amendments with a simple majority vote, the 26 least populous states — which contain **less than 18 percent** of the nation’s people — could approve an amendment for ratification.

A convention could **set its own agenda**, possibly **influenced by powerful interest groups**. The only constitutional convention in U.S. history, in 1787, went **far beyond its mandate**. Charged with amending the Articles of Confederation to promote trade among the states, the convention instead wrote an entirely new governing document. A convention held today could set its own agenda, too. There is **no guarantee** that a convention could be limited to a particular set of issues, such as those related to balancing the federal budget. As a result, powerful, well-funded interest groups would surely seek to influence the process and press for changes to the agenda, seeing a constitutional convention as an opportunity to enact major policy changes. As former Chief Justice Burger wrote, a “Constitutional Convention today would be a **free-for-all** **for special interest** groups.” Further, the broad language contained in many of the resolutions that states have passed recently might increase the likelihood of a convention enacting changes that are **far more sweeping** than many legislators supporting these resolutions envision.

A convention could **choose a new ratification process**. The 1787 convention ignored the ratification process under which it was established and created a new process, lowering the number of states needed to approve the new Constitution and removing Congress from the approval process. The states then ignored the pre-existing ratification procedures and adopted the Constitution under the new ratification procedures that the convention proposed. Given these facts, it would be **unwise to assume** that ratification of the convention’s pro­posals would necessarily require the approval of 38 states, as the Constitution currently specifies. For example, a convention might remove the states from the approval process entirely and pro­pose a national referendum instead. Or it could follow the example of the 1787 convention and lower the required fraction of the states needed to approve its proposals from three-quarters to two-thirds.

No other body, including the courts, **has clear authority** over a convention. The Constitution provides for no authority above that of a constitutional convention, so it is not clear that the courts — or any other institution — could intervene if a convention did not limit itself to the language of the state resolutions calling for a convention. Article V **contains no restrictions** on the **scope of constitutional amendments** (other than those denying states equal representation in the Senate), and the courts generally leave such “political questions” to the elected branches. Moreover, delegates to the 1787 convention ignored their state legislatures’ instructions. Thus, the courts likely would not intervene in a dispute between a state and a delegate and, if they did, they likely would not back state efforts to constrain delegates given that delegates to the 1787 convention ignored their state legislatures’ instructions.

## CIL CP

No cards

## FTC Tradeoff DA

#### Pounders – A] current FTC approach creates a harsh environment

Dashefsky, Co-Chair of Antitrust & Trade Practices Group, Bass Berry Sims, ‘8/9/21

(Michael G., “Be Prepared: Aggressive Antitrust Enforcement Is Back,” <https://www.bassberry.com/news/aggressive-antitrust-enforcement-is-back/>)

This summer has seen a flurry of bold antitrust announcements from the Biden administration. By issuing a sweeping executive order calling for numerous changes to antitrust enforcement and by naming progressive favorites and prominent Big Tech critics to head the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) and the Antitrust Division of the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), President Biden has signaled that federal antitrust policy is entering a new era.

The FTC has already begun carrying out its mandate to reshape antitrust policy. Under the leadership of new Chairwoman Lina Khan, the FTC has moved quickly to eliminate checks on its antitrust enforcement powers. A majority of the FTC’s commissioners have expressly disavowed the agency’s longstanding approaches to policing antitrust violations and have given the new chair unprecedented authority over investigations and rulemakings.

Collectively, the Biden administration and the FTC have sent a clear message to the business community: aggressive antitrust enforcement is back. Companies should expect to see an increase in antitrust investigations, stiffer penalties for violations, more burdensome merger reviews, and new rules targeting a range of industry practices. In this environment, effective antitrust counseling and compliance programs are more important than ever.

#### B] Mechanism and internal link – recent court rulings, litigation, and reaffirmation of quick-look paradigm

Cornell 9/16 – Head of the U.S. antitrust practice at global antitrust powerhouse Clifford Chance LLP

Tim Cornell, 20 years of antitrust experience, has advocated on behalf of dozens of clients before the US Federal Trade Commission, the US Department of Justice, and the federal courts, with Robert Houck, Peter Mucchetti, and Brian Yin, Antitrust Litigation 2021, Last Updated September 16, 2021, <https://practiceguides.chambers.com/practice-guides/antitrust-litigation-2021/usa/trends-and-developments>

NCAA: a Unanimous Decision for a Divided Court

On 21 June 2021, the Supreme Court unanimously held that restrictions imposed by the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) limiting the "education-related benefits" that member schools could provide to student athletes violated federal antitrust law, re-affirming the virtues of the Court's long-standing "rule of reason" analysis and making clear that the antitrust laws apply to anticompetitive agreements in labor markets. [Nat'l Collegiate Athletic Ass'n v. Alston, 141 S. Ct. 2141 (2021).] While the holding was a major blow to the NCAA, it has important implications beyond college sports—especially for its discussion of how courts could use a "quick look" form of the rule of reason analysis.

In NCAA v. Alston, former and current student-athletes sued the NCAA in class action litigation. They argued that the NCAA's rules restricting compensation were agreements between member schools that unreasonably restrained trade, in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act. [15 U.S.C. Section 1.]. The California district court applied a rule of reason analysis, considering:

whether the challenged restraints had substantial anticompetitive effects;

procompetitive rationales; and

whether these procompetitive effects could be achieved through less anticompetitive means.

After trial, the district court upheld the NCAA's restrictions capping undergraduate scholarships and compensation related to athletic performance, accepting that both improve consumer choice among sports enthusiasts by maintaining a distinction between amateur and professional sports. But the court held that the policy limiting "education-related benefits" did not fulfill that objective and violated the law. The Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit agreed.

The Supreme Court affirmed. The NCAA argued that the lower courts should have applied an "abbreviated deferential review" of its challenged restraints. Writing for a unanimous Court, Justice Gorsuch explained that the lower courts had properly applied the full rule of reason analysis, given the "complex questions" about the consumer benefits of the challenged policies. In doing so, Justice Gorsuch pointed out that the "market realities" had changed since 1984, when the Court assumed (without deciding) that different NCAA restrictions were justifiable. Justice Kavanaugh's concurrence went further, chastising the NCAA for holding themselves as "above the law" and potentially inviting future plaintiffs to again challenge the NCAA's remaining compensation restrictions (which the plaintiffs had not appealed to the Court).

The majority opinion notably recognised that the "quick look" rule of reason analysis can apply to determine that a challenged restraint is not anticompetitive. Historically, courts have used "quick look" analysis to condemn restraints, when “an observer with even a rudimentary understanding of economics could conclude that the arrangement in question would have an anticompetitive effect.” [Cal. Dental Ass'n v. Fed. Trade Comm'n, 526 U.S. 756, 770 (1999)]. The Court declined to apply the NCAA's requested quick look, but recognised that certain restraints may be "so obviously incapable of harming competition that they require little scrutiny."

While clearly a blow to the NCAA, the opinion will likely have ripple effects in other industries and contexts. It would not be surprising for more parties to advocate for "quick look" rule of reason analysis – particularly to absolve challenged restraints. And on the other end of the spectrum, the Department of Justice has already cited Justice Kavanaugh's concurrence to argue that price-fixing in labor markets should be per se unlawful. All this makes clear that attorneys and clients must be familiar with this case to be prepared when dealing with future antitrust issues.

#### Fiat solves – new authority comes with new funding authorization

Bannan is policy counsel at New America’s Open Technology Institute, focusing on platform accountability and privacy, and Gambhir, New America's Open Technology Institute, ‘21

(Christine and Raj, “Does Data Privacy Need its Own Agency?” <https://d1y8sb8igg2f8e.cloudfront.net/documents/Does_Data_Privacy_Need_its_Own_Agency.pdf>)

Proposals delegating privacy law enforcement to the FTC generally bolster an existing bureau or establish a new bureau within the agency. Senator Wyden’s Mind Your Own Business Act of 2019 would create a new 50-person Bureau of Technology within the FTC and add 125 employees to the Bureau of Consumer Protection—100 of whom would do privacy enforcement work.102 This would bring the total number of FTC employees doing privacy enforcement work up to about 190. While the Wyden bill does not provide figures for how much adding 175 new employees would cost, former FTC Chairman Joseph Simons estimated that a $50 million budget increase from Congress would enable the FTC to hire 160 new staff.103 Under this proposal, the number of employees working on privacy would more than triple. However, it would still only be about one-tenth the size of the Eshoo-Lofgren DPA proposal.

#### Defense-friendly standards increases cost and reduces impact of agency enforcement

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## BBB DA

#### No link – decision is announced in June

**Think Progress**, Everything You Need to Know About Why The DC Circuit Delayed Arguments On Obama’s Climate Plan, May 17, 20**16**, https://thinkprogress.org/everything-you-need-to-know-about-why-the-dc-circuit-delayed-arguments-on-obamas-climate-plan-d172bc032359#.pq6syhcy5

So Monday evening the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals announced it is bypassing its planned June 2 oral arguments over the Obama administration’s signature climate policy. “It is ORDERED, on the court’s own motion, that these cases, currently scheduled for oral argument on June 2, 2016, be rescheduled for oral argument before the en banc court on Tuesday, September 27, 2016 at 9:30 a.m.,” the D.C. Circuit’s announcement read. “It is FURTHER ORDERED that the parties and amici curiae provide 25 additional paper copies of all final briefs and appendices to the court by June 1, 2016. A separate order will issue regarding allocation of oral argument time.” What does this mean? The court thinks it’s important First, the D.C. Circuit thinks this is an important case — important enough to merit the attention of the full panel — and they understand that the Supreme Court can’t decide a close case following the passing of Justice Antonin Scalia. A win for the industry or for the administration is significant, with the D.C. Circuit functioning as something of a court of last resort with the Supreme Court likely to deadlock 4–4. **The decision won’t be an election issue** Second, **now it is clear that the court’s decision will come after the November election, instead of before it.** This impacts the case should it see an almost-certain appeal to the Supreme Court. Scalia’s replacement is likely to hinge on the result of the 2016 presidential election, which throws more uncertainty into the mix. **It’s already become a political issue in Congress**, with hundreds of conservative members (all Republicans except Sen. Joe Manchin (D-WV)) filing a brief opposing the rule, and hundreds of current and former legislators filing a brief in support.

#### Courts shield PC

Keith E. **Whittington 5**, Cromwell Professor of Politics – Princeton University, ““Interpose Your Friendly Hand”: Political Supports for the Exercise of Judicial Review by the United States Supreme Court”, American Political Science Review, 99(4), November, p. 585, 591-592

Political leaders in such a situation will have reason to support or, at minimum, tolerate the active exercise of judicial review. In the American context, the presidency is a particularly useful site for locating such behavior. The Constitution gives the president a powerful role in selecting and speaking to federal judges. As national party leaders, presidents and presidential candidates are both conscious of the fragmented nature of American political parties and sensitive to policy goals that will not be shared by all of the president’s putative partisan allies in Congress. We would expect political support for judicial review to make itself apparent in any of four fields of activity: (1) in the selection of “activist” judges, (2) in the encouragement of specific judicial action consistent with the political needs of coalition leaders, (3) in the **congenial reception** of judicial action after it has been taken, and (4) in the public expression of generalized support for judicial supremacy in the articulation of constitutional commitments. Although it might sometimes be the case that judges and elected officials **act in** more-or-less **explicit** **concert** to shift the politically appropriate decisions into the judicial arena for resolution, it is also the case that judges might act independently of elected officials but nonetheless in ways that elected officials find congenial to their own interests and are **willing** and able **to accommodate**. Although Attorney General Richard Olney and perhaps President Grover Cleveland thought the 1894 federal income tax was politically unwise and socially unjust, they did not necessarily therefore think judicial intervention was appropriate in the case considered in more detail later (Eggert 1974, 101– 14). If a majority of the justices and Cleveland-allies in and around the administration had more serious doubts about the constitutionality of the tax, however, the White House would hardly feel aggrieved. We should be equally interested in how judges might exploit the political space open to them to render **controversial decisions** and in how elected officials might anticipate the utility of future acts of judicial review to their own interests.¶ [CONTINUES]¶ There are some issues that politicians cannot easily handle. For individual legislators, their constituents may be sharply divided on a given issue or overwhelmingly hostile to a policy that the legislator would nonetheless like to see adopted. Party leaders, including presidents and legislative leaders, must similarly sometimes manage deeply divided or cross-pressured coalitions. When faced with such issues, elected officials may actively seek to turn over controversial political questions to the courts so as to **circumvent a paralyzed legislature** and **avoid the political fallout** that would come with taking direct action themselves. As Mark Graber (1993) has detailed in cases such as slavery and abortion, elected officials may prefer judicial resolution of disruptive political issues to direct legislative action, especially when the courts are believed to be sympathetic to the politician’s own substantive preferences but even when the attitude of the courts is uncertain or unfavorable (see also, Lovell 2003). Even when politicians do not invite judicial intervention, strategically minded courts will take into account not only the policy preferences of well-positioned policymakers but also the willingness of those potential policymakers to act if doing so means that they must assume responsibility for policy outcomes. For cross-pressured politicians and coalition leaders, **shifting blame** for controversial decisions to the Court and obscuring their own relationship to those decisions may preserve electoral support and coalition unity without threatening active judicial review (Arnold 1990; Fiorina 1986; Weaver 1986). The conditions for the exercise of judicial review may be relatively favorable when judicial invalidations of legislative policy can be managed to the electoral benefit of most legislators. In the cases considered previously, fractious coalitions produced legislation that presidents and party leaders deplored but were unwilling to block. Divisions within the governing coalition can also prevent legislative action that political leaders want taken, as illustrated in the following case.

#### Aff is absurdly bipartisan – legislative momentum comes from Klobuchar NOT Biden

Zakrzewski 10/14/2021 – technology policy reporter

Cat, “Senators aim to block tech giants from prioritizing their own products over rivals’” WaPo, 10/14/2021, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2021/10/14/klobuchar-grassley-antitrust-bill/>

A bipartisan group of senators plans to introduce a bill that they say would prevent tech platforms from using their power to disadvantage smaller rivals, signaling growing momentum in Congress to rein in Silicon Valley giants.

Sens. Amy Klobuchar (D-Minn.), chair of the Senate Judiciary Committee’s antitrust subcommittee, and Charles E. Grassley of Iowa, the top Republican on the Senate Judiciary Committee, announced that they will introduce legislation early next week making it illegal for Amazon, Apple, Facebook and Google to engage in “self-preferencing,” the tech giants’ practice of giving their own products and services a boost over those of rivals on their platforms.

The bill would effectively outlaw an array of behaviors that lawmakers describe as anticompetitive, like Amazon sucking up data from sellers on its platform to copy the products in-house or Google prioritizing its own services over rivals’ in search results.

Klobuchar said in an interview that the bill reflects a growing realization that competition laws, like the Sherman Act of 1890, which prohibits anticompetitive agreements and attempts to monopolize markets, need to be updated for the digital era. (Amazon founder Jeff Bezos owns The Washington Post.)

The American Innovation and Choice Online Act “really gets at the exclusionary conduct so unique to dominant platforms,” she said. “If there had been an Internet when Sen. Sherman was representing Ohio in the Senate, maybe they would have included this.”

The bill comes as recent cases targeting tech giants have tested existing antitrust laws. Advocates for tech regulation say legislation is needed because laws written in the era of railroads and oil barons are not equipped to address the unique ways that Silicon Valley can harm competition and consumers. Both Facebook and Apple have scored courtroom victories in recent months in high-profile antitrust cases.

The bill is widely viewed as a bellwether of whether Republicans and Democrats will be able to convert the mounting bipartisan animosity toward the tech industry into new laws. House lawmakers have already passed a companion version of this bill through the Judiciary Committee, and it awaits a vote on the House floor. The Klobuchar bill highlights the mounting bipartisan interest in both chambers of Congress in overhauling competition law to target the practices of a handful tech giants.

Klobuchar said the White House has also remained “informed” of her office’s work on the bill, as competition policy has emerged as a key focus of the administration. White House press secretary Jen Psaki said last week that President Biden “looks forward” to working with Congress on tech regulation, including antitrust legislation.

The bill’s announcement invited backlash from industry-backed groups arguing that, if passed, it would have a detrimental impact on tech companies. The bill would take a “hammer” to products that consumers love, said Adam Kovacevich, chief executive of the Chamber of Progress, an industry coalition that counts Google, Amazon and Facebook among its partner companies.

“Preventing Amazon from selling Amazon Basics and banning Google’s maps from its search results isn’t going to do anything to make the Internet better for families,” he said. “This is like calling a car mechanic to fix your laptop.”

Advocates for breaking up large tech companies praised the bill and said the recent bipartisan vote backing tech critic Lina Khan to serve on the Federal Trade Commission underscores there’s willingness in both parties to pass antitrust legislation. But they say this should only be the beginning of Congress’s work on these issues.

“The Senate must continue to reassert its power over the handful of men whose corporations undermine economic dynamism, eviscerate the free press, and threaten our democracy itself,” said Sarah Miller, executive director of the American Economic Liberties Project, a nonprofit organization that advocates for aggressive antitrust enforcement.

The Senate Judiciary antitrust subcommittee has hosted several related hearings, during which they’ve questioned witnesses on ways that the tech giants supposedly use their grip on the smart home or app stores to limit competition. Klobuchar noted that these concerns date back to the previous Congress, when a Republican-controlled committee hosted a hearing on self-preferencing, and lawmakers heard testimony from Google critic Yelp.

“Through it all was a common theme about how the dominant platforms were advantaged because they could exclude competitors as only a dominant platform can,” Klobuchar said.

A news release about the forthcoming legislation said it would give enforcers “strong, flexible tools to deter violations,” including steep fines of up to 15 percent of a company’s revenue during the time it was violating the legislation.

The bill also targets much of the conduct that was raised by House lawmakers last year in the findings of their more than year-long investigation into power in the tech industry.
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## Conduct Adv

#### Recovery isn’t guaranteed – new pandemic wave threatens small businesses

Ahuja and Todd 9/15 – Maneet Ahuja is a senior Forbes editor covering business-related topics including startups and small businesses. Samantha Todd is an assistant Forbes editor.

Maneet Ahuja and Samantha Todd, “The Next 1000: Resiliency Proves Vital to Small Businesses’ Pandemic Recovery,” *Forbes*, 15 September 2021, https://www.forbes.com/sites/maneetahuja/2021/09/15/the-next-1000-resiliency-proves-vital-to-small-businesses-pandemic-recovery/?sh=275813c61615.

Just as the nation’s more than 30 million small business owners were getting back on their feet, Main Street is again seeing its survival threatened by Covid-19.

According to a new analysis of U.S. Census data by the Economic Innovation Group, businesses are increasingly reducing employees’ hours, reporting declining revenues and, in some sectors, laying off more workers than they’re hiring. John Lettieri, president and CEO of the Economic Innovation Group, says this suggests a relationship between vaccination rates and economic health.

“The latest findings underscore the need to dramatically improve vaccination rates and the availability of rapid testing,” he says. “Small businesses are going to continue to struggle until the public health crisis is under control—it’s that simple.”

Following the first wave of the pandemic—which resulted in an unemployment rate of 14.8%, the highest since the Great Depression—the U.S. saw applications to start new businesses grow by 41%, according to the Census Bureau, a rate far outpacing the usual post-recession uptick. This trend is reflected in our third installment of the Next 1000: a Forbes list of U.S. entrepreneurs with less than $10 million in revenue or funding. (You can see the spring and summer classes of 250 each here.) Some 15% of applicants launched their businesses amid the pandemic. But the optimism that fueled that surge may be fading.

#### Things will get worse this winter

Anderson 10/10 – AP reporter covering small business.

Mae Anderson, “Small businesses navigate ever-changing COVID-19 reality,” *Associated Press*, 10 October 2021, https://apnews.com/article/coronavirus-pandemic-business-new-york-small-business-health-ccd307c31eef7cb39bdd2d91805224fb.

For a brief moment this summer, it seemed like small businesses might be getting a break from the relentless onslaught of the pandemic. More Americans, many of them vaccinated, flocked to restaurants and stores without needing to mask up or socially distance.

But then came a surge in cases due to the delta variant, a push for vaccine mandates and a reluctant return to more COVID-19 precautions. Now, small business owners are left trying to strike a balance between staying safe and getting back to being fully open.

Navigating ever-changing coronavirus reality comes with a number of risks, from financial hardship to offending customers to straining workers. Those challenges could intensify as winter approaches and outdoor alternatives become limited. Still, small business owners say the whiplash is worth it to keep customers and employees as safe as possible.

#### Recovery has been uneven – small businesses aren’t bouncing back

Ro 8/17 – Markets correspondent for Axios.

Sam Ro, “Small business struggles,” *Axios*, 17 August 2021, https://www.axios.com/small-business-struggles-53cd3201-f3cd-4a88-939c-5dfece036c2a.html.

Small businesses aren’t thriving quite like their large corporate counterparts.

Why it matters: It's a signal of the bifurcated pandemic recovery, in which the biggest U.S. companies have reported record earnings growth as they leveraged higher wages to help recruitment and used their scale to make cost cuts.

Meanwhile, small businesses have had limited capacity to execute like their larger competitors.

By the numbers: About 53.3% of small and medium-sized businesses missed out on revenue opportunities due to staffing issues, according to a new survey conducted from July 12 to 15 by Salesforce.

Of that group, 56.6% said staffing issues were responsible for at least an 11% drop in revenue over the past six months.

This sentiment was echoed in the National Federation of Independent Business (NFIB) July jobs survey, which found 63% of small businesses were hiring and 89% of that group said there were few or no qualified applicants.

In another July survey, the NFIB found most small businesses said the last three months’ worth of earnings were lower than the prior three months worth of earnings. A top reason for this was disappointing sales volumes.

What they’re saying: When asked why there’s been such a stark contrast between small business and S&P 500 earnings in recent months, Holly Wade, executive director of the NFIB Research Center, tells Axios that staffing issues explain a lot, but not all of, the bottom line woes.

"Small businesses have a harder time absorbing increased costs and passing them along" while staying competitive, she says.

Between the lines: It may seem like the obvious solution is to just raise pay more aggressively.

But raising pay for new applicants often means having to raise pay for other existing employees, which is costly.

Also, raising pay now gives employers less cost flexibility in the future as employers would rather avoid having to cut pay down the road.

The bottom line: Even in a booming economy, many small businesses will find themselves at a disadvantage relative to larger corporations if they have to compete for scarce resources like labor.

#### Rule of reason balances pro- and anti-competitive effects – only way to solve – their author

Portuese 21 – Director of Antitrust and Innovation Policy at the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation. Doctor in law from the University of Paris II.

Aurelien Portuese, “Please, Help Yourself’: Toward a Taxonomy of Self-Preferencing,” *Information Technology and Innovation Foundation*, 25 October 2021, pp. 18-19, https://itif.org/publications/2021/10/25/please-help-yourself-toward-taxonomy-self-preferencing.

CONCLUSION

The United States faces a critical turning point when it comes to antitrust law. It can continue the current system wherein it generally allows companies, even those with considerable market share, to self-preference (while not allowing active degradation of competitors), or it can go down the EU path that seeks to protect businesses, especially small firms, from competition, even if the result is a degraded consumer experience. A general, per se prohibition of self-preferencing, as proposed in the European Commission’s Digital Markets Act, would generate considerable costs and unintended consequences. Accordingly, the United States should refrain from instituting such an approach with bills such as the Klobuchar-Grassley bill and its House counterpart (Customer Non-Discrimination Act / Equality Act). Indeed, antitrust bills that aim to prohibit self-preferencing without thoughtful analysis and only for a handful of companies will likely do more harm than good. They are likely to undermine rather than strengthen competition on the merits and make consumers’ experiences worse.83

One cannot overstate the implications of the radical choice of prohibiting procompetitive self-preferencing. Unfortunately, several forces in the U.S. government seek to go down the EU path: some progressive Democrats because they despise large corporations and want a fundamentally restructured economy; some Republicans because they have let their anger toward social media sites purportedly being biased against conservative speech influence their views on antitrust; and many other elected officials simply because there is so much generated noise about the problems of “big tech.”

Policymakers need to tread carefully in this matter because going down the road of severely limiting self-preferencing would mean going down a road that will be hard to return from. This is a road that prioritizes protecting economic redistribution over economic growth; a road that protects some business interests over consumer interests. Finally, such a road would give carte blanche power to the government to hamper the U.S. innovation economy to benefit foreign competitors.

Today’s antitrust enforcers and lawmakers need to refrain from prohibiting the historically beneficial practice of self-preferencing. Indeed, imagine if antitrust officials in the 1930s and 1940s succumbed to the generated controversy over the so-called “chain store wars.” American consumers would not have benefitted from the low prices and abundance created by the rise of supermarkets and department stores. The race to efficiency led chain stores to pass on benefits to consumers at the expense of inefficient, small, less-innovative shops. To prohibit online a revolution that benefits users could only harm American consumers for the sake of protecting rent-seeking competitors willing to get through the law what they cannot get from the market. Anyone who cares about American living standards and consumer welfare should vociferously oppose such a vision that slows down competition and innovation through the prohibition of self-preferencing initially and the breakup of companies subsequently. This Neo-Brandeisian perspective jettisons American competitiveness and innovation.84

They can start by differentiating between self-preferencing and rival exclusion and commit to seeing the former as a procompetitive, proconsumer business practice that helps companies diversify their portfolios, enter new markets, challenge incumbents, and disseminate innovation through a process of imitation and disruption, which unequivocally benefits consumers. In addition, self-preferencing often is a substitute for marketing expenses, so prohibiting self-preferencing would squelch these procompetitive and pro-innovative effects.

Consequently, antitrust officials are well advised to focus on exclusionary practices only and not undermine the procompetitive effects of self-preferencing, or else the distortion of the competitive process may chill innovation at the expense of consumer benefits.

## Adv CP

#### China is spreading an authoritarian vision of the internet – digital alliance is key to stop it

Knake 20 – Senior fellow for cyber policy at the Council on Foreign Relations.

Robert K. Knake, “Weaponizing Digital Trade: Creating a Digital Trade Zone to Promote Online Freedom and Cybersecurity,” *Council on Foreign Relations*, September 2020, pp. 1-2, https://cdn.cfr.org/sites/default/files/report\_pdf/weaponizing-digital-trade\_csr\_combined\_final.pdf.

The global internet is splitting apart. China, Russia, and other authoritarian regimes are working to limit what information flows in and out of their national borders while constantly surveilling internet users inside their networks. Meanwhile, China and Russia are leading efforts at the United Nations to fundamentally reengineer how the internet works and is governed to fit their Orwellian visions. For its part, Europe is heading off in its own direction, with the European Union (EU) strengthening its privacy and content moderation requirements, targeting the practices of U.S.-based technology giants. If the United States is unable to develop a competing vision, a decade from now the internet as we know it will no longer be recognizable. Not only would the United States have lost the economic value from being the global driver of digital trade and innovation, but much of the world’s population would also have been mired in a web of censorship and surveillance woven by China’s state-owned enterprises. In this sense, the stakes go far beyond the internet and will doubtless affect the global balance of power.

Although many efforts are underway to promote digital freedom, establish norms for state conduct in cyberspace, and address the harmful consequences of the cross-border free flow of data, these efforts are largely uncoordinated, resulting in ad hoc measures that do not create mechanisms for managing the next product of concern. More important, they lack the incentives necessary to encourage better behavior— failing to protect citizens’ rights online or harboring cross-border cybercriminals has few consequences. To combat these trends, the United States should shift its diplomatic efforts from promoting a global, open internet to preserving an open internet that connects the digital economies of democratic countries.

The time to pursue a digital trade agreement that would preserve the flow of cross-border digital trade, while taking steps to address the negative effects of an open internet, is now. Trade negotiators are moving rapidly to stop countries from putting in place national laws to address cybercrime. Yet efforts at promoting digital trade will be successful only if they seriously attempt to cooperatively address cybercrime, censorship, and privacy concerns. By tying digital trade—the cross-border exchange of digital products and services—to the promotion of the free exchange of information and efforts to control the harmful side effects of an open internet, the United States and its allies can create a compelling alternative to the authoritarian vision of a tightly controlled network. In short, the United States should weaponize its digital trade relationships to create a system of incentives and penalties that will promote security hand in hand with democratic values on the internet.

#### China/Russia is exporting its authoritarian model now – U.S. should respond by partnering with the EU

Knake 20 – Senior fellow for cyber policy at the Council on Foreign Relations.

Robert K. Knake, “Weaponizing Digital Trade: Creating a Digital Trade Zone to Promote Online Freedom and Cybersecurity,” *Council on Foreign Relations*, September 2020, pp. 5, https://cdn.cfr.org/sites/default/files/report\_pdf/weaponizing-digital-trade\_csr\_combined\_final.pdf.

Beyond using legal means to shape internet content, borders are shifting from places where laws change to places where countries are implementing technical controls. Until recently, in most countries data flowed freely across national borders, filtered out at the corporate or individual level. Now countries are moving to preemptively restrict and shape the flow of data at national borders. China is the leader in this regard, with Russia following close behind. China operates what is known as the Great Firewall, a system of inspection points both internal and at gateways to the rest of the world that surveils internet use by Chinese citizens and blocks access to content deemed unlawful. Iran operates its National Information Network, which allows it to censor all content on the network and shut off external and internal data flows in times of unrest. China has exported its know-how to Russia, which is busy testing Runet, its so-called sovereign internet that will allow it to cut off traffic to the rest of the world. Russia has backed its technical efforts with a series of laws that make it a crime to publish what the state judges to be “fake news” or to criticize the government.7 China has also assisted dozens of other countries that would like to emulate its system of controls.8

Together, China and Russia have assembled a bloc of like-minded nations that are pressing their vision for the internet in the United Nations. In December, a Russia-backed resolution to create a working group charged with developing a new cybercrime treaty passed with overwhelming support from non-Western countries.9 The treaty would center internet governance within the United Nations, make governments the primary arbiters of the future of the internet, and, most troublingly, broadly define cybercrime so as to capture online speech that is protected in many democratic countries. Given this renewed push, the United States should work to mend the emerging rift with Europe on digital issues and create a compelling vision and attractive market that will draw in democratic countries around the globe.

## Platforms Adv

#### Should consider it two different markets – single-market approach can’t account for differences between both sides

Katz 19 – Professor Emeritus in the Haas School of Business and Department of Economics at UC Berkeley.

Michael L. Katz, “Platform economics and antitrust enforcement: A little knowledge is a dangerous thing,” *Journal of Economics and Management Strategy*, vol. 28, no. 1, 11 January 2019, https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/jems.12304.

Proponents of the single-market approach argue that a market definition encompassing both sides of a transactions platform is appropriate because a transaction will occur over a platform if and only if both sides choose to use the platform to complete the transaction, so that the transaction is the unit over which competition occurs.21

This argument, however, reflects a failure to account for the fundamental nature of multisided platforms. To see why it is useful to recount a debate that has taken place in the context of American Express. Relevant markets are defined as collections of products that are sufficiently close substitutes for one another. The services offered to users on one side of a platform generally are not substitutes for services offered to users on the other side, which suggests they should not be in the same relevant market.22 Some proponents of the single-market approach reject this criticism on the grounds that the substitution is among a single product (e.g., transaction facilitation) that comprises the offerings to the two sides as complementary components akin to left and right shoes.23 But this analogy is inapt because two distinct users are party to a transaction, and their interests are not fully aligned. As Rochet and Tirole (2003) put it, “[t]he interaction between the two sides gives rise to strong complementarities, but the corresponding externalities are not internalized by end users, unlike in the multiproduct literature (the same consumer buys the razor and the razor blade).”24 For example, given that a credit card transaction takes place, the merchant would rather pay a lower fee to the network, while the consumer would rather receive a higher reward; neither party is interested in the two-sided price.

As a consequence, the question of whether an increase in “the price” of a transaction would lead to substitution to other products is almost meaningless; the answer depends on the changes in the component prices, not just their sum. The price structure—in addition to the price level—matters both because the degree to which different multisided platforms are substitutes could be quite different from the perspectives of users on different sides of those platforms, and because users on different sides may have very different degrees of control with respect to which platform is used to complete a transaction.

Another way of stating the issue is that the single-market approach fails to recognize the large possible differences between the competitive conditions on the two sides of a transactions platform due to differences on the two sides in terms of product differentiation, vertical integration, user sophistication, and user multihoming.25 In a traditional antitrust case, the plaintiff can rely on a presumption that a firm with a high market share possesses sufficient market power to harm competition. Calculations based on a single, transactions share number cannot possibly capture differences in competitive conditions on the two sides of a platform.

#### Plan best allocates burdens – shifts netting to step 3, which is better because it prevents plaintiff from having to think up all the defendant’s random accusations

First 19 – Charles L. Denison Professor Law at New York University.

Harry First, “*American Express*, the Rule of Reason, and the Goals of Antitrust,” *Nebraska Law Review*, vol. 98, 2019, pp. 336, https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?collection=journals&handle=hein.journals/nebklr98&id=332&men\_tab=srchresults.

The Court's discussion of Amex's procompetitive justification, even though the Court purported to stop at Step One of the rule of reason analysis, had important consequences for the decision in the case. The reason for the separate steps in the rule of reason analysis is to allocate properly the burdens of proof in antitrust litigation to the parties best able to address them. Plaintiffs should not be tasked with dreaming up and disproving all possible justifications that a defendant could raise in support of restraints that have proven adverse effects on competition. If there is a really good justification for a restraint, let the defendant prove it. The burden will still be on the plaintiff to show that, on balance, competition is harmed.

#### And uncertainty over this decision incentivizes companies to invoke *Amex* to stymie plaintiffs

Carlton, PhD, Professor of Economics at the Graduate School of Business at the University of Chicago where he teaches in the Business School, Law School and Economics Department, commissioner on the Antitrust Modernization Commission, ‘19

(Dennis W., “The Anticompetitive Effect of Vertical Most-Favored-Nation Restraints and the Error of Amex,” Columbia Business Law Review, 2019(1), 93–106)

What will be the effect of the Amex decision? From the viewpoint of economic analysis, which by its nature, would have considered all effects (i.e., on both sides of the market) from the vertical restriction even in the usual three step procedure, I don’t think much will change, at least conceptually. From the viewpoint of burden shifting, a lot could change. I suspect that placing the burden on the plaintiff in the way the Court proposes will make it more difficult for plaintiffs to prevail, even in cases where there is a clear interference in the process of competition with no offsetting justification. The beauty of the common law is that a bad decision can be either overturned or so confined to its unique facts that the effect of bad decisions can be mitigated. I hope that is what happens here.

One thing I can predict is that, given the vagueness with which the Court has defined a two-sided market, a firm that is charged with using vertical restrictions in violation of the antitrust laws will have an incentive to claim that it is operating in a two-sided, not one-sided, market in order to take advantage of the Amex decision, which I suspect will make it harder for plaintiffs to win. This illustrates why having different legal rules for promotional activity depending on whether the market is one-sided or two-sided markets is a mistake.

**Big Tech is bad for financial competition---they’ll monopolize the industry and use platform exclusion to stifle competition**

**Thiemann 20** – OECD Competition Division, Directorate for Financial and Enterprise Affairs

Ania Thiemann, "Innovation and Competition in Financial Markets," OECD On The Level, 1-14-2020, https://oecdonthelevel.com/2020/01/14/innovation-and-competition-in-financial-markets/

Increased competition or market dominance?

So in the short term, competition in retail banking and financial services is set to increase, but the longer term outlook is more uncertain. In the case of BigTech, the link between entry and competition is not clear. BigTech can establish and entrench market power through their control of multi-sided platforms and data and potential competitors have little scope to build rival platforms. Moreover, dominant platforms can raise entry barriers to consolidate their position, using their market power and network externalities to raise switching costs for users or exclude potential competitors.[6]

BigTechs can also use their superior data to price discriminate and extract rent – i.e. using the data to assess not only a consumer’s creditworthiness, but also the highest interest rate the borrower would be willing to pay for a loan.From a welfare point of view the effect is ambiguous: the customer gets the product at the highest price they are willing to pay – but the surplus value is no longer shared between the firm and the customer; rather the firm gets all the rent. In addition, there are no distributional benefits in terms of higher productivity. Moreover, algorithms may exclude certain high-risk groups from socially desirable insurance markets, or develop biases towards minorities, as is evidenced for instance in some recruitment algorithms.[7]

#### Big tech has no *incentive* to innovate—only new firms solve

Wheeler, visiting fellow in Governance Studies at The Brookings Institution, Chairman of the Federal Communication Commission (FCC) from 2013 to 2017, ‘20

(Tom, “Digital Competition With China Starts With Competition At Home,” <https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/FP_20200427_digital_competition_china_wheeler_v3.pdf>)

The dominant tech companies certainly have the digital assets, capital, and other resources necessary to push innovation forward. But what innovation? The companies’ fiduciary responsibility is to their shareholders, not something broader. In a March 2020 speech, the U.S. deputy attorney general cited economic research that “an incumbent’s incentive to innovate is lessened because the resulting innovation replaces existing profitable sales … innovations are more likely to come not from a monopolist, but from an outsider without existing sales to replace.”53

The experience with the 20th century's dominant tech company, AT&T, graphically illustrates this point. Innovation under corporate control is innovation for corporate benefit. This is not evil, simply an exercise in fiduciary reality. To have America’s competition with China controlled by limited fiduciary interests, however, is not necessarily in the overall national interest. Beyond the risk of the dominant companies making innovation decisions based on self-interest is the nature of the global economy itself. The argument that Big Tech is the alternative to China only works if these same companies are not in alliances with China. As the dominant companies increasingly view themselves as international players, the pressure builds for them to have a “China strategy” that, intentionally or not, accrues to the benefit of China.54 Google has announced an AI center in China.55 Amazon is the second largest cloud service provider in China, after Alibaba.56 Apple, of course, famously builds its hardware in China. These are not untoward acts; however, when the United States builds its plan for competing with China around companies doing business in China, such reality becomes relevant. “Big companies are what are investing in technologies like AI the most,” Google CEO Sundar Pichai told CNN. “As a company we now invest sometimes thinking 5 to 10 years ahead without necessarily worrying about short term profits,” he said. Such investments are, indeed, important, but “thinking 5 to 10 years ahead” is not unique to large companies; it is what innovators and venture capitalists do as a matter of course.57 The challenge for those innovators and their investors is that while capital can buy creativity, intelligence, and computing power, they are disadvantaged when the data they need is being hoarded by the dominant companies.

Big Tech’s bottleneck on the data necessary for AI is not in the national interest. The dominant companies cite their data hoards as a critical asset for the United States and a reason why government policy should be hands-off. If that data is a critical national asset, however, why should only a handful of companies be allowed to control that asset to the detriment of smaller, innovative companies?

#### Tech behemoths won’t take DOD contracts. Antitrust would encourage smaller firms to develop AI for the sole purpose of defense needs.

Foster and Arnold ’20 – Researchers at ***Georgetown’s*** Center for Security and Emerging Technology [Dakota; Visiting Researcher at Georgetown’s Center for Security and Emerging Technology, graduate student in the Department of War Studies at King’s College London, conducted research on terrorism and U.S. national security policy for the U.S. military, the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and the Washington Institute; Zachary; Research Fellow at Georgetown’s Center for Security and Emerging Technology, where he focuses on AI investment flows and workforce trends, J.D. from Yale Law School; 2020; "Antitrust and Artificial Intelligence: How Breaking Up Big Tech Could Affect the Pentagon’s Access to AI"; Center for Security and Emerging Technology at Georgetown University; https://www.geopolitic.ro/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/CSET-Antitrust-and-Artificial-Intelligence.pdf; accessed 8-10-2021]

3. Are smaller vendors more likely to produce innovative products that meet the Pentagon’s needs?

Tech industry leaders have relatively **little incentive** to work with the Pentagon. Their companies already enjoy **broad customer bases** and financial independence from U.S. government contracts—including those **at the Pentagon**.89 DOD contracts involve **applying** AI technology in varied, complex, and **operationally demanding** environments with **low tolerance** for error. Similarly, industry has **little motivation** to take on unique DOD **data management** and privacy requirements, such as data compartmentalization, protection against deceptive or compromised data inputs, and strict **data accountability** provisions complicating **algorithm training**.90 Finally, some commercial AI advances will easily convert into Pentagon applications. Others will require significant, difficult adaption and productization.

Antitrust action could create **smaller AI firms** targeting DOD business as their “**niche**.” With the Pentagon as their **sole customer**, these firms could focus on its unique needs, tailoring broader AI innovations for the Pentagon through **productization** and **organizational adaptation**. They could follow the example of **Palantir**, which makes 50 percent of its revenue from **government contracts**,91 or Kratos (60 percent).92 In the last five years, a **number of companies** have emerged in this mold, including Anduril Labs (2017), Shield AI (2015), Descartes Labs (2014), and Uptake (2014). As smaller firms’ primary, high-value customer, the Pentagon can **dictate** their innovation objectives, ultimately yielding AI applications better suited to **defense needs**.