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## Theory

Interp: teams should be allowed to tell other teams what they went for in past rounds in check in during the rounds

We have never done college debate and neither of us did the wiki for our teams. We had this conversation with our coach earlier we are going to learn how to disclose negative arguments later today. Our varsity debaters had to help us with the aff disclosure. Our wiki was also not working before the round and we told them that.

Were really sorry- we told you past 2nrs and you could have asked for all neg arguments we have run if you really wanted to know.

## T sectors

#### Interpretation -- ‘Core antitrust laws’ are economy-wide.

Gerber ’20 [David; October; Distinguished Professor of Law at Chicago-Kent College of Law, Illinois Institute of Technology; Oxford Scholarship Online, Competition Law and Antitrust, “What is It? Competition Law’s Veiled Identity,” Ch. 1, p. 14-15]

C. A Core Definition

The Guide uses the terms “competition law” and “antitrust law” to refer to a general domain of law whose object is to deter private restraints on competitive conduct. We look more closely at the terms:

1. “General”—The laws included are those that are applicable throughout an economy and thereby provide a framework for all market operations (there are always some exempted sectors). Laws dealing only with specific markets (e.g., telecommunication) do not play that role.

2. “Domain of Law” here refers to a politically authorized set of norms and the institutional arrangements used to enforce them.

Is it law—or is it policy? The relationship between “competition law” and “competition policy” is not always clear. Often the terms are used interchangeably, but there can be important differences between them. Both can refer to norms used to combat restraints on competition, but they represent two different ways of looking at the relevant laws, and the differences can influence how norms are interpreted and applied. “Law” implies that established methods of interpretation are used to interpret and apply the norms and that established procedures are the sole or primary means of enforcing and changing the norms. In this view, the norms are a relatively stable component of a legal system. Thinking of those same norms as “policy,” on the other hand, implies that they are a tool of whatever government is in power and that it can use and modify them as it wishes.

3. “Restraint” refers to any limitation imposed by one or more private actors that reduces the intensity of competition in a market.

4. “Competition” refers to a process by which firms in a market seek to maximize their profits by exploiting market opportunities more effectively than other firms in the market.

#### Violation – the Aff is limited to a single sector

#### Reasons to prefer

#### Limits – This topic is already massive and this deals the death blow to negative research burden – Negs are forced to play an unwinnable game of whack-a-mole as affirmatives jump from sector to sector each debate.

#### Ground – They avoid key debates about the broader role of antitrust in the economy. Justifies a race to the margin as Affs carve out insulated niches within antitrust law.

## T prohibitions

#### Interpretation

#### Increase means to make something greater than it exists as currently – it adds to what is pre-existing

Buckley 06 (Jeremiah, Legal Counsel. Amicus Curiae Brief, Safeco Ins. Co. of America et al v. Charles Burr et al, <http://supreme.lp.findlaw.com/supreme_court/briefs/06-84/06-84.mer.ami.mica.pdf>)

First, the court said that the ordinary meaning of the word “increase” is “to make something greater,” which it believed should not “be limited to cases in which a company raises the rate that an individual has previously been charged.” 435 F.3d at 1091. Yet the definition offered by the Ninth Circuit compels the opposite conclusion. Because “increase” means “to make something greater,” there must necessarily have been an existing premium, to which Edo’s actual premium may be compared, to determine whether an “increase” occurred. Congress could have provided that “ad-verse action” in the insurance context means charging an amount greater than the optimal premium, but instead chose to define adverse action in terms of an “increase.” That def-initional choice must be respected, not ignored. See Colautti v. Franklin, 439 U.S. 379, 392-93 n.10 (1979) (“[a] defin-ition which declares what a term ‘means’ . . . excludes any meaning that is not stated”).

Next, the Ninth Circuit reasoned that because the Insurance Prong includes the words “existing or applied for,” Congress intended that an “increase in any charge” for insurance must “apply to all insurance transactions – from an initial policy of insurance to a renewal of a long-held policy.” 435 F.3d at 1091. This interpretation reads the words “exist-ing or applied for” in isolation. Other types of adverse action described in the Insurance Prong apply only to situations where a consumer had an existing policy of insurance, such as a “cancellation,” “reduction,” or “change” in insurance. Each of these forms of adverse action presupposes an already-existing policy, and under usual canons of statutory construction the term “increase” also should be construed to apply to increases of an already-existing policy. See Hibbs v. Winn, 542 U.S. 88, 101 (2004) (“a phrase gathers meaning from the words around it”) (citation omitted).

#### Prohibition is a law or order forbidding an action –

Oxford Languages Dictionary No Date (https://languages.oup.com/google-dictionary-en/)

Prohibition n. forbidding an act or activity. A court order forbidding an act is a writ of prohibition, an injunction, or a writ of mandate (mandamus) if against a public official.

#### Anti-competitive business practices are those practices that do harm to businesses or consumers – the affirmative had to add something to the list

Gibbs Law Group No Date (Anticompetitive Practices. https://www.classlawgroup.com/antitrust/unlawful-practices/)

Federal and state antitrust laws prohibit anticompetitive behavior and unfair business practices that harm other businesses and consumers.

Examples of these unlawful, anticompetitive practices include:

Price Fixing – an agreement among competitors to raise, fix, or otherwise maintain the price at which their goods or services are sold.

Pay-for-Delay – an agreement between a brand drug manufacturer and a would-be generic competitor to delay the release of a generic version of the branded drug, depriving consumers of lower-priced generics.

Bid-Rigging – competitors agree in advance who will submit the winning bid during a competitive bidding process. As with price fixing, it is not necessary that all bidders participate in the conspiracy.

Monopolization – one or more persons or companies totally dominates an economic market.

Unfair Competition – an attempt to gain unfair competitive advantage through false, fraudulent, or unethical commercial conduct.

Market Division – an agreement between competitors not to compete within each other’s geographic territories.

Group Boycotts – two or more competitors agree not to do business with a specific person or company.

Exclusive Dealing Arrangements – an agreement that a buyer will only buy exclusively from the supplier.

Price Discrimination – charging different prices to similarly situated buyers. Certain types of price discrimination may be illegal under the Robinson-Patman Act.

Tying – when a company makes the purchase of an item conditioned on buying a second item.

#### Violation – The rez requires the affirmative to substantively add to antitrust law, not just broaden enforcement of whats already on the books - Plan just applies existing antitrust law – that doesn’t increase prohibitions or expand the scope of core antitrust law

#### Cross apply standards from t sectors- Vote neg

## Business confidence da

#### Plan creates an abrupt shift and doctrinal instability in antitrust that spills over throughout the economy—it’s impossible to distinguish specific industries because it’s enforced in generalist common law

Rogerson 20 (William, Charles E. and Emma H. Morrison Professor of Economics at Northwestern University, Ph.D. in Social Sciences from the California Institute of Technology, and Dr. Howard Shelanski, Ph.D. in Economics from University of California, Berkeley, Professor of Law at Georgetown University and Partner at Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP, Director of the Bureau of Economics at the Federal Trade Commission, “Antitrust Enforcement, Regulation, and Digital Platforms”, University of Pennsylvania Law Review, 168 U. Pa. L. Rev. 1911, June 2020)

I. GOING BEYOND ADJUDICATION FOR ANTITRUST ENFORCEMENT

Antitrust statutes are primarily enforced in court, usually through the adjudication of specific cases or settlement against the backdrop of court-made antitrust doctrine. Indeed, despite statutory authority for the FTC to issue competition rules, and despite the technical complexity of many antitrust cases, antitrust enforcement and policy in the United States has evolved primarily through precedent developed by generalist courts, not specialized agencies. 18To be sure, the Department of Justice and the FTC influence policy through the investigations they pursue and the consent decrees they reach with parties. The FTC itself adjudicates some cases, although it does so largely according to law developed in the federal courts, to which parties can appeal any FTC decision. 19Academics and other commentators have also affected the evolution of antitrust in the United States, from supporting an economic, notably price-focused framework for U.S. competition policy to sparking a rethinking of that framework in contemporary debates. As the courts have absorbed such learning, antitrust doctrine has evolved over the decades through the push and pull of precedent across the United States judicial circuits, with the Supreme Court periodically stepping in to correct, clarify, or resolve differences among the lower federal courts. Commentators often cite antitrust as a rare example of "federal common law" in the U.S. system. 20

The adjudicatory model for implementing antitrust enforcement has several key attributes, which in turn have both advantages and disadvantages. We put aside for now the question of who is adjudicating--whether it be an expert tribunal or a court of general jurisdiction, for example--and focus on three characteristics of antitrust adjudication itself.

A. Case-by-Case, Fact-Specific Approach

Complexity of underlying issues aside, adjudication is well suited to settings in which applicability of the law is contingent on case-specific facts. With the exception of the limited conduct that the antitrust laws prohibit per se, courts review most business activities through a rule of reason, under which some conduct that is illegal in one set of circumstances is allowable in [\*1918] another. 21The inquiry into liability goes beyond whether particular conduct in fact occurred (which is the extent of the inquiry into conduct that is illegal per se) and extends into a balancing of the conduct's likely effects on competition. 22The more that liability is contingent on such case-specific facts, the more difficult it is to determine liability in advance of the conduct's having taken place. Adjudication typically occurs when conduct either is imminent or has already occurred, at which point the relevant facts as to the effects of the conduct are, in principle, more readily measured. 23Such "ex post" mechanisms of enforcement can reduce the risk of over-enforcement when compared to alternative approaches, like some forms of regulation, that spell out more comprehensively in advance what conduct is illegal. 24Reducing false positives, however, may or may not be a virtue--that calculation depends on the extent to which particular adjudicative institutions and processes under-enforce by allowing harmful conduct or transactions to slip through the liability screen.

B. Slow, Usually Predictable Doctrinal Development

A second attribute of the American adjudicatory process for antitrust is stability. While antitrust doctrine has occasionally swerved abruptly over the past century, the common-law process through which antitrust law has developed usually provides clear notice that a change is coming. As a recent example, the Supreme Court's shift in *Leegin Creative Leather Products, Inc. v. PSKS. Inc*. 25from per se liability to a rule of reason for resale price maintenance likely caught few observers by surprise. 26

Antitrust adjudication's stability, like its suitability for fact-dependent situations, is potentially double-edged. Antitrust jurisprudence can be slow to adjust to changes in economic learning or changes in the underlying economy that alter the effects of a particular kind of business conduct. For [\*1919] example, nearly thirty years ago the Supreme Court in Brooke Group v. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp. 27required that plaintiffs claiming predatory pricing show not only prices below some measure of incremental cost, but also that the defendant could recoup its losses. 28No plaintiff has prevailed in a predatory pricing case in a U.S. federal court since. 29That outcome might not be of concern were it the case that the Supreme Court's test accurately captures the incidence of predatory pricing. 30Economic research demonstrates, however, that predatory conduct does occur and does not depend on either below-cost pricing or recoupment. 31Predation is just one area in which court-made doctrine appears out of step with relevant economic facts and knowledge. To be sure, other forces could accelerate the common-law process of doctrinal development. For example, Congress could legislate changes to the scope, presumptions, and other parameters of antitrust law in ways that would immediately alter precedent and bind the courts going forward. 32 In practice, however, such intervention is rare and unlikely, making significant lags in doctrine a reality of antitrust adjudication in the courts.

C. Market-Driven Case Selection

In the United States, most adjudicative bodies do not select the cases that come before them. To be sure, courts have jurisdictional limitations that prevent them from hearing certain kinds of cases, and doctrines exist that allow courts to reject weak or poorly conceived complaints. Beyond those mechanisms, however, independent parties decide when and whether to pursue litigation as method of relief. One potential virtue of this separation between decisionmaking and case selection is that the market can drive the focus of judicial attention. Assuming the most widespread and most troublesome anticompetitive conduct will receive the greatest investment of litigation resources, that conduct will in turn receive the most adjudication and doctrinal development.

[\*1920] Unfortunately, the separation between adjudication and case selection will not necessarily lead to an efficient match between judicial attention and the most pressing antitrust violations. In practice, even conduct that is clearly prohibited can persist when offenders think detection is difficult; one only has to look at the consistently high number of civil and criminal price fixing cases that wind up in court, even though that conduct has clearly been illegal per se for nearly a century. 33The most widespread anticompetitive conduct might not therefore be the conduct most in need of doctrinal development--it can be just the opposite, as the persistence of cartels demonstrates. 34Moreover, if the courts develop doctrine that needs revisiting, but that deters the government or private plaintiffs from filing cases, 35then the market for judicial attention to antitrust conduct will not work well dynamically; once doctrine is settled, there may be no mechanism outside of legislation or regulatory intervention to drive doctrinal change. We return to this issue below.

D. Generalists versus Industry Experts

Returning to an issue we put aside earlier, who is doing the adjudication can matter for substantive outcomes. In U.S. antitrust law, that adjudication has occurred, at least ultimately, in generalist federal courts. That institutional locus might well make sense given the wide variety of conduct, industries, and factual circumstances that antitrust cases present. However, as specific industries come to pose particular challenges for antitrust enforcement, the case for more specialized enforcement decisionmakers becomes stronger. Traditionally, where detailed, industry-specific knowledge is required to make sound competition policy decisions, Congress has assigned authority over those decisions, at least in part, to industry-specific regulatory agencies. Thus, the Securities and Exchange Commission has authority over competitive conduct in key financial sectors. 36The FCC has parallel authority with the Department of Justice (DOJ) over telecommunications mergers and sole authority to establish terms for competitive entry into various telecommunications markets. 37State [\*1921] regulators govern entry into hospital markets through Certifications of Public Need. 38The federal courts have increasingly safeguarded the domain of industry specific regulators over competition issues even when agency decisions might be in tension with antitrust law. 39

As antitrust enforcement focuses on distinct challenges posed by a particular industry, whether digital platforms, pharmaceuticals, or something else, expert and specialized knowledge becomes even more essential to making good enforcement decisions. Under current law and enforcement frameworks, there is no systematic way to bring such specialization into the ultimate adjudication of antitrust cases in industries not already covered by specific, competition-related, regulatory statutes. To be sure, the FTC and DOJ have divisions that specialize in various industrial sectors in which they have considerable expertise. Those divisions bring that expertise into their review of conduct and transactions, but neither the FTC nor DOJ has ultimate adjudicative authority over the cases they choose to litigate. The DOJ must go to federal court to seek enforcement. The FTC can opt for an administrative enforcement mechanism with the Commission itself sitting in appellate review of initial adjudication by an administrative law judge. The Commission's decision is, however, subject to review by federal appellate courts, which have not hesitated to reverse the agency's decisions. 40 The result is that, even when agencies have brought specific industry expertise into antitrust enforcement, doctrinal application and resolution still proceeds through the common-law process of adjudication by generalist judges.

E. Tradeoffs Inherent in the Adjudicatory Approach to Antitrust

As the foregoing discussion suggests, the ex post case-by-case approach, slow doctrinal evolution, and case selection mechanism of antitrust adjudication have potential advantages and disadvantages. The tradeoffs become particularly clear through the interaction of those three characteristics.

[\*1922] Adjudication may mitigate the rate of false positives or false negatives obtained through enforcement, as proceeding case-by-case is less likely to bring about those results than are general rules that impose limits on business conduct in advance, regardless of specific circumstances. Broad ex ante specifications could prohibit beneficial or harmless conduct, and narrow ex ante specifications could fail to prevent anticompetitive practices. As a decisionmaking process moves from strict ex ante prescription to pure case-by-case adjudication, particular facts and circumstances increasingly predominate over generic categorization of conduct. 41In principle, the movement along that spectrum enables the decisionmaker to avoid under-inclusiveness or over-inclusiveness of categorical rules. 42

The extent to which an adjudicator actually succeeds in reducing enforcement errors in either direction depends on the doctrine and precedent through which it evaluates the case-specific evidence. Doctrine and precedent will determine how a court allocates burdens, prioritizes facts, and weighs presumptions in evaluating the legality of conduct. If precedent provides mistaken guidance on those factors, case-specific adjudication might do no better a job than ex ante prohibitions in avoiding errors or bias toward either under or over-enforcement. For this reason, the evolutionary pace of doctrinal development through antitrust adjudication is very important. Where that evolution has been toward convergence with state-of-the-art analysis and evidence as to the effects of conduct, doctrinal stability is a virtue. Reasonable people disagree over the Supreme Court's movement from per se illegality to rule of reason treatment of vertical price restraints, as Justice Breyer's dissent in Leegin demonstrates. 43 The decision in that case nonetheless drew on a body of legal and economic analysis that, over decades, had continually narrowed the application of per se rules to vertical conduct and led logically (even if some might argue incorrectly) to the majority's conclusion. 44Many commentators might therefore say Leegin is a good example of where the evolution of doctrine through adjudication worked well: stakeholders had notice and the doctrine moved in an internally consistent direction. While it is debatable whether the per se rule against restraints on [\*1923] intra-brand competition has in recent years led to over-enforcement, there is a good case that it had done so in the past, 45so that the doctrine plausibly moved in an error-reducing direction.

However, where doctrine gets on the wrong track, the application of precedent will perpetuate rather than reduce enforcement errors. In the case of predation, for example, there is a good argument that, in the light of current economic knowledge, the Brooke Group decision has led to underenforcement. 46The potential case-by-case advantages of adjudication are lost where judicial precedent renders important facts and circumstances irrelevant. In such cases, the relatively slow process of doctrinal correction through common law evolution is harmful to sound antitrust enforcement.

The discussion above shows that the error-reducing potential of a case-by-case, adjudicatory approach to antitrust enforcement depends heavily on the actual doctrine courts apply and on the process by which that doctrine evolves. Similarly, whether case selection in an adjudicatory approach in fact directs judicial attention to the conduct that most warrants oversight depends on existing doctrine and precedent. It may well be that the conduct doing the most harm is also the conduct for which the courts impose the highest burdens of proof on plaintiffs. The deterrent effect of those burdens likely leads to fewer cases than the conduct's actual effects warrant. 47Similarly, doctrine that too readily imposes liability could have the opposite effect: lower barriers for plaintiffs would lead to too many cases and more devotion of judicial resources than the conduct deserves. 48Like error-reduction, the distribution of antitrust cases brought for adjudication depends heavily on the state of the doctrine and on the ability of the common law process to correct course where necessary.

The potential disadvantages of antitrust adjudication by generalist courts raise the question of whether a different approach might be preferable, specifically with regard to digital platforms. Digital platforms present relatively novel challenges. Considering the tenuous fit between some [\*1924] potential theories of harm and current antitrust doctrine, the complexity of the underlying technical issues in antitrust cases, and the interrelatedness of those issues and adjacent policy goals, a more informed, comprehensive approach coordinated by an expert regulatory agency might foster more advantages than does the exclusive resort to traditional antitrust adjudication. However, before we turn to the form such regulation might take, we briefly identify some general principles for such regulation.

#### Unpredictable shifts ruin business confidence AND overall growth

Cambon 21 (Sarah Chaney Reporter on The Wall Street Journal's Economics Team, BA in Business Journalism from the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, “Capital-Spending Surge Further Lifts Economic Recovery”, Wall Street Journal, 6/27/2021, https://www.wsj.com/articles/capital-spending-surge-further-lifts-economic-recovery-11624798800)

Business investment is emerging as a powerful source of U.S. economic growth that will likely help sustain the recovery.

Companies are ramping up orders for computers, machinery and software as they grow more confident in the outlook.

Nonresidential fixed investment, a proxy for business spending, rose at a seasonally adjusted annual rate of 11.7% in the first quarter, led by growth in software and tech-equipment spending, according to the Commerce Department. Business investment also logged double-digit gains in the third and fourth quarters last year after falling during pandemic-related shutdowns. It is now higher than its pre-pandemic peak.

Orders for nondefense capital goods excluding aircraft, another measure for business investment, are near the highest levels for records tracing back to the 1990s, separate Commerce Department figures show.

“Business investment has really been an important engine powering the U.S. economic recovery,” said Robert Rosener, senior U.S. economist at Morgan Stanley. “In our outlook for the economy, it’s certainly one of the bright spots.”

Consumer spending, which accounts for about two-thirds of economic output, is driving the early stages of the recovery. Americans, flush with savings and government stimulus checks, are spending more on goods and services, which they shunned for much of the pandemic.

Robust capital investment will be key to ensuring that the recovery maintains strength after the spending boost from fiscal stimulus and business reopenings eventually fades, according to some economists.

Rising business investment helps fuel economic output. It also lifts worker productivity, or output per hour. That metric grew at a sluggish pace throughout the last economic expansion but is now showing signs of resurgence.

The recovery in business investment is shaping up to be much stronger than in the years following the 2007-09 recession. “The events especially in late ’08, early ’09 put a lot of businesses really close to the edge,” said Phil Suttle, founder of Suttle Economics. “I think a lot of them said, ‘We’ve just got to be really cautious for a long while.’”

Businesses appear to be less risk-averse now, he said.

After the financial crisis, businesses grew by adding workers, rather than investing in capital. Hiring was more attractive than capital spending because labor was abundant and relatively cheap. Now the supply of workers is tight. Companies are raising pay to lure employees. As a result, many firms have more incentive to grow by investing in capital.

Economists at Morgan Stanley predict that U.S. capital spending will rise to 116% of prerecession levels after three years. By comparison, investment took 10 years to reach those levels once the 2007-09 recession hit.

Company executives are increasingly confident in the economy’s trajectory. The Business Roundtable’s economic-outlook index—a composite of large companies’ plans for hiring and spending, as well as sales projections—increased by nine points in the second quarter to 116, just below 2018’s record high, according to a survey conducted between May 25 and June 9. In the second quarter, the share of companies planning to boost capital investment increased to 59% from 57% in the first.

“We’re seeing really strong reopening demand, and a lot of times capital investment follows that,” said Joe Song, senior U.S. economist at BofA Securities.

Mr. Song added that less uncertainty regarding trade tensions between the U.S. and China should further underpin business confidence and investment. “At the very least, businesses will understand the strategy that the Biden administration is trying to follow and will be able to plan around that,” he said.

#### Those economic declines cascade and cause nuclear war—their defense doesn’t’ apply

Maavak 21 (Matthew, 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, healthcare 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 United States 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 forcing 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 South China Sea; 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.

## Japan da

**New antitrust is applied globally which offends allies and causes backlash**

**Hovenkamp 3**. (Herbert, Ben V. & Dorothy Willie Professor of Law and History, University of Iowa. “Antitrust as Extraterritorial Regulatory Policy,” 48 Antitrust BULL. 629 (2003)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

IV. Extraterritorial antitrust and foreign deregulation

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

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

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

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

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

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

II. Extraterritorial Application of U.S. Antitrust Laws

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Extinction---Indo-Pak nuclear war.**

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Cap

#### Capitalism controls all the impacts

Foster 19 [John, Prof of Sociology at the Univ of Oregon, “Capitalism Has Failed – What Next?” *Monthly Review*, 02/01/19, <https://monthlyreview.org/2019/02/01/capitalism-has-failed-what-next/>, accessed 08/22/21, JCR]

Less than two decades into the twenty-first century, it is evident that capitalism has failed as a social system. The world is mired in economic stagnation, financialization, and the most extreme inequality in human history, accompanied by mass unemployment and underemployment, precariousness, poverty, hunger, wasted output and lives, and what at this point can only be called a planetary ecological “death spiral.”1 The digital revolution, the greatest technological advance of our time, has rapidly mutated from a promise of free communication and liberated production into new means of surveillance, control, and displacement of the working population. The institutions of liberal democracy are at the point of collapse, while fascism, the rear guard of the capitalist system, is again on the march, along with patriarchy, racism, imperialism, and war. To say that capitalism is a failed system is not, of course, to suggest that its breakdown and disintegration is imminent.2 It does, however, mean that it has passed from being a historically necessary and creative system at its inception to being a historically unnecessary and destructive one in the present century. Today, more than ever, the world is faced with the epochal choice between “the revolutionary reconstitution of society at large and the common ruin of the contending classes.”3 Indications of this failure of capitalism are everywhere. Stagnation of investment punctuated by bubbles of financial expansion, which then inevitably burst, now characterizes the so-called free market.4 Soaring inequality in income and wealth has its counterpart in the declining material circumstances of a majority of the population. Real wages for most workers in the United States have barely budged in forty years despite steadily rising productivity.5 Work intensity has increased, while work and safety protections on the job have been systematically jettisoned. Unemployment data has become more and more meaningless due to a new institutionalized underemployment in the form of contract labor in the gig economy.6 Unions have been reduced to mere shadows of their former glory as capitalism has asserted totalitarian control over workplaces. With the demise of Soviet-type societies, social democracy in Europe has perished in the new atmosphere of “liberated capitalism.”7 The capture of the surplus value produced by overexploited populations in the poorest regions of the world, via the global labor arbitrage instituted by multinational corporations, is leading to an unprecedented amassing of financial wealth at the center of the world economy and relative poverty in the periphery.8 Around $21 trillion of offshore funds are currently lodged in tax havens on islands mostly in the Caribbean, constituting “the fortified refuge of Big Finance.”9 Technologically driven monopolies resulting from the global-communications revolution, together with the rise to dominance of Wall Street-based financial capital geared to speculative asset creation, have further contributed to the riches of today’s “1 percent.” Forty-two billionaires now enjoy as much wealth as half the world’s population, while the three richest men in the United States—Jeff Bezos, Bill Gates, and Warren Buffett—have more wealth than half the U.S. population.10 In every region of the world, inequality has increased sharply in recent decades.11 The gap in per capita income and wealth between the richest and poorest nations, which has been the dominant trend for centuries, is rapidly widening once again.12 More than 60 percent of the world’s employed population, some two billion people, now work in the impoverished informal sector, forming a massive global proletariat. The global reserve army of labor is some 70 percent larger than the active labor army of formally employed workers.13 Adequate health care, housing, education, and clean water and air are increasingly out of reach for large sections of the population, even in wealthy countries in North America and Europe, while transportation is becoming more difficult in the United States and many other countries due to irrationally high levels of dependency on the automobile and disinvestment in public transportation. Urban structures are more and more characterized by gentrification and segregation, with cities becoming the playthings of the well-to-do while marginalized populations are shunted aside. About half a million people, most of them children, are homeless on any given night in the United States.14 New York City is experiencing a major rat infestation, attributed to warming temperatures, mirroring trends around the world.15 In the United States and other high-income countries, life expectancy is in decline, with a remarkable resurgence of Victorian illnesses related to poverty and exploitation. In Britain, gout, scarlet fever, whooping cough, and even scurvy are now resurgent, along with tuberculosis. With inadequate enforcement of work health and safety regulations, black lung disease has returned with a vengeance in U.S. coal country.16 Overuse of antibiotics, particularly by capitalist agribusiness, is leading to an antibiotic-resistance crisis, with the dangerous growth of superbugs generating increasing numbers of deaths, which by mid–century could surpass annual cancer deaths, prompting the World Health Organization to declare a “global health emergency.”17 These dire conditions, arising from the workings of the system, are consistent with what Frederick Engels, in the Condition of the Working Class in England, called “social murder.”18 At the instigation of giant corporations, philanthrocapitalist foundations, and neoliberal governments, public education has been restructured around corporate-designed testing based on the implementation of robotic common-core standards. This is generating massive databases on the student population, much of which are now being surreptitiously marketed and sold.19 The corporatization and privatization of education is feeding the progressive subordination of children’s needs to the cash nexus of the commodity market. We are thus seeing a dramatic return of Thomas Gradgrind’s and Mr. M’Choakumchild’s crass utilitarian philosophy dramatized in Charles Dickens’s Hard Times: “Facts are alone wanted in life” and “You are never to fancy.”20 Having been reduced to intellectual dungeons, many of the poorest, most racially segregated schools in the United States are mere pipelines for prisons or the military.21 More than two million people in the United States are behind bars, a higher rate of incarceration than any other country in the world, constituting a new Jim Crow. The total population in prison is nearly equal to the number of people in Houston, Texas, the fourth largest U.S. city. African Americans and Latinos make up 56 percent of those incarcerated, while constituting only about 32 percent of the U.S. population. Nearly 50 percent of American adults, and a much higher percentage among African Americans and Native Americans, have an immediate family member who has spent or is currently spending time behind bars. Both black men and Native American men in the United States are nearly three times, Hispanic men nearly two times, more likely to die of police shootings than white men.22 Racial divides are now widening across the entire planet. Violence against women and the expropriation of their unpaid labor, as well as the higher level of exploitation of their paid labor, are integral to the way in which power is organized in capitalist society—and how it seeks to divide rather than unify the population. More than a third of women worldwide have experienced physical/sexual violence. Women’s bodies, in particular, are objectified, reified, and commodified as part of the normal workings of monopoly-capitalist marketing.23 The mass media-propaganda system, part of the larger corporate matrix, is now merging into a social media-based propaganda system that is more porous and seemingly anarchic, but more universal and more than ever favoring money and power. Utilizing modern marketing and surveillance techniques, which now dominate all digital interactions, vested interests are able to tailor their messages, largely unchecked, to individuals and their social networks, creating concerns about “fake news” on all sides.24 Numerous business entities promising technological manipulation of voters in countries across the world have now surfaced, auctioning off their services to the highest bidders.25 The elimination of net neutrality in the United States means further concentration, centralization, and control over the entire Internet by monopolistic service providers. Elections are increasingly prey to unregulated “dark money” emanating from the coffers of corporations and the billionaire class. Although presenting itself as the world’s leading democracy, the United States, as Paul Baran and Paul Sweezy stated in Monopoly Capital in 1966, “is democratic in form and plutocratic in content.”26 In the Trump administration, following a long-established tradition, 72 percent of those appointed to the cabinet have come from the higher corporate echelons, while others have been drawn from the military.27 War, engineered by the United States and other major powers at the apex of the system, has become perpetual in strategic oil regions such as the Middle East, and threatens to escalate into a global thermonuclear exchange. During the Obama administration, the United States was engaged in wars/bombings in seven different countries—Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, Libya, Yemen, Somalia, and Pakistan.28 Torture and assassinations have been reinstituted by Washington as acceptable instruments of war against those now innumerable individuals, group networks, and whole societies that are branded as terrorist. A new Cold War and nuclear arms race is in the making between the United States and Russia, while Washington is seeking to place road blocks to the continued rise of China. The Trump administration has created a new space force as a separate branch of the military in an attempt to ensure U.S. dominance in the militarization of space. Sounding the alarm on the increasing dangers of a nuclear war and of climate destabilization, the distinguished Bulletin of Atomic Scientists moved its doomsday clock in 2018 to two minutes to midnight, the closest since 1953, when it marked the advent of thermonuclear weapons.29 Increasingly severe economic sanctions are being imposed by the United States on countries like Venezuela and Nicaragua, despite their democratic elections—or because of them. Trade and currency wars are being actively promoted by core states, while racist barriers against immigration continue to be erected in Europe and the United States as some 60 million refugees and internally displaced peoples flee devastated environments. Migrant populations worldwide have risen to 250 million, with those residing in high-income countries constituting more than 14 percent of the populations of those countries, up from less than 10 percent in 2000. Meanwhile, ruling circles and wealthy countries seek to wall off islands of power and privilege from the mass of humanity, who are to be left to their fate.30 More than three-quarters of a billion people, over 10 percent of the world population, are chronically malnourished.31 Food stress in the United States keeps climbing, leading to the rapid growth of cheap dollar stores selling poor quality and toxic food. Around forty million Americans, representing one out of eight households, including nearly thirteen million children, are food insecure.32 Subsistence farmers are being pushed off their lands by agribusiness, private capital, and sovereign wealth funds in a global depeasantization process that constitutes the greatest movement of people in history.33 Urban overcrowding and poverty across much of the globe is so severe that one can now reasonably refer to a “planet of slums.”34 Meanwhile, the world housing market is estimated to be worth up to $163 trillion (as compared to the value of gold mined over all recorded history, estimated at $7.5 trillion).35 The Anthropocene epoch, first ushered in by the Great Acceleration of the world economy immediately after the Second World War, has generated enormous rifts in planetary boundaries, extending from climate change to ocean acidification, to the sixth extinction, to disruption of the global nitrogen and phosphorus cycles, to the loss of freshwater, to the disappearance of forests, to widespread toxic-chemical and radioactive pollution.36 It is now estimated that 60 percent of the world’s wildlife vertebrate population (including mammals, reptiles, amphibians, birds, and fish) have been wiped out since 1970, while the worldwide abundance of invertebrates has declined by 45 percent in recent decades.37 What climatologist James Hansen calls the “species exterminations” resulting from accelerating climate change and rapidly shifting climate zones are only compounding this general process of biodiversity loss. Biologists expect that half of all species will be facing extinction by the end of the century.38 If present climate-change trends continue, the “global carbon budget” associated with a 2°C increase in average global temperature will be broken in sixteen years (while a 1.5°C increase in global average temperature—staying beneath which is the key to long-term stabilization of the climate—will be reached in a decade). Earth System scientists warn that the world is now perilously close to a Hothouse Earth, in which catastrophic climate change will be locked in and irreversible.39 The ecological, social, and economic costs to humanity of continuing to increase carbon emissions by 2.0 percent a year as in recent decades (rising in 2018 by 2.7 percent—3.4 percent in the United States), and failing to meet the minimal 3.0 percent annual reductions in emissions currently needed to avoid a catastrophic destabilization of the earth’s energy balance, are simply incalculable.40 Nevertheless, major energy corporations continue to lie about climate change, promoting and bankrolling climate denialism—while admitting the truth in their internal documents. These corporations are working to accelerate the extraction and production of fossil fuels, including the dirtiest, most greenhouse gas-generating varieties, reaping enormous profits in the process. The melting of the Arctic ice from global warming is seen by capital as a new El Dorado, opening up massive additional oil and gas reserves to be exploited without regard to the consequences for the earth’s climate. In response to scientific reports on climate change, Exxon Mobil declared that it intends to extract and sell all of the fossil-fuel reserves at its disposal.41 Energy corporations continue to intervene in climate negotiations to ensure that any agreements to limit carbon emissions are defanged. Capitalist countries across the board are putting the accumulation of wealth for a few above combatting climate destabilization, threatening the very future of humanity. Capitalism is best understood as a competitive class-based mode of production and exchange geared to the accumulation of capital through the exploitation of workers’ labor power and the private appropriation of surplus value (value generated beyond the costs of the workers’ own reproduction). The mode of economic accounting intrinsic to capitalism designates as a value-generating good or service anything that passes through the market and therefore produces income. It follows that the greater part of the social and environmental costs of production outside the market are excluded in this form of valuation and are treated as mere negative “externalities,” unrelated to the capitalist economy itself—whether in terms of the shortening and degradation of human life or the destruction of the natural environment. As environmental economist K. William Kapp stated, “capitalism must be regarded as an economy of unpaid costs.”42 We have now reached a point in the twenty-first century in which the externalities of this irrational system, such as the costs of war, the depletion of natural resources, the waste of human lives, and the disruption of the planetary environment, now far exceed any future economic benefits that capitalism offers to society as a whole. The accumulation of capital and the amassing of wealth are increasingly occurring at the expense of an irrevocable rift in the social and environmental conditions governing human life on earth.43

#### Antitrust is the foundation of neoliberal institution formation – it re-organizes global political space around the fiction of “the market.”

Türem 16 [Z. Umut, Assoc Prof at the Ataturk Institute for Modern Turkish History at Bogazici Univ, “‘The market’ unbound: neoliberalism, competition laws and post territoriality,” *Journal of International Relations and Development* 19.2, proquest, JCR]

The post-1980 worldwide market reforms have created a massive wave of legal production. Competition and antitrust legislation -- as well as agencies to oversee such laws -- have been among the most important vestiges of this wave of neoliberal institutional formation. Today, over 100 countries have competition laws to regulate markets, the vast majority of which have been passed since 1980 -- many, notably, after the dissolution of the Soviet Union (Gerber 2010: 79).2 Not only have laws been passed in innumerable national contexts, but new economic techniques such as 'market analysis' (Indig and Gal 2013) and 'forensic economics' (Lianos 2012), as well as administrative innovations such as competition advocacy (Zywicki and Cooper 2007), have begun to circulate globally. What, if anything, does this institutional and technical proliferation tell us about the significance of territoriality and its ongoing transformation in today's world? This article seeks to answer this question by pursuing two avenues of exploration. First, I read the spread of competition law and economics in light of the historico-theoretical framework of neoliberalism advanced by Michel Foucault in his 1978/79 College de France lectures. This reading constitutes a broad background explaining how neoliberalism brings about a transformation of territoriality as we know it, and how the concepts and practices of competition and the market are at the heart of the art of government that is neoliberalism. Two points make Foucault's work especially relevant to the present inquiry: first, his discussion of neoliberalism essentially as a transformation of state spatiality and the broader system of territoriality, and second, his discussion of competition as the most important building block of neoliberalism. These twin emphases, which are developed below, constitute the intellectual foundation for the discussion of the question of territoriality in this article. Neoliberalism brings about a momentous transformation of nation-state territoriality and it re-organises political space around the notion and practices of 'the market'. Just like exchange and circulation were the building blocks of liberalism, competition is the building block of neoliberalism. The second avenue consists of analysing the conceptualisation and operationalisation of 'the market' in competition law and economics. I take competition laws and the technical instruments that accompany them as both reflecting and constituting global neoliberalism, and I focus on one of those instruments in particular, 'the market definition', as a route to understanding the contemporary state of territoriality. Building on Foucault's theorisation of neoliberalism, I trace how 'the market' begins to constitute a significant conceptual tool to think about globalising relationships, and organise legal interventions in an environment in which territoriality is an insufficient basis for legal and sovereign action. Competition laws are a set of legal and economic rules devised to keep market competition at desired levels and inhibit anti-competitive conduct.3 According to Gerber (2010: 4), 'competition laws are intended to protect the process of competition from restraints that can impair its functioning and reduce its benefits'. While increasing economic efficiency is considered by many to be the ultimate objective (Gürkaynak 2003), particularly post-1980 (Davies 2010: 65), many secondary benefits, such as decreasing consumer prices and fostering innovation, are believed to come about as a result of the implementation of competition laws and policies. In practice, inquiries into potential or actual competition violations and actual mergers and acquisitions among corporations -- two of the most fundamental activities that competition law is designed to oversee -- require, first and foremost, the delineation of the boundaries of the relevant markets to which a specific inquiry applies. Such demarcations concern both the geographic boundaries of the market and the conceptual nature of the product in question. As Kauper puts it, 'market definition is [...] an essential element in a broad range of [competition law] cases, and thus in most cases, relevant markets must be defined in product and geographic terms' (1996: 1683). For the purposes of competition law, a market may be defined as local, sub-national, national, regional or even global in scope. Determinations are made using the tools and techniques of [industrial] economics, often utilising complex algorithms advanced within this discipline. A wealth of information concerning supply and demand dynamics and the conditions of the transportability of the product is fed into the definition of the market. In the contemporary orthodoxy of neoliberal competition law, the goal in such a determination is to actualise maximum economic efficiency by carefully 'setting' the borders of the market (Fox et al. 2004: 189, 196-98). The operation to establish the boundaries of the 'relevant market' presumes a logic that would intervene -- with the force of legality -- into economic relations and geographies. Such a logic in its ideal form does not prioritise territoriality at all. Rather, every time a competition law decision must be made, a rich ensemble of factors is taken into account to determine what the scale of the intervention should be. The market, as elastic, fluid and undetermined as it is, constitutes the basic unit of legal intervention, and efficiency is the measure of its success. Building upon Foucault's historico-theoretical framework of neoliberalism, I argue that the mobilisation of market definition practices within competition law has generated a de-territorialised network concept of sovereignty that is fundamentally at odds with nation-state territoriality and traditional notions of sovereignty. The way the market is designated in competition law as an arena of legal regulation subject to a sovereign gaze, as well as the fact that markets are defined non-territorially, through a fluid, network logic, points to this transformed state of sovereignty and territoriality. Following from the practice of defining market boundaries within competition law, I argue that 'the market' is emerging as a conceptual grid for organising the fluid network of relations that characterise neoliberal globalisation, rendering them governable via legal intervention. More importantly still, the fact that the market and its de-territorialised depiction is becoming an institutionalised practice via the spread of competition laws and agencies suggests that this practice is now becoming a technology that constitutes and enhances further the institutional mechanisms that enabled such practice in the first place.

#### The kritik is a prefigurative politics of resistance that imagines alternate modes of social organization. This is key to foster sustained mobilization

Wigger 18 [Angela, Assoc Prof in Global Political Economy at Radboud Univ, “From dissent to resistance: Locating patterns of horizontalist self-management crisis responses in Spain,” *Comparative European Politics* 16.1, p.35, JCR]

The concepts ‘prefiguration’ and ‘propaganda by the deed’, mostly developed and deployed in anarchist literatures to capture a broad range of subversive tactics and activities (Day, 2005), are well suited to understand transformative agency beyond expressions of dissent and protest that is not merely reactive or defensive but that involves an actual material reorganization of social relations in everyday life. Prefiguration implies that the way in which on-going transformative praxis is organized already entails a presentiment of the envisaged future society, while propaganda by the deed refers to exemplary political actions and interventions in the prevailing system that provide a positive example and stimulate solidarity activities and imitation. As a philosophy of praxis, prefiguration entails moreover that the means, strategies and tactics ought to be commensurable with the envisaged future. Social imaginaries or utopian visions are hence a prerequisite for prefiguration. At the same time, such imaginaries should never be understood as definite blueprints for how the future should look. Prefigurative politics often contains only an incomplete glance of the anticipated future because present tense experiments are always unfinished and imperfect, and thus in process (see also Maeckelbergh, 2013). Prefiguration is thus both a lived radical praxis and a goal for the future. The alternative organization of the social relations of (re-)production can therefore be understood as a prefigurative politics of resistance that operates at the same time as propaganda by the deed. Locations of prefiguration can become ‘infrastructures of dissent’ that enable collective capacities for memory (reflection on past struggles), analysis (theoretical discussion and debate), communication, knowledge transfer and shared learning and can thereby foster sustained mobilization by creating networks of mutual support and spread alternative practices (Sears, 2014: 6; see also Dauvergne and LeBaron, 2014).

## Case

### Adv 1

#### No risk of EU Collapse – economic power, geopolitical incentives, and cultural connections

Wallerstein 16 (Immanuel Wallerstein – American sociologist, historical social scientist, and world-systems analyst, Senior Research Scholar at Yale University, BA, MA, and PhD from Columbia University, International Sociological Association Award for Excellence in Research and Practice; “Collapse of the European Union? A Skeptical View”; <https://www.iwallerstein.com/collapse-of-the-european-union-a-skeptical-view/>; accessed 7/26/18) [DS]

One of the many games pundits and politicians are playing these days is to spell out why and how the European Union (EU) is going to collapse, is already collapsing. Anyone who follows the news worldwide knows all the standard explanations: Grexit and Brexit will only lead to other exits; nobody wants more migrants (refugees) in their country; Germany has too much power, or not enough; ultra-rightwing forces/parties are rising almost everywhere; the Schengen Agreement providing visa-less movement is being suspended in most countries that had adopted it; unemployment is unstoppably growing. There is an underlying theme in this litany of pessimism (or is it optimism?). Europeans – both the sophisticated and the “ignorant” – have become impervious to rational arguments. They are almost all acting irrationally, responding to their emotions and not to reflective analyses. But is this so, Charlie Brown? It makes for a good comic strip, but does that mean the EU will actually cease to exist? I am not here giving my views about whether the EU is good or bad, should or should not be supported or undermined. Rather, I wish to analyze what I think will actually happen. Will the institutions that now make up the European Union continue to exist ten or twenty years from now? I suspect they will. To see why I think so, let us review together what may make Europeans – both the sophisticated and the “ignorant” – hesitate about taking the fatal step of dismantling what they have been working so hard to create for the last seventy years or so. There are some reasons that one might call economic, others that are geopolitical, and finally still others that might be called cultural. Let us begin with the economy. The situation in terms of current income, both for the states and for most individuals, is bad everywhere in the EU. The question is whether dismantling Europe would be likely to improve it, or in fact make it worse. One subject of constant debate is the Eurozone – will it survive? Take for example what happened in Greece in the two 2015 elections there. Alexei Tsipras, the leader of the now-governing party Syriza, was elected in the first election on an anti-austerity platform. He then, in negotiating with the EU for a further loan, retreated on just about everything he had promised the Greek voters. He agreed to measures demanded by the EU that severely hurt the real income of the majority of the population. For this, he was denounced for betraying his promises by left forces within Syriza who withdrew from the party and established their own list. Yet in the next election called very swiftly by Tsipras, he received the mandate again. The Greek voters chose him rather than the left forces within Syriza. It seems clear, at least to me, that the Greek voters paid no attention to the left denunciations because above all they did not want to leave the Eurozone. Tsipras had made maintaining the euro a priority and the left forces sought instead to resume an autonomous currency. Apparently, the Greek voters believed that the very real negatives of being in the Eurozone were, in their view, less than the probable greater negatives of recreating the drachma. The situation is roughly the same concerning the so-called safety net features that European governments had installed, such as pensions and unemployment benefits. Virtually all the countries in the EU have been cutting the safety net back for lack of funds. These cuts have been resisted, sometimes successfully, by left or left-of-center parties. But is there any reason to suppose that, were the European Union to disappear tomorrow, these governments would have more funds to distribute? The left parties often say so, condemning what they see as the neoliberal pressures of the EU bureaucracy in Brussels. But look around the world. Can you point to governments not under the purview of Brussels that have been able to increase welfare-state expenditures? If there is no real advantage in terms of real income levels in dismantling the EU, are there other reasons to do it? The EU has played an important geopolitical role since its inception, and has been growing steadily in membership. The United States has been publicly supporting the rise and expansion of the EU but actually trying to undermine it. The United States has seen the EU as a major geopolitical danger. It is obvious to most observers that the EU’s geopolitical strength is the result of numbers. A dismantlement would end this strength and reduce the separate European states to no practical importance geopolitically. In the end, most European leaders and movements understand this. However much some of them rail against the EU as a structure, are they ready in fact to yield the advantages that a large singular entity gives them? Rightwing groups, especially in eastern Europe, see the EU as one pressure on the United States to offer them military protection against a putatively aggressive Russia. Leftwing groups in other countries, such as France, use the strength of the EU to contain what they think are putatively aggressive actions by the United States. What would either of these groups gain by the dismantlement of the EU? Finally, there are the so-called cultural links between the United States and Europe. They are publicly proclaimed and more quietly disdained as a remnant of U.S. hegemonic dominance in the first twenty-five years after 1945. Once again there are varying motivations. The left parties and movements want to use their unified structure as a mode of regaining the cultural autonomy (even superiority) they felt they had before 1945. The rightwing forces want to use their strength to insist upon their cultural autonomy on so-called human rights questions. Once again, in union there is strength. What I see happening is more and more rhetoric and less and less real action. For good or bad, my sense is that the institutions of the EU will survive. This does not mean they won’t change. There is, and will continue to be, a real political struggle within the EU about the kind of collective institution it ought to be. This intra-European political struggle is one part of a worldwide struggle about the kind of world we wish to build as an outcome to the structural crisis of the modern world-system.

#### No collapse- too many inventive to stay

**Leonardo Co Author of the Journal of International Affairs, 17**

Scuira, Leonardo 6/22/17 Journal of International Affairs “Brexit beyond borders: Beginning of the eu collapse and return to nationalism.” <https://www.thefreelibrary.com/Brexit+beyond+borders%3a+Beginning+of+the+eu+collapse+and+return+to...-a0520673966> accessed: 7/3/18 M.S.

Assuming that these countries can overcome the differences of the past, the cultural barriers, and the many divergences of agendas and interests, is it possible for the European Union as a single organism to endogenously reproduce the sentiment of a nation? If not, would it be achievable through the influence of exterior forces? Habermas believes that, in synthesis, "from the moment a state and a given community are integrated, in that very moment arises the concept of Volksnation, the Nation-State." (30) With globalization peaked at its highest and trade relations ruling the international scenario, it is sensible that Europeans want to circulate capital and be able to move freely wherever they wish in a borderless Europe. And just like all other people, Europeans want access to foreign markets for their products and services. They also want some degree of protection for their internal markets against the sudden invasion of external competitors, even if these competitors originate from within the European Union itself. However, when European citizens begin to oppose the immigration of people from within their own economic bloc, then these nations start to drop the masks of integration and end up exposing the label of the old and true European stance: the nationalist identity

#### No econ decline impact.

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

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

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

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

#### collapse doesn’t cause extinction

Dr. Stephen M. Walt 20, Robert and Renée Belfer Professor of International Relations at Harvard University, PhD in International Relations (with Distinction) from Stanford University, MA in Political Science from the University of California, Berkeley, “Will a Global Depression Trigger Another World War?”, Foreign Policy, 5/13/2020, https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/05/13/coronavirus-pandemic-depression-economy-world-war/

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

### Adv 2

#### Warming doesn’t cause extinction – disasters don’t tip climate timescales

Bastasch 16 (Mike Bastasch, a reporter for The Daily Caller News Foundation. Skeptic Documentary: Don’t Believe the Global Warming ‘Shell Game.’ April 28, 2016. <http://dailycaller.com/2016/04/28/skeptic-documentary-dont-believe-the-global-warming-shell-game/>)

A new documentary by a prominent global warming skeptic takes on many of the claims from environmentalists and politicians who want to regulate nearly every aspect of the economy to stop it. Marc Morano, a prominent global warming skeptic and publisher of the website Climate Depot, has released his new documentary film “Climate Hustle,” which takes on what Morano argues is the “shell game” created by global warming alarmists to get people worried about the climate. “You’ll see all of the cards, and we’ll let you decide for yourselves if they’re playing it straight or if you’re being hustled,” Morano says in the film while three actors play a street card game in the background. Morano’s film has already garnered lots of criticism from environmentalists, especially since the debut of the film featured a talk from former Alaska Gov. Sarah Palin. Don’t let Morano’s showmanship fool you, his film uses expert testimony and actual climate data to take on claims of catastrophic global warming. “Climate Hustle” is essentially a response to years of documentaries, starting with former Vice President Al Gore’s 2006 film, claiming that humans were sending the climate into a nosedive, which will cause massive sea level rise, more extreme weather and a whole host of other problems if governments don’t ban fossil fuels. Gore is featured many times in Morano’s film, talking about how human activity was warming the world and even making the weather worse. Gore makes these claims while news clips of storms, flooding and a whole host of weather events play in the background. Scary stuff, but Morano has a whole host of experts lined up to debunk Gore’s claims. A **Senate testimony by Dr**. Roger **Pielke,** Jr., a University of Colorado researcher, whose work revolved around extreme weather trends. “It is misleading and just plain incorrect to claim that disasters associated with hurricanes, tornadoes, floods or droughts have increased on climate timescales either in the United States or globally,” Pielke said in his 2013 testimony before the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee. “It is further incorrect to associate the increasing costs of disasters with the emission of greenhouse gases.” Morano interviews scientists to take on climate models used to predict future warming, and the film takes aim at “adjustments” made to the temperature record by government climate scientists. “Temperature records have been altered considerably,” Pat Michaels, a climate scientist at the libertarian Cato Institute, said in the film. “The alterations, in general, result in a cooler past and a warmer present.” In the end, Morano presents what he sees are the aspects of the climate debate largely left out by the media’s most popular environmentalists and scientists. Morano’s film gives a great rundown of the skeptical arguments of global warming. “I call this stuff kindergarten science,” Bob Carter, a recently-deceased Aussie scientist, told Morano. “The fact that the temperature was warmer at the end of the 20th Century than it was in the preceding 100 years is such a piece of kindergarten science,” Carter said. “It’s true, and it’s completely meaningless in telling you anything about climate change.” And if that’s not enough reason to watch the film, Morano also promises that “no carbon credits were purchased to offset this film.”

#### Financialization of capital is at the root of the aff – warming inevitable

Foster 19 [John, Prof of Sociology at the Univ of Oregon, “Capitalism Has Failed – What Next?” *Monthly Review*, 02/01/19, <https://monthlyreview.org/2019/02/01/capitalism-has-failed-what-next/>, accessed 08/22/21, JCR]

A characteristic of this new era of financialized accumulation is that it is progressively removed from the realities of production and use value, heightening the conflict between exchange value (the value form) and use value (the natural form) within the overall production and accumulation process.71 The result is “a social and ecological planetary emergency.”72 This is most evident in the rapid destruction of the natural environment. Fossil fuels are entered as financial assets on the books of corporations, even when they exist only in the form of reserves buried in the ground. In this way, they are integral to the entire financialized accumulation process of monopoly capitalism. Trillions of dollars of Wall Street assets are thus tied up in fossil capital.73 This has made it doubly difficult to shift away from the extraction and use of fossil fuels to more sustainable alternatives, such as solar and wind power. No one owns the sun’s rays or the wind. Hence, there is less of a vested interest in these forms of energy. In today’s capitalism, more than ever before, current and potential future profits dictate all, at the expense of people and the planet. The human population stands by, seemingly helpless, watching the destruction of the climate and the loss of innumerable species, all imposed by the ostensibly overwhelming force of market society.

#### No environmental collapse – nearly environmental barometer has been positive for decades

Easterbrook 18 (Gregg, American writer and a contributing editor of both The New Republic and The Atlantic Monthly, “It's Better Than It Looks: Reasons for Optimism in an Age of Fear”, It's Better Than It Looks: Reasons for Optimism in an Age of Fear, Chapter 3: Will Nature Collapse?, 2-20-2018, accessed via Google Books) //ghs-ag

INSTEAD, IN 2017, I WATCHED a bald eagle glide peacefully above my home near Washington, DC. North American eagles have proliferated so much that the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN), which keeps the books on species gains and losses, now classifies the bird under "least concern.” The eagle flew through air that was free of smog, as air almost always is in American cities. Newspapers in my driveway reported that oversupply of petroleum and natural gas was pushing energy prices toward record lows. "Oil Glut Worries"—here, Wall Street Journal, March 10, 2017; "Natural Gas Glut Deepens," same paper, same page, a week later. Society was expected by now to be in full panic mode regarding oil and gas exhaustion, and instead the apprehension is too much fuel. Another newspaper in the driveway reported so many otters frolicking off California that tourists were crowding seaside enclaves to watch. Acid rain was nearly stopped, the stratospheric ozone hole was closing. Water quality alarms were ongoing in Flint, Michigan, and along Long Island Sound, but in general cleanliness was rising, with Boston Harbor, Chesapeake Bay, Puget Sound, and other major water bodies, filthy a generation ago, mostly safe for swimming and fishing, meeting the 1972 Clean Water Act's definition of success. Nearly every environmental barometer in the United States was positive and had been so for years if not decades. Watching the bald eagle soar did not make me feel complacent regarding the natural world, rather, made me feel that greenhouse gases can be brought to heel, just as other environmental problems have been. Climate change reforms will be the subject of a coming chapter. Here, let's contemplate why nature did not collapse, despite ever more people consuming ever more resources. Man-made damage to nature can be atrocious. Think of the Exxon Valdez oil spill, which destroyed forever the wildlife in Prince William Sound, Alaska. At least that's what was said in 1989 when the tanker struck Bligh Reef. Today most sea and intertidal life in Prince William Sound has returned to pre-spill numbers, while the sound's combination of beauty and biology makes it a popular destination for whale- watching tours. Exxon, now ExxonMobil, deserved the billions in fines and settlements the company paid. But the whole thing was over in a snap of the fingers in geologic terms. Humanity is hardly the only force that damages nature. In 1980, pressurized magma inside Mount Saint Helens in Washington State exploded with the power of about 1,500 Hiroshima bombs. "Some 19 million old-growth Douglas firs, trees with deep roots, were ripped from the ground and tossed about like cocktail swizzles," one analyst wrote. Hundreds of square miles burned to cinders, animals and fifty- seven people near the eruption turned to char. Commentators of the time called the Mount Saint Helens area destroyed forever. When I hiked the blast zone in 1992, I was amazed to behold areas that had been lifeless moonscapes in 1980; just a dozen years later, they were bright with biology: wildflower, elk, sapling firs. Today Mount Saint Helens National Volcanic Monument is a recommended destination for backpackers. Through the eons, nature has healed after insults far worse than the worst ever done by people—ice ages, asteroid strikes, thousand-year periods of volcanism so extreme that global ash clouds blocked the sun for years at a time. The mega-volcanism that long ago created Siberia is estimated to have unleashed three billion times the force of the Hiroshima blast, plus far more smoke than humanity's wars and factories combined. Nature has evolved defenses against such harm in the same way that the body has evolved defenses against pathogens. This does not make harm to nature insignificant, any more than having an immune system makes germs insignificant. But before asking whether nature will collapse, it's good to remind ourselves that our ongoing existence is evidence that the biosphere is a green fortress.