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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---T-Prohibitions

#### We meet—changing plaintiff’s burden increases “scope”

Orbach, Professor of Law and the Director of the Business Law Program, the University of Arizona College of Law, ‘15

(Barak, “The Durability of Formalism in Antitrust,” 100 Iowa L. Rev. 2197)

In other dimensions, the Supreme Court has developed formalistic rules and categories. For example, in the late 1970s, when the Court started blurring the distinction between per se and rule of reason, it also introduced the “direct purchaser” doctrine as a standing requirement. This rule bars indirect purchasers from bringing antitrust lawsuits, regardless of the circumstances. Also in the late 1970s, the Court began drawing a categorical distinction between horizontal and vertical restraints. The distinction is exceptionally important for the understanding of economic relationships but it does not necessarily define competitive effects as some suggested. Likewise, since the late 1970s, the Supreme Court has been using procedure—namely by applying formalism—to narrow the scope of antitrust through rules that disfavor plaintiffs.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 2AC---Multi-Side CP

#### Perm do both shields---implied immunity means the aff wouldn’t apply in instances that the counterplan covers

Kobayashi & Wright 20 – Paige V. and Henry N. Butler Chair in Law and Economics at the Antonin Scalia Law School at George Mason; University Professor and the Executive Director of the Global Antitrust Institute at Scalia Law School at George Mason University, holds a courtesy appointment in the Department of Economics, former Commissioner at the Federal Trade Commission

Bruce H. Kobayashi, Joshua D. Wright, “Antitrust and Ex-Ante Sector Regulation,” Report on the Digital Economy, Section III, Global Antitrust Institute, 2020, https://gaidigitalreport.com/2020/10/04/ex-ante-regulation-versus-ex-post-antitrust-enforcement/#\_ftn29

Conclusion

Using ex-ante regulation to replace inefficient and ineffective ex-post litigation based antitrust is a familiar refrain for those interested in regulating large technology firms. But the narrative that antitrust is either solely or predominantly based on ex-post litigation is a false narrative, as both the current antitrust laws and its institutions incorporate many of the features that reformers put forth as ex-ante regulation. As a matter of optimal regulatory design, this is not surprising, as a true ex-ante approach will incorporate both approaches.

In the U.S., the Supreme Court has expanded its implied immunity and related common law limits on the use of the antitrust laws in response to the potential costs of inconsistent and overlapping regulation. This forces an ex-ante choice between antitrust and sector specific regulation when addressing specific problems associated with regulated industries. We suggest the ex-ante choice between antitrust and sector regulation be made based on the comparative institutional advantage of each approach, and that such an approach will result in the allocation of duties to deal and price setting to sector specific regulators. Because both approaches are imperfect vehicles for controlling competition, both the initial allocation between antitrust and regulation and the choice to regulate in the first place should be undertaken with caution, and expected to involve a long, slow, and costly evolution towards a more efficient system of antitrust and regulation.

#### Antitrust key—ex ante enforcement/regulation is extremely dangerous in platform markets—ex post litigation minimizes costs

Shelanski, JD, PhD, Professor @ the Georgetown University Law Center, Partner, Davis Polk & Wardell, former ORIA Administrator, former FCC Chief Economist, former Director of the FTC Bureau of Economics, ‘13

(Howard, “Information, Innovation, and Competition Policy For The Internet,” University of Pennsylvania Law Review, May 2013, Vol. 161, No. 6)

Competition enforcers could adopt a number of approaches to these mixed results depending on whether the changes are on balance more beneficial than harmful, or depending on whether the harms are intentional or not. Both inquiries, however, run the risk of calling into question company's best judgment about how to engineer its own products. Finding that an innovation—say a new proprietary interface or product integration is anticompetitive because the value of the innovation to consumers deemed ex post to be outweighed by the costs of competitive exclusion cause firms to hesitate to make beneficial product changes. Knowing the firm could be punished for the effects the innovation has on rivals if the innovation does not turn out well (or perhaps turns out too well for compet itors' tastes), the firm will raise the required ex ante probability of success and undertake fewer R&D efforts. Similarly, punishing a firm that has or mixed motives for undertaking innovation might harm consumers deterring product changes that benefit consumers despite the firm's partly anticompetitive motives.

Absent compelling evidence, then, caution and modesty in enforcement are warranted in this area. This prescription comes not from a glib hope that competition or innovation will somehow eradicate any harm, but from risk that intervention is as likely to make things worse as to make things better. Some have advocated for a government regulatory body to evaluate search algorithms and other intermediary behavior on the Internet.112 There are compelling reasons to be very skeptical of interposing such a government review process into the ongoing and demanding process of private innovation. Algorithms change quickly and must adapt to gaming manipulation by those seeking to profit from online search.113 Regulators are certain to know less about a new technology than those who invent work with it daily. Moreover, regulatory processes and related litigation will inevitably become part of rivals' competitive strategy, distracting resources from competition and innovation in the marketplace. A much better course is for government to give a wide berth to innovation, even where the firm's intentions may not seem benevolent and where the conduct may appear harm competition at the same time that it benefits consumers. And where there is a compelling case for harm, ex post intervention on a case-by-case basis through antitrust law is preferable to general regulation in this context.

This wide berth does not, however, mean we should abandon enforcment or place all purportedly innovative conduct beyond the reach of antitrust law. Microsoft 7/114 gave significant deference to product innovation and integration, but clearly left open the door to a finding that such activity was a ruse or pretext for anticompetitive exclusion. It allowed for antitrust liability where a product innovation was not in some way different and better than what a consumer could do for himself, thereby preserving anticompetitive tying as a possible claim against a software platform.115

Generalizing from the Microsoft II decision, where innovation was clearly a pretext for harming rivals or for deterring rival innovation, competition enforcement should be available. Two kinds of conduct which digital platforms have been accused of undertaking would appear to harm innovation without constituting legitimate innovation: raising rivals' costs and forced free riding.

#### Regulatory programs cannot address all platform conduct

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)

If action is needed, the alternative to antitrust is some form of regulation. But broad regulation is ill-suited for digital platforms because they are so disparate. By contrast, regulation in industries such as air travel, electric power, and telecommunications targets firms with common technologies and similar market relationships. This is not the case, however, with the four major digital platforms that have drawn so much media and political attention—namely, Amazon, Apple, Facebook, and Google. These platforms have different inputs. They sell different products, albeit with some overlap, and only some of these products are digital. They deal with customers and diverse sets of third parties in different ways. What they have in common is that they are very large and that a sizeable portion of their operating technology is digital. To be sure, increased regulatory oversight of individual aspects of their business—such as advertising, acquisitions, or control of information—is possible and likely even desirable. But the core of their business models should be governed by the antitrust laws.

This Article argues that sustainable competition in platform markets is possible for most aspects of their business. As a result, the less intrusive and more individualized approach of the antitrust laws is better for consumers, input suppliers, and most other affected interest groups than broad-brush regulation. It will be less likely to reduce product or service quality, limit innovation, or reduce output. Where antitrust law applies, federal judges should be given a chance to apply the law.

#### If they try to, it’s too broad and harms innovation

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)

Few platforms are natural monopolies. If the market contains room for competition among multiple incumbent firms, regulation is usually a poor alternative. 70 It rarely comes close to mimicking competitive behavior. Regulation necessarily generalizes and applies the same rules to several firms in an area, while antitrust requires a fact-specific inquiry for each firm. This is particularly important if the firms in question are quite diverse.

Regulation also entrenches existing technologies and, in doing so, bolsters existing incumbents. For example, the Federal Communications Commission’s (FCC) longstanding willingness to protect AT&T’s dominant position from all rivals very likely held back innovation in telecommunications for decades.71 Of course, proper regulatory design might mitigate this. But if viable and robust competitive alternatives are available, regulation usually is not the best answer.

#### New agency is a disaster—capture completely undermines solvency

Childson, former chief technologist at the FTC, ‘19

(Neil, “Creating a new federal agency to regulate Big Tech would be a disaster,” October 30, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2019/10/30/creating-new-federal-agency-regulate-big-tech-would-be-disaster/>)

On its face, a single expert agency, laser-focused on one set of problems, sounds sensible. But history shows that such industry-specific agencies are most susceptible to “regulatory capture,” a term used to describe when an institution is dominated by the industry they are charged with overseeing — for example, when a state board that sets the rules for the practice of dentistry is dominated by practicing dentists.

The idea was popularized by the Stigler Center’s namesake, Nobel economist George Stigler, who argued that “regulation is acquired by the industry and is designed and operated primarily for its benefit.” In his foundational paper “The Theory of Economic Regulation,” Stigler warned that any regulated industry has strong incentives to form close connections with its regulators to seek favors. The inevitable result, he argues, is that industries disproportionately influence the agency’s agenda, shape its rulemaking and even supply it with personnel.

Companies find it much easier to influence narrowly focused institutions than institutions with broader law enforcement mandates. Where the latter hear from a wide range of companies with a variety of concerns, the former hear only from one type of company. Think about how much easier it is to talk your way out of a speeding ticket from the local police officer, who knows your family, than it is to deal with an effectively anonymous city cop who pulls over dozens of drivers a day. Similarly, big companies would much rather deal with a select group of bureaucrats whom they know well — and who hear only their perspective most of the time.

Captured agencies don’t hold companies accountable; instead, they act to benefit the industry’s established players, disadvantaging newer firms and the public at large. In worst-case scenarios, such agencies can block new, disruptive competitors that threaten the established, regulated industry.

The recent report from the Stigler Center holds up the Federal Communications Commission as an example of what a new Digital Authority could look like. But the FCC is a perfect example of the likely problems of an industry-specific regulator. At nearly every turn, with every new potentially disruptive communications innovation, the FCC (and its predecessor, the Federal Radio Commission) did the bidding of the best-connected incumbents. As former FCC chairman Michael Powell said, “[T]he history of the FCC is, when something happens that it doesn’t understand, kill it. We tried to kill cable. We tried to kill long-distance. When [MCI founder] Bill McGowan start[ed] stringing out microwave towers that threatened AT&T, the FCC tried to stop him. The FCC tried to kill cable because it was going to threaten broadcasting.” While it didn’t halt technological progress or competition, it often slowed it, occasionally by decades.

#### 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.

#### 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**.

#### Military AI ushers in the erosion of conventional deterrence – developing it is necessary to prevent great power wars.

Brose ’19 – Senior Fellow at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace [Christian; Senior Fellow at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace; 2019; "The New Revolution in Military Affairs"; Foreign Affairs; <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/2019-04-16/new-revolution-military-affairs>]

The idea of a future military revolution became discredited amid nearly two decades of war after 2001 and has been further damaged by reductions in defense spending since 2011. But along the way, the United States has also **squandered** hundreds of **billions** of dollars trying to modernize in the **wrong ways**. Instead of thinking systematically about buying faster, more **effective kill chains** that could be built now, Washington poured **money** into **newer versions** of **old military platforms** and **prayed** for **technological miracles** to come (which often became acquisition debacles when those miracles did not materialize). The result is that U.S. battle networks are not nearly as **fast** or **effective** as they have appeared while the United States has been fighting lesser opponents for almost three decades.

Yet if ever there were a time to **get serious** about the coming revolution in **military affairs**, it is **now**. There is an emerging consensus that the United States' top **defense-planning priority** should be **contending** with **great powers** with **advanced militaries**, primarily **China**, and that **new technologies**, once intriguing but speculative, are now both **real** and **essential** to **future military advantage**. Senior military leaders and defense experts are also starting to agree, albeit belatedly, that when it comes to these threats, the United States is **falling dangerously behind**.

This reality demands more than a revolution in technology; it requires a revolution in thinking. And that thinking must focus more on how the U.S. military fights than with what it fights. The problem is not **insufficient spending** on defense; it is that the U.S. military is being countered by **rivals** with **superior strategies**. The United States, in other words, is playing a **losing game**. The question, accordingly, is not how **new technologies** can improve the U.S. military's ability to do what it already does but how they can enable it to operate in **new ways**. If American defense officials do not answer that question, there will still be a **revolution in military affairs**. But it will primarily **benefit others**.

It is still possible for the United States to adapt and succeed, but the scale of change required is enormous. The **traditional model** of U.S. **military power** is being **disrupted**, the way Blockbuster's business model was amid the rise of Amazon and Netflix. A military made up of **small numbers** of **large**, **expensive**, **heavily manned**, and **hard-to replace** systems will not **survive** on **future battlefields**, where swarms of **intelligent machines** will deliver violence at a **greater volume** and **higher velocity** than **ever before**. Success will require a **different kind of military**, one built around **large numbers** of **small**, **inexpensive**, **expendable**, and **highly autonomous** systems. The United States has the money, human capital, and technology to assemble that kind of military. The question is whether it has the imagination and the resolve.

NEW TECHNOLOGIES, OLD PROBLEMS

**Artificial intelligence** and other emerging technologies will change the way **war is fought**, but they will not change its nature. Whether it involves longbows or source code, war will always be violent, politically motivated, and composed of the same three elemental functions that new recruits learn in basic training: move, shoot, and communicate.

Movement in warfare entails hiding and seeking (attackers try to evade detection; defenders try to detect them) and penetrating and repelling (attackers try to enter opponents’ space; defenders try to deny them access). But in a world that is becoming one giant sensor, hiding and penetrating—never easy in warfare—will be far more difficult, if not impossible. The amount of data generated by networked devices, the so-called Internet of Things, is on pace to triple between 2016 and 2021. More significant, the proliferation of low-cost, commercial sensors that can detect more things more clearly over greater distances is already providing more real-time global surveillance than has existed at any time in history. This is especially true in space. In the past, the high costs of launching satellites required them to be large, expensive, and designed to orbit for decades. But as access to space gets cheaper, satellites are becoming more like mobile phones—mass-produced devices that are used for a few years and then replaced. Commercial space companies are already fielding hundreds of small, cheap satellites. Soon, there will be thousands of such satellites, providing an unblinking eye over the entire world. Stealth technology is living on borrowed time.

On top of all of that, quantum sensors—which use the bizarre properties of subatomic particles, such as their ability to be in two different places at once—will eventually be able detect disruptions in the environment, such as the displacement of air around aircraft or water around submarines. Quantum sensors will likely be the first usable application of quantum science, and this technology is still many years off. But once quantum sensors are fielded, there will be nowhere to hide.

The future of movement will also be characterized by a return of mass to the battlefield, after many decades in which the trend was moving in the opposite direction—toward an emphasis on quality over quantity—as technology is enabling more systems to get in motion and stay in motion in more places. Ubiquitous sensors will generate exponentially greater quantities of data, which in turn will drive both the development and the deployment of artificial intelligence. As machines become more autonomous, militaries will be able to field more of them in smaller sizes and at lower costs. New developments in power generation and storage and in hypersonic propulsion will allow these smaller systems to travel farther and faster than ever. Where once there was one destroyer, for example, the near future could see dozens of autonomous vessels that are similar to missile barges, ready to strike as targets emerge.

Technology will also transform how those systems remain in motion. Logistics—the ability to supply forces with food, fuel, and replacements—has traditionally been the limiting factor in war. But autonomous militaries will need less fuel and no food. Advanced manufacturing methods, such as 3-D printing, will reduce the need for vast, risky, and expensive military logistics networks by enabling the production of complicated goods at the point of demand quickly, cheaply, and easily.

In an even more profound change, space will emerge as its own domain of maneuver warfare. So far, the near impossibility of refueling spacecraft has largely limited them to orbiting the earth. But as it becomes feasible to not just refuel spacecraft midflight but also build and service satellites in space, process data in orbit, and capture resources and energy in space for use in space (for example, by using vast solar arrays or mining asteroids), space operations will become less dependent on earth. Spacecraft will be able to maneuver and fight, and the first orbital weapons could enter the battlefield. The technology to do much of this exists already.

THE MILITARIES OF TOMORROW

Technology will also radically alter how militaries shoot, both literally and figuratively. Cyberattacks, communication jamming, electronic warfare, and other attacks on a system’s software will become as important as those that target a system’s hardware, if not more so. The rate of fire, or how fast weapons can shoot, will accelerate rapidly thanks to new technologies such as lasers, high-powered microwaves, and other directed-energy weapons. But what will really increase the rate of fire are intelligent systems that will radically reduce the time between when targets can be identified and when they can be attacked. A harbinger of this much nastier future battlefield has played out in Ukraine since 2014, where Russia has shortened to mere minutes the time between when their spotter drones first detect Ukrainian forces and when their precision rocket artillery wipes those forces off the map.

The militaries of the future will also be able to shoot farther than those of today. Eventually, hypersonic munitions (weapons that travel at more than five times the speed of sound) and space-based weapons will be able to strike targets anywhere in the world nearly instantly. Militaries will be able to attack domains once assumed to be sanctuaries, such as space and logistics networks. There will be no rear areas or safe havens anymore. Swarms of autonomous systems will not only be able to find targets everywhere; they will also be able to shoot them accurately. The ability to have both quantity and quality in military systems will have devastating effects, especially as technology makes lethal payloads smaller.

Finally, the way militaries communicate will change drastically. Traditional communications networks—hub-and-spoke structures with vulnerable single points of failure—will not survive. Instead, technology will push vital communications functions to the edge of the network. Every autonomous system will be able to process and make sense of the information it gathers on its own, without relying on a command hub. This will enable the creation of radically distributed networks that are resilient and reconfigurable.

Technology is also inverting the current paradigm of command and control. Today, even a supposedly unmanned system requires dozens of people to operate it remotely, maintain it, and process the data it collects. But as systems become more autonomous, one person will be able to operate larger numbers of them single-handedly. The opening ceremonies of the 2018 Winter Olympics, in South Korea, offered a preview of this technology when 1,218 autonomous drones equipped with lights collaborated to form intricate pictures in the night sky over Pyeongchang. Now imagine similar autonomous systems being used, for example, to overwhelm an aircraft carrier and render it inoperable.

Further afield, other technologies will change military communications. Information networks based on 5G technology will be capable of moving vastly larger amounts of data at significantly faster speeds. Similarly, the same quantum science that will improve military sensors will transform communications and computing. Quantum computing—the ability to use the abnormal properties of subatomic particles to exponentially increase processing power—will make possible encryption methods that could be unbreakable, as well as give militaries the power to process volumes of data and solve classes of problems that exceed the capacity of classical computers. More incredible still, so-called brain-computer interface technology is already enabling human beings to control complicated systems, such as robotic prosthetics and even unmanned aircraft, with their neural signals. Put simply, it is becoming possible for a human operator to control multiple drones simply by thinking of what they want those systems to do.

Put together, all these technologies will displace decades-old, even centuries-old, assumptions about how militaries operate. The militaries that embrace and adapt to these technologies will dominate those that do not. In that regard, the U.S. military is in big trouble.

A LOSING GAME

Since the end of the **Cold War**, the United States' approach to **projecting military force** against regional powers has rested on a series of **assumptions** about how conflicts **will unfold**. The U.S. military assumes that its forces will be able to move **unimpeded** into forward positions and that it will be able to **commence hostilities** at a time of **its choosing**. It assumes that its forces will operate in **permissive environments**-that adversaries will be **unable to contest** its **freedom of movement** in any domain. It assumes that **any quantitative advantage** that an adversary may possess will be **overcome** by its own **superior ability** to **evade** detection, **penetrate** enemy defenses, and **strike targets**. And it assumes that U.S. forces will suffer **few losses** in combat.

These **assumptions** have led to a force built around relatively **small numbers** of **large**, **expensive**, and **hard-to-replace** systems that are optimized for moving undetected close to their targets, shooting a limited number of times but with extreme precision, and communicating with impunity. Think stealth aircraft flying right into downtown Belgrade or Baghdad. What's more, systems such as these depend on **communications**, **logistics**, and **satellite networks** that are almost **entirely defenseless**, because they were designed under the **premise** that no adversary would ever be able to **attack them.**

This military enterprise and its underlying suppositions are being called into question. For the past two decades, while the United States has focused on **fighting wars** in the **Middle East**, its competitors-especially **China**, but also **Russia**-have been dissecting its way of war and **developing** so-called anti-access/area-denial (or A2/AD) capabilities to **detect U.S. systems** in **every domain** and **overwhelm them** with large salvos of precision fire. Put simply, U.S. rivals are fielding **large quantities** of **multimillion-dollar weapons** to destroy the United States' **multibillion-dollar military** systems.

China has also begun work on **megaprojects** designed to **position it** as the **world leader** in **artificial intelligence** and other advanced technologies. This undertaking is not exclusively military in its focus, but every one of these **advanced-technology megaprojects** has **military applications** and benefits the **People's Liberation Army** under the doctrine of "**military-civil fusion**." Whereas the U.S. military still largely treats its data like engine exhaust-a **useless byproduct**-China is moving with **authoritarian zeal** to stockpile its data like **oil**, so that it can power the **autonomous** and **intelligent** military systems it sees as **critical** to **dominance** in **future warfare**.

The United States' position, **already dire**, is **rapidly deteriorating**. As a 2017 report from the rand Corporation concluded, "U.S. forces could, under plausible assumptions, lose the **next war** they are **called upon to fight**." That same year, General Joseph Dunford, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, sounded the alarm in stark terms: "In **just a few years**, if we do not **change** the **trajectory**, we will **lose** our qualitative and quantitative **competitive advantage**."

The **greatest danger** for the United States is the **erosion of conventional deterrence**. If leaders in **Beijing** or **Moscow** think that they might **win a war** against the United States, they will run **greater risks** and **press their advantage**. They will take actions that steadily undermine the United States' commitments to its allies by casting doubt on whether Washington would really send its military to defend the Baltics, the Philippines, Taiwan, or even Japan or South Korea. They will try to **get their way** through **any means necessary**, from coercive diplomacy and economic extortion to meddling in the domestic affairs of other countries. And they will steadily harden their **spheres of influence**, turning them into areas ever more **hospitable** to **authoritarian ideology**, **surveillance states**, and **crony capitalism**. In other words, they will try, as the military strategist Sun-tzu recommended, to "win without fighting."

### 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.

## 1AR

### T

**Increase means to make larger.**

**MacMillan ND**

“increase definitions and synonyms,” MacMillan Dictionary, https://www.macmillandictionary.com/us/dictionary/american/increase\_1

TRANSITIVE to **make something become larger** in **amount** or **number**

We have managed to increase the number of patients treated.

Sunbathing increases your risk of getting skin cancer.

**We INCREASE what is BANNED. Undermining consumer welfare on ONE side of the platform is now ILLEGAL.**

**Hovenkamp 20** --- James G. Dinan University Professor, University of Pennsylvania Carey Law School and The Wharton School.

Herbert, 1-17-2020, "Herbert Hovenkamp ‘Platforms and the Rule of Reason: The American Express Case’ (2019) Columbia Business Law Review, 1 34," Antitrust Digest by Pedro Caro de Sousa, https://antitrustdigest.net/herbert-hovenkamp-platforms-and-the-rule-of-reason-the-american-express-case-2019-columbia-business-law-review-1-34/

This links to the author’s criticism of the market definition. The majority places production complements (i.e. the **two sides** of the platform) **into the same market**, simply because making a deal requires both. This jettisons economically coherent conceptions of the relevant market as a group of substitute goods or services. Superior techniques exist for evaluating the pricing relationship among substitutes and complements, and their effects on market power that do not require abandonment of sensible economics, as the court has done.

In any event, market definition and market share are only the starting points in the analysis of market power by indirect measures. If there is direct evidence of anticompetitive effects – as there was here – no market definition may even be required. However, if one is to look at market definition, the way to go about is to identify substitutes – not complements such as card user and merchant services. Even if the presence of a **second market** side may affect the ability of the first side to exercise market power – as with complements – no part of that determination requires a conclusion that the **second side is in the same market** where market power is being exercised.

This leads to the appropriate means to identify anticompetitive harm. No one denies that properly conducted **antitrust law** already requires analysis of **two sides** in cases of vertical interbrand restraints, including the tying of complementary products. However, this does not require – and **has never required** – anything as economically incoherent as **putting them into the same relevant market**. The law of tying and exclusive dealing both assess competitive effects by examining power in a primary market and foreclosure in a secondary market. Typically, as in Amex, the two products are complements. It is true that the Amex majority concluded that the two sides of the transaction were not complements because they were not purchased by the same buyers; their mistake is that the two sides were clearly complements in production, i.e. goods or services that are produced together, such as oil and natural gas, lumber and sawdust, or voice services and messaging services.

**Previously, conduct harming consumers on one side would have been sufficient to violate Sherman. Now, because of Amex, it only applies to conduct on two sides. That means our AFF makes currently legal conduct ILLEGAL.**

**Hovenkamp 20** --- James G. Dinan University Professor, University of Pennsylvania Carey Law School and The Wharton School.

Herbert, 1-17-2020, "Herbert Hovenkamp ‘Platforms and the Rule of Reason: The American Express Case’ (2019) Columbia Business Law Review, 1 34," Antitrust Digest by Pedro Caro de Sousa, https://antitrustdigest.net/herbert-hovenkamp-platforms-and-the-rule-of-reason-the-american-express-case-2019-columbia-business-law-review-1-34/

In conclusion, stated **in rule of reason terms**, the question was whether the plaintiff had presented enough evidence of competitive harm to require the defendant to offer a defence. The **harms were clear**: cardholders were denied an opportunity to obtain **lower prices**, and merchants were denied the opportunity for a less costly transaction. From a **consumer welfare perspective**, the directly affected **consumers were worse off**, as well as other consumers who were forced to pay higher product prices regardless of the form of payment they chose. While Amex itself benefitted by preserving the transaction to its own system, this was at best a wealth transfer from whatever payment method or platform lost the transaction.

The paper closes with a discussion of what are the implications of this decision for the future.

Grouping **both sides** of a platform into a **single relevant market** in cases such as this may be economic nonsense, but it is **now the law.** The Supreme Court held that not every two-sided platform qualified for its unique approach, but noted that transactional platforms in which there is a simultaneous one-to-one correspondence between the transactions on one side of the platform and those on the other side are “different”.

**Doctrines regarding plaintiff’s burden control scope of the Sherman Act**

**Orbach**, Professor of Law and the Director of the Business Law Program, the University of Arizona College of Law, **‘15**

(Barak, “The Durability of Formalism in Antitrust,” 100 Iowa L. Rev. 2197)

When addressing substantive questions, courts often use presumptions and rules that answer factual inquiries and economize the need to examine actual circumstances. For example, under present law, price fixing is **illegal per se**, a price squeeze is practically per se legal, and market share often defines monopoly power or lack thereof. Such doctrines are adopted when the Supreme Court believes that circumstances are “always or almost always” irrelevant. When beliefs of this kind are imprecise—and historically many such beliefs turned out to be flawed—doctrines addressing substantive antitrust issues establish poor policies.

Past concerns regarding vertical price and nonprice restraints are a prime example of beliefs that shaped formalism and their abandonment, which led to relaxation of that formalism. But the relaxation of per se bans on vertical restraints (formalistic rules) was facilitated through the adoption of a formalistic distinction between vertical and horizontal restraints. Another example of troubled formalism is the Supreme Court’s section 2 jurisprudence in recent decades. Heavily influenced by outdated economic theories and beliefs, in recent decades the **Supreme Court developed several doctrines that considerably narrowed the scope of section 2 of the Sherman Act.** These doctrines are likely to evolve and allow courts greater discretion when they consider exclusion claims.

**---AT: “ROR Not T”**

**The text of the Sherman Act prohibits practices that restrain trade. But, WHAT restrains trade is determined by the COURTS through the Rule of Reason. This arrangement was the EXPLICIT intent of Congress AND is the only way that the Sherman Act retains coherency.**

**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**.

**3---Most anti-trust literature is centered around legal tests. It’s the single job of courts in antitrust cases**

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

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

That courts craft Section 2 legal tests to minimize expected legal pro- cess and error costs is not just evident from comparing different Section 2 legal tests on the spectrum; **it is also *expressly* the task in which antitrust courts are engaged**. This is well illustrated by Trinko.88 The Trinko Court did not stop upon concluding that plaintiffs refusal-to-deal claim "does not fit within the limited exception [s]" to the principle that a monopolist generally has no duty to deal.89 The Court further assessed whether "**traditional antitrust principles** justify **adding the present case to the few existing exceptions** from the proposition that there is no duty to aid competitors."90

### Agency Tradeoff DA

**Policies collectively signal sea change.**

**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/>)

These and other policies in the Order are significant in their own right. But perhaps **more than any concrete policy**, the Order demands attention because it suggests the Biden administration envisions an **antitrust sea change** and is willing to rethink long-settled principles of U.S. competition law.

Aggressive New Leadership at DOJ

To implement these **bold new policies,** President Biden on July 20 nominated Jonathan Kanter to lead DOJ’s Antitrust Division. The White House touts Kanter as a “leading advocate” in the effort to promote “strong and meaningful antitrust enforcement.” If confirmed by the Senate, he is widely expected to be active and progressive at the helm of DOJ’s Antitrust Division.

Kanter is known as a **particularly vocal critic of Big Tech**. A former co-chair of the antitrust practice at Paul Weiss, Kanter left to found **his own “antitrust advocacy boutique**” after some of his clients—which include many rivals and critics of the big technology companies—created conflicts at his old firm.

Kanter’s past statements suggest a generally **aggressive** and **creative enforcement approach**. He is on record stating that antitrust enforcement “serves an important deterrent value, and the more it’s enforced and the more companies are understanding of where the boundaries lie, that deterrent has meaning.” He has also argued for **rethinking merger enforcement policy** in light of the realities of modern markets.

**Enforcement is inevitable and immediate—only question is whether it is effective**

**Farrington**, JD, antitrust partner @ White & Case, **‘21**

(Rebecca, “US dealmaking braces for more challenging antitrust environment,” July 30, <https://www.whitecase.com/publications/insight/us-ma-2021/us-dealmaking-antitrust>)

President Joe **Biden has made antitrust enforcement a policy priority** for his administration, with **stricter oversight** of the US’s large **technology companies** among his policy priorities.

Biden named Lina Khan, an antitrust academic and **prominent critic of Big Tech,** as Federal Trade Commission (FTC) chair and appointed Tim Wu, a Columbia University law professor and **also a Big Tech critic**, to the National Economic Council as a special assistant to the president for technology and competition policy.

A proactive approach

These appointments signal the White House's intention to take a **more proactive approach to antitrust enforcement**, with a focus on the technology sector.

**Tighter scrutiny** of the technology industry is an issue that precedes the Biden administration, with the Department of Justice and FTC launching antitrust lawsuits against Google and Facebook during the Trump administration. These efforts are expected to **continue**, and **may see the scope expanded**, under the Biden administration.

Legislative changes

In addition to the Biden administration's appointments, **Congress is considering five antitrust bills** with **bipartisan support** that could lead to additional scrutiny of larger technology businesses.

These legislative efforts are still nascent and should be watched carefully as they develop, both for their focus on merger enforcement and on practices by businesses deemed to be dominant.

Slow but certain impact

Many of these initiatives from the White House and Congress may take time for the impact to be felt, **but the scrutiny on technology transactions will likely be more immediate**, adding **complexities** for technology companies considering transactions in this **new environment of enhanced enforcement**.

**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.