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**1AC---Platforms**

Advantage 1 is Platforms---

**Platform companies facilitate transactions between two sets of users—think Amazon—the *Amex* decision made it extremely difficult to challenge anticompetitive conduct in platform 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.

**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 fin**ancial **tech**nology 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, **fin**ancial **tech**nology **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.

**Fin**ancial **tech**nologies 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 U**nited **S**tates **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 U**nited **S**tates **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---that obviates the 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** **U**nited **S**tates - 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.

**Strong sanctions 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 preempts Iran prolif---draws in all 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 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 memb+ers 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**.

**1AC---Plan**

Plan---

**The United States federal government should prohibit platform conduct that fails under rule of reason without imposing heightened burdens on plaintiffs.**

**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**.

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

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

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

C. Plaintiffs Already Bear the Burden on Balancing

Balancing anticompetitive effects against procompetitive efficiencies is **notoriously challenging**. 196 It is intuitively sensible that, if there are countervailing welfare effects, **the burden ought to be on the plaintiff** to establish that the balance of effects results in a net injury. **But it is incorrect** to presume that the AmEx III decision-which requires balancing right out of the gates-**was necessary to achieve this result**.

Recall that, if the defendant establishes a procompetitive justification and the plaintiff fails to identify a less restrictive alternative, then the court must attempt to balance the countervailing effects. Here, **the plaintiff carries the burden of persuasion** by virtue of its underlying obligation to prove an anticompetitive effect by a preponderance of evidence. 1 9 7 As such, **the rule of reason already ensures** that the plaintiff **bears the ultimate burden** as to the balance of countervailing effects. But, **critically**, the usual approach delays the balancing inquiry until such time as the court can be sure it is necessary-namely, until after the defendant has established a significant efficiency that might warrant balancing.

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**.

**Regulatory approaches are systemically compromised—capture and comfort means anticompetitive conduct becomes the norm**

**Lambert**, Wall Family Chair in Corporate Law and Governance Professor of Law, University of Missouri Law School, November, **‘11/1/21**

(Thomas, “Tech Platforms and Market Power: What’s the Optimal Policy Response?” Mercatus Working Paper)

The agency oversight approach, however, **is not simply “faster antitrust** with expert adjudicators.” While standards-based and flexible, the approach differs from antitrust along three significant dimensions: **focus**, political **susceptibility**, and duration of **control**. Taken together, antitrust **courts’** more **narrowly focused objectives**, **greater insulation** from **political influences**, and **limited jurisdiction** over their subjects render them far less susceptible to **adverse public choice concerns** than agencies like the UK’s DMU.

In crafting remedies for anticompetitive harm, antitrust courts have a tremendous reservoir of authority.174 But antitrust’s focus—and the objective of any court-ordered remedy—**is narrow:** the restoration of market output **to competitive levels** for the benefit of consumers.175 This **precludes** successful claims by, and remedies in favor of, parties **seeking some private benefit** apart from the enhancement of market output. A digital markets **regulator** is unlikely to be as laser-**focused** on output effects as an antitrust court and will therefore be a more attractive target to rentseeking firms. The DMU’s “open choices” objective, for example, **invites a laggard competitor** that might otherwise be driven out of business to seek some rule **hindering its more efficient rivals**, on the ground that preserving its own offering will create a broader range of options for consumers.

A second important difference between antitrust courts and agencies relates to the decision makers’ incentives. The **federal judges** determining liability and imposing remedies in antitrust cases have **little reason to please** the parties before them. Possessing life tenure and fearing no retribution save possible reversal, they are **insulated from outside pressure** and motivated to make decisions calculated to enhance market output and thereby benefit consumers. The bureaucrats staffing agencies, by contrast, **do not enjoy this level of political insulation**. Many will have been appointed by or **have ties to a political leader**, whom they will wish to please. They may also contemplate **future employment** at one of their regulatees or at a regulatee’s rival. **Even absent** contemplation of a job change, they may have a **stake** in one regulatory outcome over another, as the budget or prestige of their agency **may be affected** by the regulatory choices they make. **Their personal interests** are therefore less aligned with the public’s interest **in maximizing overall market output.**

A third difference between antitrust and agency oversight is that antitrust courts’ involvement with parties is **limited in duration**, while overseeing agencies **remain perpetually involved** with the firms they regulate. Ongoing oversight requires **continuous contact** with the regulatee, whose perspective the regulator needs in order to make sound decisions. Eventually, however, the regulator may begin seeing things from the perspective of the regulatee.176 This is **especially likely** if the individuals with interests adverse to the regulatee’s position are widely dispersed and difficult to organize.177 The benefits to a regulatee from a decision may be outweighed by the **aggregate costs it would impose**, but if the costs are so widely spread that no individual or group has an incentive to incur the cost of arguing against the decision, the only argument the regulator will hear is that of the **regulatee-beneficiary**.178 In light of the relationships that develop from perpetual supervision and the common “concentrated benefits-diffused costs” dynamic, agencies possessing continuing oversight over their regulatees are **frequently captured by those firms,** **to the detriment of the public at large**.179

It seems, then, that the ongoing agency oversight model for addressing market power from digital platforms **may not be the panacea** its proponents have suggested. Combining broad discretion that invites interest group **manipulation**, **exposure to political pressures** that may sway regulators from pursuing the public interest, and the sort of continuous regulatee contact **that often leads to capture**, the approach raises **serious public choice concerns**. The UK’s experience with its new DMU will be informative. But US policymakers would do well to wait on the results of the UK’s experiment, and the resolution of the numerous pending antitrust actions, before abandoning antitrust in favor of a digital platforms regulator.

**1AC---Conduct**

Advantage 2 is Conduct---

**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.**

***Amex* undermines enforcement against nascent acquisitions**

**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.**

**Exclusionary practices suppress innovation---sole big tech innovation has reached its ceiling**

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

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

E. Whither Innovation?

As a theoretical matter, big tech’s refusals to deal and predatory copying **suppress innovation**. A retailer with a new idea for a household product will be **less inclined to invest** in producing it if he knows Amazon can **appropriate the returns**. A developer with a better “app for that” will be less likely to bring it to market if she believes Apple or Facebook might someday **remove it from their platforms.** And if a rival search company cannot hope to keep its data private from Google, it will not invest in building a better search engine to try to take on the giant.

Whether big tech stifles innovation as an empirical matter is less clear, but there is anecdotal evidence that it does. During a recent hearing following the House Judiciary Committee’s investigation into competition abuses among high-tech firms, Representative Cicilline read a quote that he said was typical of the entrepreneurs he interviewed: “If someone came to me with an idea for a website or a web service today, I’d tell them to run. Run as far away from the web as possible.”111 **Venture capital,** while booming overall,112 **is shy about funding projects that might compete with Big Tech**. The best-case scenario for a start-up is acquisition by one of the big four—a lucrative payday, for sure, but nothing compared to what could come from **actually toppling a dominant firm**. This puts a **ceiling on the upside**, and with the **ever-present risk of failure**, **it likely leads to under-investment in new ideas**. As one funder put it, **“[w]e don’t touch anything that comes too close to Facebook, Google or Amazon**.”113

CONCLUSION: “ANTITRUST IS GREEDY”

The promise that we saw in high tech during its first boom—that it would change the way we work, communicate, shop, and play—**has largely been realized**. Few can argue with the efficiencies that digital communication and commerce have brought to our lives and markets. But, as Professor Herbert Hovenkamp has said, **“antitrust is greedy.”**114 It wants not only efficiency in end products, but efficiency in the competitive process that brings them about. During the dot-com era, American antitrust institutions became enthralled with the idea that encouraging the development of dynamic, innovative products required **compromising our commitment to dynamic**, innovative markets. That compromise contributed—in a way that is often overlooked—to the current competition crisis in big tech.

**Platform misuse 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.**

**Platform monopoly ensures any breach cascades, collapses society**

Sandra **Matz** is an Assistant Professor of Business at Columbia Business School, 20**18**, Guy Rolnik is a Clinical Associate Professor for Strategic Management at the University of Chicago Booth school of Business, and an editor of ProMarket.org, Moran Cerf is a Professor of Neuroscience and Business at the Kellogg School of Management at Northwestern University, Solutions to the Threats of Digital Monopolies, <https://promarket.org/2018/04/10/solutions-threats-digital-monopolies/>

1. Risk of data breaches. A security breach of any of the digital monopolies could result in **Exabytes of users’ most vulnerable information** being publicly exposed (7). Besides the risk of irreparable damage to people’s reputation, private lives, and identity (as in, e.g., the “Ashley Madison” case (8)), such a breach could result in **unprecedented damage to our econom**y (as in, e.g., the “Sony Pictures” case (9)) and our **political standing** (as in, e.g., “Wikileaks Cablegate” (10)). Importantly, a security **collapse of that nature** might only be the start of a **series of follow-up breaches**. A hack of Google’s Gmail, for example, could allow the perpetrators to obtain a **user’s bank account password** through the “forgot password” functionality, and **ultimately lead to a collapse of businesses and industries (e.g. banking, taxation, weapon silos, etc.**). Compared to what was deemed a “too big to fail” state when a handful of banks collapsed in 2008, such a crisis could be **unparalleled**. Although the digital monopolies employ talented security teams to prevent such hacks, the public has no guarantee that a **skillfully deployed attack** (e.g., by another nation-state, powerful underground organization, or simply a disgruntled employee) **would not be successful**. **Even with the best efforts of the digital monopolies**—which often heavily depend on the priorities of high-ranking leaders in the organization—societies should hence operate under the assumption that the data held by the digital monopolies could be **leaked at any point in time.**

**Goes 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.

**1AC---Search**

Advantage 3 is Search---

**Google’s self-preferencing flagrantly violates the Sherman Act---annihilates small 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 anti-competitive self-preferencing is necessary and sufficient to solve**

Pat **Garofalo 20**, 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.**

**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.

**Decline cascades---nuclear war**

Dr. Mathew **Maavak 21**, PhD in Risk Foresight from the Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, External Researcher (PLATBIDAFO) at the Kazimieras Simonavicius University, Expert and Regular Commentator on Risk-Related Geostrategic Issues at the Russian International Affairs Council, “Horizon 2030: Will Emerging Risks Unravel Our Global Systems?”, Salus Journal – The Australian Journal for Law Enforcement, Security and Intelligence Professionals, Volume 9, Number 1, p. 2-8

Various scholars and institutions regard **global social instability** as the **greatest threat** facing this decade. The catalyst has been postulated to be a **Second Great Depression** which, in turn, will have **profound implications** for **global security** and national integrity. This paper, written from a broad systems perspective, illustrates how emerging risks are getting more complex and **intertwined**; blurring boundaries between the economic, environmental, geopolitical, societal and technological taxonomy used by the World Economic Forum for its annual global risk forecasts. **Tight couplings** in our **global systems** have also enabled risks accrued in **one area** to **snowball** into a **full-blown crisis** **elsewhere**. The COVID-19 pandemic and its socioeconomic fallouts exemplify this systemic chain-reaction. Onceinexorable forces of globalization are rupturing as the current global system can no longer be sustained due to poor governance and runaway wealth fractionation. The coronavirus pandemic is also enabling Big Tech to expropriate the levers of governments and mass communications worldwide. This paper concludes by highlighting how this development poses a dilemma for security professionals.

Key Words: Global Systems, Emergence, VUCA, COVID-9, Social Instability, Big Tech, Great Reset

INTRODUCTION

The new decade is witnessing rising volatility across global systems. Pick any random “system” today and chart out its trajectory: Are our education systems becoming more robust and affordable? What about food security? Are our healthcare systems improving? Are our pension systems sound? Wherever one looks, there are dark clouds gathering on a global horizon marked by volatility, uncertainty, complexity and ambiguity (VUCA).

But what exactly is a global system? Our planet itself is an autonomous and selfsustaining mega-system, marked by periodic cycles and elemental vagaries. Human activities within however are not system isolates as our banking, utility, farming, **health**care and retail sectors etc. are increasingly **entwined**. Risks accrued in **one system** may **cascade** into an **unforeseen crisis** within and/or without (Choo, Smith & McCusker, 2007). Scholars call this phenomenon “emergence”; one where the behaviour of **intersecting systems** is determined by **complex** and largely **invisible interactions** at the **substratum** (Goldstein, 1999; Holland, 1998).

The ongoing COVID-19 pandemic is a case in point. While experts remain divided over the source and morphology of the virus, the contagion has ramified into a global health crisis and supply chain nightmare. It is also tilting the geopolitical balance. China is the largest exporter of intermediate products, and had generated nearly 20% of global imports in 2015 alone (Cousin, 2020). The pharmaceutical sector is particularly vulnerable. Nearly “85% of medicines in the U.S. strategic national stockpile” sources components from China (Owens, 2020).

An initial run on respiratory masks has now been eclipsed by rowdy queues at supermarkets and the bankruptcy of small businesses. The entire global population – save for major pockets such as Sweden, Belarus, Taiwan and Japan – have been subjected to cyclical lockdowns and quarantines. Never before in history have humans faced such a systemic, borderless calamity.

COVID-19 represents a classic emergent crisis that necessitates real-time response and adaptivity in a real-time world, particularly since the global Just-in-Time (JIT) production and delivery system serves as both an enabler and vector for transboundary risks. From a systems thinking perspective, emerging risk management should therefore address a whole spectrum of activity across the economic, environmental, geopolitical, societal and technological (EEGST) taxonomy. Every emerging threat can be slotted into this taxonomy – a reason why it is used by the World Economic Forum (WEF) for its annual global risk exercises (Maavak, 2019a). As traditional forces of globalization unravel, security professionals should take cognizance of emerging threats through a systems thinking approach.

METHODOLOGY

An EEGST sectional breakdown was adopted to illustrate a sampling of extreme risks facing the world for the 2020-2030 decade. The transcendental quality of emerging risks, as outlined on Figure 1, below, was primarily informed by the following pillars of systems thinking (Rickards, 2020):

• Diminishing diversity (or increasing homogeneity) of actors in the global system (Boli & Thomas, 1997; Meyer, 2000; Young et al, 2006);

• Interconnections in the global system (Homer-Dixon et al, 2015; Lee & Preston, 2012);

• Interactions of actors, events and components in the global system (Buldyrev et al, 2010; Bashan et al, 2013; Homer-Dixon et al, 2015); and

• Adaptive qualities in particular systems (Bodin & Norberg, 2005; Scheffer et al, 2012) Since scholastic material on this topic remains somewhat inchoate, this paper buttresses many of its contentions through secondary (i.e. news/institutional) sources.

ECONOMY

According to Professor Stanislaw Drozdz (2018) of the Polish Academy of Sciences, “a global financial crash of a previously unprecedented scale is highly probable” by the mid- 2020s. This will lead to a **trickle-down meltdown**, impacting **all areas** of human activity.

The economist John Mauldin (2018) similarly warns that the “2020s might be the worst decade in US history” and may lead to a **Second Great Depression**. Other forecasts are equally alarming. According to the International Institute of Finance, global debt may have surpassed $255 trillion by 2020 (IIF, 2019). Yet another study revealed that global debts and liabilities amounted to a staggering $2.5 quadrillion (Ausman, 2018). The reader should note that these figures were tabulated before the COVID-19 outbreak.

The IMF singles out widening income inequality as the trigger for the next Great Depression (Georgieva, 2020). The wealthiest 1% now own more than twice as much wealth as 6.9 billion people (Coffey et al, 2020) and this chasm is widening with each passing month. COVID-19 had, in fact, boosted global billionaire wealth to an unprecedented $10.2 trillion by July 2020 (UBS-PWC, 2020). Global GDP, worth $88 trillion in 2019, may have contracted by 5.2% in 2020 (World Bank, 2020).

As the Greek historian Plutarch warned in the 1st century AD: “An imbalance between rich and poor is the oldest and most fatal ailment of all republics” (Mauldin, 2014). The stability of a society, as Aristotle argued even earlier, depends on a robust middle element or middle class. At the rate the global middle class is facing catastrophic debt and unemployment levels, widespread social disaffection may morph into outright anarchy (Maavak, 2012; DCDC, 2007).

Economic stressors, in transcendent VUCA fashion, may also induce **radical geopolitical realignments**. Bullions now carry more weight than NATO’s **security guarantees** in **Eastern Europe**. After Poland repatriated 100 tons of gold from the Bank of England in 2019, Slovakia, Serbia and Hungary quickly followed suit.

According to former Slovak Premier Robert Fico, this **erosion** in **regional trust** was based on historical precedents – in particular the 1938 Munich Agreement which ceded Czechoslovakia’s Sudetenland to Nazi Germany. As Fico reiterated (Dudik & Tomek, 2019):

“You can hardly trust even the closest allies after the Munich Agreement… I guarantee that if something happens, we won’t see a single gram of this (offshore-held) gold. Let’s do it (repatriation) as quickly as possible.” (Parenthesis added by author).

President Aleksandar Vucic of Serbia (a non-NATO nation) justified his central bank’s gold-repatriation program by hinting at economic headwinds ahead: “We see in which direction the crisis in the world is moving” (Dudik & Tomek, 2019). Indeed, with two global Titanics – the **U**nited **S**tates and China – set on a **collision course** with a quadrillions-denominated iceberg in the middle, and a viral outbreak on its tip, the **seismic ripples** will be felt **far**, **wide** and for a **considerable period**.

A reality check is nonetheless needed here: Can additional bullions realistically circumvallate the economies of 80 million plus peoples in these Eastern European nations, worth a collective $1.8 trillion by purchasing power parity? Gold however is a potent psychological symbol as it represents national sovereignty and economic reassurance in a potentially hyperinflationary world. The portents are clear: The current global economic system will be weakened by rising nationalism and autarkic demands. Much uncertainty remains ahead. Mauldin (2018) proposes the introduction of Old Testament-style debt jubilees to facilitate gradual national recoveries. The World Economic Forum, on the other hand, has long proposed a “Great Reset” by 2030; a socialist utopia where “you’ll own nothing and you’ll be happy” (WEF, 2016).

In the final analysis, COVID-19 is not the root cause of the current global economic turmoil; it is merely an accelerant to a burning house of cards that was left smouldering since the 2008 Great Recession (Maavak, 2020a). We also see how the four main pillars of systems thinking (diversity, interconnectivity, interactivity and “adaptivity”) form the mise en scene in a VUCA decade.

ENVIRONMENTAL

What happens to the **environment** when our **economies implode**? Think of a **debt-laden** workforce at sensitive **nuclear** and **chemical plants**, along with a concomitant **surge** in **industrial accidents**? **Economic stressors**, workforce demoralization and rampant profiteering – rather than manmade climate change – arguably pose the **biggest threats** to the environment. In a WEF report, Buehler et al (2017) made the following pre-COVID-19 observation:

The ILO estimates that the annual cost to the global economy from accidents and work-related diseases alone is a staggering $3 trillion. Moreover, a recent report suggests the world’s 3.2 billion workers are increasingly unwell, with the vast majority facing significant economic insecurity: 77% work in part-time, temporary, “vulnerable” or unpaid jobs.

Shouldn’t this phenomenon be better categorized as a societal or economic risk rather than an environmental one? In line with the systems thinking approach, however, global risks can no longer be boxed into a **taxonomical silo**. Frazzled workforces may precipitate another Bhopal (1984), Chernobyl (1986), Deepwater Horizon (2010) or Flint water crisis (2014). These disasters were notably not the result of manmade climate change. Neither was the Fukushima nuclear disaster (2011) nor the Indian Ocean tsunami (2004). Indeed, the combustion of a long-overlooked cargo of 2,750 tonnes of ammonium nitrate had nearly levelled the city of Beirut, Lebanon, on Aug 4 2020. The explosion left 204 dead; 7,500 injured; US$15 billion in property damages; and an estimated 300,000 people homeless (Urbina, 2020). The environmental costs have yet to be adequately tabulated.

Environmental disasters are more attributable to Black Swan events, systems breakdowns and corporate greed rather than to mundane human activity.

Our JIT world aggravates the **cascading potential** of risks (Korowicz, 2012). Production and delivery delays, caused by the COVID-19 outbreak, will eventually require industrial **overcompensation**. This will further stress senior executives, workers, machines and a variety of computerized systems. The trickle-down effects will likely include substandard products, contaminated food and a general lowering in health and safety standards (Maavak, 2019a). Unpaid or demoralized sanitation workers may also resort to indiscriminate waste dumping. Many cities across the United States (and elsewhere in the world) are no longer recycling wastes due to prohibitive costs in the global corona-economy (Liacko, 2021).

Even in good times, strict protocols on waste disposals were routinely ignored. While Sweden championed the global climate change narrative, its clothing flagship H&M was busy covering up toxic effluences disgorged by vendors along the Citarum River in Java, Indonesia. As a result, countless children among 14 million Indonesians straddling the “world’s most polluted river” began to suffer from dermatitis, intestinal problems, developmental disorders, renal failure, chronic bronchitis and cancer (DW, 2020). It is also in cauldrons like the Citarum River where pathogens may mutate with emergent ramifications.

On an equally alarming note, depressed economic conditions have traditionally provided a waste disposal boon for organized crime elements. Throughout 1980s, the Calabriabased ‘Ndrangheta mafia – in collusion with governments in Europe and North America – began to dump radioactive wastes along the coast of Somalia. Reeling from pollution and revenue loss, Somali fisherman eventually resorted to mass piracy (Knaup, 2008).

The coast of Somalia is now a maritime hotspot, and exemplifies an entwined form of economic-environmental-geopolitical-societal emergence. In a VUCA world, indiscriminate waste dumping can unexpectedly morph into a Black Hawk Down incident. The laws of unintended consequences are governed by actors, interconnections, interactions and adaptations in a system under study – as outlined in the methodology section.

Environmentally-devastating industrial sabotages – whether by disgruntled workers, industrial competitors, ideological maniacs or terrorist groups – cannot be discounted in a VUCA world. Immiserated societies, in stark defiance of climate change diktats, may resort to dirty coal plants and wood stoves for survival. Interlinked ecosystems, particularly water resources, may be **hijacked** by nationalist sentiments. The **environmental fallouts** of critical infrastructure (CI) breakdowns loom like a **Sword of Damocles** over this decade.

GEOPOLITICAL

The **primary catalyst** behind **WWII** was the **Great Depression**. Since history often **repeats itself**, expect **familiar bogeymen** to **reappear** in societies roiling with **impoverishment** and ideological clefts. Anti-Semitism – a societal risk on its own – may reach alarming proportions in the West (Reuters, 2019), possibly **forc**ing Israel to undertake **reprisal operations** inside allied nations. If that happens, how will **affected nations** react? Will security resources be reallocated to protect certain minorities (or the Top 1%) while larger segments of society are exposed to restive forces? **Balloon effects** like these present a classic VUCA problematic.

Contemporary geopolitical risks include a possible **Iran-Israel war**; **US-China military confrontation** over **Taiwan** or the **S**outh **C**hina **S**ea; **North Korean proliferation** of **nuclear** and **missile technologies**; an **India-Pakistan nuclear war**; an **Iranian closure** of the Straits of **Hormuz**; **fundamentalist-driven implosion in the Islamic world**; or a **nuclear confrontation** between **NATO** and **Russia**. Fears that the Jan 3 2020 assassination of Iranian Maj. Gen. Qasem Soleimani might lead to WWIII were grossly overblown. From a systems perspective, the killing of Soleimani did not fundamentally change the actor-interconnection-interaction adaptivity equation in the Middle East. Soleimani was simply a cog who got replaced.

## 2AC

### 2AC---Antitrust DA

#### 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.

#### Turn—their link is backwards for platforms—defense-friendly regime incentivizes platforms NOT to innovate

Newman, Trial Attorney, U.S. Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, ‘12

(Jordan, “Anticompetitive Product Design in the New Economy,” 39 Fla. St. U. L. Rev 682)

What all these approaches have in common is that they place a thumb on the scale in favor of defendants, at least as compared to the generally used section 2 exclusionary-conduct inquiry,258 essentially a rule-of-reason analysis. The D.C. Circuit in Microsoft III set forth the general method of analysis, complete with allocations of the burden of proof. First, the burden is on the plaintiff to make a prima facie case that the defendant has engaged in monopolistic conduct (properly defined).259 If the plaintiff does so, the burden then shifts to the defendant to show a procompetitive justification for the redesign.260 If the defendant fails to do so, the conduct is exclusionary.261 If, however, the defendant shows some plausible justification, the burden shifts back to the plaintiff to rebut that justification.262 If the plaintiff fails to do so, then the plaintiff must show that the anticompetitive harm outweighs the procompetitive justification.263 The leading treatise takes issue with the last step, at least insofar as it seems to call for courts to engage in “balancing” of close cases—advocating instead a burden-shifting analysis that, while perhaps somewhat less defendant-friendly than the above approaches, calls for “resolv[ing] close cases in favor of the defendant.”264 The various approaches described above, however, end the analysis and dismiss the claim as soon as the defendant shows any plausible justification for its behavior. This favorable treatment traditionally accorded to defendants in this area is due largely to the concerns noted above—the fear that, because (1) the markets themselves act as a check on exclusionary product redesigns (making them quite rare) and (2) antitrust courts are generally not competent to second-guess design changes, condemning product redesigns will tend to unduly stifle innovation.

Yet, as shown above, these concerns largely dissipate in the types of markets under discussion. As to the first, the nature of code-based products and the widespread availability of high-speed Internet access have combined to make the now standard method of redesigning these products—software updates—a uniquely attractive method of foreclosing rivals. This is so for three primary reasons: (1) low development and distribution costs,265 (2) low risk that consumers will reject redesigns,266 and (3) low losses incurred if these product redesigns fail.267 Additionally, new-economy markets tend to be characterized by strong positive network externalities, which may further incentivize monopolistic behavior.268 Given the confluence of these factors, it is much more likely that Ci > Pm – LR in these markets.

And with regard to the second concern, as shown above, the inherent and unique nature of code-based product redesign makes it uniquely susceptible to antitrust scrutiny.269 Given that such redesigns are more easily analyzed than traditional, physical product redesigns, it should come as no surprise that firms may be able to offer no justification for their conduct (as occurred in Microsoft III). Alternatively, they may simply settle out of court or enter into consent decrees (as may have occurred in In re Intel). At any rate, the point is that antitrust courts no longer need to simply throw up their hands and find for defendants in design-related cases.

Since these concerns largely dissipate in these markets, the need to place a thumb on the scale in favor of defendants—that is, the need for the inquiry to end as soon as the defendant makes any plau sible claim of a procompetitive benefit—dissipates as well. And in the formula expressed above, a defendant-friendly approach lowers R by reducing the risk of antitrust liability for engaging in exclusionary, design-related conduct. Absent the usual check of market forces, such an approach even further incentivizes such conduct. Firms can and almost certainly do engage in anticompetitive design in these markets; witness Microsoft’s commingling of code,270 the FTC’s theory in In re Intel, 271 or Apple’s allegedly exclusionary software updates.272 While courts are rightly reluctant to review antitrust challenges to physical product design changes, code-based product markets exhibit unique features that obviate the need for an overly defendant friendly analysis.

#### Pounder—antitrust policy 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.

### 2AC---T-Immunity

#### “Expand the scope of its core antitrust laws” requires modifying the applicability of the antitrust laws such that they are applicable to conduct that would otherwise not violate.

Kovacic et al. 03 – Professor at George Washington University Law School

William E. Kovacic, Theodore B. Olson, R. Hewitt Pate, Paul D. Clement, Jeffrey A. Lamken, Catherine G. O’Sullivan, Nancy C. Garrison, David Seidman, Brief for the United States and the Federal Trade Commission as Amici Curiae Supporting Petitioner, Verizon Communs. Inc. v. Law Offices of Curtis v. Trinko, 2003 U.S. S. Ct. Briefs LEXIS 513, Supreme Court of the United States, May 2003, LexisNexis

Conversely, the 1996 Act does not expand the scope of the antitrust laws to outlaw conduct that, but for the 1996 Act, would not violate the antitrust laws. Such an expansion of Sherman Act duties would "modify \* \* \* the applicability of \* \* \* the antitrust laws" in contravention of 47 U.S.C. 152 note. Violations of the duties imposed by the 1996 Act are just that--violations of the 1996 Act, subject to the sanctions and penalties imposed by that Act. They do not automatically amount to treble-damages antitrust claims. The courts of appeals are again in accord. Pet. App. 29a; Covad, 299 F.3d at 1283 ("We agree with Goldwasser that merely pleading violations of the 1996 Act alone will not suffice to plead Sherman Act violations."); Goldwasser, 222 F.3d at 400 (It is "both illogical and undesirable to equate a failure to comply with the 1996 Act with a failure to comply with the antitrust laws."); Cavalier Tel. Co., 2003 WL 21153305, at \*11-\*12 (similar).

#### The AFF does that---courts make law.

**Quinn 11** --- Patent attorney and a leading commentator on patent law and innovation policy. Mr. Quinn has twice been named one of the top 50 most influential people in IP by Managing IP Magazine, in both 2014 and 2019.

Gene, 11-17-2011, "Antitrust Law Basics: A Primer on Patent and Copyright Misuse," IPWatchdog, https://www.ipwatchdog.com/2011/11/17/antitrust-law-basics-a-primer-on-patent-and-copyright-misuse/id=20458/

The antitrust laws, which can be found at 15 U.S.C. § 1 et seq, apply to virtually all industries and to every level of business, including manufacturing, transportation, distribution, and marketing. They prohibit a variety of practices that restrain trade, such as price-fixing conspiracies, corporate mergers likely to reduce the competitive vigor of particular markets, and predatory acts designed to achieve or maintain monopoly power.

The historic goal of the antitrust laws is to protect economic freedom and opportunity by promoting competition in the marketplace. Competition in a free-market benefits American consumers through lower prices, better quality and greater choice. Competition provides businesses the opportunity to compete on price and quality, in an open market and on a level playing field, unhampered by anticompetitive restraints. Competition also tests and hardens American companies at home, the better to succeed abroad.

The Sherman Antitrust Act, the first of the major antitrust laws, makes illegal every contract, combination, or conspiracy, in the restraint of trade. Unfortunately, Antitrust Law is not so simple as a cursory reading of the statue would otherwise suggest.

One problem presented by the language of §1 of the Sherman Act is that it cannot mean what it says. The statute says that “every” contract that restrains trade is unlawful. But, as Justice Brandeis perceptively noted, restraint is the very essence of every contract; read literally, §1 would outlaw the entire body of private contract law. Yet it is that body of law that establishes the enforceability of commercial agreements and enables competitive markets — indeed, a competitive economy — to function effectively.

Congress, however, did not intend the test of the Sherman Act to delineate the full meaning of the statute or its application in concrete situations. The legislative history makes it perfectly clear that it expected the courts to give shape to the statute’s broad mandate by drawing on common-law tradition. The so-called Rule of Reason, for example, has its origins in common-law precedents long antedating the Sherman Act. It has been used to give the Act both flexibility and definition, and its central principle of antitrust analysis has remained constant. Contrary to its name, the Rule does not open the field of antitrust inquiry to any argument in favor of a challenged restraint that may fall within the realm of reason. Instead, it focuses directly on the challenged restraint’s impact on competitive conditions.

### 2AC---States CP

#### CP is a de facto patchwork—majority of states bound by federal 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.

#### 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.

#### CP impliedly preempted—conflicts with federal precedent

Victoria Graham, Bloomberg Law, Ohio Rethinks State Antitrust Laws to Confront Facebook, Google (1), October 17, 2019, <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/antitrust/ohio-rethinks-state-antitrust-laws-to-confront-facebook-google>

Ohio Rethinks State Antitrust Laws to Confront Facebook, Google (1)

Ohio legislators are considering whether to rewrite antitrust laws to reflect the growth of big tech in the latest sign of growing bipartisan state-level interest in confronting Alphabet Inc.’s Google and Facebook Inc.

Most state antitrust laws directly mirror U.S. competition law and Ohio could only go so far with antitrust revisions before they potentially conflict with federal law or interfere with how companies do business.

“Given the global and national footprints for the digital technology companies, state legislative carve-outs for the sector could affect companies’ ability to do commerce across states and regions,” said Diana Moss, president of the American Antitrust Institute.

States do have some room to maneuver in areas where the U.S. Congress hasn’t expressly enacted legislation, similar to how California enacted its own privacy law in the absence of a federal statute.

“Just because certain conduct is legal under federal law doesn’t mean the state couldn’t outlaw it,” Ralph Breitfeller, of counsel at Kegler, Brown, Hill & Ritter Co. in Columbus, Ohio, said.

State Scrutiny

Ohio lawmakers discussed a possible rethink of the state’s antitrust laws Oct. 17 during a legislative hearing in Cleveland examining the impact of Google and Facebook. The hearing featured several academics and Yelp Inc. executive, Luther Lowe, who has emerged as an outspoken critic of Google’s power to control the internet.

Legislators should consider changing state antitrust laws to allow regulators to assess factors other than price, such how much data one firm controls, when reviewing a merger, Dennis Hirsch, a professor at The Ohio State University Moritz College of Law, said during the hearing.

Current merger analysis, at both the state and federal level, doesn’t factor in data aggregation since it’s mostly concerned on how consumer prices are impacted by a merger.

A second hearing will follow in Cincinnati on Oct. 28.

The probe—the first of its kind by any U.S. state legislature—is led by state Sen. John Eklund, a Republican who represents a district east of Cleveland and practiced competition law for more than 40 years.

Ohio’s Attorney General Dave Yost (R) is among state attorneys general in both parties that have emerged as some of the most vocal critics of big tech’s power. Multi-state investigations into Facebook and Google’s dominant market power have positioned the states as potentially more aggressive enforcers than federal regulators.

At the federal level, Justice Department and Federal Trade Commission officials have been hesitant to call for new antitrust legislation, while Congress contemplates whether modifications need to be made to address the unique challenges of big tech.

The antitrust laws that date back as late as 1890 during the breakup of Standard Oil don’t need major changes since they are flexible enough to deal with new technology changes, such as the rise of Amazon.com Inc. and Apple Inc., most federal enforcers argue.

Yost, who is involved in both a Google and Facebook multi-state antitrust investigation, said during a September press conference that these hearings will “help inform” the state’s investigation and the discovery it conducts into both tech companies.

Ohio has played a pivotal role in shaping the history of U.S. antitrust law.

The nation’s first antitrust legislation which is still the current federal statute that prohibits monopolistic conduct, the Sherman Antitrust Act, was introduced by Senator John Sherman (R-Ohio).

After the Sherman Act’s passage, it was then Ohio’s Attorney General David Watson who first sued Standard Oil, which eventually lead the U.S. Supreme Court to force a breakup of the corporate trust in 1911.

Workarounds

States have to ensure that any new antitrust statutes don’t directly conflict with existing federal law since courts generally strike state laws as invalid if they clash with the federal government, John Newman, a former attorney at the DOJ’s antitrust division, who is now an antitrust professor at The University of Miami School of Law, said.

#### Even if the CP results in uniform LAW, patchwork ENFORCEMENT kills solvency

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, 2004, The Case for Federal Preemption in Antitrust Enforcement, 18 Antitrust 79

State-to-State Conflicts

When states file antitrust cases under their own statutes, rather than under the Clayton or Sherman Acts, the likelihood the cases will be governed by Inconsistent or even conflicting antitrust precedents runs high. Even if state laws were uniform, with enforcers in each state coming from different backgrounds and holding divergent philosophies, legal Interpretations are bound to differ. While diverse views can be helpful in some areas of law-for example, varying state rules can provide a natural test for the efficacy of new regulations at the federal level-this kind of experimentation is likely to be wasteful in the antitrust arena.

A Case Study

The problems cataloged above are not mere theoretical possibilities, United Stales v. Microsoft provides a real-world example. Throughout the course of the lawsuit, the parties lobbied state attorneys general, federal antitrust authorities, and even the courts ." Thus, California Attorney General Bill Lockyor chose to reject an early settlement attempt, noting that "his resolve was hardened after listening over the weekend to advice from technical technical experts and officials from Microsoft's competitors, such as IBM, AOL Time Warner Inc., Sun Microsystems Inc., and Novell Inc. "24 California subsequently took the lead in continuing the litigation on behalf of the non-settling states and even provided the bulk of the funding."

Comments made by officials at the Justice Department suggest that federal authorities are a much tougher sell for lobbyists. Assistant Attorney General for Antitrust Charles James emphasized his concern over special Interests. "The number of requests for meetings with me immediately after my nomination but before my confirmation became so daunting," he wrote, "that I adopted the posture of refusing to meet personally with any third parties in the Microsoft case. . ."?n While lobbying on Individual antitrust cases certainly occurs at the federal level, the magnitude of Issues and the probability that competing views will neutralize arguments make it far more costly to gain influence.

In addition to derailing early settlement talks,;" the states created uncertainty that the settlement finally reached by the Department of Justice would stick. Nine states agreed to settle along with the DOJ, but nine others proposed a radically different remedy. Those nine states, which included California and Massachusetts are home of some of Microsoft's most vocal rivals,'6 Not surprisingly, their remedy proposal neatly dovetailed with the Interests of Microsoft's competitors.

For example, the states that refused to settle demanded that Microsoft license large amounts of valuable intellectual property for little or no compensation." The Initial effect of weakening the protection of intellectual property after It has been developed Is always positive for consun'ers, who need not compensate the innovator to get the benefit. The long-term effects, however, are decidedly negative, even for consumers: Innovation could decline because firms will have less Incentive to Invest in R&D if they cannot prevent others from using the fruits of their efforts and will not receive any compensation for the expropriation." Under the litigating states' remedy, competitors would have gained access to Microsoft's software code at no cost, but consumers could have suffered In the long term because the disclosure requirements would have left Microsoft with little incentive to improve Windows or many of the company's software applications.

One of the litigating states' requirements would have forced Microsoft to auction off the right to adapt its Office business applications suite to three non Windows operating systems. In return, Microsoft would have received only the one-time auction fees and no royalty payments. As part of the auction, Microsoft would have had to provide the winning bidders with code for any future upgrades to Office, plus access to any Windows source code (the program's "blueprints") at no charge.

Another of the litigating states' proposals would have required Microsoft to release its Web browser software (Internet Explorer and MSN Explorer) under "open source" licenses. To comply, Microsoft would have had to publish the underlying source code, making it available at no charge to all (that is, not just to three winners of the Office auction). Indeed, most of the Intellectual property disclosure rules proposed by the litigating states seemed designed to prevent Microsoft from recouping the value of R&D investments through licensing. Thus, under the states' alternative remedy, technology companies stood to gain a great deal of Microsoft's Intellectual property at little or no cost. Still other provisions would have raised Microsoft's costs with little apparent benefit to consumers.

#### AFF reinvigorates EU-US digital democratic alliance—big tech antitrust key

Muscolo, Commissioner, Italian Competition Authority, Rome, and Massolo, Economic advisor of Commissioner Gabriella Muscolo, Italian Competition Authority, Rome, ‘21

(Gabriella and Alessandro, “Will the Biden Presidency Forge a Digital Transatlantic Alliance on Antitrust?” Concurrences, Issue 1, <https://www.concurrences.com/en/review/issues/no-1-2021/on-topic/the-new-us-antitrust-administration-en>)

5. Finally, the deterrence principle will catalyse the third pillar. Democracy will in fact be the main criterion for choosing US partners in order to consolidate the West against the expansion of the East.

6. Within this context, the digital economy represents an extremely important battlefield for the US to regain world leadership. The USA is well placed when it comes to digital competition—indeed, almost all the prominent Western online platforms are American.

7. However, over the last decade, Google, Amazon, Facebook, Apple and Microsoft (hereinafter “GAFAM”) have come under severe antitrust and regulatory scrutiny, starting in the European Union and ending in the United States. A “break-up” sentiment is spreading on both sides of the Atlantic and this will certainly represent one of the main issues on Biden’s agenda. Indeed, GAFAM’s huge market power is perceived as a threat to Western democracies and has been accused of hampering competition and innovation. Both the USA and the EU know that it is fundamental to shape global standards in order to face security and privacy concerns posed by the rise of Eastern tech giants. [247] Moreover, there is a growing feeling that the growth of big tech, combined with non-democratic governments, could lead to “techno-authoritarianism.” [248]

8. Therefore, will there be a transatlantic unity when clamping down on online giants in the name of protecting and strengthening Western “techno-democracies?” A digital transatlantic alliance shall not be taken for granted.

9. Indeed, over the last decade, the EU has markedly shaped its own way of building a European data market and of facilitating the emergence of European tech companies.

#### That’s key to various geopolitical threats—hybrid war, cyber estalation

Schaake is the international policy director at Stanford University’s Cyber Policy Center and an international policy fellow, Stanford Institute for Human-Centered Artificial Intelligence, ‘20

(Marietje, “How democracies can claim back power in the digital world,” September 29, <https://www.technologyreview.com/2020/09/29/1009088/democracies-power-digital-social-media-governance-tech-companies-opinion/>

Today, technology regulation is often characterized as a three-way contest between the state-led systems in China and Russia, the market-driven one in the United States, and a values-based vision in Europe. The reality, however, is that there are only two dominant systems of technology governance: the privatized one described above, which applies in the entire democratic world, and an authoritarian one.

The laissez-faire approach of democratic governments, and their reluctance to rein in private companies at home, also plays out on the international stage. While democratic governments have largely allowed companies to govern, authoritarian governments have taken to shaping norms through international fora. This unfortunate shift coincides with a trend of democratic decline worldwide, as large democracies like India, Turkey, and Brazil have become more authoritarian. Without deliberate and immediate efforts by democratic governments to win back agency, corporate and authoritarian governance models will erode democracy everywhere.

Does that mean democratic governments should build their own social-media platforms, data centers, and mobile phones instead? No. But they do need to urgently reclaim their role in creating rules and restrictions that uphold democracy’s core principles in the technology sphere. Up to now, these governments have slowly begun to do that with laws at the national level or, in Europe’s case, at the regional level. But to bring globe-spanning technology firms to heel, we need something new: a global alliance that puts democracy first.

Teaming up

Global institutions born in the aftermath of World War II, like the United Nations, the World Trade Organization, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, created a rules-based international order. But they fail to take the digital world fully into account in their mandates and agendas, even if many are finally starting to focus on digital cooperation, e-commerce, and cybersecurity. And while digital trade (which requires its own regulations, such as rules for e-commerce and criteria for the exchange of data) is of growing importance, WTO members have not agreed on global rules covering services for smart manufacturing, digital supply chains, and other digitally enabled transactions.

What we need now, therefore, is a large democratic coalition that can offer a meaningful alternative to the two existing models of technology governance, the privatized and the authoritarian. It should be a global coalition, welcoming countries that meet democratic criteria.

The Community of Democracies, a coalition of states that was created in 2000 to advance democracy but never had much impact, could be revamped and upgraded to include an ambitious mandate for the governance of technology. Alternatively, a “D7” or “D20” could be established—a coalition akin to the G7 or G20 but composed of the largest democracies in the world.

Such a group would agree on regulations and standards for technology in line with core democratic principles. Then each member country would implement them in its own way, much as EU member states do today with EU directives.

What problems would such a coalition resolve? The coalition might, for instance, adopt a shared definition of freedom of expression for social-media companies to follow. Perhaps that definition would be similar to the broadly shared European approach, where expression is free but there are clear exceptions for hate speech and incitements to violence.

Or the coalition might limit the practice of microtargeting political ads on social media: it could, for example, forbid companies from allowing advertisers to tailor and target ads on the basis of someone’s religion, ethnicity, sexual orientation, or collected personal data. At the very least, the coalition could advocate for more transparency about microtargeting to create more informed debate about which data collection practices ought to be off limits.

The democratic coalition could also adopt standards and methods of oversight for the digital operations of elections and campaigns. This might mean agreeing on security requirements for voting machines, plus anonymity standards, stress tests, and verification methods such as requiring a paper backup for every vote. And the entire coalition could agree to impose sanctions on any country or non-state actor that interferes with an election or referendum in any of the member states.

Why Facebook’s political-ad ban is taking on the wrong problem

A moratorium on new political ads just before election day tackles one kind of challenge caused by social media. It’s just not the one that matters.

Another task the coalition might take on is developing trade rules for the digital economy. For example, members could agree never to demand that companies hand over the source code of software to state authorities, as China does. They could also agree to adopt common data protection rules for cross-border transactions. Such moves would allow a sort of digital free-trade zone to develop across like-minded nations.

China already has something similar to this in the form of eWTP, a trade platform that allows global tariff-free trade for transactions under a million dollars. But eWTP, which was started by e-commerce giant Alibaba, is run by private-sector companies based in China. The Chinese government is known to have access to data through private companies. Without a public, rules-based alternative, eWTP could become the de facto global platform for digital trade, with no democratic mandate or oversight.

Another matter this coalition could address would be the security of supply chains for devices like phones and laptops. Many countries have banned smartphones and telecom equipment from Huawei because of fears that the company’s technology may have built-in vulnerabilities or backdoors that the Chinese government could exploit. Proactively developing joint standards to protect the integrity of supply chains and products would create a level playing field between the coalition’s members and build trust in companies that agree to abide by them.

The next area that may be worthy of the coalition’s attention is cyberwar and hybrid conflict (where digital and physical aggression are combined). Over the past decade, a growing number of countries have identified hybrid conflict as a national security threat. Any nation with highly skilled cyber operations can wreak havoc on countries that fail to invest in defenses against them. Meanwhile, cyberattacks by non-state actors have shifted the balance of power between states.

Right now, though, there are no international criteria that define when a cyberattack counts as an act of war. This encourages bad actors to strike with many small blows. In addition to their immediate economic or (geo)political effect, such attacks erode trust that justice will be served.

### 2AC---Biz Con DA

#### Tons of antitrust now

Jon Swartz 12-28, Senior Reporter for MarketWatch, “Big Tech Heads for ‘A Year of Thousands of Tiny Tech Papercuts,’ But What Antitrust Efforts Could Make Them Bleed?”, MarketWatch, 12/28/2021, https://www.marketwatch.com/story/big-tech-heads-for-a-year-of-thousands-of-tiny-tech-papercuts-but-what-antitrust-efforts-could-make-them-bleed-11640640776

Antitrust enforcement of Big Tech is expected to take place on a scale never before seen in 2022, following years of escalating rhetoric from Washington.

So far, Wall Street has shrugged as the five companies under the microscope — Google parent Alphabet Inc. GOOGL, -0.92% GOOG, -0.91%, Facebook parent Meta Platforms Inc. FB, -2.33%, Apple Inc. AAPL, -0.35%, Amazon.com Inc. AMZN, -1.14%, and, yes, Microsoft Corp. MSFT, -0.88% — have been targeted by governments and rivals across the globe. Despite a steady drumbeat of negative headlines, tech’s quintet of heavy hitters boasted a cumulative market value of nearly $10 trillion as 2021 neared an end, after producing a collective $2.4 trillion in revenue over the past two years of pandemic misery.

The stock prices of tech companies have only been “minorly impacted because investors do not tend to make decisions based on the mere possibility of legislation,” Ashley Baker, director of public policy at the Committee for Justice, told MarketWatch.

Many investors have simply looked back on history and shrugged, according to one Silicon Valley venture capitalist.

“There is more antitrust noise, but investment people remember the Microsoft and IBM IBM, -0.19% [antitrust investigations] in which waves of innovation followed those investigations and proved they did not own the industry,” Alexandra Sasha Johnson, president of Global Tech Symposium, a Silicon Valley investment conference, told MarketWatch. “Until the Big Tech companies buy each other, this is not a problem.”

For more: Big Tech was built by the same type of antitrust actions that could now tear it down
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This could finally change in 2022 as it did in the late 1990s, when some tech companies struck a cautious stance during the Justice Department’s investigation of Microsoft for monopolistic practices, Syed said.

“The difference is that we’re talking about interconnected companies that own an industry versus just one company [with Microsoft],” she said. “And there is bipartisan support, which makes it easier politically.”

More on the antitrust challenges facing Big Tech in 2022

Amazon has mostly avoided antitrust scrutiny, but that may change in 2022

Possible Justice Department lawsuit looms over Apple, which is facing scrutiny worldwide

Google enters 2022 battling antitrust actions on multiple fronts — with more likely to come

Facebook’s acquisitions of Instagram and WhatsApp are antitrust targets, but its metaverse mergers may be the victims

Microsoft has avoided U.S. antitrust scrutiny, but Europe is a different matter

With more than a dozen pieces of anti-tech legislation, a plethora of lawsuits and regulatory fines escalating in the U.S. and abroad, as well as the Biden administration rounding out Big Tech’s nightmare team of government agency heads, 2022 is shaping up as a seminal year for tech regulation after decades of inaction.

In rapid succession this year, Biden named and nominated an antitrust team of Tim Wu (to the newly created position of head of competition policy at the National Economic Council), Lina Khan (chair of the Federal Trade Commission) and Jonathan Kanter (head of the antitrust division of the Justice Department). Each is a heralded anti-monopolist advocate who has written extensively on the topic or represented companies making antitrust claims against Big Tech.

The trio have been referred to as members of a “New Brandeis movement,” named after Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis, whose decisions limited the power of big business in the early 20th century. With the New Brandeis trifecta in place, and Congress evaluating more than dozen possible anti-tech bills, next year is “shaping up to be the year of Tech Takedown,” Bhaskar Chakravorti, dean of global business at the Fletcher School at Tufts University, told MarketWatch.

More troubling for tech CEOs, he said, are the “many tiny actions at the FTC, Justice Department and Congress that will continue to keep feeding the news cycles with a steady stream of actions” that add up to a “a year of thousands of tiny tech papercuts.”

Big Tech’s treacherous path to antitrust enforcement has three potentially damaging roads: federal agencies challenging acquisitions and mergers; legislation tailored to stimulate competition and curtail the influence of tech’s dominant platforms; and federal and state lawsuits.

Closer scrutiny of M&A activity

The biggest immediate impact from the Biden administration’s all-out assault could be a cooling-off period of frenzied mergers and acquisitions by the biggest players. Regulators have been empowered with examining past deals and more strenuously inspecting tech’s latest purchases.

Major movement is already happening on the M&A front because, as lawyers and executives told MarketWatch, the FTC and Justice Department have new leadership empowered to more closely review and approve mergers while they await legislation and court actions. A non-binding presidential executive order largely seen as aimed at Big Tech announced a policy of greater scrutiny of mergers over the summer, and the FTC and Justice Department each would receive $500 million in new funding to boost staff working on antitrust enforcement as part of the House-passed reconciliation bill awaiting Senate action.

The FTC is signaling greater oversight over deals, requiring affirmative consent on certain transactions, which may prolong uncertainty on merger agreements. The agency has already sued to block the largest semiconductor deal ever — Nvidia Corp.’s NVDA, -0.59% proposed $40 billion acquisition of U.K.-based chip-design provider Arm Ltd., saying the deal would “distort Arm’s incentives in chip markets and allow the combined firm to unfairly undermine Nvidia’s rivals.”

Another FTC antitrust probe, into Meta’s plan to acquire VR fitness app Supernatural for $400 million, is underway, according to a report by The Information.

The Justice Department’s direction is less clear at this point, but signals from Kanter’s confirmation hearing point to “vigorous enforcement” of antitrust laws.

“Personnel is policy. With the trifecta of Khan, Kanter and Wu, there is a new sheriff in town,” Luther Lowe, senior vice president of public policy at Yelp Inc. YELP, -0.66%, told MarketWatch. “Efforts by Amazon and Facebook to recuse Khan, and Google’s attempt to recuse Kanter, is like arsonists asking for firefighters to be removed from a fire.”

#### Business confidence thesis is wrong.

Baer ’20 [Bill; October 1; Visiting Fellow in Governance Studies, former Assistant Attorney General for Antitrust at the U.S. Department of Justice and Director of the Bureau of Competition at the Federal Trade Commission, J.D. from Stanford University; Testimony Before the United States House of Representatives, “Proposals to Strengthen the Antitrust Laws and Restore Competition Online,” <https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/Bill-Baer-10.1.20-Testimony-to-House-Antitrust-Subcommittee.pdf>]

That overly cautious approach has largely defined antitrust enforcement for the last three decades. And, as Bob Pitofsky and his co-contributors explained in his 2008 book “How the Chicago School Overshot the Mark: The Effect of Conservative Economic Analysis on Antitrust,” the result is that too much current or potential future conduct that poses antitrust risk has gone unchallenged by enforcers or unremedied by the courts. 8

We need to promote innovation, reward success, protect intellectual property, and allow mergers and acquisitions that will make markets more efficient. Those are givens. But we should not succumb to the frequently made argument that the threat of a government antitrust challenge will cause firms not to invest

#### “Tough talk” sufficient to trigger the link

Andrew Ross Sorkin, Biden’s Antitrust Team Talks Its Way to a Win, 7/27/21, https://www.nytimes.com/2021/07/27/business/dealbook/aon-deals-antitrust.html

Tough talk on antitrust

In the Biden administration’s first major antitrust action, the government scored a victory simply by showing a willingness to fight. Aon called off its proposed $30 billion takeover of the rival insurer Willis Towers Watson yesterday, citing delays stemming from a lawsuit brought just over a month ago by the Justice Department to block the deal, which was first announced in March last year.

“This is a victory for competition and for American businesses,” Attorney General Merrick Garland said in a statement after the deal was scrapped. The government argued that merging two of the three biggest insurance brokers would “likely lead to higher prices and less innovation.” The companies countered that the government didn’t understand their businesses.

“We reached an impasse,” Greg Case, Aon’s C.E.O., said in a statement. Aon had angled for a summer trial while the Justice Department suggested winter next year. The judge set a November date, but warned of delays; Aon decided that instead of digging in, it would pay a $1 billion termination fee to Willis and move on.

Tough talk can make big deals less appealing, former antitrust officials told DealBook. “The risk and time delays of a merger challenge often cause the parties to abandon a deal,” said Doug Melamed, a Stanford law professor and former acting chief of the Justice Department’s antitrust division. President Biden’s pledge to rein in corporate power with more aggressive antitrust enforcement efforts, backed by a team of Big Tech critics, is limited by existing laws. Aon’s move highlights how trustbusters can have their way by other means.

#### Confidence is irrelevant AND impact is inevitable.

Cameron Bagrie 18, Managing Director, Bagrie Economics, "Business Confidence Is a Hopeless Indicator. But That Doesn’t Mean the Economy Isn’t in Trouble," Spinoff, 08/09/2018, https://thespinoff.co.nz/business/09-08-2018/business-confidence-is-bullshit-but-that-doesnt-mean-the-economy-isnt-in-trouble.

The good news is that business confidence is hopeless as an economic indicator. The correlation with economic growth is poor and I largely ignore business confidence readings. Changes in direction can provide some insightful information – whether things are picking up or slowing down, but not the levels.

Businesses tend to be more upbeat regarding general confidence about the economy under a blue flag as opposed to a red one. Business confidence averaged minus 18 between 2000 and 2007. The economy (measured by real gross domestic product) grew on average by more than 3.5% per year. Yep, confidence was negative, but growth was positive. So, we ignore business confidence as an economic indicator. This is nothing new. It’s surprising headline business confidence figures receive so much attention.

Commentators make the constant mistake of saying the ANZ survey is a business confidence survey. The same applies to the NZIER’s QSBO. They are surveys of business views across an array of key indicators including prospects for growth, hiring, whether firms are planning to invest and experiences with inflation / costs. These indicators matter. Business confidence is one question.

The so-called “soft” or “perception” indicators are the hard data of tomorrow. They are estimates and view based but you can’t ignore them. They are well correlated with growth.

In a perfect world we’d have timely “hard” official data and statistics. We don’t. Official data comes with a lag. So, we need to rely on sentiment-based indicators if we want timely readings on the economy and a guide as to the year ahead.

The likes of the ANZ survey are showing a sombre mood when it comes to indicators that matter. The ANZ survey asks key questions about activity, employment, investment and profitability. When these indicators head to zero, which they have done now, growth can do the same. Those indicators were weak in 2000 during the so-called winter of discontent – and growth slowed to 0.9% year on year.

Growth did rebound. But back then the economy was early in the economic expansion. The economy is late in the business cycle this time around. The economy has tended to go through a ten-year cycle, so businesses are naturally looking more nervously over their shoulders at present. The economy is going through substantial economic change too and businesses are wary. There is little argument over the need to change the economy. However, there are serious questions about the actual economic plan and what the new economy looks like. That is a key issue that needs addressed.

Some of the weakness in survey measures could be put down to the way survey questions are phrased. Firms are asked their view and given three options; will conditions improve, stay the same, or worsen. For a lot of firms’ things are damned good. It’s telling that finding skilled staff is the biggest problem firms are facing. Businesses are facing capacity constraints. So, zero readings may reflect a levelling out at a high base.

### 2AC---Court Clog DA

#### Courts clogged now – reopening from COVID isn’t happening fast enough

Smith 6/14 – Criminal justice reporter for WBEZ. His reporting has won awards from the Associated Press, the Chicago Headline Club, the Radio Television Digital News Association, the Chicago Bar Association and others.

Patrick Smith, “As The Nation’s Courthouses Reopen, They Face Massive Backlogs In Criminal Cases,” *NPR*, 14 July 2021, https://www.npr.org/2021/07/13/1015526430/the-nations-courthouses-confront-massive-backlogs-in-criminal-cases.

Criminal courthouses across the United States are confronting massive case backlogs as they begin slowly reopening after long pandemic shutdowns. It has some prosecutors preparing to drop so-called "low-level cases" because they will not be able to handle the expected crush of speedy trial demands.

Prosecutors in Chicago, for example, are preparing to drop a large number of criminal cases when the courts fully reopen later this year.

Thousands of criminal cases have built up in Cook County over the past 15 months, as the county's massive court system has been all-but shut down because of the COVID-19 pandemic. That means thousands of people locked up in jail, on electronic monitoring or out on bond have essentially had their cases on hold. But the waiting caused by the pandemic could mean many people accused of nonviolent crimes will get off scot-free.

"I think we should be prepared for a system that is going to be overwhelmed," Cook County State's Attorney Kim Foxx said.

Foxx said that will likely mean dropping a large number of lower-level cases in order to prioritize cases involving violent crime.

"We cannot allow for violent cases to fall through the cracks," Foxx said. "And so using that calculus, [we have to make] sure that those cases that could be dealt with outside of the system are in fact purged from the system so we can focus our attention on violence."

Courthouses are likely to see a steep increase in speedy trial requests

The Illinois Supreme Court announced June 30 that courthouses will return to normal in October, and defendants will once again be able to assert their Constitutional right to a speedy trial, a right the Illinois Supreme Court suspended in March 2020 amid COVID-19.

Chicago-based defense attorney Adam Sheppard said he expects to see "a flood of speedy trial demands" across the system.

"It is gonna be overwhelming," Sheppard said.

Foxx said there is no way her prosecutors — or the court system overall — will be able to deal with that coming crush.

"In a scenario where everyone demands [a trial], potentially 30,000-plus cases needing to go to trial within the span of several months, and the reality is our court system, I don't think there's any court system in the world that would be prepared to have that many trials just logistically, staff wise, all of it, it would overwhelm the system," Foxx said.

That pattern could be repeated in jurisdictions across the country, as courthouses try to return to normal with thousands of people who have been waiting months or more for their day in court.

Dropping cases sends the message that "you don't matter"

Meg Garvin, executive director of the National Crime Victim Law Institute at Lewis and Clark Law School, said she's heard of other jurisdictions that are also considering dropping a large number of cases because of backlogs. She's concerned about the message that could send to victims.

#### ‘Floodgates’ are fake---established docket control works

Meredith M. Render 20, Professor of Law at the University of Alabama School of Law, JD from the Georgetown University Law Center, BA from Boston College, “Fiduciary Injury and Citizen Enforcement of the Emoluments Clause”, Notre Dame Law Review, 95 Notre Dame L. Rev. 953, January 2020, Lexis

First, as previously discussed, there is reason to be skeptical about the efficacy of the CAP rule in terms of reducing the overall number of cases in the federal courts. 315 Moreover, in addition to the fact that the CAP rule likely does little to reduce the overall number of opportunities for federal courts to judge the behavior of coordinate branches, there is reason to [\*1007] believe that the opening-the-floodgates worry itself is overblown. 316 Not only is the floodgates argument in support of the CAP rule lacking in empirical support, 317 but it may also be lacking in a clear, germane, and substantive content when used by various members of the Court. 318F or example, Professor Marin Levy has observed that "recent cases show the justices vacillating between providing assurances that their decision will not result in a deluge of new claims, and accusing each other of being driven by an improper desire to stave off such a deluge." 319 The floodgate alarm has been used in diverse and internally inconsistent contexts without the mooring benefit of evidentiary support, such that it has taken on more the character of epithet than of a serious constitutional obstacle. 320Justice Ginsburg, writing in dissent, has succinctly summarized this development, stating: "The 'floodgates' argument the Court today embraces has been rehearsed and rejected before." 321

The fact that the floodgate rationale is frequently used to support both sides of a contested determination by the Court suggests that it may lack a stable normative content. 322 The floodgate rationale is, at heart, a prediction about how future litigants will behave if the Court adopts a new rule. Yet the ordinary norms of prediction with their attendant empirical safeguards seem not to obtain. 323 Those invoking the floodgate alarm have not felt [\*1008] obliged to supply evidence of past instances in which the federal courts were in fact "flooded" as the result of similar rule changes, and that the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure were inadequate to address the "flood." 324 Given that members of the Court have so frequently predicted a litigatory deluge as a consequence of a rule change, it would seem a simple matter to confirm that a deluge has, in fact, occurred. 325 However, evidence of past flooding has yet to emerge within the floodgate discourse. 326

It is possible that the reason that the floodgate worry has not been documented may be because it has yet to come to pass. There is ample reason to believe that the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure are generally commensurate to the task of qualitatively stemming the tide of litigation. 327 The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure are designed to weed out duplicative, harassing, frivolous, and meritless cases. 328While no standing rule - including the CAP rule - prevents nonmeritorious cases from being filed in federal court, such cases are generally resolved on a Rule 12(b)(1) motion to dismiss. 329The Rule 12(b)(1) motion to dismiss is also the first opportunity during which a defendant can challenge standing. 330There is no strategic advantage to [\*1009] defendants - in terms of the expenditure of resources - to having a case dismissed for want of standing as compared to any other grounds for dismissal under Rule 12(b)(1). 331Likewise, doctrines and mechanisms designed to conserve both judicial and defendant resources, such as claim preclusion, issue preclusion, abstention, joinder, and case consolidation, all operate to prevent horizonal lawsuits alleging the same nexus of operative facts from going forward simultaneously in multiple district courts - a point that is especially important in the emoluments context where presumably any citizen suit would allege the same operative facts. 332

#### AI acquisitions have increased six-fold.

CB Insights ’19 – data analytics company [CB Insights; private company with a business analytics platform and global database that provides market intelligence on private companies and investor activities, targeted at private equity, venture capital, investment banking, angel investing, and consulting professionals by providing insights about high growth private companies; 9-17-2019; "The Race For AI: Here Are The Tech Giants Rushing To Snap Up Artificial Intelligence Startups"; CB Insights; https://www.cbinsights.com/research/top-acquirers-ai-startups-ma-timeline/; accessed 8-15-2021]

Artificial intelligence has long been a major focus for tech leaders across industries. Big corporations across every sector, from retail to agriculture, are trying to integrate machine learning into their products. At the same time, there is an acute shortage of AI talent.

This combination is fueling a heated race to scoop up top AI startups, many of which are still in the early stages of research and funding.

Below, we dig into AI acquisition trends, from which companies are the most acquisitive to what areas of focus are attracting the most attention.

TECH GIANTS LEAD IN AI ACQUISITIONS

The usual suspects are leading the race for AI: tech giants like Facebook, Amazon, Microsoft, Google, & Apple (FAMGA) have all been aggressively acquiring AI startups in the last decade.

Among the FAMGA companies, Apple leads the way, making 20 total AI acquisitions since 2010. It is followed by Google (the frontrunner from 2012 to 2016) with 14 acquisitions and Microsoft with 10.

Apple’s AI acquisition spree, which has helped it overtake Google in recent years, was essential to the development of new iPhone features. For example, FaceID, the technology that allows users to unlock their iPhone X just by looking at it, stems from Apple’s M&A moves in chips and computer vision, including the acquisition of AI company RealFace.

In fact, many of FAMGA’s prominent products and services came out of acquisitions of AI companies — such as Apple’s Siri, or Google’s contributions to healthcare through DeepMind.

That said, tech giants are far from the only companies snatching up AI startups.

Since 2010, there have been 635 AI acquisitions, as companies aim to build out their AI capabilities and capture sought-after talent (as of 8/31/2019).

The pace of these acquisitions has also been increasing. AI acquisitions saw a more than 6x uptick from 2013 to 2018, including last year’s record of 166 AI acquisitions — up 38% year-over-year.

In 2019, there have already been 140+ acquisitions (as of August), putting the year on track to beat the 2018 record at the current run rate.

#### 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**.

### 2AC---Agency Tradeoff

#### Non-unique and turn—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.

#### Turn—*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.

#### No internal link—agency resources ineffective b/c they drive away the best talent

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

The modern critique of the U.S. system often describes the federal agencies as captured by the business community or beholden to ideas that disfavor robust intervention.143 Advocates of change suggest that the execution of their reform program at the federal antitrust agencies will require the appointment of senior managers and new staff who repudiate the consumer welfare standard, or at least embrace a vision for expanded enforcement under the consumer welfare, and embrace the multidimensional conception of the proper goals of competition law. Those already employed by the enforcement agencies as managers and staff will be expected to accept the expanded (goals) framework or they will find their duties reduced and their roles marginalized. New appointees to top leadership positions will not be tainted by substantial previous experience in the private sector, nor will they have spent too much time as civil servants in a government enforcement culture that assumed the primacy of consumer welfare as the aim of antitrust law and accepted norms that tilted toward underenforcement. The concern about compromised motives is also likely to disqualify many academics who, though sympathetic to some expansion of antitrust enforcement, remain excessively beholden to some notion of a consumer (rather than citizen) welfare standard, or have engaged in consulting on behalf of large corporate interests.

One consequence of the acute anxiety about capture is to slam the revolving door shut, or at least to slow the rate at which it spins. We offer two cautions about this approach. First, the modern experience of the FTC raises reasons to question the strength of the theory. For example, if business perspectives dominate the FTC, why did the agency persist in its efforts to challenge reverse payment agreements involving leading pharmaceutical producers?144 Was it because the pharmaceutical firms weren’t as good at lobbying as, say, the information services giants? And what explains the FTC’s decision to sue Qualcomm for monopolization early in 2017?145 Is this simply attributable to the inadequacy of Qualcomm’s Washington, DC, lobbyists, or is the capture explanation for the behavior of the federal antitrust agencies not entirely airtight?

Our second caution is that severe restrictions on the revolving door could deny the federal agencies access to skills they will need to carry out a major expansion of antitrust enforcement. Recruiting attorneys, economists, and other specialists from the private sector can give the agencies a vital infusion of talent which, when combined with agency careerists, permit the creation of project teams that can equal the capability of the best teams that the defense can mount in major litigation matters. We also are wary of the idea that an attorney or economist coming from the private sector will discourage effective intervention during the period of public service as a way to pave the road to a better private sector position upon leaving the agency. Rather, there is evidence to suggest that creating a reputation for aggressiveness and toughness as an enforcer increases one’s post-agency employment options. More than a few individuals have development prosperous careers based on piloting businesses through navigational hazards that they helped create while they were senior officials in public agencies.

#### No tradeoff – newest resolution creates more capacity

Gehl 9-24 (Kate, Senior Counsel for Foley and Lardner LLP, Elizabeth A. N. Haas, Partner, Alan D. Rutenberg, Partner, H. Holden Brooks, Partner, Benjamin R. Dryden, Partner, Foley and Lardner LLP“A Divided FTC Approves Omnibus Resolutions to Step Up Enforcement Actions and Votes to Withdraw the 2020 Vertical Merger Guidelines” [https://www.foley.com/en/insights/publications/2021/09/divided-ftc-approves-omnibus-resolutions Published 9-24-2021](https://www.foley.com/en/insights/publications/2021/09/divided-ftc-approves-omnibus-resolutions%20Published%209-24-2021), MSU-MJS)

According to the FTC’s press release, the resolutions are aimed at broadening its ability “to obtain evidence in critical investigations on key areas where the FTC’s work can make the most impact.” The resolutions also will purportedly permit the FTC to “better utilize its limited resources” to quickly investigate potential misconduct. The FTC views the resolutions as one method to increase efficiency at the FTC, which certain Commissioners believe has become necessary due to the “increased volume of investigatory work” caused by a “surge” in merger filings in recent months.

In practice, these resolutions allow a single Commissioner, instead of a majority of sitting Commissioners, to approve compulsory process requests in any investigation within the scope of the resolution for the next 10 years. What practical effect these resolutions will have remains to be seen; however, businesses engaged in conduct that may be implicated by the resolutions should be aware that FTC staff will now have an expedited ability to carry out compulsory process requests, which will very likely increase the number and scope of investigations conducted by the FTC.

#### Funding is normal means – AND boosts are coming

Byers 21 (Dylan Byers, senior media reporter for NBC News; **internally citing George Washington University professor and former FTC chair William Kovacic**; “Is Facebook untouchable? It's complicated,” NBC News, 7-1-2021, https://www.nbcnews.com/tech/tech-news/facebook-untouchable-complicated-rcna1323)

The House Judiciary Committee recently advanced six bills that would bolster the government's ability to regulate Big Tech. They range from simple budgeting measures — one would give more funding to the FTC and the Department of Justice for their antitrust enforcement efforts — to profound reforms — one that would stop platform companies from preferencing their products over those of their competitors and another that would make it illegal for companies to eliminate competitors through acquisitions.

This legislative package faces an arduous road ahead. House Majority Leader Steny Hoyer, who sets the House floor schedule, has said none of the six bills are ready for a vote, which suggests they don't have broad bipartisan support. If and when they do make it through the House, they face an even harder battle in the Senate.

"It's hard to imagine that the larger legislative package is accomplished this year," Kovacic said, though he predicted a few of the less-threatening bills — budgeting, for example — are likely to pass on their own.

"The funding for the FTC and DOJ antitrust divisions, it's nearly 100 percent likely that Congress will pass that law," he said. He said another bill, which would block the tech firms from moving court hearings to more favorable states, was also likely to pass.

#### Lots of thumpers

Zakrzewski 8-19 (Cat Zakrzewski, technology policy reporter at The Washington Post, covers antitrust, privacy and the debate over regulating social media companies, former reporter for Wall Street Journal Pro Venture Capital, BS Journalism, Northwestern University; **internally citing competition policy director at the consumer group Public Knowledge Charlotte Slaiman, and George Washington University professor and former FTC chair William Kovacic**; “Lina Khan’s first big test as FTC chief: Defining Facebook as a monopoly,” The Washington Post, 8-19-2021, https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2021/08/19/ftc-facebook-lawsuit-lina-khan-deadline/)

“There’s multiple signals that FTC is serious about doing their job of investigations and bringing these cases and fighting them hard,” said Charlotte Slaiman, competition policy director at the consumer group Public Knowledge.

Though the most significant, the Facebook case is but one of a wide range of issues on Khan’s plate. A month after she assumed office, the Biden administration issued a sweeping competition executive order, which called for her agency to take a tougher line on concentration throughout the economy.

So far, Khan has taken a series of steps to signal a shake-up has arrived at the FTC. She’s started hosting open meetings to open the agency’s business to the public, and she’s warned that greater scrutiny of mergers is on its way.

But the challenge will be for the agency to remain focused on the most important cases, including Facebook, Kovacic said. “She has a downpour of demands from both ends of the avenue,” he said.

And none of her other efforts will matter if she can’t show that she can win against companies, including Facebook, in court.

“The real measure to business decision-makers of your effectiveness and seriousness is your ability to prosecute and win cases,” Kovacic said.

### 2AC---Neolib K

#### Markets are a computational necessity.

Posner and Weyl 18 – Eric A. Posner is Kirkland and Ellis Distinguished Service Professor of Law and Arthur and Esther Kane Research Chair at the University of Chicago. E. Glen Weyl is an economist and researcher at Microsoft Research New England.

Eric A. Posner and E. Glen Weyl, “Epilogue: After Markets?” *Radical Markets: Uprooting Capitalism and Democracy for a Just Society*, Princeton University Press 2018, Epub (email [arg5180@gmail.com](mailto:arg5180@gmail.com) for relevant text).

Markets as Miracles

As we saw in chapter 1, many economists who were committed to the market economy also considered themselves “socialists.” Yet in the early twentieth century, socialism became identified with central planning, thanks to the role of Marxism and the French Revolution in inspiring and justifying the economic policies of the Soviet Union. Central planning also received a boost from World War I, where national control of the economy for the purpose of war production was more successful than advocates of laissez-faire could ever have imagined. This led to a heated debate about whether central planning should be used in peacetime as well.

In the popular imagination, central planning could not succeed because it provided individuals with no incentives to work. People needed the prospect of riches, or at least wages, to get them out of bed in the morning. Yet incentives were quite strong in the Soviet Union, stronger, in many ways, than they are in capitalist countries. While there was less chance under Communism to grow rich, any prisoner of the Gulag knew the fate of those who “malingered.”

Another popular argument against central planning was advanced by Nobel Laureate Friedrich Hayek in 1945. Hayek argued that no central planner could obtain information about people’s tastes and productivity necessary to allocate resources efficiently.1 The genius of the market was the way that the price system could, in disaggregated fashion, collect this information from everyone and supply it to those who needed to know it, without the involvement of a government planning board.

A related version of this argument, less well-known than Hayek’s but actually more compelling, was made a few decades earlier. The brilliant economist Ludwig von Mises argued that the fundamental problem facing socialism was not incentives or knowledge in the abstract but communication and computation.2 To see what Mises meant, consider an illustrative parable proposed by Leonard Read in his 1958 essay, “I, Pencil.” 3

Read tells the “life story” of a pencil. Such a simple thing, one would at first think. And yet as you begin to reflect, you realize the enormously complex layers of thought and planning it would require to make a pencil from scratch. The wood must be chopped, cut, shaped, polished, and honed. The graphite must be mined, chiseled, and shaped. The ferrule—the collar that connects the wood shaft and the eraser—is an alloy of dozens of metals, each of which must be mined, melted, combined, and reformed. And so forth.

Yet what is most remarkable about the pencil is not its complexity but the complete lack of understanding that anyone involved in the manufacture of the eventual pencil has about any of these steps in the process. The lumberjack knows only that there is a market for his wood and some price that induces her to buy the needed tools, cut down trees, and sell lumber down the line of production. The lumberjack may never even know that the wood is used for a pencil. The pencil factory owner knows only where to purchase the needed intermediate materials and how to run a line assembling them. The knowledge and planning of the pencil’s creation emerge organically from the process of market relations.

Now suppose that we were to try to replicate the market relationships with a central planning board. The board would determine how much wood to chop and when, the number of workers to employ at each stage of production, the correct places and times to produce, ship, and build. Yet, to do this effectively the board would have to understand a great many things. It would have to learn from each of these specialized producers the unique knowledge of her domain of expertise that allows her to earn a living—for example, whether the lumber would have a more valuable use elsewhere in the economy (to build houses or ships or children’s toys) than as an input for pencils. Absorbing all this information and constantly receiving and processing the necessary updates to keep abreast of evolving conditions in each of these steps of the process, would overwhelm the capacity of even the most skilled managers.

And even if the board somehow had an unlimited capacity to absorb this information, it would still have the unmanageable problem of trying to act on this sea of data. Prices, supply and demand, and production relations in markets arise through a complex interplay of individuals each helping to optimize a tiny part of a broad social process. If, instead, a single board had to plan this entire dance, it would force a small number of individuals to contemplate an endless sequence of choices and plans. Such elaborate calculations are beyond the capacity of even the most brilliant group of engineers.

Mises wrote decades before the rise of the fields of computer science and information theory and lacked any way to formalize these intuitive ideas. Many of Mises’s arguments were dismissed by mainstream economists, whose increasingly narrow mathematical approach to the field Mises disdained. Mises’s critics, including Oskar Lange, Fred Taylor, and Abba Lerner, argued that the market mechanism was but one of many ways (and far from the most efficient way) to organize an economy. They viewed the economy purely mathematically, rather than computationally, and saw no difficulty in principle with solving a (very large) system of equations relating the supply and demand of various goods, resources, and services.

In a simplified picture of the economy, ordinary people perform dual functions as producers (workers, suppliers of capital, etc.) and consumers. As consumers, people have preferences regarding different goods and services. Some people like chocolate, others like vanilla. As producers, they have different talents and capacities. Some people are good at doing math, others at mollifying angry customers. In principle, all we need to do is figure out people’s preferences and their talents, and assign jobs to people who do them best, while distributing the value created by production in the form of goods and services that people really want. Rewards and penalties need to be determined to give people incentives to reveal their preferences and talents, and to ensure that they actually do what they are supposed to do. All of this can be represented mathematically and solved. That’s why socialist economists viewed the economy as a math problem the solution of which only required a computer.

Yet the later development of the theory of computational and communication complexity vindicated Mises’s insights. What computational scientists later realized is that even if managing the economy were “merely” a problem of solving a large system of equations, finding such solutions is far from the easy task that socialist economists believed. In an incisive computational analysis of central planning, statistician and computer scientist Cosma Shalizi illustrates how utterly impossible “solving” a modern economy would be for a central planning board. As Shalizi notes in his essay, “In the Soviet Union, Optimization Problem Solves You,” the computer power it takes to solve an economic allocation problem increases more than proportionately in the number of commodities in the economy.4 In practical terms, this means that in any large economy, central planning by a single computer is impossible.

To make these abstract mathematical relationships concrete, Shalizi considers an estimate by Soviet planners that, at the height of Soviet economic power in the 1950s, there were about 12 million commodities tracked in Soviet economic plans. To make matters worse, this figure does not even account for the fact that a ripe banana in Moscow is not the same as a ripe banana in Leningrad, and moving it from one place to the other must also be part of the plan. But even were there “merely” 12 million commodities, the most efficient known algorithms for optimization, running on the most efficient computers available today, would take roughly a thousand years to solve such a problem exactly once. It can even be proven that a modern computer could not achieve even a reasonably “approximate” solution—and, of course, today there are far more goods, services, transport choices, and other factors that would go into the problem than there were in the Soviet Union in the 1950s. Yet somehow the market miraculously cuts through this computational nightmare.

Markets as Parallel Processors

But all of this raises a question. If the problem is so hard to solve, how is it possible for the market to solve it? Consider Lange’s quote from our epigraph.5 The market is just a set of rules enforced by the government—not much different from a computer algorithm, although a very complex one. It’s true that no single person invented the market. Yet the rules of the market are well understood, and economists are constantly telling people to implement them. Imagine that a new country is created, and its leaders ask a western economist how best to create an economy. The economist will tell them how to set up a market—the rules of contract and property law, for example. (Indeed, economists have been running around the halls of government of developing countries and the floors of start-ups for decades doing just this.) Aren’t the economists just supplying a kind of computer program to the leaders, who by implementing it are engaging in a style of centralized planning?

To understand how the market solves the “very large system of equations,” you need to know the key ideas of distributed computing and parallel processing. In these systems, complicated calculations that no one computer could perform are divided into small parts that can be performed in parallel by a large number of computers distributed across different geographic locations. Distributed computing and parallel processing are best known for their role in the development of “cloud computing,” but their greatest application has gone unnoticed: the market economy itself.

While the human brain is wired differently from a computer, computational scientists estimate that a single human mind has a computational capacity roughly ten times greater than the most powerful single supercomputer at the time of this writing.6 The combined capacity of all human minds is therefore tens of billions of times greater than this most powerful present-day computer. The “market” is then in some sense a giant computer composed of these smaller but still very powerful computers. If it allocates resources efficiently, it does so by harnessing and combining their separate capacities.

Adopting this perspective, we must ask how the market is “programmed” to achieve this outcome. The economy consists of a variety of resources and human capacities at a range of locations, along with a system for transmitting data about these resources among individual human beings. A standard approach in parallel processing is to take information local to one location in, say, a picture or puzzle and assign this to one processor, integrating these inputs on still other processors in a hierarchical fashion. Now apply this image to the economy. In every place, we take one of the computers (humans) available to us and assign it to collect information about that location’s needs and resources and report some parsimonious “compressed” summary of all that data to other computers. For example, there might be a hierarchical arrangement of computers, with those responsible for particular locations on the ground reporting to a higher “layer” that integrates local areas and then upward from there.

Consider the following example. A person works on a farm and is in charge of ensuring that the farm is productive and that her family is happy. This person sends information about the farm and her family, not in its full richness and complexity, but in broad strokes, to district managers. One manager specializes in understanding the resources that farms need to operate—seeds, fertilizer— while another understands the resources that people living on farms need in order to be happy, including food and clothing. These managers would then aggregate these data and convey them to the next layer, perhaps a national wheat distributor or a regional supplier of products for use on farms. At every level of this chain, some information would need to be lost for the parallel processing to remain parallel and tractable: the farm manager could not detail every way in which a slightly better paved road would help in conveying goods to market or how slightly cleaner water would protect her crops. But at least she could report the largest and most important needs and hope that the loss of information only slightly reduces the efficiency of the resulting solution.

This arrangement has a flavor of central planning but also resembles a market economy. People specialize in different parts of the production chain and operate under limited information, yet are able to coordinate their behavior because the information takes a certain form. While people are experts on local conditions, they know little about economic conditions elsewhere. They know that grain prices are high and tractor prices are low, but not why this is the case. When they buy a tractor or sell grain, they don’t tell the vendor or purchaser their life story, all the conditions on their farm, and so forth. They just place an order or offer so much grain at the going price.

This “price system” thus greatly simplifies communication between different parts of the economy. In fact, economists have shown that prices are the minimum information that a farmer needs to plan her operations effectively. So long as every important way that the farm could benefit or draw down resources from the outside world has a price attached to it, this is all the information the farmer needs to make economic decisions. Any greater information would be a waste, from a purely economic efficiency perspective, though it might be interesting from time to time to develop personal relationships. Conversely, if these prices were not available, there would be no way for a farmer to know whether it pays to use new tractors or rely instead on more labor, nor would she know how many seeds to plant for next season. The farmer without such prices could easily produce too little or waste resources on a tractor that could be better used for more labor, seed, or even consumption.

In this sense, prices are the “minimum” information necessary for rational economic decision-making.7 No other system of distributed computing can be equally productive and yet require less communication.

Markets elegantly exploit distributed human computational capacity. In doing so they allocate resources in ways that no present computer could match. Von Mises was right that central planning by a group of experts cannot replace the market system. But his argument was mistakenly taken as implying that the market is “natural” rather than a human-created program for managing economic resources. In fact, there is nothing natural about market institutions. Human beings create markets—in their capacity as judges, legislators, administrators, and even private business people who frequently set up organizations that create and manage markets.

Markets are powerful computers, but whether they produce the greatest good or not depends on how they are programmed. We advocate “Radical Markets” because we believe that in the present stage of technological and economic development, when cooperation has grown too large to be managed by moral economies, the market is the appropriate computer to achieve the greatest good for the greatest number. If we see it as such, we can fix the bugs in the market’s code and enable it to generate more wealth that is distributed more fairly.

By sharpening our understanding of the role and value of markets, the computational analogy clarifies our claim that the solutions we propose are based on extending the reach of markets. The COST on wealth radicalizes markets as it puts greater responsibility on individuals to articulate their values and gives them greater ability to claim things they value highly. QV does the same in the political sphere. Our ideas on migration give individuals more scope for determining the best path for where they live and work. Our proposals on antitrust and data valuation break up centralized power and place greater responsibility on individuals and small firms to compete, innovate, and make rational economic choices to allow for the distributed computation of optimal economic allocations. But all these proposals raise the question: if the market is just a computer program that harnesses the power of individual human intellects, will it still be necessary as computer power increases?

#### Turn—prefer our tailored defense of competition policy—it is compatible with broader anti-neoliberalism—their k conflates sources of structural equality and devolves into totalitarianism

Coniglio, antitrust attorney in the Washington, DC office of Sidley Austin LLP, ‘20

(Joseph V., “Economizing the Totalitarian Temptation: A Risk-Averse Liberal

Realism for Political Economy and Competition Policy in a Post-Neoliberal Society,” 59

Santa Clara L. Rev. 703)

The implication of the foregoing is that the most pressing task for competition policymakers may not involve a rethinking of first principles. The principles of neoliberal competition policy may have ultimately been proven justified by an unprecedented period of economic growth, technological progress and reductions in poverty, and should presumably remain operative as long as they remain the best framework for bringing about these ends. Neither, as we have suggested, must the capitalist entrepreneur be lost in the process. The totalitarian temptation to submit to general state control of the economy-whether it be in the form of communism from below or fascism from above should be resisted so as to preserve and build upon the great prosperity Western Civilization has managed to achieve.

This statement will no doubt be highly unsatisfactory to many critics of neoliberalism who seek more fundamental and revolutionary changes. Surely, they suggest, there must be some principled basis for critiquing the neoliberal status quo with which so many are frustrated. Indeed, there very well may be, and none of the arguments in this article should be understood to the contrary. The goal of this article has been limited to a tailored defense of neoliberal principles only as they relate to competition policy, broadly understood. It does not suggest that neoliberal monetary, trade, and fiscal policies are also sound-let alone a neoliberal social order, where all the core institutions within society are organized according to the neoliberal principles of wealthmaximization, empiricism, and the rest.129 This is to say that even if neoliberalism is a sound theory as applied to the area of competition policy, neoliberal monetary policy, for example, may be problematic and a just target for contemporary critics. Similarly, claiming that competition policy should be enforced using a consumer welfare standard does not mean that all the organs of law and civil society should be oriented to maximize wealth or consumer welfare, even if this economic inquiry is nonetheless informative. 30 It is well known that several prominent neoliberals have expanded the neoliberal policy apparatus beyond the regulation of market capitalism with which antitrust is concerned to domains typically understood to be beyond a purely utilitarian purview.' 3 ' However, whatever the merits of these broader neoliberal policy programs, the competition policy baby, so to speak, should not be thrown out with the bathwater.

Consider the charge that neoliberal policies have increased wealth inequality in the United States. Some commentators attempt to link this increased inequality with a decline in competition'3 2 and, by implication, consumer welfare competition policy. Notwithstanding the interest such theories appeared to have garnered from highly distinguished economists and policymakers, such as Nobel Laureate Joe Stiglitz,133 one might alternatively consider whether increasing wealth inequality and the resultant social strife are far more a result of policies in other areas, such as monetary policy. 134 At the same time as Chicago School antitrust policy took root, the American economy began to undergo sustained expansions in the money supply and reductions in interest rates that, at least in theory, disproportionately reward the owners of financial assets, who are more likely to be wealthy. 135

Indeed, after the financial crisis, monetary policy engaged in a truly unprecedented expansion, with the Federal Reserve lowering interest rates to zero and increasing its balance sheet from approximately $900 billion before the crisis to $4.5 trillion after, most of which constituted either troublesome mortgage-backed securities or treasury bonds. 36 The share of wealth of the world's richest people roughly doubled. 37 At the same time, however, one would seem to look in vain for any shift toward an increased laissez faire competition policy during the Obama administration. Indeed, antitrust enforcement under the Obama administration arguably increased relative to the George W. Bush administration, even if only at the margins and not in the area of monopolization. 3

#### The stakes are high—antitrust policy can and should be distinguished from broad political economy—conflating the two risks undoing every achievement of the past 100 years

Coniglio, antitrust attorney in the Washington, DC office of Sidley Austin LLP, ‘20

(Joseph V., “Economizing the Totalitarian Temptation: A Risk-Averse Liberal

Realism for Political Economy and Competition Policy in a Post-Neoliberal Society,” 59

Santa Clara L. Rev. 703)

The justification for a consumer welfare standard, as well as for neoliberal political economy more generally, should be distinguished from a defense of this sense of neoliberalism as a comprehensive social order which, like its Marxist rival, shares in this totalitarianizing of the economic. 150 Put simply, notwithstanding its fruits, neoliberalism should not become the very sort of utopian and totalitarian ideology that it was designed to replace. The existence of a justification for neoliberal competition policy does not mean that the wealth maximizing logic of the market should be the organizing principle for society writ large' 5 ' -or even law, as a general matter. 52 To paraphrase Schum- peter, it is the higher order question of "Meaning," upon which the indictment of neoliberalism is likely most sound and most neededhowever difficult that may be to articulate.

VI. CONCLUSION

The United States has been the preeminent embodiment of capitalism and democracy around the world. As it transitioned through what we have understood as the classical liberal, progressive, and neoliberal phases of its political economy, it played a leading role in overcoming the greatest authoritarian and totalitarian forces in modem history: the last of the monarchies of the Old Order in World War I, national socialism in World War II, and communism in the Cold War. But rather than herald a liberal and democratic end of history,'53 the current crisis of the neoliberal order is an occasion for policymakers to reflect upon precisely where things may have went wrong.

The stakes are high. But for the United States' unique achievements in republican government, victory in two world wars, and technological and economic progress, Schumpeter may very well have been proven right that the great revolution of capitalist democracy, which preceded over a hundred and fifty years of inter-Western wars, civil strife, and the resultant loss of hundreds of millions of lives, could have been merely a precursor'5 4 to a far more barbaric and inhumane system of government than what came before it,'55 and which would put to death by the tens of millions the very masses it claimed it would liberate. 156 The United States, with its unrivaled system of free enterprise, commitment to the rule of law, and inheritance of the Western tradition remains the best hope to prevent, in solidarity with its allies, the final triumph of such a totalitarian tragedy.

The competition policy community, which during the neoliberal period accustomed itself to a comfortable and technocratic discourse about which conduct rules will maximize consumer welfare, 157 must adapt its thinking by considering changes to antitrust law within the context of a broader debate that questions not only the consumer welfare consensus, but also the neoliberal principles upon which contemporary antitrust is premised. In this debate, competition policymakers should remain steadfast in their conviction that history has justified a consumer welfare standard as the lodestar of antitrust law158 --even if incremental changes are appropriate in some areas. Simply put, the inability for antitrust law to operate as an economic, social, or political panacea does not mean it isn't working.

Rather, what is good policy for antitrust law may not be good policy for all organs of society, and the fundamental problem with neoliberalism may not so much as involve what has been gained, but what has been lost-that is, so to speak, Burke's "chivalry" or Schumpeter's "holy grail"-within neoliberalism's broader program to generalize the market form across society. 159 Seeking to use antitrust or other market tools as a means to understand, let alone solve, larger social problems fundamentally fails to grasp the deeper forms of which societies have historically been constituted. 60 Even if man is a homo economicus- as he always has been' 6 '-that is certainly not all he is, and his economic nature need not and should not come at the expense of the higher rational faculties that ground moral and political order. These questions, as uncomfortable as they may be, far outstrip the search of the New Brandeisians and others for a golden mean in the Herfindal- Hirschman index that balances the interests of capitalism and democracy in a given market. They are also more important.

The hope lies not, moreover, in a return to either Jeffersonian democracy or New Deal progressivism. 162 Just as the analysis of the problem may be better found on the classical "anthropological' 163 analysis, to avoid the Scylla and Charybdis of tyranny and ochlocracy, a path forward for America and the West lies in its unique and millennia- old tradition of republican government. In particular, if liberal capitalist democracy continues to falter,164 the United States can take the lead in looking back to the cosmopolitan and meritocratic model of republican Rome1 65 that inspired Presidents166 and abolitionists167 -even if America ultimately chartered a different course. 68 The West's ability to once again renew its civilization around a rightful heir-lest imposters claim the title-to its great tradition of right order, individual liberty, and progress in the condition of man may hang in the balance.

#### Tech and inevitable adaptation prevent apocalyptic collapse – reject their pessimistic fear mongering

Bailey ’18 – Warren T. Brookes Fellow in Environmental Journalism at the Competitive Enterprise Institute, award-winning science correspondent for Reason magazine

Ronald. March 12. “Climate Change Problems Will Be Solved Through Economic Growth” <https://reason.com/blog/2018/03/12/climate-change-problems-will-be-solved-t>

"It is, I promise, worse than you think," David Wallace-Wells wrote in an infamously apocalyptic 2017 New York Magazine article. "Indeed, absent a significant adjustment to how billions of humans conduct their lives, parts of the Earth will likely become close to uninhabitable, and other parts horrifically inhospitable, as soon as the end of this century."

The "it" is man-made climate change. Temperatures will become scalding, crops will wither, and rising seas will inundate coastal cities, Wallace-Wells warns. But toward the end of his screed, he somewhat dismissively observes that "by and large, the scientists have an enormous confidence in the ingenuity of humans....Now we've found a way to engineer our own doomsday, and surely we will find a way to engineer our way out of it, one way or another."

Over at Scientific American, John Horgan considers some eco-modernist views on how humanity will indeed go about engineering our way out of the problems that climate change may pose. In an essay called "Should We Chill Out About Global Warming?," Horgan reports the more dynamic and positive analyses of two eco-modernist thinkers, Harvard psychologist Steven Pinker and science journalist Will Boisvert.

In an essay for The Breakthrough Journal, Pinker notes that such optimism "is commonly dismissed as the 'faith that technology will save us.' In fact, it is a skepticism that the status quo will doom us—that knowledge and behavior will remain frozen in their current state for perpetuity. Indeed, a naive faith in stasis has repeatedly led to prophecies of environmental doomsdays that never happened." In his new book, Enlightenment Now, Pinker points out that "as the world gets richer and more tech-savvy, it dematerializes, decarbonizes, and densifies, sparing land and species." Economic growth and technological progress are the solutions not only to climate change but to most of the problems that bedevil humanity.

Boisvert, meanwhile, tackles and rebuts the apocalyptic prophecies made by eco-pessimists like Wallace-Wells, specifically with regard to food production and availabilty, water supplies, heat waves, and rising seas.

"No, this isn't a denialist screed," Boisvert writes. "Human greenhouse emissions will warm the planet, raise the seas and derange the weather, and the resulting heat, flood and drought will be cataclysmic. Cataclysmic—but not apocalyptic. While the climate upheaval will be large, the consequences for human well-being will be small. Looked at in the broader context of economic development, climate change will barely slow our progress in the effort to raise living standards."

Boisvert proceeds to show how a series of technologies—drought-resistant crops, cheap desalination, widespread adoption of air-conditioning, modern construction techniques—will ameliorate and overcome the problems caused by rising temperatures. He is entirely correct when he notes, "The most inexorable feature of climate-change modeling isn't the advance of the sea but the steady economic growth that will make life better despite global warming."

Horgan, Pinker, and Boisvert are all essentially endorsing what I have called "the progress solution" to climate change. As I wrote in 2009, "It is surely not unreasonable to argue that if one wants to help future generations deal with climate change, the best policies would be those that encourage rapid economic growth. This would endow future generations with the wealth and superior technologies that could be used to handle whatever comes at them including climate change." Six years later I added that that "richer is more climate-friendly, especially for developing countries. Why? Because faster growth means higher incomes, which correlate with lower population growth. Greater wealth also means higher agricultural productivity, freeing up land for forests to grow as well as speedier progress toward developing and deploying cheaper non–fossil fuel energy technologies. These trends can act synergistically to ameliorate man-made climate change."

Horgan concludes, "Greens fear that optimism will foster complacency and hence undermine activism. But I find the essays of Pinker and Boisvert inspiring, not enervating....These days, despair is a bigger problem than optimism." Counseling despair has always been wrong when human ingenuity is left free to solve problems, and that will prove to be the case with climate change as well.

#### No resource shortages – tech prevents every scenario

Bailey ’18 – Warren T. Brookes Fellow in Environmental Journalism at the Competitive Enterprise Institute, award-winning science correspondent for Reason magazine

Ronald. February 16. “Is Degrowth the Only Way to Save the World?” <https://reason.com/blog/2018/02/16/is-degrowth-the-only-way-to-save-the-wor>

Unless us folks in rich countries drastically reduce our material living standards and distribute most of what we have to people living in poor countries, the world will come to an end. Or at least that's the stark conclusion of a study published earlier this month in the journal Nature Sustainability. The researchers who wrote it, led by the Leeds University ecological economist Dan O'Neill, think the way to prevent the apocalypse is "degrowth."

Vice, pestilence, war, and "gigantic inevitable famine" were the planetary boundaries set on human population by the 18th-century economist Robert Thomas Malthus. The new study gussies up old-fashioned Malthusianism by devising a set of seven biophysical indicators of national environmental pressure, which they then link to 11 indicators of social outcomes. The aim of the exercise is to concoct a "safe and just space" for humanity.

Using data from 2011, the researchers calculate that the annual per capita boundaries for the world's 7 billion people consist of the emission of 1.6 tons of carbon dioxide per year and the annual consumption of 0.9 kilograms of phosphorus, 8.9 kilograms of nitrogen, 574 cubic meters of water, 2.6 tons of biomass (crops and wood), plus the ecological services of 1.7 hectares of land and 7.2 tons of material per person.

On the social side, meanwhile, the researchers say that life satisfaction in each country should exceed 6.5 on the 10-point Cantril scale, that healthy life expectancy should average at least 65 years, and that nutrition should be over 2,700 calories per day. At least 95 percent of each country's citizens must have access to good sanitation, earn more than $1.90 per day, and pass through secondary school. Ninety percent of citizens must have friends and family they can depend on. The threshold for democratic quality must exceed 0.8 on an index scale stretching from -1 to +1, while the threshold for equality is set at no higher than 70 on a Gini Index where 0 represents perfect equality and 100 implies perfect inequality. They set the threshold for percent of labor force employed at 94 percent.

So how does the U.S. do with regard to their biophysical boundaries and social outcomes measures? We Americans transgress all seven of the biophysical boundaries. Carbon dioxide emissions stand at 21.2 tons per person; we each use an average of 7 kilograms of phosphorus, 59.1 kilograms of nitrogen, 611 cubic meters of water, and 3.7 tons of biomass; we rely on the ecological services of 6.8 hectares of land and 27.2 tons of material. Although the researchers urge us to move "beyond the pursuit of GDP growth to embrace new measures of progress," it is worth noting that U.S. GDP is $59,609 per capita.

On the other hand, those transgressions have provided a pretty good life for Americans. For example, life satisfaction is 7.1; healthy life expectancy is 69.7 years; and democratic quality stands at 0.8 points. The only two social indicators we just missed on were employment (91 percent) and secondary education (94.7 percent).

On the other hand, our hemisphere is home to one paragon of sustainability—Haiti. Haitians breach none of the researchers' biophysical boundaries. But the Caribbean country performs abysmally on all 11 social indicators. Life satisfaction scores at 4.8; healthy life expectancy is 52.3 years; and Haitians average 2,105 calories per day. The country tallies -0.9 on the democratic quality index. Haiti's GDP is $719 per capita.

Other near-sustainability champions include Malawi, Nepal, Myanmar, and Nicaragua. All of them score dismally on the social indicators, and their GDPs per capita are $322, $799, $1,375, and $2,208, respectively.

The country that currently comes closest to the researchers' ideal of remaining within its biophysical boundaries while sufficient social indicators is...Vietnam. For the record, Vietnam's per capita GDP is $2,306.

"Countries with higher levels of life satisfaction and healthy life expectancy also tend to transgress more biophysical boundaries," the researchers note. A better way to put this relationship is that more wealth and technology tend to make people happier, healthier, and freer.

O'Neill and his unhappy team fail drastically to understand how human ingenuity unleashed in markets is already well on the way toward making their supposed planetary boundaries irrelevant. Take carbon dioxide emissions: Supporters of renewable energy technologies say that their costs are already or will soon be lower than those of fossil fuels. Boosters of advanced nuclear reactors similarly argue that they can supply all of the carbon-free energy the world will need. There's a good chance that fleets of battery-powered self-driving vehicles will largely replace private cars and mass transit later in this century.

Are we about to run out of phosphorous to fertilize our crops? Peak phosphorus is not at hand. The U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) reports that at current rates of mining, the world's known reserves will last 266 years. The estimated total resources of phosphate rock would last over 1,140 years. "There are no imminent shortages of phosphate rock," notes the USGS. With respect to the deleterious effects that using phosphorus to fertilize crops might have outside of farm fields, researchers are working on ways to endow crops with traits that enable them to use less while maintaining yields.

O'Neill and his colleagues are also concerned that farmers are using too much nitrogen fertilizer, which runs off fields into the natural environment and contributes to deoxygenated dead zones in the oceans, among other ill effects. This is a problem, but one that plant breeders are already working to solve. For example, researchers at Arcadia Biosciences have used biotechnology to create nitrogen-efficient varieties of staples like rice and wheat that enable farmers to increase yields while significantly reducing fertilizer use. Meanwhile, other researchers are moving on projects to engineer the nitrogen fixation trait from legumes into cereal crops. In other words, the crops would make their own fertilizer from air.

Water? Most water is devoted to the irrigation of crops; the ongoing development of drought-resistant and saline-tolerant crops will help with that. Hectares per capita? Humanity has probably already reached peak farmland, and nearly 400 million hectares will be restored to nature by 2060—an area almost double the size of the United States east of the Mississippi River. In fact, it is entirely possible that most animal farming will be replaced by resource-sparing lab-grown steaks, chops, and milk. Such developments in food production undermine the researchers' worries about overconsumption of biomass.

And humanity's material footprint is likely to get smaller too as trends toward further dematerialization take hold. The price system is a superb mechanism for encouraging innovators to find ways to wring ever more value out less and less stuff. Rockefeller University researcher Jesse Ausubel has shown that this process of absolute dematerialization has already taken off for many commodities.

After cranking their way through their models of doom, O'Neill and his colleagues lugubriously conclude: "If all people are to lead a good life within planetary boundaries, then the level of resource use associated with meeting basic needs must be dramatically reduced." They are right, but they are entirely backward with regard to how to achieve those goals. Economic growth provides the wealth and technologies needed to lift people from poverty while simultaneously lightening humanity's footprint on the natural world. Rather than degrowth, the planet—and especially its poor people—need more and faster economic growth.

#### Their alternative vision of industrial organization is meaningless and will just create a different version of squo market failures

Hovenkamp, James G. Dinan University Professor, University of Pennsylvania Law School and the Wharton School, ‘18

(Herbert, “Whatever Did Happen to the Antitrust Movement?” Faculty Scholarship at Penn Law. 1964)

As a movement, antitrust often succeeds at capturing political attention and engaging at least some voters, but it fails at making effective or even coherent policy. The result is goals that are unmeasurable and fundamentally inconsistent, although with their contradictions rarely exposed. Among the most problematic contradictions is the one between small business protection and consumer welfare. In a nutshell, consumers benefit from low prices, high output, and high quality and variety of products and services. But when a firm or a technology is able to offer these things they invariably injure rivals, typically those who are smaller or heavily invested in older technologies. Although movement antitrust rhetoric is often opaque about specifics, its general effect is invariably to encourage higher prices or reduced output or innovation, mainly for the protection of small business or those whose technology or other investments have become obsolete. Indeed, that has been a predominant feature of movement antitrust ever since the Sherman Act was passed, and it remains a prominent feature of movement antitrust today. Indeed, some spokespersons for movement antitrust write, as Louis Brandeis did, as if low prices are the evil that antitrust law should be combatting.17

Nevertheless, mantras such as “industrial concentration” or “big business” have great political force. These terms provide almost nothing in the way of administrable rules while yet evoking an image of something big, bad, and powerful that government must bring under control. For example, here is the plank of the 2016 Democratic Party’s platform on antitrust:

Large corporations have concentrated their control over markets to a greater degree than Americans have seen in decades—further evidence that the deck is stacked for those at the top. Democrats will take steps to stop corporate concentration in any industry where it is unfairly limiting competition. We will make competition policy and antitrust stronger and more responsive to our economy today, enhance the antitrust enforcement arms of the Department of Justice (DOJ) and the Federal Trade Commission (FTC), and encourage other agencies to police anti-competitive practices in their areas of jurisdiction.

We support the historic purpose of the antitrust laws to protect competition and prevent excessively consolidated economic and political power, which can be corrosive to a healthy democracy. We support reinvigorating DOJ and FTC enforcement of antitrust laws to prevent abusive behavior by dominant companies, and protecting the public interest against abusive, discriminatory, and unfair methods of commerce. We support President Obama’s recent Executive Order, directing all agencies to identify specific actions they can take in their areas of jurisdiction to detect anticompetitive practices—such as tying arrangements, price fixing, and exclusionary conduct—and to refer practices that appear to violate federal antitrust law to the DOJ and FTC.18

The antitrust plank never references low consumer prices, or anything having to do with product quality. That is not because Democrats are not interested in low consumer prices.19 Rather, they apparently believe that antitrust has little to do with it. The references to prices occur in other sections of the platform, devoted to such subjects as health and safety and the high price of pharmaceutical drugs. Those sections make no reference to antitrust law.20 The only references to “consumers” occur in planks pertaining to unionization, affordable housing, Wall Street, banks and Dodd-Frank, and clean energy.21 So according to the platform, while legal policy generally is concerned with high consumer prices, antitrust policy apparently is not. By contrast, the 2016 Republican platform never references antitrust, although it does contain a plank promoting a “competitive America,” but focused entirely on lowering tax rates.22

The antitrust plank in the 2016 Democrat platform is actually one of the most detailed to appear in any platform by a major political party.23 The catchphrases that it uses, however—“corporate concentration,” “unfairly limiting competition,” or “abusive behavior by dominant companies”—can mean practically anything depending on assumptions. The platform is peppered with references to “fair” or “fairness,” including the antitrust plank, but with no reference point indicating how fairness should be assessed. Is it “fair” that consumers be asked to pay high prices in order to accommodate the shortcomings of some businesses; or conversely, is it “fair” that small businesses suffer simply because they are not able to compete with larger firms on price or quality; or is it “fair” that firms heavily invested in old brick-andmortar distribution lose out to more technologically entrepreneurial firms? “Fairness” as an antitrust concern means nothing without a reference point or set of measurement tools.

As for specific practices, the antitrust plank in the Democrat platform singles out “tying arrangements, price fixing, and exclusionary conduct,” saying nothing about mergers, other vertical restraints, or anticompetitive patent practices. In fact, the platform never mentions patents, although it makes frequent references to innovation, largely in the context of proposed government intervention to stimulate production24 or to finance research and development and educate people for more technically demanding jobs.25 Of the three anticompetitive practices that it singles out, “price fixing” is completely uncontroversial and has always been a central focus of nearly every articulation of antitrust policy, left, center, and right—including in Bork’s The Antitrust Paradox. 26 The term “exclusionary conduct” is so vague that it is meaningless. Both socially harmful and socially beneficial conduct can be “exclusionary.” The inclusion of “tying arrangements” is mystifying. Tying is ubiquitous in modern economies and is an essential characteristic of networks and technology.27 Further, the vast majority of it is procompetitive because it increases output without excluding anyone. Finally, the number of antitrust tying cases is small in comparison with merger cases, which make up a large portion of antitrust enforcement activity. A major party platform that identifies “tying arrangements” but not “mergers” as a fundamental concern requires an explanation. Most importantly, it seems to miss the whole point of competitive markets, which is to produce a high output of quality, competitively priced goods.

At least in part, the Democratic Party platform reflects the reappearance of movement antitrust. While it is hardly the only expression, and certainly not the most extreme, it represents a troublesome development—namely, the idea that America needs higher prices in order to give smaller firms a fair chance. The platform also gives a reader the strong impression that its slogans were selected in order to achieve maximum political traction with the illiterati, and perhaps that is all that can be expected of a political platform. In the process, however, it does antitrust policy a great disservice by making its legitimate targets almost impossible to define and not providing ammunition for attacking them when they are defined. Its supporters generally disparage the use of economics, sometimes suggesting that antitrust policy should be governed by political theory instead.28 Exactly how political theory gets one to specific antitrust rules is not completely clear, but it involves excluding the opinions of antitrust experts concerning the public’s interest.29

Movement antitrust argues variously for abandoning the measurement of competition by reference to output and price,30 or even abandoning consumer welfare as an antitrust proscription altogether.31 It accuses retailers such as Amazon of engaging in “predatory pricing” without providing a coherent definition of the practice.32 It never explains how a nonmanufacturing retailer such as Amazon could ever recover its investment in belowcost pricing by later raising prices, and even disputes that raising prices to higher levels ever needs to be a part of the strategy, thus indicating that it is confusing predation with investment.33 Charging low but profitable prices indefinitely is not unlawful “predatory pricing”‘ nor is forcing suppliers to price competitively.

The movement antitrust attack on “consumer welfare” reflects both a misunderstanding of that term, and an exaggeration of its influence on recent antitrust jurisprudence. This point is critical because much of movement antitrust blames the consumer welfare principle for the current state of antitrust law. Consumer welfare as it is properly used today refers to the welfare of consumers as consumers, pure and simple.34 Speaking objectively, consumer welfare is improved by high output and low prices, as well as high quality. Under this definition the welfare of producers, competitors, or anyone other than consumers who might be affected by a practice is ignored. In addition to its substantive advantages, this principle has a powerful administrative advantage: it does not require courts to compute welfare “tradeoffs,” because there is nothing to trade off.35

In sharp contrast, Robert Bork very famously used the term “consumer welfare” when he was really referring to the combined welfare of both producers and consumers.36 He observed that an economic tradeoff occurs when a supplier practice causes monopolistic increases in consumer prices but also reduces the supplier’s costs.37 Most peculiarly, for Bork the word “consumer” referred to suppliers as well as customers.38 For Bork, a practice that generated one hundred dollars in seller profits but buyer losses of sixty dollars would be counted as a net improvement of “consumer welfare.” Bork also believed, however, that actual computation of welfare tradeoffs in individual cases would be too difficult. Further, an attempt to do so would overlook important efficiencies. Rather, efficiencies should be presumed, even when the challenged practice creates market power.39 That presumption of efficiency without proof is one of the most controversial aspects of Bork’s approach to the welfare question.

These two understandings of consumer welfare have produced a troublesome ambiguity in antitrust law ever since. For example, some of those who write in movement antitrust today attribute the consumer welfare principle to Bork,40 and as a result blame it for higher prices that accrue to producers. But the important thing is that high producer profits for Bork was part of the consumer welfare that antitrust law should produce.

This ambiguity about definition has also affected Supreme Court usage of “consumer welfare.” The Supreme Court has never categorically embraced any particular definition of consumer welfare, even though it has used the term several times. Six majority opinions speak of consumer welfare. Two were quotations from Bork’s The Antitrust Paradox, suggesting that the Court was either speaking of producer welfare as well, or else that it did not appreciate the difference between Bork’s definition and true consumer welfare.41 Plaintiffs won both cases, however, and the holdings are consistent with true consumer welfare. Indeed, in one of them, Reiter v. Sonotone Corp., the Supreme Court held that end-use consumers had standing to pursue price fixing, making it an important consumer welfare decision.42

Of the remaining four uses, two involved predatory pricing cases observing that consumer welfare would be enhanced by a period of below-cost pricing that was not followed by recoupment of losses through subsequent higher prices.43 That would very likely be true. An unsuccessful attempt at predatory pricing would result in lower consumer prices temporarily, but no subsequent period of high prices. The final uses of consumer welfare are related to the Leegin Creative Leather Products, Inc. v. PSKS, Inc. decision holding that some instances of resale price maintenance may promote consumer welfare. The first was Leegin itself44 and the second was Ohio v. American Express Co., making essentially the same observation.45 That could also be true under either definition of consumer welfare.

Four additional usages of the term are in dissents.46 Finally, the term appeared in Justice Brennan’s concurring opinion in the Jefferson Parish Hospital District No. 2 v. Hyde tying case. Justice Brennan observed that some ties could impair horizontal competition, injuring consumer welfare.47 A few other cases never use the phrase “consumer welfare” but do speak more generally about benefits to consumers.48 None of these Supreme Court decisions distinguish the Bork definition of consumer welfare from the true consumer welfare position. Beyond the Supreme Court, the strongest case for application of a consumer welfare principle is in merger law under the Horizontal Merger Guidelines, which embrace a consumer welfare principle to the extent that they tie merger policy to the effect on output and consumer prices.49

One of the most disturbing things about movement antitrust is its indifference or even disparagement of low consumer prices. Without citing any evidence, some of its protagonists proclaim that most Americans are not concerned with high prices that might result from monopoly, but rather with “loss of their properties, hence their independence, even their dignity.”50 They recommend harsh rules against vertical integration without ever stating a test, other than a very general suggestion that vertical integration leads to leveraging and foreclosure.51 They call for a return to the merger enforcement standards expressed in the 1968 Merger Guidelines—for example, blocking any merger between a firm with fifteen percent of a market and any other firm whose market share is one percent or more. The relevance of these numbers is not apparent, other than their suggestion that firms are

currently too big.52

Clearly, high prices are not the target. The movement’s proponents denigrate the importance of prices to merger analysis—for example, objecting to the fact that, while the 1968 Merger Guidelines were not particularly focused on consumer prices, guidelines issued in the 1980s and after were. Indeed, low prices appear to be the enemy that antitrust must combat.53 Movement protagonists argue in favor of resale price maintenance, not in order to promote lower cost distribution, but rather to protect less efficient retailers’ higher margins from predatory pricing—without any evidence of a type of predatory pricing that resale price maintenance could combat.54 They enthusiastically embrace Louis Brandeis’s repeated arguments that “price-cutting” is in fact “the most potent weapon of monopoly—a means of killing the small rival.”55 Much of the resale price maintenance that Brandeis supported occurred at the behest of dealer cartels who forced suppliers to use resale price maintenance as a way of disciplining price cutters.56

Certainly, big business can cause harm to the lives of Americans in other ways than through competitive pricing. But these ways need to be articulated, supported by evidence, and then sorted into those things that are conceivably within the domain of antitrust and those that are not. Promiscuous application of the antitrust laws so as to make big firms smaller and prices higher could cause irreparable harm, not only to consumers, but to the entire economy.
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#### Sanctions are targeted and effective---pressure forces Iranian compromise.

**Hook 19** --- Special Representative for Iran, Senior Policy Advisor to the Secretary of State, U.S. Department of State.

Brian H, 12-12-2019, "A Conversation With Brian Hook," Council on Foreign Relations, https://www.cfr.org/event/conversation-brian-hook

This is a speech that has been some time coming. And I want to discuss the economic impacts of our maximum pressure campaign by examining Iran’s economy, the regime’s government budget, its access to foreign exchange reserves, and the role that corruption plays in Iran’s economy. More than one year after the re-imposition of American sanctions, the United States is depriving this regime of historic levels of revenue. Because of our pressure, Iran’s leaders are facing a decision they have not confronted seriously since the 1980s: Either negotiate and compromise or manage economic collapse.

The Islamic Republic’s economy shares many of the same features as a corruption racket. The revenue schemes and shadow financial networks that the supreme leader oversees enrich the regime’s ruling class while undermining opportunity for everyone else. These networks divert resources away from the people and fund a range of illicit and destabilizing activities from terrorist groups in Lebanon, to proxy wars in Yemen, to threatening ballistic missile and nuclear programs.

Unprecedented American sanctions are exposing this regime’s corruption and exploiting structural deficiencies in its financial networks. Our sanctions are meaningfully targeting the revenue streams the clerics rely on to foment sectarian violence, suffering in Iran, suffering in the region, and, because Iran has conducted terrorist operations across five continents, around the world. Iran’s leaders bear responsibility for how they choose to spend the Iranian people’s money, and for the state of their nation’s economy, and the stagnation of the Iranian people’s livelihoods that result.

Iran’s clerics have had four decades to build an economy based on transparency. Yet, they have deliberately chosen to take a different path. They instead use the nation’s economy as a bank to finance their revolution and expansionist foreign policy, thereby exposing it to our financial pressure. Iran’s economy is opaque by design. There is a reason reformers in Iran too often find themselves cast out or incarcerated. The clerical establishment prefers the current system to meaningful changes that would benefit its own people.

Recently the clerics derailed efforts to adopt international anti-money laundering and counterterrorism financing standards that would bring transparency to Iran’s banking sector. To almost every country in the world these standards are normal and commonsense. But Iran’s leaders view them as unnecessary and imposing. They continue to resist transparency because they know it will expose the regime to real scrutiny, which would conform—which would confirm what we already know, that the regime uses the Iranian economy to finance and spread its violent revolution and to make the regime elite wealthier.

This is partly why President Trump re-imposed sanctions on Iran, to deprive the clerical rulers of revenue and to disrupt their financial networks. When he did, many experts said that by acting alone the United States could not and would not bring sufficient pressure to bear on this regime’s economic interests. They also said our sanctions would cause protests against the United States as the Iranian people rallied around the flag and the regime. These experts were wrong. The sanctions we have imposed on the regime are the toughest ever and they are making an enormous difference. Sanctions on Iran’s oil sector are at the core of our economic pressure. And for as long as we were in the Iran nuclear deal we were unable to impose oil sanctions.

This regime has relied on oil more than any other export to support its destabilizing activities. Our sanctions on Iran’s oil sector, which were only fully imposed in May, have driven Iran’s oil exports to levels not seen since the onset of the Iran-Iraq War in 1980. Iran’s oil exports have decreased by more than two million barrels per day, driving down Iran’s oil—revenue from oil by more than 80 percent. This amounts to a loss of more than $30 billion per year, with a total loss likely exceeding $50 billion since May of 2018.

Since Iran can no longer find legitimate buyers for its crude oil, it is turning increasingly to evasive practices such as falsifying documents and turning off maritime AIS transponders for its tankers. This strategy will fail to make up for its declining exports. The United States is working closely with nations and industry to educate the maritime and energy sectors about Iran’s evasive practices and potential exposure to U.S. sanctions, if they fail to do their diligence. We are raising awareness of best practices and encouraging entities to adopt appropriate controls to avoid sanctions risks. As we have said, if we see any sanctionable activity, we will take action.

Iran is also running out of options to store the oil it is unable to export. This has forced the regime to shut in its production and increase the amount of crude oil and condensate it sends to refineries and to petrochemical facilities. The regime is hoping to compensate for the fall in crude exports by increasing its output of refined products. But here too our enforcement is adapting, and we are confident that Iran’s refined product and petrochemical sectors—customers will continue to stay away once they are made aware of the risks.

Even as Iran tries to increase its exports of refined products, the regime is facing significant logistical constraints. Iranian tankers are increasingly being used as floating storage, making them unavailable to transport refined products to begin with. Our sanctions are also restricting Iran’s investment in its oil and gas sector, which will have a lasting impact beyond the immediate loss of revenue from the reduction in imports. Both upstream and downstream investments in Iran’s oil and gas sector have stopped. Foreign investments have almost entirely pulled out of Iran due to the risks. Billions of investment has been lost.

While domestic Iranian companies are taking over some of the projects left behind, they are not able to replicate the role of more experienced international oil companies and investors. As time goes on, the impact of our sanctions on Iran’s energy sector will continue to increase. Iran will not be able to make the investments it needs to maintain long-term energy production. The longer the regime chooses to reject diplomacy, the greater the impact will be on its future oil and gas production and revenues.

The decline in energy exports is an important place to start this discussion because it is having a profound impact on the regime’s ability to continue business as usual. The effects have been most pronounced in three key areas: Iran’s economic growth, the regime’s annual budget, and its access to foreign currency. So I’ll first talk about the economy. Last year in 2018 Iran’s economy contracted by about 5 percent. This year Iran’s economy will likely shrink by at least 9.5 percent, according to the IMF. This would be the steepest single year decline in more than thirty years. Some analysts have projected an even steeper contraction, possibly as high as 12-14 percent.

This would put the Iranian economy on the verge of a depression. The IMF and World Bank’s projections place Iran’s economy as the third worst in the world, behind Libya and Venezuela. However, the assumptions underlining even these dismal projections may be optimistic. The IMF has assumed that Iran will average oil exports of six hundred thousand barrels a day. This vastly exceeds Iran’s oil exports since May and is beyond what Iran will export under our sanctions. The IMF and others have repeatedly revised down their growth projections for Iran over the course of the last year. This will almost certainly happen again.

Inflation has also increased and is currently running at 40 percent overall. This is affecting the price of essential household goods significantly. To make matters worse, while Iran manages an official exchange rate the parallel open market exchange rate shows over 50 percent depreciation since May of 2018. The large gap between official and open market exchanges creates corrupt arbitrage opportunities that well-connected importers exploit for private gain. Yet, when ordinary Iranians seek to purchase foreign goods with their weakened currency they are now paying a steep premium.

Iran’s declining growth is having ripple effects throughout the country. Pension funds are coming under increasing strain. Of the eighteen existing retirement funds in Iran, seventeen are in the red. As Iran’s elderly population continues to grow and employment stagnates, these funds will come under greater pressure. Many analysts have compared the current economic decline under this regime’s watch to prior round—to the prior round of sanctions imposed before the nuclear deal was finalized in 2015. However, Iran’s recession today is far worse than it was in 2012. That is when its economy contracted by 6 percent. The more appropriate comparison, as the data suggests, is the opening phase of the Iran-Iraq War in 1980 to 1981, which severely disrupted Iran’s oil production and exports.

Second thing I’d like to discuss is the low—how the low exports are putting unprecedented pressure on the regime’s government budget. Due to the staggering loss of oil revenue, it is nearly impossible for the regime to put forward a credible budget. Oil export revenues typically comprise at least 30 percent of Iran’s revenues. Our sanctions are bringing this figure closer to zero percent. After initially assuming oil exports would average 1.5 million barrels of oil a day in fiscal year 2019, the regime later revised this figure down to only three hundred thousand. It is surprising then that the draft budget released just this month for Iran’s next fiscal year assumes oil exports will average around 1 million barrels per day. This is fantasy. It is an unrealistic forecast. Iran’s budget proposal is so off base that it spooked the Iranian market. The rial hit a six-month low against the dollar shortly after Iran released its government budget.

Iran has attempted over the past year to respond to budget shortfalls by cutting spending and resorting to stopgap measures to raise additional revenue, which it very much needs. These include raiding its sovereign wealth fund, issuing even more domestic debt, attempting to privatize additional state assets, and slashing subsidies. Recently Iran’s financial desperation forced the government to raise gasoline prices in an effort to save money and to increase exports. As the protests last month demonstrated, it will be difficult for the regime to implement further subsidy cuts without sparking even greater frustration among Iranians.

So where will the regime find the money? It would make more sense for the regime to close the revenue gap by plugging holes to tax collection from Iran’s wealthy elite, or by expanding the tax base to include religious and IRGC-linked holding companies that dominate Iran’s economy, and yet pay no taxes. The regime is choosing instead to shift the burden onto the middle class. The regime must also grapple with how to keep its subsidized industries afloat. Iran is one of the most heavily subsidized nations in the world. More than 70 percent of Iran’s budget expenditures are allocated to underperforming state-owned enterprises which make up the bulk of Iran’s economy. And audit by the Supreme Audit Court for 2016 to 2017 that—showed that 162 of 377 state-owned enterprises were, quote, “economically unviable.” The real number is likely much higher.

This suggests that as Iran’s oil sector shrinks the Iranian regime will be unable to continue subsidizing its vast sector of underperforming non-oil industries, just as it is struggling to subsidize gas prices. The government is running out of emergency measures to take or off-budget funds to raid. Moving forward the regime will be less and less able to respond to continued pressure. No creative number-crunching can change the fact that this regime’s coffers are running dry. Short-term fixes will only exacerbate inflation and do nothing to address the structural deficiencies in Iran’s economy. If the regime insists on continuing to divert resources to fund terrorist activity or ballistic missile development ultimately it will be forced to choose between printing money or delaying spending on development, salaries, and benefits.

The Iranian people have been demanding for a long time that the regime stop investing in wars and terrorism abroad and start spending more money at home. Now is an opportunity for the regime to do that, or the regime will face greater pressure from its own people. The recent protests were costly for Iran’s economy. The regime’s unprecedented decision to shut down the internet for a week also created losses for the economy as high as $700 million in e-commerce sales and missed business opportunities.

Last thing I’d like to put—take a look at is the access to foreign exchange reserves. As exports decline the third major impact on the regime has been reduced access to foreign currency. The regime is already struggling to acquire the foreign currency it needs to procure imports such as machinery, industrial imports, and consumer goods—industrial inputs. Prior to the re-imposition of sanctions Iran relied on oil exports for around 50 percent of its foreign currency earnings. Much of the remainder came from petrochemicals, metals, and refined petroleum products. All of these exports are now subject to sanctions.

According to U.S. government analysis, Iran currently has around $100 billion in foreign exchange reserves. Of that, only 10 percent is immediately accessible to Iranian authorities. That is $10 billion. Many exports—many experts have failed to appreciate the difference between reserves and access to reserves. That difference is $90 billion. Given the current sanctions on all of Iran’s top revenue-generating exports, this is simply not sustainable for the regime.

The fact that Iran’s access to foreign currency is declining is all the more dire given last year’s collapse in the rial’s value. The rial has fallen over 50 percent at the market exchange rate since May of 2018. Iranian authorities may be compelled to spend reserves to prevent further depreciation as pressures mount on the rial, even as the regime is increasingly seeking to protect its dwindling accessible foreign currency reserves. By the end of October, Iran’s commerce ministry had banned the import of over 1,500 goods, ostensibly to reduce pressures to spend foreign currency.

Today the Iranian economy has devolved into a kleptocracy which protects the privilege of regime elites while leaving the vast majority of Iranians behind. Although Iran’s clerics promised economic prosperity and social equality after the revolution in 1979, the Iranian people know all too well that neither have been delivered. Massive clerical hedge funds—there aren’t many religious leaders who have a hedge fund—massive clerical hedge funds or so-called charitable foundations worth tens of billions of dollars are just one aspect of Iran’s dark economy. Iran’s Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps has its tentacles in nearly every sector of Iran’s economy.

This is despite a strong declaration from the regime’s first supreme leader, who cautioned that the IRGC should stay out of politics and the economy. Quite the opposite has happened. After forty years, the autocratic rule of the ayatollahs is proving to be an economic catastrophe for the Iranian people. It has robbed Iranians of what should have been decades of progress and prosperity. To summarize, exports are down, the economy is in deep contraction, the budget is facing unprecedented pressures it cannot fix, and access to foreign reserves is minimal.

Most importantly, however, the Iranian people have had enough. Hundreds of thousands of them took recently to the streets in one of the largest protest movements in the Islamic Republic’s history. This followed an unexpected hike in gasoline prices. In cities around the country Iranians joined to demand accountability, reform, and transparency. Many were killed. Many were injured. And many were jailed. The supreme leader dismissed the protesters as “thugs,” which tells you something about how the regime elite think of their own people. But the real thugs are the security officials who fired on unarmed protesters and committed massacres.

The Iranian people understand better than most that their government’s policies are the root cause of Iran’s economic stagnation. When the Iranian people peacefully demand a better life and a more representative government, they are mowed down and brutally silenced. The Iranian people view their government with skepticism and deep frustration. The regime has simply lost all credibility. Again, it has only itself to blame. The Islamic Republic rewards corrupt officials more often than it punishes them.

Our sanctions are exploiting these structural deficiencies to deprive the—to deprive the regime of revenue. We are exposing this regime’s corruption, revealing its gross mismanagement, and we are holding accountable those privileged insiders who have, for decades, profited off the backs of the proud Iranian people. We very much hope that at the end of this economic sanctions—this economic pressure campaign and diplomatic isolation that the regime will start making better choices.

When the president let the Iran deal, Secretary Pompeo gave a speech announcing our new policy. And he made very clear that Iran faces a choice. And this is a year—this is in May of 2018. The regime can either come to the table and negotiate or it can watch its economy collapse. And the supreme leader has chosen collapse. And we very much hope that we can get to the negotiating table with the regime. We have made clear that if we can conclude an agreement that addresses all of Iran’s threats to peace and security, that we will submit it as a treaty to the Senate. We will end all of our sanctions. We will restore diplomatic ties with Iran and exchange ambassadors and welcome them into the international community.

But the agreement has to come first. And in the meantime, we know that this regime is weaker, and its proxies are weaker, today than when this administration came into office three years ago. We recognize that diplomatic isolation and economic pressure is very much—it’s a—it is a necessary response to this regime. We tried sanctions relief and the regime exploited that and, during the period of the Iran nuclear deal, was able to run an expansionist foreign policy with impunity. So we are very pleased with the progress that we are making. We very much hope that we can get to an agreement, and end the sanctions, and welcome Iran into the international community. Thank you.

### States CP

#### CP creates mass uncertainty that stops businesses in their tracks

HLR, Harvard Law Review Note, Antitrust Federalism, Preemption, and Judge-Made Law, June 10, 2020, 133 Harv. L. Rev. 2557

Closely related to the patchwork regime problem is the one-state dominator problem: because national firms may not always be able to maintain different business practices in each state, firms could be forced to follow the law of whichever state has the strictest antitrust policy nationwide. For example, a single state could use its own antitrust laws to “challenge the largest nationwide transactions so long as it can show that the state itself, its citizens, or its economy is affected in a way that provides standing.”44 If a nationwide merger is illegal under one state’s laws, it may not be worth it for the firm to restructure the transaction in order to merge in all but one jurisdiction. This reality could allow for the state with the strictest antitrust policy to dominate the policy decisions of every other state and of the federal government.45

The one-state dominator problem is exacerbated by unrecognized interstate externalities: in making its antitrust laws, a state is not forced to consider the harm or benefit to businesses based outside of its borders. 46 These uninternalized externalities make it more likely that a state will overregulate. The laboratory-of-democracy defenses to the patchwork regime problem, with their variety-is-the-spice-of-life flair, fail to explain why an individual state’s antitrust regime should be allowed to dominate the policy of the entire nation.

#### Even if CP changes ALL state laws, state *courts* will interpret new language in accordance with federal precedent

Dodson, Harry & Lillian Hastings Research Chair and Professor of Law, UC Hastings College of the Law, ‘16

(Scott, “The Gravitational Force of Federal Law,” 164 U. Pa. L. Rev. 703)

b. State Conformity Under Dissimilar Rules

The gravitational pull of federal law can be so forceful that state courts follow federal courts even when the language of their state rules is different from the language of federal rules. Pleading standards again present a useful example, for Rule 8 and its federal interpretation have exerted a strong gravitational pull even on states that retained code pleading.65

A useful 2001 study by Thom Main illustrates this phenomenon. Main studied the way state courts in code-pleading states reacted to federal court interpretations of federal rules on pleading and summary judgment.66 Main selected states whose rules were among those least influenced by the federal rules.67 In Illinois, Main found "persuasive evidence of substantial intra-state uniformity, notwithstanding the fundamental differences between code pleading ... and notice pleading,"68 as well as evidence that Illinois state courts followed the Supreme Court's interpretive gloss on pleading and summary judgment under the Federal Rules.69 Main also found similar following in Pennsylvania.70 Further, both states marched in tune-with relatively consistent lag times-with the federal changes to summaryjudgment after Celotex,71 despite different summary-judgment rule texts.7 2 And Edward Cavanaugh has reported that state appellate courts in New York-a codepleading state-are using the Supreme Court's "plausibility" standard even though it applies only to pleadings in federal court.7 3

Note how the Supreme Court's gravitational pull on state courts compounds the overall gravitational effect of federal law. The federal rules pull state rulemakers toward parallel state rules in the first instance, resulting in rampant mimicry. Even when state rulemakers do resist, state courts are still drawn to interpret divergent state rules in a manner that approaches the interpretation of the federal rules. The overall effect amplifies the gravitational force of federal law.

#### CP is vast over-deterrence that causes companies to abandon transactions—primary federal enforcement better

Lande, Associate Professor, University of Baltimore School of Law, ‘90

(Robert H., “When Should States Challenge Mergers: A Proposed Federal/State Balance,” 35 N. Y. L. Sch. L. Rev. 1047)

Further, it is confounding enough for antitrust counselors to have to contend with two potential federal enforcement agencies. Since both the Assistant U.S. Attorney General and the Chair of the FTC are selected by the President, 63 however, their approaches are in practice similar, if not identical. 64 Experienced merger counselors can provide relatively certain advice to their clients as to what the federal enforcers are likely to do by closely monitoring both agencies.65

It is immensely more difficult to actively monitor the enforcement philosophies of fifty state attorneys general, many of whom have little track record in the merger area (and some of whom bring few antitrust cases of any type).66 The state attorneys general come from both political parties and can have widely differing enforcement philosophies.67 The states have agreed upon a common substantive standard to be used in evaluating mergers-the NAAG Merger Guidelines.68 No set of guidelines with fifty different potential enforcers can offer anything close to predictability, however, since enforcers with divergent philosophies necessarily will interpret ambiguous terms differently in various factual contexts. In the extreme, business would be forced "to limit its activities to the levels set by the most restrictive state interpretation of federal antitrust law.,,70 The additional uncertainty from fifty potential state reviews, along with the inevitable accompanying delays and costs,71 could cause many beneficial transactions never to be attempted. These uncertainties and costs are an increment to the transaction costs already arising from federal review, which by itself may deter significant beneficial transactions.72

### FTC Tradeoff

**She’s pursuing Big Tech hard now.**

David **Mclaughlin 21**, 12-1-2021, "Lina Khan, Biden’s Eyes on Big Tech," Bloomberg, https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2021-12-01/lina-khan-biden-pick-to-lead-ftc-big-tech-antitrust-bloomberg-50-2021

Khan published a paper in 2017 about [Amazon.com Inc.](https://www.bloomberg.com/quote/AMZN:US) that she’d written as a student at Yale Law School. Titled “[Amazon’s Antitrust Paradox](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/note/amazons-antitrust-paradox),” the article argued that the traditional framework for [antitrust enforcement](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2018-01-17/forget-consumer-welfare-this-antitrust-movement-targets-power-instead) was inadequate to deal with today’s tech giants. It was a contrarian attack on mainstream thinking, and it made Khan a radical in the eyes of regulators and Big Law.

Today she’s on the inside. Khan is responsible for helping carry out one of Biden’s sweeping economic policy prescriptions: reining in the power of companies the administration says have benefited from [unchecked consolidation](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2021-07-10/biden-vow-to-tackle-industry-giants-confronts-consolidation-wave), to the detriment of economic growth and workers. Khan, who’s on leave as an associate professor at Columbia Law School, is putting that goal into action. In July she and her two fellow Democrats on the commission voted to rescind an Obama-era policy that limited the agency’s authority in bringing antitrust cases. The next month, seeking to salvage a landmark monopoly lawsuit against Facebook Inc. that a federal judge had dismissed earlier this summer, Khan filed a new complaint against the company. The case seeks to break up Facebook (now [Meta Platforms Inc.](https://www.bloomberg.com/quote/FB:US)) by splitting off Instagram and WhatsApp. If the FTC wins, it would be historic: The government hasn’t broken up a monopoly since AT&T’s “Ma Bell” telephone system in the early 1980s.

**Merger filings prove**

**Feiner 4/20** – News associate for CNBC. Quoting Rebecca Kelly Slaughter, current FTC commissioner and former acting FTC chair.

Lauren Feiner, “FTC commissioners agree they should act to protect consumer privacy if Congress doesn’t,” *CNBC*, 20 April 2021, https://www.cnbc.com/2021/04/20/ftc-commissioners-agree-they-should-protect-consumer-privacy.html.

Expanding resources

Another theme of the hearing was about the need for greater resources at the FTC to pursue strong enforcement.

During the coronavirus pandemic, Slaughter said, the commission did see a brief dip in merger filings, but **they’ve since returned to record levels**. She said **March saw the second-highest number of merger filings in a month** at more than 300, following November’s record over more than 400 filings.

Even with a growing workload, the FTC has not been able to hire on more help. Slaughter said **employment** at the agency **has remained flat while merger filings are** at about **double the level as they were 10 years ago**.

“The absence of resources means that our enforcement decisions are harder,” she said. “If we think that we have a real case, a real law violation in front of us, but a settlement on the table that is maybe OK but doesn’t get the job done, **we have to make difficult decisions about whether it’s worth spending** a lot of **taxpayer dollars to** go **sue the companies who are going to come in with many, many law firms worth of attorneys and expensive economic experts**, versus taking that settlement.”

**FTC commissioners agree**

**Vittorio and Kern 9/29** – Andrea Vittorio is a tech reporter for Bloomberg Law. Rebecca Kern is a tech and cyber policy reporter for Bloomberg Government.

Andrea Vittorio and Rebecca Kern, “Past FTC Officials Back Resource Boost for Consumer Privacy Work,” *Bloomberg Law*, 29 September 2021, https://news.bloomberglaw.com/privacy-and-data-security/past-ftc-officials-back-resource-boost-for-consumer-privacy-work.

**Former F**ederal **T**rade **C**ommission **officials lined up behind a** Democrat **proposal** in Congress **to boost agency resources** for policing consumer privacy as **the tech industry’s collection and use of data outpaces enforcement.**

**The commission is underfunded and understaffed, especially when it comes to** having in-house technologists who can oversee companies’ data handling and their **compliance with agency enforcement orders**, said David Vladeck, a law professor at Georgetown University who previously directed the FTC’s consumer protection bureau.

“That’s an endemic problem, and it’s going to be an enduring problem unless Congress allocates more resources to the FTC,” Vladeck said Wednesday at a hearing held by the Senate Commerce, Science and Transportation Committee.

House Democrats have included a $1 billion proposal to create a new privacy bureau within the FTC as part of a budget reconciliation measure. A privacy bureau was also proposed in the latest privacy bill from Sen. Maria Cantwell (D-Wash.), who leads the Senate Commerce Committee.

**The FTC doesn’t have the resources or the expertise to “keep pace” with technology platforms** and protect consumers’ personal information, Cantwell said during the hearing.

**Court wins key to funding—squo ineffective enforcement diverts resources**

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, 20**20**, Antitrust’s Implementation Blind Side: Challenges to Major Expansion of U.S. Competition Policy, The Antitrust Bulletin 2020, Vol. 65(2) 227-255

In a striking number of instances, this pattern has emerged in discussions of antitrust policy.137 In current discussions about the future of the U.S. antitrust regime, advocates of fundamental reform sometimes portray the federal antitrust enforcement agencies as **decrepit**—perhaps to underscore the need for basic change.138 The proponents of root-and-branch transformation often suggest that only a complete makeover of the antitrust system will enable antitrust law to fulfill its intended role. The implication is that, because the antitrust system has **failed so miserably**, there are few, if any, positive lessons to be derived from experience since the retrenchment of U.S. policy began in the late 1970s, and certainly none since 2000.

This style of argument **has several potential costs**. One danger is that it overlooks genuine accomplishments and, in doing so, ignores experience that suggests how to build successful programs in the future. Consider three examples that deserve close study in building future cases that seek to expand the reach of the antitrust system. The first is the development of the FTC’s pharmaceutical and nonpharmaceutical health-care program from the mid-1970s forward; this initiative used the full range of the agency’s policy tools—cases, rules, reports, and advocacy—to change doctrine and alter business behavior.139 A second example is the FTC’s effort over the past two decades to restore the effectiveness of the quick look as an analytical tool in the wake of the Supreme Court’s decision in Federal Trade Commission v. California Dental Association. 140 A third example is the FTC’s successful litigation of three cases before the Supreme Court over the past decade.141

The programs that accounted for these results were **not accidental**. Each program began with a careful examination of the existing framework of doctrine and policy to identify desired areas of extension. **This stock-taking guided** the identification of potential candidates for cases and the application of other policy-making tools.142 Each program **built incrementally** upon the bipartisan contributions of agency leadership and the sustained commitment of staff across several presidential administrations headed by Democrats and Republicans.

If one assumes (as a number of reform proponents assert) that the FTC was a useless body in the modern era, there would be little purpose in studying these examples, or anything else it did, as there would be nothing useful to learn. The paint-it-black interpretation of modern antitrust history makes the costly error of tossing aside experience that might inform the successful implementation of new reforms.

A second notable cost of the catastrophe narrative, most **relevant to the discussion of human capital,** is its **demoralizing effect** on the agency’s existing managers and staff. To see one’s previous work portrayed **as substandard**, or worse, **tends not to inspire superior effort**. It breeds **cynicism** and **distrust**, where managers and staff understand that the critique badly distorts what they have done. Proponents of basic change must realize that the success of their program to expand antitrust intervention will require **major contributions** from **existing staff and managers**.

**The DOJ and FTC are already overstretched, but their prior resource allocation has proven they’ll move resources away from other less important teams**

**Kern 22** – tech policy reporter for POLITICO

Rebecca Kern, "Antitrust enforcers are drowning in mergers," POLITICO, 1-10-2022, https://www.politico.com/newsletters/morning-tech/2022/01/10/antitrust-enforcers-are-drowning-in-mergers-799773

FIRST IN MT: MORE LIKE A MERGER TSUNAMI — The **Federal Trade Commission** and **Justice Department** have been warning for months that a **surge** in merger filings has **stretched them thin**. They weren’t just grousing: In 2021, companies reported 4,130 mergers to the two agencies — **more than double** the number from the previous year, according to an analysis by the law firm White & Case. In December alone, businesses reported 285 mergers, dwarfing any previous December figure since 2011 (even though December often sees a surge, as companies seek to wrap up deals by the end of the calendar year).

[[Figure omitted]]

The **flood of deals** has forced the agencies to **devote** more of their already scarce **resources** to them. **The FTC has moved some attorneys focused on policy and international affairs**, for example, **to help with merger review**. Under law, the FTC and DOJ only have 30 days to decide whether a deal warrants a more in-depth probe, an added time pressure.