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#### Contention 1 is the TLP:

#### The 2nd circuit’s most recent decision expanded exemptions for Chinese export cartels based on post-hoc defenses that undermine transparency

\*The decision was Animal Science Products v. Hebei Welcome Pharmaceuticals (Also called Vitamin C)

Wesley, 21 (Richard C. Wesley is a Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. At the time of his appointment in 2003, he was a Judge of the New York Court of Appeals. Judge Wesley received his B.A. degree summa cum laude from the State University of New York at Albany in 1971, and his J.D. degree from Cornell Law School in 1974., 8-10-2021, accessed on 11-29-2021, Cases.justia, "Animal Sci. Prods. v. Hebei Welcome Pharma. Co. Ltd. 2021 Dissenting Opinion", <https://cases.justia.com/federal/appellate-courts/ca2/13-4791/13-4791-2021-08-10.pdf?ts=1628605810)//Babcii>

Did “Chinese law require[] the Chinese sellers’ conduct[?]” Animal Sci. Prods., Inc. v. Hebei Welcome Pharm. Co., 138 S. Ct. 1865, 1875 (2018). **The majority never** really **answers. Instead, it improperly applies** the doctrine of **international comity to avoid a finding it cannot contest: that Chinese law did not require the defendants to fix prices** above the minimum of $3.35/kg, which is what Hebei and NCPG (the “defendants”) did. Because it was not impossible for the defendants to comply with both Chinese and U.S. law, this case should not be dismissed on international comity grounds. See Hartford Fire Ins. Co. v. California, 509 U.S. 764, 799 (1993). Section 1 of the Sherman Act prohibits “[e]very contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce among the several [s]tates, or with foreign nations.” 15 U.S.C. § 1. “[P]rice-fixing agreements are unlawful **per se** under the Sherman Act.” Arizona v. Maricopa Cty. Med. Soc., 457 U.S. 332, 345 (1982). It is well established that § 1 proscribes only concerted, not unilateral, action. See Fisher v. City of Berkeley, Cal., 475 U.S. 260, 266 (1986). “Even where a single firm’s restraints directly affect prices and have the same economic effect as concerted action might have, there can be no liability under § 1 in the absence of agreement [with another, separate entity].” Id. As a threshold matter, the plain text of the regulations and agency charter demonstrates Chinese law did not require the defendants to coordinate vitamin C prices and quantities at all. The 2002 Notice establishing the Price Verification and Chop (“PVC”) system stated “the relevant chambers must . . . submit to [Customs] information on industry-wide negotiated prices.” Sp. App’x 302. The 2003 Announcement explained “the Chambers shall . . . affix the . . . chop . . . to the export contracts at the blocks where the prices and quantities are specified” and “verify the submissions by the exporters based on the industry agreements.” Id. at 310. The Vitamin C Subcommittee, “a self-disciplinary trade organization jointly established on [a] voluntary basis” to, inter alia, “coordinate and guide vitamin C import and export business,” expressly gave members “[f]reedom to withdraw from the Subcommittee” in its amended 2002 Charter. Id. at 325–26. The 2003 Announcement acknowledged **membership was optional**, instructing the Chambers to “give [non-member exporters] the same treatment as to member exporters.” Id. at 311. In other words, under the PVC regime, the defendants were not legally required to engage in any concerted action. They could have complied with Chinese law without violating the Sherman Act by resigning from the Subcommittee and thereby independently setting their prices at or above the industry-coordinated minimum price, abstaining from any “meeting of the minds” to agree on price.1 See Fisher, 475 U.S. at 267. The Ministry and defendants do not dispute this conclusion. The Ministry explicitly agreed that “[u]nder the [Vitamin C Subcommittee’s] 2002 Charter . . . [Subcommittee] membership was no longer necessary to export vitamin C.” Ministry’s Letter Br. at 5. Its argument that “through the PVC system . . . the Chamber . . . ensured that each manufacturer complied with the industry’s price and volume restrictions,” id., does not amount to a violation of the Sherman Act. See Fisher, 475 U.S. at 267 (holding that “the mere fact that all competing property owners must comply with the same provisions of the [city’s rent control] [o]rdinance is not enough to establish a conspiracy among landlords”). The defendants concede members were able to freely resign, but contend they could not because they were members of the executive “Council” elected to four-year terms. See Appellants’ Letter Br. at 3. However, there is no indication their status impeded their legal right to resign. Their argument they could not as “a practical matter,” id., is inapposite; we are concerned only with what Chinese law required. Despite recognizing that members could resign from the Subcommittee, the Ministry avers that the PVC regime required the defendants to violate the Sherman Act. I do not think the Ministry’s submissions merit deference under the Supreme Court’s five-factor test. See Animal Sci. Prods., 138 S. Ct. at 1873. They lack sufficient “clarity, thoroughness, and support,” id., as they conflate China’s 2002 PVC regime with its 1997 regime and fail to address salient issues such as the “suspension provision” of the 2002 Notice permitting “the customs and chambers [to] suspend export price review,” Sp. App’x 302, and the right under the 2002 Charter to freely resign from the Vitamin C Subcommittee. The “context and purpose” factor, Animal Sci. Prods., 138 S. Ct. at 1873, cuts strongly against the Ministry; I do not see how this being the Chinese government’s first official appearance in a U.S. court mitigates the fact that the Ministry has only taken this ––as the majority recognizes––**self-serving position** for the first time in the context of this litigation. See Maj. Op. at 47–48. Its view conflicts with China’s public representation to the World Trade Organization (“**WTO**”) in 2002 **that it “gave up export administration of . . . vitamin C**,” noted under the heading “any restrictions on exports through non-automatic licensing or other means . . . .” World Trade Organization, Transitional Review under Art. 18 of the Protocol of Accession of the People's Republic of China, G/C/W/438, at 2–3 (2002) (some emphasis omitted). Upon careful and respectful consideration, these deficiencies prevent me from finding the submissions worthy of deference. Moreover, the record makes clear that Chinese law did not require the defendants to agree on prices above the minimum of $3.35/kg, which is what the defendants did. In a 2003 Notice informing “member enterprises” of the “industry[-]agreed export prices,” the Chamber asserted “[t]he agreed prices are the minimum prices. We put the limit on the floor prices but not the ceiling prices.” App’x 1934 (emphases added). Wang Qi, an executive of one of the original defendants that settled before trial, testified: Question: And when the minimum price for verification and chop was $3.35, the Chamber of Commerce did not care if your company sold Vitamin C at a price higher than $3.35; isn’t that right? Answer (Qi): Correct. That is like a minimum price. Question: You were free to decide about prices above $3.35 when that was the minimum price? Answer (Qi): Yes, when it’s over they don’t care. . . . Question: And no one ordered you outside of your company to charge prices higher than $3.35 when that was the minimum price? . . . [(Qi asks to clarify question)] Answer (Qi): No. Id. at 1709–10 (emphases added). Qi’s testimony is consistent with the Ministry’s and defendants’ accounts. The Ministry described the PVC regime as “the minimum export price rule,” explaining that “Chinese law imposed minimum price thresholds via PVC,” Ministry’s Letter Br. at 2, 4 (emphasis added), and “[i]f the price was at or above the minimum acceptable price set by coordination through the Chamber, the Chamber affixed a . . . ‘chop,’ on the contract,” App’x 164 (emphasis added). This accords with the Ministry’s consistent contention that China adopted the PVC system to “avoid anti-dumping sanctions imposed by foreign countries on China’s exports,” id., also identified as a goal in the 2002 Notice. See also Appellants’ Letter Br. at 4 (“The prices agreed on were up to the companies so long as they exceeded anti-dumping minima.”). As a result, even if Chinese law required vitamin C exporters to coordinate in setting a price, it was only a minimum price; to collude on prices above that was the defendants’ choice, not their legal obligation. The majority acknowledges that “the [Subcommittee] members were able to exercise some discretion in determining actual market prices by consensus,” Maj. Op. at 36, and that “the PVC regime’s enforcement scheme appears to have required only the [minimum price of $3.35/kg],” id. at 47 n.33. Yet it surmises that “the additional price and volume coordination” above the minimum was “still clearly mandated by the Chinese government,” without any support.2 Id. Neither the defendants nor the majority proffer any evidence suggesting vitamin C exporters needed to agree on every price rather than just the minimum price. Instead, the defendants argue that “the price level established does not matter” because the Sherman Act prohibits price fixing per se. Appellants’ Letter Br. at 6. However, international comity does not work that way. International comity is a careful balancing act.3 It requires “tak[ing] into account the interests of the United States, the interests of the foreign state, and those mutual interests the family of nations have in just and efficiently functioning rules of international law.” In re Maxwell Commc'n Corp., 93 F.3d 1036, 1048 (2d Cir. 1996). Accordingly, “[w]hen there is a conflict, a court should seek a reasonable accommodation that reconciles the central concerns of both sets of laws.” Societe Nationale Industrielle Aerospatiale v. U.S. Dist. Ct. for S. Dist. of Iowa, 482 U.S. 522, 555 (1987) (Blackmun, J., concurring). China’s purpose in enacting the PVC regime, as characterized by the Ministry, was to “transition from a Statecontrolled economy” as it entered the WTO and to avoid anti-dumping sanctions. Ministry’s Letter Br. at 3. Even accepting for argument’s sake that Chinese law required the defendants to coordinate on a minimum price to achieve its concern about anti-dumping claims, applying comity for agreements **above the minimum** goes above and beyond **accommodating the central interests of the foreign state**. Nothing in the international comity precedents implies a true conflict exists where only part of the defendants’ conduct was required under foreign law. As the Supreme Court held in Hartford Fire, there is no true conflict if foreign law did not “require[] [defendants] to act in some fashion prohibited by the law of the United States” or if the defendants’ “compliance with the laws of both countries” was possible. 509 U.S. at 799. The phrase “act in some fashion” does not direct courts to ignore whether there exists a true conflict as to the defendants’ actual conduct at issue. Indeed, as the majority recites repeatedly, the comity analysis looks to the “degree of conflict with foreign law,” not simply whether there is any conflict period. See Timberlane Lumber Co. v. Bank of Am., N.T. & S.A., 549 F.2d 597, 614 (9th Cir. 1976) (emphasis added).4 Accordingly, even if the PVC regime required the defendants to agree on a minimum price and the defendants could not have complied with the Sherman Act because it prohibits price fixing per se, comity does not demand that we set aside examining if their actual price-fixing conduct was required under Chinese law. The defendants could have complied with Chinese law and the Sherman Act by: (1) exercising their legal right to resign from the Subcommittee and not participating in any conspiracy to set prices, or (2) not colluding on prices above the minimum, the only price needed to receive a chop. Given the “virtually unflagging obligation of the federal courts to exercise the jurisdiction given them,” Colorado River Water Conservation Dist. v. United States, 424 U.S. 800, 817 (1976), this is not the “rare” case presenting “extraordinary circumstances” that warrants dismissal on the basis of comity, see Brief for U.S. Gov’t as Amicus Curiae, Animal Sci. Prods., 138 S. Ct. 1865 (No. 16-1220), at 19. I would affirm the judgment of the district court.5

#### That opens the door for inconsistency in WTO and Antitrust laws by creating an immunization strategy under both --- post-hoc defenses are key

Wang, 12 (Dingding Tina Wang, J.D. Candidate 2012, Columbia Law Vol. 112, No.5 , June 2012, Accessed 11-12-21, “WHEN ANTITRUST MET WTO: WHY U.S. COURTS SHOULD CONSIDER U.S.-CHINA WTO DISPUTES IN DECIDING ANTITRUST CASES INVOLVING CHINESE EXPORTS” https://www.jstor.org/stable/23238449) //Babcii

2. Interplay of Antitrust Law and WTO Law. — **WTO law and antitrust law share the common goal of ensuring competition**, whether between domestic and foreign producers or among producers in general.79 But the WTO did not standardize an international form of antitrust law, and antitrust law remains cleaved along national lines.80 A **member country** generally cannot sue another member country in the WTO for anticompetitive **conduct by private actors**.81 Some scholars have argued that there is little incentive for a country to sign onto an international antitrust agreement because the advantage of export cartels for the exporting country is that losses typically fall to foreign consumers and gains accrue to domestic producers.82 National governments have an incentive to set up, encourage, or tolerate export cartels as a way to prop up domestic producers and externalize the costs of doing so to foreign markets,83 though at the risk of provoking trade tensions.84 Overall, WTO law continues to **focus on state conduct while antitrust** law mostly **targets private anticompetitive conduct**. But national antitrust law and WTO law interact and are **likely to conflict** when private anticompetitive conduct is mixed with state conduct. As a prime example, the recent U.S.-China WTO dispute over China's export restraints on certain raw materials closely tracks the pending antitrust cases in U.S. courts, but the U.S. government and U.S. plaintiffs made contradicting claims: The U.S. government argued in the WTO that the Chinese government directed the export restraints, while the U.S. private parties argued in U.S. courts that the Chinese government did not direct the export restraints.85 If China's price restraints are public in nature, the producers may be **immune from U.S. antitrust** li ability, due to available common-law foreign-sovereignty-related defenses, but the country should be vulnerable to WTO liability. If the price restraints are private in nature, **China should avoid WTO liability** but the private antitrust cases should proceed on the merits, because the foreign sovereignty-related defenses would fail.86 **There is** the risk of **theoretical inconsistency**, in which both the foreign country and its private producers are held liable, and the resulting "double whammy" for the foreign country of both treble damages from U.S. antitrust liability and trade sanctions from WTO liability.87 As one antitrust treatise notes, WTO and national antitrust cases "when taken together raise fascinating possibilities for the interaction between competition policy and international trade law."88 The DOJ and FTC also observe, "There has always been a close relationship between the international application of the antitrust laws and the policies and rules governing the international trade of the United States. II. Chinese Exports: A Tale of Three Judicial Approaches to the U.S.-China WTO Dispute This Part explores the interaction between three domestic antitrust actions and the parallel WTO dispute. Part II.A describes the unprecedented Chinese government participation in the vitamin C case in the Eastern District of New York and describes the court's treatment of the Chinese government's representations to the court. Part II.B shows how the U.S.-China WTO dispute interacts with the vitamin C case, particularly through the U.S. government's extensive use, in its WTO filings, of the Chinese government's statements in the vitamin C case. Part II.C compares the approaches that the three district courts have taken in re sponse to the existence of the U.S.-China WTO dispute. Part II.C.l de scribes the Western District of Pennsylvania's constitutional and prag matic rationales for issuing a stay of its case pending resolution of the WTO dispute. Part II.C.2 explores the District of New Jersey's use of the U.S. executive branch's position in the WTO dispute to help it make fac tual and legal findings. Part II.D.l provides the broader context of U.S. courts' treatment of decisions by international tribunals, and, in particu lar, the Federal Circuit's refusal to accord legal deference to WTO rul ings in its interpretation of U.S. trade law. The section notes that the precedent leaves room for ways that WTO cases can factually inform courts' application of other areas of U.S. law, such as antitrust. Part II.D.2 describes a line of trade-remedy cases in which courts still acknowledge that WTO decisions can be informative or persuasive and argues that this approach can be extended to domestic antitrust cases. A. Vitamin C Case: The Chinese Government Speaks In the vitamin C case discussed in Part I.B, the Chinese government, apparently for the first time ever, filed an amicus brief in U.S. court.90 China's Ministry of Commerce, a government body under the direction of the State Council (China's equivalent of the U.S. Cabinet) that regulates China's foreign trade, sought to bolster the Chinese vitamin C producers' **defenses of act of state, foreign sovereign compulsion, and international comity**. The Ministry first submitted a brief to the district court in 2006 explaining that, under China's export regulatory regime, the Chinese government, through an affiliated trade chamber, **directed** defendants to coordinate export **price** floors **among themselve**s.91 To counter the plaintiffs' argument that the defendants' trade association, CCCMHPIE, was a private organization, the Ministry stated that the chamber "is an entity under the Ministry's direct and active supervision"92 and that it authorized the creation of the chamber's vitamin C subcommittee to which the Chinese defendants belonged. **The Ministry did not directly set prices** but ordered the subcommittee members to attend price discussion meetings, vote on price floors, and comply with those price floors, under penalty of having their export allowances reduced or their export licenses revoked.93 In response, the plaintiffs pointed to the Chinese government s past public statements extolling the independence of trade chambers to support the plaintiffs' position that the chamber is a private actor. The Ministry of Commerce then filed a statement with the court in 2008 emphasizing that its 2006 amicus brief, rather than the past public statements, represented the Ministry's official position.94 The Ministry stressed that China's chambers of commerce do not fit the U.S. conception of a chamber of commerce: "[P] lain tiffs trivialize China's organs of regulation where those organs differ in structure or function from ones more familiar to the plaintiffs."95 Finally, the Ministry appealed to respect for sovereignty and reliance on diplomacy: [T]he Chinese government respectfully submits that, to the extent the plaintiffs take issue with the Chinese government's sovereign actions over the conduct solely of its own citizens, that issue should not be addressed in the courts of the United States but rather through bilateral trade negotiations conducted by the executive branches of the respective sovereign nations . . . .96 This argument echoed the judicial reasoning behind the act of state doctrine, with its concern for preserving the role of the executive branch in conducting foreign policy. Nonetheless, the district court allowed the action to proceed past the motion to dismiss stage, stating it was still **unclear whether the Chinese vitamin C producers' actions were compelled or voluntary**.97 While professing deference to the Ministry's arguments, the court em phasized that the trade association's own documents, including its public website, portrayed the exporters as reaching a "self-regulated agreement" in which they would "voluntarily control" the price and quantity of ex ports and take "self-restraint measures."98 But it also noted the Ministry's argument that terms such as exporters' "voluntary self-restraint" and "self-discipline" used in the chamber's documents should not be taken at "face value" or for their literal translations but should be placed in the context of China's regulatory system.99 In support of the defendants' mo tion for summary judgment, the Ministry submitted a statement to the court in 2009 in response: This [self-discipline] system has a long history in China and has been well known to, and complied with by, Chinese companies. Self-discipline does not mean complete voluntariness or self conduct. In effect, self-discipline refers to a system of regulation under the supervision of a designated agency acting on behalf of the Chinese government.100 These Ministry statements in U.S. court would come in handy when the United States sued China under the WTO, as discussed in the next sec tion. Nevertheless, the district court (this time under a different judge) eventually ruled against the Chinese defendants' summary judgment mo tion, finding that as a matter of law the Chinese government did not compel defendants to fix export prices.101 The court found that there was no evidence, on the face of the government directives and the trade as sociation's documents, that the Ministry of Commerce required, rather than merely encouraged, the exporters' price and output agreements.102 It found that even if some compulsion existed, the Chinese government only compelled exporters to avoid below-cost pricing and foreign anti dumping charges, not to set specific price levels that were above those necessary to achieve the government's goals.103 The court settled on ac cepting the so-called "plain language" of government regulations and trade association documents that emphasized the exporters' system of "self-discipline" and "voluntary" cooperation, and rejected the Chinese defendants' and Chinese government's insistence that such language be placed in the context of China's regulatory culture.104 It also found that **the Ministry of Commerce's amicus brief and statements105 to the court reflected a "carefully crafted and phrased litigation position" that was a "post-hoc" attempt to shield the exporters from liability.**106

#### That creates incentives to game the system --- It is proven to be theoretically and empirically likely

Fox and Janow, 12 (Eleanor Fox and Merit Janow, Walter J. Derenberg Professor of Trade Regulation at New York University School of Law, l Professor, Columbia University, 2012, accessed on 2-8-2022, Its.law.nyu, "China, the WTO, and Statesponsored export cartels: Where trade and competition ought to meet ", https://its.law.nyu.edu/faculty/profiles/representiveFiles/fox%20-%20China\_%20the%20WTO\_%20and%20Statesponsored%20export%20cartels\_FED2F0A6-A495-4641-11BC016851056F31.pdf)//Babcii

Has China lit its candle at both ends? We consider the hypothetical case of China sponsored hard core export restraints, which could in theory be carried out either by the state or by firms under the control of the state. We examine their legitimacy, both under WTO treaty obligations and under antitrust law. In so doing, we are struck by the opportunities for nations to **play** one **system** (trade) **against the other** (competition). At the end of this essay, we suggest a modality for bringing the systems and their fact-finding into greater coherence or at least awareness. We concentrate principally on one particular ongoing litigation, the US antitrust case against four Chinese firms for fixing prices of vitamin C into the United States (the firms admit the price-fixing and attribute it to China),1 as compared with a hypothetical proceeding in the World Trade Organization against China for sponsoring the export cartel. In the pending US antitrust case, Vitamin C, the Chinese firms defend that their cartel was lawful; that it was in fact China’s cartel; and they argue that the price-fixers are shielded from liability by the foreign sovereign compulsion defense. In the Vitamin C case, China’s Ministry of Commerce has, exceptionally, filed an amicus brief taking ownership of the cartel.2 Some years earlier, in the process of joining the WTO, **China undertook** extensive market-opening accession commitments. These  commitments included China’s undertaking to **allow the market to set prices** “in every sector” **except in areas specified**.3 Vitamins were not among the reserved items. China’s commitments reinforce a number of WTO provisions. For example, Article XI of the GATT speaks to the elimination of quantitative restrictions on imports and exports,4 Article 7.2 of China’s Protocol states its commitment not to “introduce, reintroduce or apply non-tariff measures;”5 Article 11 of the Safeguards Agreement prohibits voluntary export restraints, orderly marketing arrangements and other similar export measures... 6 What if China were exonerated in notional **WTO proceedings** against it for ordering a **vitamin C cartel** on grounds that the evidence was too ambiguous to conclude that the government itself ordered the output and price restrictions (a measure that would be reachable under some facts under China’s protocol and GATT Article XI7 ), **and** if the Chinese vitamins firms were **exonerated in the US court proceedings** on grounds that China did order the restrictions? We pose this possibility to examine two larger questions. 1) What is the appropriate perspective on the right of the state to take measures that impose costs on the trading system, and what is the appropriate perspective on the right of firms to invoke state action in defense of their export cartel? 2) What modalities can minimize the gaming and can nudge the systems towards coherence, both on fact-finding (what did Chinese officials say to whom?) and on the narrative: Did China adopt a governmental measure ordering the cartel within the meaning of its WTO undertakings; did it order the cartel within the meaning of the antitrust foreign sovereign compulsion defense? Did it order the cartel and also the terms of it, and does that matter?8 Should “order” mean the same thing in WTO language and in antitrust language? What are the consequences if the default perspectives for trade and for competition are not aligned? What are the consequences if WTO obligations are construed to give more policy space to China, and if the antitrust defense is construed to disfavor exceptions from the antitrust rule against cartels (as it is)? The appropriate perspective? We have a view: Trade and competition are two sides of the same coin. Trade and competition rules sympathetic to markets are important in today’s world of deep economic globalization. The financial crisis and its aftermath has increased tendencies of nations to draw inwards and to be attracted to more narrowly self-interested measures in the hope that nationalism might solve their problems. Often, the opposite is true. A perspective of openness and regard for the larger community is likely to enhance economic welfare, in general to produce more harmony, and to take an edge off conflicts in the world. We therefore prefer an approach in which commitments are interpreted strictly when construing undertakings by nations to forsake export restraints or export cartels. The counterpart to a state commitment to play by rules of free trade (not to restrain exports) is the private firm commitment to play by the rules of competition (not to cartelize). The anticartel rule is strong and stronger than it ever has been in the history of the world. Why? Because more and more nations appreciate the value of markets; they are in search of growth, and they are committed to building environments in which their producers can flourish and in which consumers can get fair deals. All antitrust nations of the world recognize that hard core cartels are heinous; cartels rob the people; they degrade competition, chilling the incentives that lead firms to invent and produce, create jobs and create wealth. There is no international law of competition, but there is one principle of antitrust law that can be found in all national antitrust regimes: No hard core cartels.9 Why, then, does the law of the US and other nations allow a foreign sovereign compulsion defense to a hard core cartel? There are two reasons: 1) Deference to sovereignty. If the state has a right to take certain measures (restrain exports), then should it not be allowed to use its firms as the means to do so? 2) Fairness to the commanded firms. Should a firm be punished merely for following the command of its state? If indeed China undertook not to order export cartels, then there would be no need for a foreign sovereign compulsion defense in order to respect the sovereignty space of China, for China would have forsaken just such policy space in return for the greater benefits of the world trading system.10 If, further, the defendant vitamin C firms had the choice not to price fix into the United States as far as China was concerned, either because China did not issue an order or the order was objectively invalid as contrary to China’s obligations, it would not be unfair to the firms to hold them to account. Indeed, even if the firms perceived that they were following the policy of their country, one could make a rather convincing argument that it is more unfair to the overcharged consumers for a court to refuse to apply the anti-cartel law than it is unfair to the profiteering cartelists to apply the US law.11 And if China (MOFOM) ordered the firms to collaborate on production to avoid dumping lawsuits and the firms proceeded to agree to an elevated price far above what any objective avoidance would require (plaintiffs allege that price rose almost 200%, from $2.50 to $7.00 per kilogram), again, fairness may not lie on the side of the firms.12 Thus, depending on the facts, neither the privilege of the sovereign nor equity to firms may require an antitrust defense, let alone a wide one. But still, our hypothetical may **come to pass**. The reach of international trade rules over state sponsored export cartels is **not well established**, we are just beginning to see cases litigating the scope of applicable rules. Moreover, both **China’s** governmental measures and the WTO obligations are not without ambiguity. The WTO could uphold the state as fulfilling its WTO commitments and the US federal court could uphold the firms’ submission that their conduct was compelled.13 Or conversely, there could be state liability at the WTO and private liability in antitrust. What might be done to avert such possibilities, or at least to avert **gaming by the litigants**?

#### The most recent decision is unique --- It will greatly increase the risk of gaming through post-hoc measures

Qingxiu Bu, Commercial Law @ University of Sussex, formerly professor of transnational business @ Georgetown Law Center, ’20, ‘“Respectful Consideration, but Not Deference: Chinese Sovereign Amici in the US Supreme Court Vitamin C Judgment” Journal of European Competition Law & Practice, Vol. 11, No. 5–6

A. Neutrality, accuracy, and consistence

A foreign sovereign would unlikely be wholly impartial and could be liable to make false or inconsistent representations to federal courts.66 One of the possible risks is that it may not be neutral, which results from a strong incentive to shield its domestic entities from antitrust liability abroad.67 In Vitamin C, MOFCOM may have been motivated to shield domestic firms from treble damages.68 As Sweeney observed, the gains from the uncompetitive behaviour would accrue to their home state, while the victims are foreign purchasers.69 This is reflected in the Chinese government’s allegedly inconsistent position regarding its regulation of Vitamin C exports in front of the World Trade Organisation (WTO).70 China’s submission directly contradicted previous statements it had made about its competition law to theWTO.71 It is inferred that MOFCOM’s position was a post hoc attempt to shield the Chinese defendants’ conduct from antitrust scrutiny.72 Being inconsistent and self-serving, MOFCOM’s statement is due limited deference.73 The **lack of consistency** with earlier positions is not dispositive; however, it **can compromise** the **reliability** of the litigants’ position. As Godi said: ‘In fact, when a foreign government wishes to intervene as a third party to a dispute, its objective is rather clear: self-interest.’74 **Opening the door to this kind of manipulation** of American lawsuits would be self evidently unwise.75 **The Court should assess** the extent to which the foreign sovereign’s litigation position is **consistent with the positions it has taken in earlier briefs.**76

#### Attempts to “game” the system undermine the transnational legal process (TLP) and undermines WTO legitimacy --- Allowing antitrust to fill the gap is reverse causal

Shen, 20 (Weimin Shen, L.L.M, J.S.D., Washington University School of Law, 8-2-2020, accessed on 11-24-2021, Papers.ssrn, "The Role of Transnational Legal Process in Enforcing WTO Law and Competition Policy", https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=3785688)//Babcii

“Export cartel” refers to a collusive behavior between exporting firms “to charge a specified export price or to divide export markets among themselves.”1 The purpose is often to enhance domestic firms’ welfare at the expense of foreign consumers. 2 **Antitrust and** the World Trade Organization (“**WTO**”) are mutually exclusive remedies when dealing with an **export cartel**. The difference is that a successful antitrust proceeding depends on showing the **absence of government involvement**. In contrast, a WTO proceeding’s success depends on showing **the State’s participation** in export restraints. Lately, **the lines have blurred when certain export cartels wind their way through U.S. courts.** In such cases, the extent to which U.S. courts should enforce antitrust laws against foreign export cartels has been controversial, as defendants often invoke foreign-sovereignty-related defenses. This issue has become more prominent than ever with involved litigants who are at times unable to apply their antitrust laws extraterritorially to international cartels because of the difficulty of obtaining evidence that is located outside of their jurisdiction. Similarly, litigants at the WTO complained about the government’s role in the administrative and judicial system, including the use of verbal demands and informal notices on export cartels. This intervention undermines the ability to show that a WTO-inconsistent measure exists. Several recent U.S. antitrust litigations involving Chinese export cartels highlight this challenge. In **In re Vitamin C** Antitrust Litigation (“Vitamin C”),3 the Chinese defendants moved to dismiss the complaint of price-fixing on the ground that Chinese law required them to fix the price and quantity of vitamin C exports, **shielding them from liability under U.S. antitrust law.** The defendants invoked comity, sovereign compulsion, and the act of state doctrines.4 The Chinese **Ministry of Commerce** (“Ministry”) took the unprecedented step of intervening as amicus curiae in the proceeding. The Ministry explained that the China Chamber of Commerce of Medicines & Health Products Importers & Exporters (“CCCMHPIE”) is a “Ministry-supervised entity authorized by the Ministry to regulate vitamin C export prices and output levels.”5 Thus, the Chinese defendants were compelled under Chinese law to collectively set a price for vitamin C exports.6 Two similar antitrust cases were brought in the U.S. courts against Chinese export cartels. In Resco Products, Inc. v. Bosai Minerals Group,7 private litigants alleged price-fixing and other anti-competitive behavior by certain Chinese exporters of bauxite. As the members of the China Chamber of Commerce of Metals Minerals & Chemicals Importers & Exporters (“CCCMC”), the Chinese defendants relied on the amicus brief filed by the Ministry in Vitamin C and argued that CCCMC was a government entity that directed them to coordinate their price.8 Similarly, in Animal Science Products, Inc. v. China National Metals and Minerals Import and Export Corp,9 private litigants alleged price-fixing and other anti-competitive behavior by certain Chinese exporters of magnesite in a separate U.S. court proceeding. The defendants asserted that their trade chamber, CCCMC, was an instrument of the Chinese government to regulate export trade.10 On June 23, 2009, with the blessings of the Obama Administration, the U.S. government requested WTO consultations with China regarding China’s export restraints on several raw materials.11 In its first written submission, the U.S. government cited the above three cases, arguing that based upon representations already made by the Chinese Ministry, “the European understands that the CCCMC’s export-price related functions and responsibilities . . . are attributable to China.”12 On December 21, 2009, the Dispute Settlement Body (“DSB”) established a single panel to examine the complaints.13 The above **case**s fostered a **perception that** antitrust and WTO meet when private anticompetitive conduct is mixed with state conduct. Emblematic of this viewpoint is Professor Eleanor M. Fox and Professor Merit E. Janow’s argument that “[t]rade and competition rules sympathetic to markets are important in today’s world of deep economic globalization.”14 Both of the scholars were astonished by the **opportunities for nations to play one system** (trade) **against the other** (competition). They also cautioned that U.S. **courts** involved with foreign export cartels need to flexibly interact with the international regime to form a coherent approach to legal challenges over foreign regulatory systems.15 What academics and other commentators have missed is that the involved U.S. courts and the executive branch’s stance in the above litigations perfectly illustrates a pervasive Transnational Legal Process. The U.S. not only **represents all antitrust nations’ interests** when it is anti-cartel. The **transnational actors generated interactions that led to WTO law** and competition policy interpretations that become internalized, thereby binding under domestic law (in this Article, China law). This Article assesses the roles of Transnational Legal Process by examining transnational actors engaged in antitrust litigation and evaluating their relationship to transnational actors participating in the WTO litigation. My central thesis is that essential **synergies exist** between trade and competition, in which Transnational Legal Process will largely prove a positive role in constraining state-sponsored export cartels and international cartels. To avert gaming by the litigants due to ambiguous factual evidence in cartel cases, U.S. courts and the executive branch should become active transnational actors. They therefore stimulate each other to **participate in a dynamic process of Transnational Legal Process**. Under the condition that cartel action is attributable to State in the antitrust proceeding, as defendants invoke foreign-sovereignty-related defenses, transnational actors in the competition system promote WTO obedience by sending a strong signal to the executive branch. Under the condition that **cartel action is attributable to private parties** in the WTO proceeding, transnational actors in **the competition system** should perform a gap-filling role that the WTO system precludes. 16 The resulting tendency is to suggest **a synergistic relationship** between transnational actors to play by rules of free trade (not to restrain exports) and competition (not to cartelize). Having described the most basic features of Transnational Legal Process, my Article partly confirms that Transnational Legal Process **could** somewhat fix the potentially worrying issue of nations’ opportunities to play one system (trade) against the other (competition). This Article is organized as follows: Part II explores the treatment of cartels and important synergies that exist between WTO law and competition law. Part III details the theory of Transnational Legal Process and explores its potential role where the antitrust system and the WTO system meet. Part IV examines the role of Transnational Legal Process in enforcing WTO law and competition policy in the Chinese context.17 I examine the chief factors behind China’s economic transition that have shaped its current antitrust economic conditions. I then discuss the relationship between trade associations and the government under the hybrid nature of China’s regulatory environment. Part V explores relevant cases, focusing on U.S. transnational actor involvement. These cases support the basic premises that U.S. courts as part of Transnational Legal Process have successfully stimulated other participants (in this Article, the United States Trade Representative (“USTR”)). The key point is that Transnational Legal Process is active and significantly affected China’s WTO internalization and competition policy convergence.18 The last Chapter stresses the future of Transnational Legal Process, free trade, and competition. I suggest that the WTO plays a central role in framing the issues at play in the U.S.-China **trade dispute**. Meanwhile, I argue Transnational Legal Process needs to discern the means to champion **transformation in other facets, such as human rights**, before internalizing international trade laws. Or, given the **high stakes**, it needs to learn how to **leverage trade cooperation to internalize other domains of laws and regulations as a part of Transnational Legal Process**. On the surface, it may appear that faith in Transnational Legal Process has collapsed in the domain of international trade. Critics argued that the world is experiencing a new situation where there is no international law to apply, or the existing WTO law may not precisely cover this new situation. I contend, however, that the influence of Transnational Legal Process is still at work, even **as the world experiences its longest-ever trade tensions**. Transnational Legal Process remains standing in good faith among the opportunities **for the U**nited **S**tates to strengthen free trade and competition—by translating the spirit and **intent of existing law to govern it.**

#### It's the core test for overall legitimacy of the process --- Success spills over to other domains

Shen, 20 (Weimin Shen, L.L.M, J.S.D., Washington University School of Law, 8-2-2020, accessed on 11-24-2021, Papers.ssrn, "The Role of Transnational Legal Process in Enforcing WTO Law and Competition Policy", https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=3785688)//Babcii

Nevertheless, the influence of **T**ransnational **L**egal **P**rocess is still very much **at work**, even as the world is experiencing its worst “slowbalisation.” 299 What is at stake is that the success experienced in the international trade regime **did not replicate itself in other international law domains**. In particular, when this theory comes to human rights, the government would block them out. As such, having secured the legal certainty and economic benefits of most-favored-nation treatment through WTO accession, the failed internalization parts embarked on a mission to ensure that the economic transformation would not upend its political control. V. CONCLUSION This article seeks to explore the roles of Transnational Legal Process in the realm of trade and competition systems. It is mainly focused on how US courts and the executive branch in a synergistic relationship enforce WTO obedience and **competition policy** convergence as part of **Transnational Legal Process**. I have given concrete examples of Transnational Legal Process actively working and reforming China’s industry to comply with rules of free trade and competition. Transnational Legal Process is a wise strategy to negotiate with China through a combination of self-interest and legal process, which could contribute to long-term national obedience with international law. **A spirit of openness** and regard for the broader community is likely to promote **economic welfare** as a whole, create **more harmony**, and take an edge off the world’s **conflicts**. Time will tell whether Transnational Legal **Process can meet this challenge**. What is certain, though, is that the unique nature of the Chinese economy creates new tensions for interpreting **WTO law and the roles of Transnational Legal Process**. In the future, Transnational Legal Process may need to discern the means to champion transformation in other facets, such as human rights, before internalizing international trade laws. Or, given the **high stakes**, it may need to learn how to leverage **trade** cooperation to internalize **other domains of laws** and regulations **in the process** of Transnational Legal Process. In any event, the U.S. is not the only proponent of Transnational Legal Process. All allies should support the system of global governance and address the real problems of the world.

#### That’s key to an effective form of multilateralism

Shen, 20 (Weimin Shen, L.L.M, J.S.D., Washington University School of Law, 8-2-2020, accessed on 11-24-2021, Papers.ssrn, "The Role of Transnational Legal Process in Enforcing WTO Law and Competition Policy", https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=3785688)//Babcii

From this perspective, I have already argued that **transnational actors** (in this Article, U.S. courts and the USTR) **preserved international law** by participating in **Transnational Legal Process** by **working together** and encouraging each other through a complex **norm internalization**. They were not only spurred by self-interest; more importantly, these transnational actors also promoted WTO law compliance and competition policy convergence. In the next section, I propose transnational actors’ suggestions that together would constitute positive next steps for this critical economic relationship. The core is to avoid fostering a relationship shaped only by competition and identifying where mutually beneficial outcomes are possible. As the U.S. Department of Defense has pointed out, while China is a critical long-term strategic competitor, “competition does not mean conflict is inevitable, or preclude cooperation with China on areas of mutual interest.”276 B. What’s at Stake: Transnational Legal Process, Free Trade, and Competition The **cooperation of the 21st century was dominated by international organizations** created by formally negotiated and legally binding treaties.277 To maintain this structure of global cooperation, **the U**nited **S**tates supported the creation of an elaborate **legal framework to constrain illiberal actions** and encourage the notion of using global collaboration to solve global problems, such as **war** crimes, **trade** imbalances, **climate change**, immigration, and refugees. As the primary pioneer of liberal internationalism, this approach adopted by the United States was simple: **more diplomacy, more human rights, more democracy, and more legal process**.278 For example, the Paris Deal about climate change was negotiated under the auspices of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (“UNFCCC”), a treaty with 196 state parties to which the U.S. Senate gave its consent in 1992. Indeed, the evolution of the Paris Deal “graphically illustrated the engage-translate-leverage framework.”279 This deal also allows the U.S. to engage with countries around the world, such as G-20 members, members of the Major Economies Forum (“MEF”), and members of BASIC (Brazil, South Africa, India, and China) to frame the global deal. As Professor Koh commented: Instead of treating **climate change** as an area without law, the United States translated from **norms** inchoate in the rigid, legally binding, top-down Kyoto architecture, which specified internationally negotiated emissions targets that applied only to developed countries, to a much more informal, politically binding, bottom-up Copenhagen blueprint infused with stronger norms and with greater symmetry between the duties of developed and developing nations. 280 Likewise, the theory of Transnational Legal Process is significant in trade domains as well.281 The world is in a system of international commercial transactions that operates mostly with the hope of more and more market opening and less governmental intervention. The WTO is the only multilateral set of agreed-upon rules and norms of behavior to evaluate the Chinese economic structure’s impact on the international level. Seeing the WTO in this way **grants the U.S. authority** to confirm where China fails to comply with **existing commitments** and indicate where WTO laws are unable to discipline China on unfair trade practices and where bilateral or unilateral action may be necessary.

#### That solves numerous global risks and pathways for extinction

Yuval Noah Harari 18, Professor of History at Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 9/26/18, “We need a post-liberal order now,” The Economist, <https://www.economist.com/open-future/2018/09/26/we-need-a-post-liberal-order-now>

The second thing to note about this vision of friendly fortresses is that it has been tried—and it failed spectacularly. All attempts to divide the world into clear-cut nations have so far resulted in war and genocide. When the heirs of Garibaldi, Mazzini and Mickiewicz managed to overthrow the multi-ethnic Habsburg Empire, it proved impossible to find a clear line dividing Italians from Slovenes or Poles from Ukrainians. This had set the stage for the second world war. The key problem with the network of fortresses is that each national fortress wants a bit more land, security and prosperity for itself at the expense of the neighbors, and without the help of universal values and global organisations, rival fortresses cannot agree on any common rules. Walled fortresses are seldom friendly. But if you happen to live inside a particularly strong fortress, such as America or Russia, why should you care? Some nationalists indeed adopt a more extreme isolationist position. They don’t believe in either a global empire or in a global network of fortresses. Instead, they deny the necessity of any global order whatsoever. “Our fortress should just raise the drawbridges,” they say, “and the rest of the world can go to hell. We should refuse entry to foreign people, foreign ideas and foreign goods, and as long as our walls are stout and the guards are loyal, who cares what happens to the foreigners?” Such extreme isolationism, however, is completely divorced from economic realities. Without a global trade network, all existing national economies will collapse—including that of North Korea. Many countries will not be able even to feed themselves without imports, and prices of almost all products will skyrocket. The made-in-China shirt I am wearing cost me about $5. If it had been produced by Israeli workers from Israeli-grown cotton using Israeli-made machines powered by non-existing Israeli oil, it may well have cost ten times as much. Nationalist leaders from Donald Trump to Vladimir Putin may therefore heap abuse on the global trade network, but none thinks seriously of taking their country completely out of that network. And we cannot have a global trade network without some global order that sets the rules of the game. Even more importantly, whether people like it or not, humankind today faces three common problems that make a mockery of all national borders, and that can only be solved through global cooperation. These are nuclear war, climate change and technological disruption. You cannot build a wall against nuclear winter or against global warming, and no nation can regulate artificial intelligence (**AI) or bio**engineering single-handedly. It won’t be enough if only the European Union forbids producing killer robots or only America bans genetically-engineering human babies. Due to the immense potential of such disruptive technologies, if even one country decides to pursue these high-risk high-gain paths, other countries will be forced to follow its dangerous lead for fear of being left behind. An AI arms race or a biotechnological arms race almost guarantees the worst outcome. Whoever wins the arms race, the loser will likely be humanity itself. For in an arms race, all regulations will collapse. Consider, for example, conducting genetic-engineering experiments on human babies. Every country will say: “We don’t want to conduct such experiments—we are the good guys. But how do we know our rivals are not doing it? We cannot afford to remain behind. So we must do it before them.” Similarly, consider developing autonomous-weapon systems, that can decide for themselves whether to shoot and kill people. Again, every country will say: “This is a very dangerous technology, and it should be regulated carefully. But we don’t trust our rivals to regulate it, so we must develop it first”. The only thing that can prevent such destructive arms races is greater trust between countries. This is not an impossible mission. If today the Germans promise the French: “Trust us, we aren’t developing killer robots in a secret laboratory under the Bavarian Alps,” the French are likely to believe the Germans, despite the terrible history of these two countries. We need to build such trust globally. We need to reach a point when Americans and Chinese can trust one another like the French and Germans. Similarly, we need to create a global safety-net to protect humans against the economic shocks that AI is likely to cause. Automation will create immense new wealth in high-tech hubs such as Silicon Valley, while the worst effects will be felt in developing countries whose economies depend on cheap manual labor. There will be more jobs to software engineers in California, but fewer jobs to Mexican factory workers and truck drivers. We now have a global economy, but politics is still very national. Unless we find solutions on a global level to the disruptions caused by AI, **entire countries might collapse**, and the resulting chaos, violence and waves of immigration will destabilise the entire world. This is the proper perspective to look at recent developments such as Brexit. In itself, Brexit isn’t necessarily a bad idea. But is this what Britain and the EU should be dealing with right now? How does Brexit help prevent nuclear war? How does Brexit help prevent climate change? How does Brexit help regulate artificial intelligence and bioengineering? Instead of helping, Brexit makes it harder to solve all of these problems. Every minute that Britain and the EU spend on Brexit is one less minute they spend on preventing climate change and on regulating AI. In order to survive and flourish in the 21st century, humankind needs effective global cooperation, and so far the only viable blueprint for such cooperation is offered by liberalism. Nevertheless, governments all over the world are undermining the foundations of the liberal order, and the world is turning into a network of fortresses. The first to feel the impact are the weakest members of humanity, who find themselves without any fortress willing to protect them: refugees, illegal migrants, persecuted minorities. But if the walls keep rising, eventually the whole of humankind will feel the squeeze.

#### Antitrust on Chinese gaming induces economic liberalism and compliance with the WTO --- The process of the plan is empirically successful

Shen, 20 (Weimin Shen, L.L.M, J.S.D., Washington University School of Law, 8-2-2020, accessed on 11-24-2021, Papers.ssrn, "The Role of Transnational Legal Process in Enforcing WTO Law and Competition Policy", https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=3785688)//Babcii

V. THE IMPLICATIONS OF TRANSNATIONAL LEGAL PROCESS FOR TRADE AND COMPETITION There are potential implications of Transnational Legal Process for WTO compliance. Suppose a WTO member country moves in a legally noncompliant direction. In that case, other member countries can legally challenge that country in a WTO dispute and generate an interaction that yields a settlement (interpretation) that the government defendant must then obey as a matter of domestic law (internalization).252 I already discussed how US **courts** and both **governmental** and non-governmental **actors** were part of the Transnational Legal Process. In this Chapter, I examine important normative questions **via Transnational Legal Process**. I argue that Transnational Legal Process has laid the groundwork for China’s economic transition. What is at stake is that the international trade regime’s success did not replicate itself in other international law domains. The appropriate solution, in my view, remains Transnational Legal Process. I then apply Transnational Legal Process to current international trade, focusing particularly on the trade war rages between the US and China. As we shall see, Transnational Legal Process remains alive and significant opportunities exist for US transnational actors if they remain active **participants**. A. The Fruits of Transnational Legal Process There are at least three practical reasons that Transnational Legal Process can be robust, even in a place where judicial institutions are weak and governmental openness limited.253 First, the heart of effective internalization depends on the degree to which particular rules are or are not internalized into the domestic legal structure, instead of the particular domestic legal system in question.254 Second, Transnational Legal Process is a constructivist process by which it serves to reorder not just national interests but even national identity. 255 Third, Transnational Legal Process actually could help to explain why nations obey and why nations do not obey. 256 The United States has encouraged the Chinese agencies to enforce the Anti-monopoly Law (“AML”) to work with Chinese regulatory agencies with sectoral responsibilities to emphasize the importance of trade associations refraining from engaging in **conduct that would violate antitrust** law.257 On 30 August 2007, China promulgated the AML, shortly after antitrust class actions brought against Chinese defendants.258 The AML delineates the legal framework for the prohibition of cartels. Article 11, for example, stated that “[t]rade associations shall tighten their selfdiscipline, give guidance to the undertakings in their respective trades in lawful competition, and maintain the market order in competition.”259 Article 16 makes explicit that trade associations may not make arrangements for undertakings within their respective trades to engage in monopolistic practices.260 Article 46 increases the maximum fines imposable on trade associations from 500,000 yuan to 5 million yuan.261 The same article also stated that if the circumstances are serious, the administrative department for the registration of public organizations may cancel the registration of the trade association per the law.262 Since the initial implementation of the AML in 2008, several price-related investigations involving trade associations were conducted by the country’s antitrust agencies, including fields of papermaking, sea sand, gold jewelry, construction equipment, insurance, brick manufacturing, tourism and so on.263 Action accompanied the commitment that China will implement its DSB rulings and recommendations on May 2, 2015.264 According to State Councilor Wang Yong: “The separation of industry associations and chambers of commerce from the government represents a major reform measure that China is currently carrying out.”265 On July 8, 2015, the General Office of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China and the General Office of the State Council released the “Overall Plan for the Decoupling of Chambers of Commerce of Industry Associations and Administrative Organs” to promote the decoupling of industry associations from administrative agencies. 266 The plan is considered to be a first step for the Chinese government to formally clarify the functional boundaries between administrative agencies and industry association chambers of commerce. 267 It includes 1) cancellation of the sponsorship, supervisory, and affiliation relationship between the administrative organ (including subordinate units) and the industry associations and the chamber of commerce; 2) clarification of the functions of the industry associations and the chamber of commerce, including removing the existing administrative functions of the industry associations and the chamber of commerce, except as otherwise provided by laws and regulations; 3) separation of assets and finance, and standardization of property relations; and 4) separation the personnel management of these industry associations and the chamber of commerce from the government, and define their relationship regarding personnel; and 5) separation Communist Party of China affairs and international exchanges of these organizations from the government and define their relationship regarding administration.268 By the end of 2018, 422 national-based industry associations had been decoupled from administrative agencies, which exceeded 50% of the total number.269 On June 14, 2019, the Central Office announced the decoupling of the remaining 373 national-based industry associations.27 All the above changes show that the government delineated a robust enforcement system against protectionist and other abusive government restraints. In fact, the fruits of Transnational Legal Process are visible on the streets of any major Chinese metropolis. With the WTO accession and **Transnational Legal Process** application, **thousands of Chinese laws and regulations were rewritten**. 271 Chinese legal scholars, international lawyers, law students, and government officers acquired knowledge about the rules necessary for their country to **reengage with the global trade regime**. They, in turn, widely disseminated this knowledge internally.272 Yet it would be **incorrect to assume that Transnational Legal Process is always perfect**. As many scholars argued, the enforcement powers of the AML are so **weak** as to nearly undermine the effort.273 **Nevertheless**, it is essential to step back and be clear that China is currently the United States’ largest merchandise trading partner, its third-largest export market, and its most significant source of imports. The economic costs of the bilateral economic relationship are genuine. Meanwhile, the **WTO** is the only international body dealing with trade rules between the U.S. and China that reflect core U.S. values. It “**form[s]** a baseline . . . to build **global support** to **critique** and **push back** against **Chinese** economic **practices**.” 274 In the context of comprehensively addressing China’s challenges, **the WTO is** still a **central** system, and subject to the strong leadership of the U.S. Viewed through the optic of a Transnational Legal Process, legal internalization occurs when an international norm is incorporated into the domestic legal system and becomes domestic law through executive action, judicial interpretation, legislative action, or some combination of the three.275 That is, the U.S. should take a comprehensive approach to the negotiations based on market-oriented solutions, **strengthening the global trading system and the rule of law.** Progressing on China’s WTO commitments will be most **effective** where the U.S. is also complying with its WTO commitments.

#### That’s key to global trade --- Otherwise Chinese cartels will increase populism and spread mercantilism that will rip apart free trade

Petit, 16 (Nicolas Petit, Nicolas Petit is Joint Chair in Competition Law at the Department of Law and at the Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies. He is also invited Professor at the College of Europe in Bruges. Prof at and phd from University of Liege, 6-21-2016, accessed on 7-8-2021, Papers.ssrn, "Chinese State Capitalism and Western Antitrust Policy", https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=2798162)//Babcii

II. MORAL IMPERATIVE The moral case for an antitrust reaction is easier to lay out. In recent years, public confidence in open markets that bring in foreign competition has been **fraying at the seams**. The growing opposition to ongoing trade partnership negotiations in the West is **a visible symptom** of this. The increasing political **clout** of anti-establishment and populist parties with anti-free trade agendas is another indicator of the public’s diminishing confidence in open markets. Chinese competition in Western markets has likely **meant distortions** in the level playing field, engineered by systemic subsidization, currency manipulation and extractive labor market relations.50 This has **eroded the political capital of the West’s “open door” trade policies**. A widespread realization that doing **business with China means** opening the door to a syndicate of firms, coordinated backstage by the CCP, could be **the final nail in the coffin for our current free trade system**. The collateral damage of doing business with the Chinese supertrust could indeed fuel further demands for a blanket abandonment of free and competitive **trade across the board**, including with nations which, unlike China, do have effective market governance institutions. This would in practice deny Western citizens the benefits of legitimate competitive imports. The risk of a backlash reinforces the pressing **need for antitrust** attention to the CCP-led supertrust, and may help forestall the emergence of an even **greater anti-free trade** platform than we presently observe. After all, the core raison d'être of antitrust regimes is reflective of Western societies’ moral commitment to promote competition in all of its forms. The **objection that this is a trade issue is** in our view **irrelevant**. As George Stigler wrote in a paper titled “The Economists and the problem of monopoly”: “**Free trade is** a sort of international **antimonopoly program in itself**”

#### Covid is uniqueness --- Only restraining mercantilism can prevent a full collapse

Sally, 20 (Razeen Sally, Visiting Associate Professor, Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy, National University of Singapore. Sally taught at the London School of Economics, where he received his PhD., Sep-24-2020, accessed on 11-19-2021, Hinrich Foundation, "Deglobalization and the new mercantilism | Hinrich Foundation", <https://www.hinrichfoundation.com/research/article/us-china/deglobalization-new-mercantilism/)//Babcii>

Three eras of international trade preceded the present pandemic. The first – the quarter-century until the GFC – was an era of unprecedented liberalisation and globalisation. The second – the near-decade after the GFC – saw globalisation stall, though not reverse, and trade growth stagnate alongside [“creeping” protectionism](https://www.ft.com/content/4ee2d69a-6aa3-11e4-bfb4-00144feabdc0). The third, [starting in early 2017](https://www.china-briefing.com/news/the-us-china-trade-war-a-timeline/), was triggered by President Trump, partly to retaliate against increasing Chinese protectionism. It centred on a US-China trade war but rippled out into copycatting protectionism by other countries. Protectionism went from creeping to galloping. This **pandemic has triggered the worst deglobalisation since 1945**. International trade may shrink by up to a third, foreign direct investment by up to 40 per cent, and international remittances by 20 per cent, this year. The trade outlook is worse than it was during the GFC in two ways. Now economic contraction is synchronised around the world; during and after the GFC, fast growth in emerging markets, [**led by China**](https://www.bbc.com/news/business-45493147)**,** cushioned the fall in trade and enabled a recovery. Now services trade is suffering even more than goods trade; travel and tourism have collapsed. The GFC, in contrast, hit goods trade hard but services trade was more resilient, especially fast-growing travel and tourism. Now there are signs of a protectionist upsurge, starting with export bans on medical equipment, with new restrictions on foreign ownership in the pipeline. What is the medium-term – post-vaccine – trade outlook? First, protectionism is likely to increase as a spillover of domestic state – particularly industrial-policy – interventions that last beyond the present crisis. Crisis-induced subsidies will be difficult to reverse wholesale and will **have trade-discriminating effects**. New screening requirements might have a chilling effect on foreign investment. These and other **interventions to protect domestic sectors** and national champions have a home-production bias. **The list of “strategic” sectors to protect** on “national security” grounds **against foreign competition will likely expand**. There will probably be more restrictions on migration and the cross-border movement of workers. Two precedents are relevant: the “new protectionism” of the 1970s and ‘80s, which partly resulted from bigger, more interventionist government in domestic markets; and, more perniciously, the expansion of government after the first world war, which empowered interest groups to lobby effectively for restricted imports, foreign investment and immigration. Second, national unilateralism – this time “illiberal unilateralism” – will likely expand and make effective regional and global policy cooperation more difficult. It bodes ill for the WTO, APEC and the G20, also for regional organisations such as ASEAN, and will cramp the liberalising effects of stronger preferential trade agreements. This only increases the prospect of tit-for-tat retaliation, starting with the Big Three (the US, EU and China), and **copycatting protectionism that will spread around the world.** Third, the reorientation of global value chains will accelerate. Western multinationals will relocate parts of their **production from China** to other countries on cost grounds, as they have been doing, but increasingly **on political-risk and security grounds** as well. There will be a combination of onshoring, near-shoring and regionalisation of value chains, which will vary widely by sector. But the **overall effect will be to raise costs for producers and consumers.** Fourth, international trade will be hit harder by a more fractured and conflictual geopolitical environment, especially US-China rivalry, but not helped either by an inward-looking and divided EU. It will be squeezed between more unstable geopolitics and the recalibration of states and markets – more “state” and less “market” – domestically. All the above points to a new mercantilist trade order that might be more malign than benign, echoing the “new protectionism” of the 1970s and early ‘80s, or, even more worryingly, the 1920s and ‘30s. My ideal world is a classical-liberal one: limited government, free markets and free trade, underpinned by appropriate domestic and international rules. I would add political liberalism and legally protected individual freedoms. The post-1945 global order was some distance from this classical-liberal ideal, but it was liberal enough to deliver unprecedented freedom and prosperity. From this vantage point, the new mercantilist order, with emerging malign characteristics, is alarming – bad economics, politics and international relations; bad for individual freedoms and global prosperity. As a realist, however, I must take the world “as it is” rather than indulge in wishful thinking. To improve the world, principled liberalism must be combined with practical realism. I believe **the two biggest threats to global order are rising illiberal populism in the West**, endangering the West’s adherence to its own liberal values, **and the increasingly aggressive illiberalism of the Chinese party-state**. Both have mercantilist features that spill over the border into protectionism and restricted globalisation. Both feed off each other in a global negative-sum game. Hence both must be resisted: naivety and complacency should apply to neither. China under Xi Jinping, with its mix of authoritarianism, a state-directed market economy and external assertiveness, is **becoming a classic mercantilist power**, like Germany and Japan in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century. Its external power projection, especially in the last decade, looks quite different to that of the US in the Pax Americana. Of course, at times, here and there, the US threw its weight about unilaterally and arbitrarily. But the essence of US leadership was to provide public goods for a stable, **open and prosperous world order**. It did so by organising concerts of international and regional cooperation. **In international trade,** that took the form of the GATT, later the WTO, and the multilateral rules it administers. **China**, in contrast, prioritises a combination of unilateral and bilateral **action to expand and entrench its power**. That subsumes the expansion of the PLA Navy in the East China Sea, South China Sea and Indian Ocean; and tight, asymmetric bilateral relations with smaller, weaker states in a twenty-first century recreation of the ancient tributary system. The Belt and Road Initiative should be seen in this frame: a network of hub-and-spoke bilateral relationships in which China wields power over dependent states. This is classic mercantilism. It privileges discretionary power, exercised unilaterally and bilaterally, over plurilateral and multilateral rules that constrain such power. **China** – meaning the Chinese Communist party state – **presents a pressing challenge to the liberal world order**. Dealing with this challenge will require some trade, technological and investment restrictions, and **limited supply-chain decoupling**. But that could easily descend into an all-round mercantilist and deglobalisation spiral. Hence China must be engaged at the same time, not least to preserve existing links that are mutually beneficial. Engagement and strategic decoupling need not be mutually exclusive. Still, this will prove an incredibly difficult, perhaps elusive, balancing act.

#### Breakdown causes civil and proxy conflicts that draw in Iran, Russia, and North Korea---nuclear war.

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

But that overlooked the ways in which the risk of interstate war was already rising before COVID-19 began to spread. Civil wars were becoming more numerous, lasting longer and attracting more outside involvement, with dangerous consequences for stability in many regions of the world. And the global dynamics most commonly cited to explain the falling incidence of interstate war—democracy, economic prosperity, international cooperation and others—were being upended. If the spread of democracy kept the peace, then its global decline is unnerving. If globalization and economic interdependence kept the peace, then a looming global depression and the rise of nationalism and protectionism are disconcerting. If regional and global institutions kept the peace, then their degradation is unsettling. If the balance of nuclear weapons kept the peace, then growing risks of proliferation are disquieting. And if America’s preeminent power kept the peace, then its relative decline is troubling. Now, the pandemic, or more specifically the world’s reaction to it, is revealing the extent to which the factors holding major wars in check are withering. The idea that war between nations is a relic of the past no longer seems so convincing. The Pessimists Strike Back More than any other individual, it was cognitive scientist Steven Pinker who popularized the idea that we are living in the most peaceful moment in human history. Starting with his 2011 bestseller, “The Better Angels of Our Nature: Why Violence Has Declined,” Pinker argued that the frequency, duration and lethality of wars between great powers have all decreased. In his 2019 book, “Enlightenment Now: The Case for Reason, Science, Humanism, and Progress,” he wrote that war “between the uniformed armies of two nation-states appears to be obsolescent. There have been no more than three in any year since 1945, none in most years since 1989, and none since the American-led invasion of Iraq in 2003.” Optimists like Pinker held that, rather than the world falling apart, as a quick glance at headline news might suggest, the opposite was true: Humanity was flourishing. More regions are characterized by peace; fewer mass killings are occurring; governance and the rule of law are improving; and people are richer, healthier, better educated and happier than ever before. In their book, “Clear and Present Safety: The World Has Never Been Better and Why That Matters to Americans,” Michael A. Cohen and Micah Zenko argued that the evidence is so overwhelming that it is difficult to argue against the idea that wars between great powers, and all other interstate wars, are becoming vanishingly rare. Even when wars do break out, they tend to be shorter and less deadly than they were in the past. John Mueller, a senior fellow at the Cato Institute, also reasoned that the idea of war, like slavery and dueling before it, was in terminal decline, while Joshua Goldstein, an international relations researcher at American University, credited the United Nations and the rise of peacekeeping operations for helping win the “war on war.” But in recent years, a range of critics have begun to poke holes in these arguments. Tanisha M. Fazal, an international relations professor at the University of Minnesota, contends that the decline in war is overstated. Major advances in medicine, speedier evacuations of wounded soldiers from the field of battle and better armor have made war less fatal—but not necessarily less frequent. Fazal and Paul Poast, who is at the University of Chicago, further assert that the notion of war between great powers as a thing of the past is based on the assumption that all such conflicts resemble World War I and II—both are historical anomalies—and overlooks the actual wars fought between great powers since 1945, from the Korean War and the Vietnam War to proxy wars from Afghanistan to Ukraine. Meanwhile, Bear F. Braumoeller, an Ohio State political science professor, analyzed the same historical data on conflicts used by Pinker, Mueller and Goldstein, and found no general downward trend in either the initiation or deadliness of warfare over the past two centuries. What’s more, Braumoeller contends that the so-called “long peace”—the 75 years that have passed without systemic war since World War II—is far from invulnerable, and that wars are just as likely to escalate now as they used to be. Just because a major interstate war hasn’t happened for a long time, doesn’t mean it never will again. In all probability, it will. And by focusing solely on interstate wars, the optimists miss half the story, at least. Wars between states have declined, but civil wars never disappeared—and these internal conflicts could easily escalate into regional or global wars. The number of conflicts in the world reached its highest point since World War II in 2016, with 53 state-based armed conflicts in 37 countries. All but two of these conflicts were considered civil wars. To make matters worse, new studies have shown that civil wars are becoming longer, deadlier and harder to conclusively end, and that these internal conflicts are not really internal. Civil wars harm the economies and stability of neighboring countries, since armed groups, refugees, illicit goods and diseases all spill over borders. Some 10 million refugees have fled to other countries since 2012. The countries that now host them are more likely to experience war, which means states with huge refugee populations like Lebanon, Jordan and Turkey face legitimate security challenges. Even after the threat of violence has diminished in refugees’ countries of origin, return migration can reignite conflicts, repeating the brutal cycle. A Yugoslav Federal Army tank. Perhaps most importantly, recent research indicates that civil wars increase the risk of interstate war, in large part because they are attracting more and more outside involvement. In a 2008 paper, researchers Kristian Skrede Gleditsch, Idean Salehyan and Kenneth Schultz explained that, in addition to the spillover effects, two other factors in civil wars increase international tensions and could possibly provoke wider interstate wars: external interventions in support of rebel groups and regime attacks on insurgents across international borders. Immediately after the Cold War, none of the ongoing civil wars around the world were internationalized. According to the Uppsala Conflict Data Program, there were 12 full-fledged civil wars in 1991—in Afghanistan, Iraq, Peru, Sri Lanka, Sudan, and elsewhere—and foreign militaries were not active on the ground in any of them. Last year, by contrast, every single full-fledged civil war involved external military participants. This is due, in part, to the huge growth in U.S. military interventions abroad into civil conflicts, but it’s not only the Americans. All of today’s major wars are in essence proxy wars, pitting external rivals against one another. Conflicts in Syria, Yemen and Libya are best understood not as civil wars, but as international warzones, attracting meddlers including the United States, Russia, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, Iran, France and many others, which often intervene not to build peace, but to resolve conflicts in a way that is favorable to their own interests. These internationalized wars are more lethal, harder to resolve and possibly more likely to recur than civil wars that remain localized. It is not that difficult to imagine how these conflicts could spark wider international conflagrations. Wars, after all, can quickly spiral out of control. As Risks Increase, Deterrents Decline To make matters worse, most of the global trends that explained why interstate war had decreased in recent decades are now reversing. The theories that democracy, prosperity, cooperation and other factors kept the peace have been much debated—but if there was any truth to them, their reversals are likely to increase the chance of war, irrespective of how long the coronavirus pandemic lasts. Democracy is often considered a prophylactic for war. Fully democratic countries are less likely to experience civil war and rarely, if ever, go to war with other democracies—though, of course, they do still go to war against non-democracies. While this would be great news if democracy and pluralism were spreading, there have now been 14 consecutive years of global democratic decline, and there have been signs of additional authoritarian power grabs in countries like Hungary and Serbia during the pandemic. If democracy backslides far enough, internal conflicts and foreign aggression will become more likely. Other theories posit that economic bonds between countries have limited wars in recent decades. Dale Copeland, a professor of international relations at the University of Virginia, has argued that countries work to preserve ties when there are high expectations for future trade, but war becomes increasingly possible when trade is predicted to fall. If globalization brought peace, the recent wave of far-right nationalism and populism around the world may increase the chances of war, as tariffs and other trade barriers go up—mostly from the United States under President Donald Trump, who has launched trade wars with allies and adversaries alike. The coronavirus pandemic immediately elicited further calls to reduce dependence on other countries, with Trump using the opportunity to pressure U.S. companies to reconfigure their supply chains away from China. For its part, China made sure that it had the homemade supplies it needed to fight the virus before exporting extras, while countries like France and Germany barred the export of face masks, even to friendly nations. And widening economic inequalities, a consequence of the pandemic, are not likely to enhance support for free trade. This assault on open trade and globalization is just one aspect of a decaying liberal international order, which, its proponents argue, has largely helped to preserve peace between nations since World War II. But that old order is almost gone, and in all likelihood isn’t coming back. The U.N. Security Council appears increasingly fragmented and dysfunctional. Even before Trump, the world’s most powerful country ratified fewer treaties per year under the Obama administration than at any time since 1945. Trump’s presidency only harms multilateral cooperation further. He has backed out of the Paris Agreement on climate change, reneged on the Iran nuclear deal, picked fights with allies, questioned the value of NATO and defunded the World Health Organization in the middle of a global health crisis. Hyper-nationalism, rather than international collaboration, was the default response to the coronavirus outbreak in the U.S. and many other countries around the world. It’s hard to see the U.S. reluctance to lead as anything other than a sign of its inevitable, if slow, decline. The country’s institutionalized inequalities and systemic racism have been laid bare in recent months, and it no longer looks like a beacon for others to follow. The global balance of power is changing. China is both keen to assert a greater leadership role within traditionally Western-led institutions and to challenge the existing regional order in Asia. Between a rising China, revanchist Russia and new global actors, including non-state groups, we may be heading toward an increasingly multipolar or nonpolar world, which could prove destabilizing in its own right. Finally, the pacifying effect of nuclear weapons could be waning. While vast nuclear arsenals once compelled the United States and the Soviet Union to reach arms control agreements, old treaties are expiring and new talks are breaking down. Mistrust is growing, and the chance of an unwanted U.S.-Russia nuclear confrontation is arguably as high as it has been since the Cuban missile crisis. The theory of nuclear peace may no longer hold if more countries are tempted to obtain their own nuclear deterrent. Trump’s decision to abandon the Iran nuclear deal, for one thing, has only increased the chance that Tehran will acquire nuclear weapons. It’s almost easy to forget that, just a few short months ago, the United States and Iran were one miscalculation or dumb mistake away from waging all-out war. And despite Trump’s efforts to negotiate nuclear disarmament with Kim Jong Un’s regime in Pyongyang, it is wishful thinking to believe North Korea will give up its nuclear weapons. At this point, negotiators can only realistically try to ensure that North Korea’s nuclear menace doesn’t get even more potent. In other words, by turning inward, the United States is choosing to leave other countries to fend for themselves. The end result may be a less stable world with more nuclear actors. If leaders are smart, they will take seriously the warning signs exposed by this global emergency and work to reverse the drift toward war. If only one of these theories for peace were worsening, concerns would be easier to dismiss. But together, they are unsettling. While the world is not yet on the brink of World War III and no two countries are destined for war, the odds of avoiding future conflicts don’t look good. The pandemic is already degrading democracies, harming economies and curtailing international cooperation, and it also seems to be fostering internal instability within states. Rachel Brown, Heather Hurlburt and Alexandra Stark argue that the coronavirus could in fact sow more civil conflict. If this proves accurate, the increase in civil wars is likely to lead to more external meddling, and these next proxy wars could soon precipitate all-out international conflicts if outsiders aren’t careful. With the usual deterrents to conflict declining around the world, major wars could soon return

#### Recent, robust studies prove our impact

Julian Adorney 20, Contributing Writer at the Hinrich Foundation, Young Voices Advocate, Senior SEO Analyst for Colorado SEO Pros, Writing Appeared at The Federalist, Fox Nation, The Hill, and the Mises Institute, BA from the University of Colorado, Boulder, “Want Peace? Promote Free Trade”, Hinrich Foundation for Advancing Sustainable Free Trade, 9/10/2020, https://www.hinrichfoundation.com/research/tradevistas/sustainable/trade-and-peace/

Why does protectionism lead to conflict and why does free trade help prevent it? Learn about the connection between peace and free trade.

Frédéric Bastiat famously claimed that “if goods don’t cross borders, soldiers will.”

Bastiat argued that free trade between countries could reduce international conflict because trade forges connections between nations and gives each country an incentive to avoid war with its trading partners. If every nation were an economic island, the lack of positive interaction created by trade could leave more room for conflict. Two hundred years after Bastiat, libertarians take this idea as gospel. Unfortunately, not everyone does. But as recent research shows, the historical evidence confirms Bastiat’s famous claim.

To trade or to raid

In “Peace through Trade or Free Trade?” professor Patrick J. McDonald, from the University of Texas at Austin, empirically tested whether greater levels of protectionism in a country (tariffs, quotas, etc.) would increase the probability of international conflict in that nation. He used a tool called dyads to analyze every country’s international relations from 1960 until 2000. A dyad is the interaction between one country and another country: German and French relations would be one dyad, German and Russian relations would be a second, French and Australian relations would be a third. He further broke this down into dyad-years; the relations between Germany and France in 1965 would be one dyad-year, the relations between France and Australia in 1973 would be a second, and so on.

Using these dyad-years, McDonald analyzed the behavior of every country in the world for the past 40 years. His analysis showed a negative correlation between free trade and conflict: The more freely a country trades, the fewer wars it engages in. Countries that engage in free trade are less likely to invade and less likely to be invaded.

Trading partners

The causal arrow

Of course, this finding might be a matter of confusing correlation for causation. Maybe countries engaging in free trade fight less often for some other reason, like the fact that they tend also to be more democratic. Democratic countries make war less often than empires do. But McDonald controls for these variables. Controlling for a state’s political structure is important, because democracies and republics tend to fight less than authoritarian regimes.

McDonald also controlled for a country’s economic growth, because countries in a recession are more likely to go to war than those in a boom, often in order to distract their people from their economic woes. McDonald even controlled for factors like geographic proximity: It’s easier for Germany and France to fight each other than it is for the United States and China, because troops in the former group only have to cross a shared border.

The takeaway from McDonald’s analysis is that protectionism can actually lead to conflict. McDonald found that a country in the bottom 10 percent for protectionism (meaning it is less protectionist than 90 percent of other countries) is 70 percent less likely to engage in a new conflict (either as invader or as target) than one in the top 10 percent for protectionism.



#### Unchecked Chinese cartels create escalating deficits that encourage aggressive mil-mod and nuclear war

Collins, 16 (Michael Collins, Michael P. Collins is President of MPC Management, was Vice President and General Manager of two divisions of Columbia Machine in Vancouver, Washington. He has more than 35 years of experience in Manufacturing., 6-13-2016, accessed on 6-9-2021, Industry Week, "It is Time to Stand Up to China", <https://www.industryweek.com/the-economy/trade/article/21974236/it-is-time-to-stand-up-to-china)//Babcii>

The U.S. has been an **enabler** to China’s approach. **China continually** challenges the U.S. by **ignoring** free-market **rules** and doing whatever it takes to **capture market share.** Meanwhile, the U.S. **looks the other way** when China breaks the rules, thus encouraging them to do it again. The most recent example is the steel industry. According to The American Steel and Iron Institute, American steel mills have had to layoff 13,500 employees because China has been dumping steel in the U.S. The Chinese steel companies can sell steel at below-market prices because they are state-owned and, by definition, are subsidized by the government. [[The U.S. in May affirmed that China had been dumping cold-rolled steel;](http://www.industryweek.com/competitiveness/us-affirms-266-dumping-margin-cold-rolled-steel-imports-china) the International Trade Commission will make public its ruling on the case on June 30.] Further, a recent lawsuit by [United States Steel Corp. (IW500/91)](http://www.industryweek.com/resources/us500/2016/United-States-Steel) charges China with price fixing, stealing the company’s trade secrets, and shipping steel to the U.S. through other countries so buyers won’t know the country of origin. China is not a market economy, much less a free-market economy. Still, the U.S. continues to treat China as a free-market economy, with the hope that it will somehow encourage them to **begin playing by the** same **rules** governing the rest of the world. But, alas, it's not happening. Here is a short list of some of China's strategies. Currency Manipulation – China manipulates its currency to keep the U.S. dollar value high, so that Chinese companies have a 30% to 40% cost advantage. This undervaluation is illegal and should be considered to be a direct export subsidy, yet the Commerce Department has refused to treat currency undervaluation as actionable under the law. State-Owned Enterprises (SOE) – China owns and subsidizes many companies, as in the steel industry example, above. Through the subsidized companies, China can target a market with low-cost products, capture market share and drive competitors out of business. Technology Theft – China knows that technology and innovation is what can make them the No. 1 manufacturer in the world, and they are prepared to get it any way they can. They have been accused of using espionage, counterfeiting and buying American technology companies as standard strategies. According to the [US-China Economic Panel Security Commission](https://www.industryweek.com/the-economy/trade/article/21974236/US-China%20Economic%20Panel%20Security%20Commission)’s [2015 report to Congress,](http://www.uscc.gov/Annual_Reports/2015-annual-report-congress) “China’s government conducts and sponsors a massive cyber espionage operation aimed at stealing trade secrets and intelligence from U.S. corporations and the government.” This includes blocking U.S. company websites, revoking business licenses and censoring the internet. Technology Transfer - As a condition of accessing the Chinese markets, China requires U.S. companies that build plants in China to create joint ventures with local companies—and share with them their latest technologies. [Testimony to Congress by Patrick A. Mulloy](https://books.google.com/books?id=rkbfsgEACAAJ&dq=%22Across+the+Pond+U.s.+Opportunities+and+challenges+in+the+Asia+Pacific&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwi-lL_ui9jMAhVN4GMKHX5fCAAQ6AEIHDAA) asserts that we are slowly losing the Advanced Technology Products industries to China. Advanced technology products includes the more advanced elements of the computer and electronics industry as well as life sciences, biotechnology, aerospace and nuclear technology, all of which are central to U.S.'s own innovation strategy. In 2014, the U.S. trade deficit with China in advanced technology products was $123 billion. Research & Development Facilities - China requires foreign companies with plants in China set up R&D facilities in China. As a result, foreign companies have built more than 1,000 R&D labs in China. The Results of China's Unfair Trade Practices & U.S.'s Weak Response So what are the results of China's unfair trade practices? First, by now, everyone knows that trade agreements do not benefit all citizens; there are winners and losers. The **winners are** the multinational corporations who have plants in **China**. The losers are American small businesses and workers. The initial promotion of China trade promised that consumers would be better off because of the cheap imported products. However, China trade created a $**3.6 trillion deficit**, which eliminated **jobs** and stagnated **wages**. It is part of the reason the rich have gotten richer and the poor poorer. Second, the **economic strength** built upon these practices has helped China **grow** its **military might**. According to the U.S.-China Commission, China continues to modernize its forces "... creating additional challenges for the United States and its allies. Most notably, China conducted its first test of a new **hypersonic** missile vehicle, which could enable China to conduct kinetic strikes anywhere in the world within minutes to hours, and performed its second flight test of a new **road-mobile intercontinental missil**e that will be able to strike the entire continental United States and could carry up to 10 independently maneuverable warheads. “China is making **big investments** in modern **submarines, ships** and combat **aircraft**. For the first time, its Navy began combat patrols in the Indian Ocean. Its first aircraft carrier has conducted a long-distance deployment. China is exerting force to control its claims in the **East and South China Seas**. "Perhaps of most concern is Beijing's apparent **willingness to provoke incidents** at sea and in the air that could lead to a **major conflict** as China's maritime and air forces expand their operations beyond China's immediate periphery."

### 1AC --- Adv --- Development

#### Contention 2 is DEVELOPMENT:

#### Post-hoc defenses spillover to undermine deterrence globally and encourages states to follow in the footsteps

Brunell and Stutz, 18 (Richard Brunell and Randy Stutz, Richard Brunell previously served as the General Counsel of the American Antitrust Institute. In 2012-13, he served as Senior Advisor for Competition Matters in the chairman’s office at the Federal Trade Commission. graduate of Swarthmore College and the Harvard Law School, Randy M. Stutz is Vice President of Legal Advocacy at the American Antitrust Institute. Stutz is a graduate of Washington University in St. Louis and the Catholic University Columbus School of Law., 3-5-2018, accessed on 11-18-2021, Antitrust institute, "BRIEF FOR THEAMERICAN ANTITRUST INSTITUTEAS AMICUS CURIAE INSUPPORT OF PETITIONERS", <https://www.antitrustinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/16-1220-tsac-AmericanAntitrustInst.pdf)//Babcii>

C. The Lack of Transparency of a Foreign Government’s Law is Grounds for Less, Not More, Deference The Second Circuit thought the fact that “‘Chinese law is not as transparent as that of the United States’” made it particularly important to defer to the Ministry’s interpretation. Pet. App. 29a (quoting district court). But the opposite is true. A lack of transparency should be grounds to call into question a **post hoc statement** that price fixing of exports has been compelled. To facilitate its entry into the WTO, China made representations to the world trading body **that it “gave up export administration” of vitamin C** and many other products. JA 319; see also 2001 WTO Report ¶¶ 50, 56, 62, at 10-12 (China represented that it had sharply reduced the number of products subject to government price control—identifying those products in an annex—and that “price controls would not be used for purposes of affording protection to domestic industries”). **Then, in this case, MOFCOM claimed to have directed its exporters to fix prices** and restrict the supply of vitamin C. The district court concluded that China’s **representations to the WTO “appear to contradict** the Ministry’s position in the instant litigation,” which was a further reason not to defer to the Ministry’s position. Pet. App. 120a-121a. More generally, the very fact that China’s minimum export price system is “largely opaque” and “highly non-transparent,” according to the U.S. Trade Representative,9 is itself grounds for affording less deference. Cf. Int’l Guidelines § 4.2.2 n.124 (ambiguous statements regarding compulsion not given dispositive weight). As in the state-action context, it is important that foreign sovereigns that mandate anticompetitive export restraints “**accept political responsibility** for actions they intend to undertake” **in the worldwide trading arena**. Fed. Trade Comm’n v. Ticor Title Ins. Co., 504 U.S. 621, 636 (1992). A foreign government should “make clear that [it] is responsible for the price fixing it has sanctioned and undertaken to control.” Id. at 633. Its failure to do so militates against affording conclusive deference to its post hoc statements. D. Weakening Deterrence Is Unwise in an Era of Rampant International Cartels International cartels are a scourge of the global economy. Known international cartels have been estimated to cost consumers around the globe more than $1.5 trillion since 1990, with North American consumers paying more than $400 billion.10 The Justice Department has prosecuted dozens of international cartels, obtaining fines of over $12 billion, and jail time for over 88 foreign nationals.11 See generally Minn-Chem, Inc. v. Agrium Inc., 683 F.3d 845, 860 (7th Cir. 2012) (“Foreign cartels . . . have often been the target of either governmental or private litigation.”). But despite stepped up U.S. and foreign anti-cartel enforcement, international cartels continue to proliferate. See Connor at 22-23 (75 discovered per year); Scott D. Hammond, Deputy Ass’t Attorney General, The Evolution of Criminal Antitrust Enforcement Over the Last Two Decades 1, 3 (Feb. 25, 2010) (50 DOJ investigations open at a time). Deterrence remains insufficient. See John M. Connor & Robert H. Lande, Cartels as Rational Business Strategy: Crime Pays, 34 Cardozo L. Rev. 427, 429 (2012). Conclusive deference, by making it easier to prove a foreign sovereign compulsion or “true conflict” defense, will only **undercut deterrence**, making cartels that harm U.S. consumers **more likely. “The host country** for the cartel will often **have no incentive to prosecute it”** and “would logically be pleased to reap the economic rents from other countries . . . [that] their exporters collect.” Minn-Chem, 683 F.3d at 860. The same **incentive may lead foreign governments to lend their support to export cartels** when challenged in U.S. courts. And even if such support is not forthcoming, deterrence is lessened if foreign **firms believe that they can immunize their** export **cartels** under U.S. law by obtaining a statement from their government that their conduct was compelled.

#### Specifically, that causes sprawling cartels in the global south --- The question of antitrust immunization is key

Martyniszyn, 12 (Marek Martyniszyn, PhD Candidate, Ad Astra Scholar, University College Dublin School of Law, 2012, accessed on 1-3-2022, Queens University, "Export Cartels: Is it Legal to Target your Neighbour? Analysis in Light of Recent Case Law", https://pureadmin.qub.ac.uk/ws/portalfiles/portal/13701517/SSRN\_id2012838\_1.pdf)//Babcii

VI. Conclusion The **creativity of the corporate world seems unlimited**. There is no reason to believe that businesses around the world would refrain from taking advantage of the present **regulatory system allowing for export cartels**. The absence of empirical data should not lead to the conclusion that the issue is nonexistent. The unique treatment accorded to export cartels at the moment, as compared to other types of cartels, by their tolerance or encouragement, and the immunity from domestic antitrust laws, is not a beneficial policy in the long-run. The recent case law illustrates the deficiencies of the present regulatory framework. The lack of an international mechanism addressing export cartels forces targeted states to rely on extraterritorial application of national competition laws. In general this unilateral route, from a practical perspective, requires expertise and resources, which are scarce in many jurisdictions. As the Indian ANSAC case shows, the lack of an explicit legal basis in national legislation providing for extraterritoriality may hinder such actions. It also underlines that when binding international mechanisms in competition law are lacking, the matter will be addressed through trade policy when important economic interests are at stake. It suggests that it is in the best interest of the less powerful states who are interested in legal resolution of controversies arising from transnational anticompetitive conduct and who lack trade muscle, to work towards international consensus in this area. At the same time, the South African case shows that when competition law is free to take its course unobstructed, extraterritoriality may lead to positive outcomes and may be a useful tool in the fight with export cartels. It is noteworthy that both cases concerned the same officially registered and publicly known export cartel, which was earlier challenged in a developed competition law regime. This seems to be the only case of this nature. **The Chinese**/US **cases**, in general, point out that export **cartels** may come also **from the global South**. If this development becomes **a large**r **phenomenon**, it could, in principle, reframe the discussion on export cartels in terms of possible tradeoffs. Some economists suggested tying a general prohibition of export cartels in developed countries227 with market access concessions on behalf of and transfers from developing world as a form of reciprocation.228 Were export cartels to become more widespread in the global South, any such ‘package deal’ would require reconsideration. Moreover, the Chinese export cartel cases show that government’s **involvement** in transnational anticompetitive conduct, like export cartels, **poses a challenge to antitrust regimes**. If the bulwark of sovereignty proves to provide a **shelter** in such scenarios, then there is a risk that state-protected **export cartels become more prevalent, undermining** not only the competition laws, but also the **rules of international trade**, by according entities engaged in such anticompetitive conduct **a comparative advantage**. This perspective may in fact incentivize international community to look for a solution to the issue of both private and public, state(s)-driven, export cartels. While it is unlikely to reach a compromise prohibiting public export cartels dealing with natural resources,229 this as such should not restrain us from placing them on the international agenda as well, looking for a mutually beneficial solution with an intention to tighten up the gaps in the current regulatory framework.

#### Now is key ---The pandemic spurs massive incentives for cartelization

World Bank Group ’21 [The World Bank Group; “FIXING MARKETS, NOT PRICES Policy Options to Tackle Economic Cartels in Latin America and the Caribbean,” <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/35985/Fixing-Markets-Not-Prices-Policy-Options-to-Tackle-Economic-Cartels-in-Latin-America-and-the-Caribbean.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>;]

Collusive agreements among competitors create unmitigated harm. When competitors agree to limit competition, i.e. to form economic cartels, the poor pay up to 50 percent more for essential goods, growth is stymied as competitiveness and productivity declines, and public policies become less effective. Such collusion undermines citizens’ trust in market economies and in the role of the private sector as an engine of growth.

And yet, cartels are common across many markets, mostly undetected and likely on the rise in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic. Cartels affect hundreds of markets from milk and poultry to oxygen and cement. Only a fraction of such secretive agreements is detected each year. In the aftermath of the COVID-19 crisis, the corporate sector is consolidating, and governments are intervening more in markets. Increasing corporate market power is associated with lower business dynamism.1 More concentrated and less dynamic markets create fertile ground for even more cartels. All the while, cartel detection has come to a virtual halt since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic.

#### Cartelization undermines sustainable development

Bunkanwanicha 21, \*Pramuan Bunkanwanicha is a full Professor of Finance at ESCP Europe - Paris Campus, where he teaches Corporate Finance, Emerging Markets Finance, and International Finance. He received a Doctorate in Economics from the Université Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne in 2006 with an Habilitation in Management Sciences from the Université Paris - Dauphine in 2013. He also holds the degrees of MBA from AIT and B.Eng. from King Mongkut’s University of Technology North Bangkok. Prior to joining ESCP Europe, he was a visiting scholar at Columbia Business School and Yale University. He was also a visiting professor at Boston College and Hitotsubashi University. He is "Dean of Research"; (2021, “Good Faith Competition as a Natural Mechanism for Sustainable Economic Growth”, https://academ.escpeurope.eu/pub/IP%202021-31-EN.pdf)

III. Market failures and the need for regulation to avoid firms' misconduct Collusion is a market failure that occurs when firms in a market coordinate, restricting competition and negatively affecting prices, outputs, and innovation. Public institutions are making a great effort in detecting firms' collusion practices that harm competition. Research on cartel overcharge shows a significant increase in price attributable to collusion (Connor 2010; Smuda 2014; Boyer and Kotchoni 2015). Among other adverse effects, collusion may provoke an extraction of consumers' welfare in favor of the cartel firms, reducing firms' incentives to invest in innovation. It is important to contextualize the relevance of collusion agreements. Private International Cartels (PIC) database, developed by Professor John M. Connor, contains detailed information for price-fixing cartels detected between 1990 and 2017. Relative to the GDP, cartels operating in Europe are triple those operating in North America, while the affected sales' size is equal between both markets, with affected sales' totaling about $900 billion, of which global cartels account for 37%. One clear example of market manipulation is the truck cartel. In July 2016, the European Commission ("E.C.") imposed a record fine of €3 billion to MAN, Volvo/Renault, Daimler, Iveco, and DAF for continuing collusion in the medium and heavy truck market. Over 14 years, the firms colluded on pricing, the introduction of new emission technologies, and passing on compliance costs with stricter emission rules. Scania was part of the cartel practices but did not accept the fine and initiated a separate legal proceeding to defend itself from the accusations. Scania was eventually declared guilty by the E.C. and received a fine of €880m2. One essential piece to improving good faith competition is an efficient competition law that avoids firms' misconduct. Antitrust is considered as one of the most important public policies that has aimed at protecting a public good as well as protecting consumers from predatory business practices: good faith competition. There are substitute arguments on the necessity of governments' intervention. The theory of "public interest" is based on the assumption that government can solve inefficiencies caused by monopolistic conduct and externalities through intervention. The second stream of thought states that competition and private enforcement mitigate market failures within strong legal systems and well functioning courts (Coase 1960). Shleifer (2005) highlights that the enforcement environment determines the optimal intervention system (public regulation or court-based system). In antitrust cases, victims can initiate an action from scratch (stand-alone) or after the competition body adopts an infringement decision (follow-on). Claimants initiating a standalone action have to prove the infringement, while in follow-on actions, the claimants benefit from the antitrust resolutions. Stand-alone damage actions have high barriers for victims due to the difficulties obtaining evidence of the infringement conduct. These actions are highly costly and risky. Therefore, it may not achieve the deterrence function for colluding firms. Private enforcement is the necessary complement for public enforcement to have efficient competition law. However, a study commissioned by the EU in 2004 identified actions for damages against antitrust infringement were totally undeveloped. In 2014, the EU adopted antitrust actions for damages to eliminate obstacles to compensation for antitrust victims and better define the relationship between public and private enforcement. The Directive 2014/104/EU facilitates private enforcement through follow-on actions for damages on European Commission or national competition bodies' resolutions. Among other changes, the Directive establishes that the competition regulators' final decision is binding before courts. It also states that there is a presumption that cartels cause harm3 , and cartel victims have to prove in national courts the amount of loss they suffered from an infringement. The Directive establishes a time-barred period of five years to bring cases to courts since the infringement has ceased, so victims will have had sufficient time to bring an action. Before the Directive enaction, limitation periods differed considerably among member states, and the starting period cannot be precisely identified. While this new regulation facilitates victims' actions and incentivizes private enforcement, it is still complex in time and cost. The main difficulties that claimants face are related to proving and quantifying this misconduct's effects on their specific situation. The quantification of the economic effects usually requires a large sample of data and a high level of expertise to deal with it properly. It is difficult to prove the economic effects of the misconduct with single-case data. The limitations associated with single enforcements have generated an opportunity for funds who are willing to invest in damage claims. Currently, litigation funds provide complete financing for the process under a profit-sharing structure, and even some investors are directly acquiring such claims4 . In December 2020, the European Union adopted the Directive 2020/1828 on representative actions to protect consumers' collective interests. It is one additional step in the regulation process to protect consumers' interests against infringement actions. The new regulation, jointly with the interest of funds to support these claims, enhances private enforcement in Europe, and it is an important element in promoting the good faith competition disincentivizing firms to collude. IV. Conclusion Within perfect competition, profits are zero at the maximum, and firms have little or no incentives to innovate because they cannot create sustainable competitive advantages. However, most industries have some degree of heterogeneity and differentiation. In product-differentiation markets and under good faith competition, profit-maximization firms have incentives to obtain abnormal returns through value-creating strategies that competitors cannot replicate. This search for competitive advantage creates a virtuous cycle of innovation, which is the pillar for economic growth, employment, and welfare enhancement. Poverty reduction is one of the main goals of governments and multilateral organizations. Sustained economic growth is a powerful mechanism to reduce poverty providing new employment opportunities and making education more accessible to the wider population. It also incentivizes entrepreneurship. All these factors improve competitiveness, which results in more economic growth. Markets have to operate in good faith to achieve the advantages of innovation. Governments have to ensure the fair-functioning of the markets. However, firms may try to extract consumers' welfare through anti-competitive agreements. Cartels are situations in which firms decide to cooperate and not compete, thereby injuring customers by rising prices, restricting production, or reducing their investments in R&D. These anti-competitive agreements reduce innovation and negatively affect economic growth. Competition law plays an essential role in disincentivizing firms to collude. The interaction of antitrust regulation and private enforcement is a powerful instrument in deterring future antitrust violations and supporting good faith competition. Sustainable growth is one dimension of sustainable development. The evaluation of sustainable development requires the inclusion of other relevant factors in the equation, such as reducing carbon emissions and global warming, reducing « with-in » countries' inequality, and ensuring equal opportunities for all. There is an open discussion on the correct balance between the three dimensions of sustainable development- economic, environmental, and social. One example of the adequacy of the sustainability indicators is the recent research developed by Einsenmenger et al. (2020) that criticizes the overweight of economic growth versus ecological integrity in the SDGs of the U.N.'s 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Some economic models offer a new approach for including sustainability factors in the equation. The so-called Doughnut Economy (Raworth 2017) includes planetary and social as upper and lower boundaries for economic growth. The planetary boundaries assure that economic growth does not put too much pressure on the planet's health and includes, among other concepts, climate change, ocean acidification, and the loss of biological diversity. The social boundaries include life's essentials, from food to healthcare and education. Lastly, there is a sweet spot area for economic growth within those two boundaries, environmentally friendly and socially. In sum, there are multiple potential trade-offs between economic growth and social and environmental impacts, and each generation will have to decide what is the right balance. But whatever the chosen balance is, we argue that good faith competition is still a minimum requirement to promote long-term sustainable growth that helps reduce poverty and improve people's standard of living and well-being around the world.

#### AND causes government capture and state collapse

Khameni 7, \*R. Shyam, Advisor, Competition Policy, in the Financial and Private Sector Development Vice-Presidency of the World Bank Group, Washington D.C., 2007, (“Competition Policy and Promotion of Investment, Economic Growth and Poverty Alleviation in Least Developed Countries,” (<https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/397801468174885108/pdf/413340FIAS1Competition1Policy01PUBLIC1.pdf>)

A persistent challenge that faces the governments of least-developed countries as well as policy advisors at the Bretton Woods Institutions, the United Nations, and aid agencies is: how to foster sustainable broad-based economic growth, development, and poverty reduction. During the past two decades or more, various policy approaches have been explored. In the “first-generation reforms,” the World Bank Group and the International Monetary Fund (IMF), among others, focused on promoting the macroeconomic stability and trade integration of countries. Second-generation reforms moved from the broad policy environment to encourage more microeconomic changes, namely, improvements in the administrative, legal, and regulatory functions of the State. Of late, particular emphasis has been placed on the role of the public sector in establishing an “investment climate” conducive to promoting private sector-led investment, growth, and poverty alleviation. The quality of a country’s investment climate determines the risks and transaction costs of investing in and operating a business. These risks and costs are in turn determined by the legal and regulatory framework, barriers to entry-exit, and conditions prevailing in markets for labor, finance, infrastructure services, and other productive inputs. Essentially, the quality of the investment climate will determine the mobility and speed with which resources can be redeployed from lower to higher productive uses. For this to occur effectively, the nature and degree of competition in markets plays a pivotal role. In this regard, there is significant economic evidence suggesting that private investment has grown faster in countries with better investment climates. Also, economies with competitive domestic markets tend to attract more domestic and foreign direct investment, have higher levels and rates of growth in per capita gross domestic product (GDP), and lower rates of poverty.1 Promoting effective competition is often argued on grounds that it spurs firms to focus on efficiency and improve consumer welfare by offering greater choice of higher-quality products and services at lower prices. However, it also promotes greater accountability and transparency in government-business relations and decision making, and contributes to reducing corruption, lobbying, and rent-seeking behavior. Additionally, by lowering barriers to entry, it provides opportunities for broad-based participation in the economy and for sharing in the benefits of economic growth. Without effective competition, firms are more likely to possess considerable market power, which enables them to earn excess profits and wield political influence to tilt public policy in their favor. There are also likely to be distorted price and profit signals and increased risk of misguided investment and output decisions, which can lead to economy-wide repercussions. The merits and benefits of fostering open and competitive markets have been recognized in many countries that have adopted various macro- and microeconomic reforms. However, there is wide variation in the economic growth and development of nations. Casual observations indicate that there is also a wide variation in the nature and extent of competition prevailing within and across countries. Moreover, notwithstanding the merits and benefits of competition, there is no consensus or widespread support for promoting competition within and across countries—especially developing nations. This stems in part from the lack of understanding or appreciation of what effective competition can tangibly contribute to the betterment of the lives of ordinary citizens, and in part from ideological differences and the influence wielded by vested interest groups in both government and the economy at large. Although the differences in the economic growth and development of nations cannot purport to be explained by the differences in the prevailing degrees of competition, this paper argues that it is one of the important, if not critical explanatory factors. It is well established that least-developed economies are encumbered by limitations of human and physical capital, governance and institutional structures, and other resource constraints. But they are also prevented from achieving their potential by various types of public policy-based and private sector anticompetitive business practices. The primary message of this paper is that these countries need to take concrete, consistent, and coherent measures to integrate and promote effective competition policy as part of their overall government economic and regulatory framework. An effective competition policy should be viewed as the “fourth cornerstone” of this framework— along with sound monetary, fiscal, and commercial (international trade) policies.

#### Sustainable development prevents global existential risks

Cernev and Fenner, 20—Australian National University AND Centre for Sustainable Development, Cambridge University Engineering Department (Tom and Richard, “The importance of achieving foundational Sustainable Development Goals in reducing global risk,” Futures, Volume 115, January 2020, Article 102492, dml)

4. Risks from failure to meet the SDGs 4.1. Cascading failures Fig. 3 demonstrates that cascade failures can be transmitted through the complex inter-relationships that link the Sustainable Development Goals. Randers, Rockstrom, Stoknes, Goluke, Collste, Cornell, Donges et al. (2018) have suggested that where meeting some SDGs impact negatively on others, this may lead to “crisis and conflict accelerators” and “threat multipliers” resulting in conflicts, instability and migrations. Ecosystem stresses are likely to disproportionately affect the security and social cohesion of fragile and poor communities, amplifying latent tensions which lead to political instabilities that spread far beyond their regions. The resulting “bad fate of the poor will end up affecting the whole global system” (Mastrojeni, 2018). Such possibilities are likely to go beyond incremental damage and lead to runaway collapse. The World Economic Forums’ Global Risks Report for 2018 shows the top five global risks in terms of likelihood and impact have changed from being economic and social in 2008 to environmental and technological in 2018, and are closely aligned with many SDGs (World Economic Forum, 2018). The report notes “that we are much less competent when it comes to dealing with complex risks in systems characterised by feedback loops, tipping points and opaque cause-and-effect relationships that can make intervention problematic”. The most likely risks expected to have the greatest impact currently include extreme weather events natural disasters, cyber attacks, data fraud or theft, failure of climate change mitigation and water crises. These are represented in Fig. 3 by the following exogenous variables. “Climate change” drives the need for Climate Action (SDG 13), “Cyber threat” may adversely impact technology implementation and advancement which will disrupt Sustainable Cities and Communities (SDG 11); Decent Work and Economic Growth (SDG 8) and the rate of introduction of Affordable and Clean Energy (SDG 7), with reductions in these goals having direct consequences in also reducing progress in the other goals which they are closely linked to. “Data Fraud or Threat” has the capacity to inhibit innovation and Industrial Performance (SDG 9), reducing competitiveness (and having the potential to erode societal confidence in governance processes). “Water Crises” (linked with climate change) have a direct impact on Human Health and Well Being (SDG 3) as well as reducing access to Clean Water and Sanitation (SDG 6) and reducing agricultural production which increases Hunger (SDG 2). The causal loop diagram also highlights “Conflict” as a variable (driven by multiple environmental-socio-economic factors) which together with regions most impacted by climate degradation will lead to an increase in migrant refugees enhancing the spread of disease and global pandemic risk, thus impacting directly on Human Health and Well Being (SDG 3) 4.2. Existential and catastrophic risk The level and consequences of these risks may be severe. Existential Risks (ER) have a wide scope, with extreme danger, and are “a risk that threatens the premature extinction of humanity or the permanent and drastic destruction of its potential for desirable future development” (Farquhar et al., 2017,) essentially being an event or scenario that is “transgenerational in scope and terminal in intensity” (Baum & Handoh, 2014). With a smaller scope, and lower level of severity, global catastrophic risk is defined as a scenario or event that results in at least 10 million fatalities, or $10 trillion in damages (Bostrom & Ćirković, 2008). Global Catastrophic Risk (GCR) events are those which are global, but they are durable in that humanity is able to recover from them (Bostrom & Ćirković, 2008; Cotton-Barratt, Farquhar, Halstead, Schubert, & Snyder-Beattie, 2016) but which still have a long-term impact (Turchin & Denkenberger, 2018b). Achieving the Sustainable Development Goals can be considered to be a means of reducing the long-term global catastrophic and existential risks for humanity. Conversely if the targets represented across the SDGs remain unachieved there is the potential for these forms of risk to develop. This association combined with the likely emergence of new challenges over the next decades (Cook, Inayatullah, Burgman, Sutherland, & Wintle, 2014) means that it is of great value to identify points within the systems representations of the Sustainable Development Goals that could both lead to global catastrophic risk and existential risk, and conversely that could act as prevention, or leverage points in order to avoid such outcomes. This identification in turn enables sensible policy responses to be constructed (Sutherland & Woodroof, 2009). Whilst existential threats are unlikely, there is extensive peril in global catastrophic risks. Despite being lesser in severity than existential risks, they increase the likelihood of human extinction (Turchin & Denkenberger, 2018a) through chain reactions (Turchin & Denkenberger, 2018a), and inhibiting humanity’s response to other risks (Farquhar et al., 2017). It is necessary to consider risks that may seem small, as when acting together, they can have extensive consequences (Tonn, 2009). Furthermore, the high adaptability potential of humans, and society, means that for humanity to become extinct, it is most likely that there would be a series of events that culminate in extinction as opposed to one large scale event (Tonn & MacGregor, 2009; Tonn, 2009).

### 1AC --- Plan

#### The United States federal government should increase its prohibitions on anticompetitive business practices by the private sector by expanding the scope of its core antitrust laws to restrict exemptions under act of state, foreign sovereign compulsion, and international comity where the private party and foreign sovereign did not affirmatively disclose their intent to act in an anti-competitive nature

### 1AC --- Solvency

#### Contention 3 is SOLVENCY:

#### The plan institutes a transparency requirement for future exemptions which is goldilocks --- Requiring ex-ante consent for exemptions deters gaming by ensuring that they are liable to either WTO OR Antitrust law BUT retains legitimate deference

Fox and Healey, 14 (Eleanor Fox and Deborah Healey, Eleanor Fox is Walter J. Derenberg Professor of Trade Regulation at New York University School of Law, Deborah Healey is Associate Professor on the Faculty of Law at the University of New South Wales, Austra, 2014, accessed on 11-15-2021, ABA - Antitrust Law Journal, Vol. 79, No. 3, "WHEN THE STATE HARMS COMPETITION—THE ROLE FOR COMPETITION LAW on JSTOR", https://www.jstor.org/stable/43486966)//Babcii

In terms of the defense, which if allowed would validate the state action, we might frame the principal choice in broad terms: **Should private parties**, acting anticompetitively, **be accorded a broad or a narrow state action defense**? Under a broad defense, private parties could defend their anticompetitive behavior if a state policy **merely encouraged it. Under a narrow defense** private parties would be responsible for their behavior **unless the state specifically ordered it** or the state clearly expressed a policy that depended upon the anticompetitive behavior and closely supervised the private anticompetitive acts. (The latter conditions are akin to those required by U.S. law.) The European Union has a very narrow defense: the private **party must have had no autonomy to act competitively.** A yet narrower defense could in theory **require** one more condition - **transparency**. Let us suppose that the offense was price fixing. Contemporaneously with its agreeing to fix prices the implicated firm could be **required to make a public disclosure: "I have just agreed to fix the price of x. The state required me to do it**." This condition would not only provide transparency but would **smoke out latter-day contrived contentions**: "The state made me do it." A narrow defense favors more **market**, less state. A broad defense favors more state, less market. A **broad defense has significant costs.** It errs on the side of vested interests. It would give private firms generous leeway to act **anticompetitively** for their private benefit, which may be **far beyond** what the state contemplated and not remotely needed by the state for its public objectives, as the uranium firms attempted to do in carrying out their cartel in the late 1970s.153 But what costs might a narrow defense impose upon state autonomy? Might it chill the adoption of programs that are (according to the state) good for the people and that the state cannot effectively execute by itself? China made such a claim in an international context in litigation in a U.S. court charging Chinese **vitamin C** makers with price fixing of vitamin C for sale into the United States. China argued that the pharmaceutical trade associations - which became the forum for the private price fixing - were infused with a governmental character, and that China ordered the price fixing of vitamin C in order to shield its firms from dumping claims and to ease them into a market economy.154 **We prefer a narrow defense**. The state can almost always carry out its desired state policy efficiently without enlisting private firms in otherwise **illegal conduct**, and the gains from a broad defense are almost always private. We now turn to fairness. If a defendant firm followed the policy of its state and could not have known that it was doing wrong, there would be a fairness concern. That situation will be rare. If unfairness would occur - e.g., treble damages liability for following an apparent command of the state - **it could normally be addressed in the remedy**. The court could issue an injunction against future price fixing, and perhaps (if allowed by law) could limit damages to the amount of the price fixers' windfall profits. The needs of the state, not the fairness claims of defendants, would lead the search for a wise rule.

#### The only comprehensive studies prove the plans expansion of antitrust successfully deters cartels and induces state compliance with transnational law

\*Card is based  
\*These are the most specific studies to the aff possible --- Found that extraterritorial US antitrust induced both private and state compliance with transnational law --- It also found that exterritorial application deterred vitamin cartels, which are the main question of the Animal Science rulings

Putnam 16 – Tonya L. Putnam is a Research Scholar at the Arnold A. Salzman Institute of War and Peace Studies at Columbia University. From 2007 to 2020 she was a member of the Political Science at Columbia University. Tonya’s work engages a variety of topics related to international relations and international law with emphasis on issues related to jurisdiction and jurisdictional overlaps in international regulatory and security matters. “Extraterritoriality in the Absence of Agreement: International Antitrust.” Chapter. In Courts without Borders: Law, Politics, and US Extraterritoriality, 101–51. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016. doi:10.1017/CBO9781316480304.004.

In maintaining a legal and institutional capacity to apply U.S. law **extraterritorially** on the basis of U.S. effects, U.S. courts have prompted a broad spectrum of private entities – American and foreign – **to give U.S. rules substantial weight** in their **transnational operations**. Of course, foreign governments can block their own domestic institutions from enforcing unwelcome U.S. court judgments, which restricts the efficacy of U.S. courts to situations where the United States has independent enforcement power. Foreign governments also retain the option to engineer legal grounds for defendants in U.S. litigation to claim “**sovereign compulsion**” by enacting laws expressly requiring private entities inside their territories to take actions that violate U.S. law. In many instances, however, taking such steps would narrow options for private actors in foreign jurisdictions in ways that would have large commercial and economic downsides (as, for example, if the Swiss government had changed its laws to require, rather than merely to permit, domestic watchmakers to restrict the production and sale of watch parts). In sum, the ability and **willingness** of U.S. courts to apply U.S. antitrust laws extraterritorially has shaped not only the **incentives** of private **entities but also** the menu of domestic legal options available to **foreign governments** whose citizens have U.S. ties. In contrast, the legal and administrative tools for effects-based extraterritoriality have existed in German, British, and EEC law since the 1950s and have been used at a modest but growing rate since the late 1960s. Over this period, European competition rules and practices, particularly with respect to anti-cartel policies, have increasingly come to resemble those of the United States.200 Economic integration achieved through the EEC, and now the EU, correspondingly, has given European regulators and courts an enforcement capacity analogous to that of the United States. However, this equality of capacity has not yet translated into extraterritorial regulatory claim-making on a scale approaching that of the United States. A key reason why is that the power to initiate competition enforcement in Europe remains, in many practical respects, under the near-exclusive control of EU and member state regulators. The hypothesis that U.S. **extraterritoriality** influences private strategic behavior in the antitrust realm is further confirmed by other **empirical work** that focuses on firm behavior. One study, by Julian Clarke and Simon Evenett (2003), examines the effects of international anti-cartel enforcement on the decisions of private entities about whether and on what level to engage in legally prohibited activities in particular settings. Their approach uses a gravity trade model and **data from the World Trade Analyzer database** to measure actual trade flows for a specific commodity (**vitamins**) for nine countries on three continents. They then compare those results with estimated benchmarks in the absence of a cartel constructed from OECD budget and enforcement records. Overall Clarke and Evenett **find that robust enforcement of antitrust rules has deterrent effects on international cartel activity**. **Another study** by John M. Connor (2007) compares the effectiveness of U.S., Canadian, and EU anti-cartel enforcement in the period between 1990 and 2008 along two dimensions. The first is the likelihood of detecting illegal behavior. The second concerns the harshness of penalties. Connor **finds** the U.S. system both more likely to **detect** **wrongdoing** and more likely to produce a **swift and harsh response** when wrongdoing is identified, for example, by imposing large corporate fines or individual criminal penalties. Among the observable ways in which this affects private strategic behavior is in the selection of locations for cartel meetings. Connor finds that conspirators generally avoid U.S. territory, preferring instead to meet “in Switzerland, Mexico, Japan, Hong Kong, and several EU cities that were regarded as less risky.” 201 Still more to the point, he finds that, although the U.S. and EU economies have become roughly equal in terms of GDP, 62 percent of the enterprises that were the target of criminal antitrust enforcement during his study were headquartered in Europe, and only 16 percent were headquartered in the United States. This **implies a high degree of awareness** among U.S. enterprises about the outer limits of U.S. antitrust rules and a healthy **respect for U.S. enforcement** power. To summarize, U.S. government regulators and many key private constituencies inside the United States stand to gain little from a more internationally centralized approach to antitrust enforcement. As Europeans have edged ever closer to U.S.-style antitrust rules and practices, EU regulators and those in Europe’s larger states have learned to wield the effects doctrine to their advantage. At the same time, the integration of European markets has given those regulators increasing leverage to use it effectively. European extraterritorial enforcement, however, has been, with few exceptions, limited in comparison to U.S. practice. If this were to change substantially in the future with the growth of private enforcement in Europe, the result could be an increase in clashes over the authority and appropriateness of extraterritorial regulation and the erosion of the long-standing U.S. preference for unilateralism in international antitrust enforcement.

#### No DA’s --- Even a full rejection of deference to future foreign sovereign cartels would be within the world welfare

\* No Econ DA --- The defense was a massive risk that companies assumed they would lose  
\* No Trade DA --- It’s not a jurisdictional question, controversy isn’t derived from the “direct” question in the FTAIA

Fox, 19 (Eleanor M. Fox, Walter J. Derenberg Professor of Trade Regulation, New York University School of Law. , 2019, accessed on 11-12-2021, Awards.concurrences, "ANTITRUST: UPDATING EXTRATERRITORIALITY", https://awards.concurrences.com/IMG/pdf/4.\_updating\_extraterritoriality.pdf55787/361912bf66b468d8848477187d73628b861dbf86)//Babcii

4. CHINESE VITAMIN C EXPORT CARTEL: CAN A FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNIZE ITS COMPANIES FROM THE IMPORTING NATION’S ANTI-PRICEFIXING LAW? A limited foreign sovereign compulsiondefense is available under US **antitrust law**. Defendants can defend that they did the violative act solely on their own soil, they had to do it because their government ordered them to do it, and the penalties they faced from violating the order were so great that they could not afford to violate the order. 29 There is also the possibility of dismissal of a private action on comity grounds. It is unclear and much debated as to whether this ground is available in antitrust cases where the anticompetitive effects in the U.S. are direct, substantial and foreseeable, and indeed the intended and the only harm is local.30 Comity is a domestic law concept and, if available, is intended to be applied where foreign interests outbalance US interests and assertion of the US interests will interfere with the foreign relations of the United States.31 The Chinese vitamin C makers fixed the export price of vitamin C to the United States. They admitted it. The price fixing took place within the Chinese trade association, the Association of Importers and Exporters of Medicines and Health Products. Trade associations in China were infused with the presence of government officials, who typically guided the firms in the interests of China.32 US direct buyers sued. The defendants pled foreign sovereign compulsion and comity. The Chinese Ministry of Commerce (MOFCOM) told the federal district court that it ordered the firms to fix their export prices. MOFCOM explained: The firms needed to adjust to a market economy, and MOFCOM wanted them to avoid a US antidumping action. Did MOFCOM really order the firms to fix prices? The jury found that it had not; a Chinese notice invited industry self-regulation, and the notice did not appear to be an order. The jury returned a large award to the overcharged buyers. The Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit reversed. It held that comity required the court to accept China’s word (China’s interpretation of its notice) and that the Chinese interests outweighed the US interests, and it dismissed the case. The Supreme Court vacated the decision and remanded the case because the appellate court improperly treated as conclusive China’s declaration to the court that it ordered the cartel.33 The Vitamin C case—also called Animal Science—**is not about extraterritorial jurisdiction**. There was clearly jurisdiction. The case is about an **alleged** clash of sovereigns. The analysis applicable to the cases of extraterritoriality is equally applicable to resolve the clash. 1. Were the effects of the price-fixing direct, substantial and reasonably foreseeable? The answer is, yes, without question. 2. Was the US enforcement proportionate to the interests of the United States? Again, yes, without question.34**\*\*\*FOOTNOTE BEGINS\*\*\*** 34 Moreover, enforcing the price-fixing **law would create no business uncertainty**. The Chinese firms would surely have known of the strict US law and the uncertainty of a foreign sovereign compulsion defense, and must have taken the risk. If they did not want to take the risk, **they could have** refrained or (if really compelled) **asked for a business review letter rather than keeping their conduct secret**. In a credible case for China’s overriding interest, a favorable business review letter should issue; transparency would facilitate the process of clarifying the law. **\*\*\*FOOTNOTE ENDS\*\*\*** 3. Where did the world welfare interests lie? **This was a naked export cartel**—to the US and the other countries as well. **World welfare lay with the enforcement**. 4. How should the conflict of sovereigns be resolved? China wanted to shield its firms from the US antitrust system. But so did Saskatchewan and maybe Canada (in the potash situation), and so did Korea and Taiwan (in LCD panels); they just did not claim that they said to their firms: “I order you to cartelize.” Why should a country’s order to its firms (let alone its claim that it ordered its firms) to violate the regulating country’s law be enough to differentiate the Potash case (where the US harming conduct was not even as direct) and to immunize the price-fixers? What gives China a greater interest in shielding its firms from the US anti-price-fixing law than the US interest in enforcing its world-standard law against pricefixing?35 If China did order its firms to fix prices in violation of US law and in violation of **the principles of all antitrust jurisdictions including its own internal market rules**, this was a frontal assault on US law and **world norms**. China’s own domestic law not only prohibits pricefixing but even prohibits government officials from ordering firms to price-fix.36 Even if there was a clash of sovereigns in Vitamin C, **the US and world interests easily outweigh China’s**, in the view of this author37 (albeit not in the view of the Court of Appeals of the Second Circuit, which is now reconsidering the case on remand from the Supreme Court).38

#### BUT they are also thumped --- The Supreme court’s decision in Vitamin C smashed foreign deference and comity --- Ensures infinite uncertainty

Bu, 20 (Qingxiu Bu, Commercial Law @ University of Sussex, formerly professor of transnational business @ Georgetown Law Center, 4-30-2020, accessed on 11-30-2021, Oxford University Press, "Respectful Consideration, but Not Deference: Chinese Sovereign Amici in the US Supreme Court Vitamin C Judgment", https://academic.oup.com/jeclap/article-abstract/11/5-6/274/5827020)//Babcii

VI. Conclusion

The US Supreme Court’s **Vitamin C** ruling clarifies that international **comity does not require a court to give binding deference** to a foreign sovereign’s interpretations of its own laws **has far-reaching and significant consequences**. The Supreme Court certified only a narrow question, and offered several (non-exhaustive) criteria the courts should consider. The standard of **respectful consideration** leaves open the possibility that federal courts may reach decisions that completely or partially **reject positions of foreign governments, and that they may do so on inconsistent grounds.** The ruling is focused more on qualitative analysis, there is no much difference in procedures though. Such a multipronged balancing approach **casts more uncertainty for litigants**. Although it addresses the long-standing split in the deference level, this ruling will not change the federal court’s practice dramatically. In this vein, the ruling does not constitute a significant departure from the current approaches by the federal court. It is not a revolution, but a milestone of the evolution of the deference standard.

# 2AC --- Districts R3

## 2AC --- Adv --- TLP

### 2AC --- F/L --- Trade Bad

#### 2. Empirics prove

Cary Huang 18, Senior Writer and Veteran Columnist at the South China Morning Post, Former China Editor for The Standard, “Trade Wars Cause World Wars, History Shows. Will This Time Be Different?”, South China Morning Post, 7/17/2018, https://www.scmp.com/comment/insight-opinion/united-states/article/2155565/trade-wars-cause-world-wars-history-shows-will

History provides ample evidence that trade problems have heightened tensions among nations. Such fights lead to economic crises, and trigger political and social crises and, finally, trigger wars.

A full-blown trade war often features the combination of a tariff war and currency war. In practice, exporting countries will, in response to imposed tariffs, resort to currency manipulation, moving to cheapen their money to offset the impact of the tariffs.

But a competitive devaluation among trade partners makes a currency war meaningless. Once countries realise that currency wars do not work, they resort to all the tools available to set up barriers to block trade. This seems evident amid the escalating US-China trade feud. The slump in the renminbi in past few months is stoking fears in markets that China’s policymakers are deliberately pushing the currency’s depreciation in an effort to offset the US tariff hikes.

Trump staring down barrel of yuan devaluation in trade war

Before the first world war, most countries accepted the classical gold standard of pegging their currencies to gold as an effort to anchor smooth trade. However, from 1913, countries began to suspend or abandon the system as they devalued their currencies to compete for export markets in the ongoing tariff war.

The end of the first world war sparked the first worldwide currency war, starting in Weimar Germany in 1921, followed by France in 1925. In the end, all the major economies scrambled to devalue their currencies – sterling, the franc and the US dollar – throughout the 1930s.

In 1930, US president Herbert Hoover signed into law the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, which intensified the currency war and deepened the Great Depression. The protectionist law raised tariffs on more than 20,000 imported products and triggered retaliation from many US trade partners.

Trade wars stoke nationalism and hatred among people and finally trigger wars, as evidenced by the breakout of the second world war: the Japanese invaded Manchuria in 1931, and the whole of China in 1937; the Germans invaded Poland in 1939, then the rest of Europe; and the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbour in 1941.

Could Trump’s trade war turn into a third world war?

A quote often attributed to the 19th-century French economist, Frédéric Bastiat, goes: “When goods do not cross frontiers, armies will.” It is obvious that the current US-China trade war is stoking geopolitical tensions between the world’s two largest economies and chief political adversaries, as they become more confrontational over their discord on maritime issues in the South and East China seas and over Taiwan.

History often repeats itself if we do not learn from it. The two full-blown trade wars some 80 and 100 years ago helped to ignite the two world wars. Could such a catastrophe happen again?

#### 3. Forecasting --- the current environment is uniquely primed for global escalation---trade’s key

Dr. Christopher M. Dent 20, Professor in Economics and International Business at Edge Hill University, PhD in International Political Economy, University of Hull, MA in Economics from the University of Leeds, “Brexit, Trump and Trade: Back to a Late 19th Century Future?”, Competition & Change, Volume 24, Issue 3-4, p. 338-339

Introduction

The global economy and system are entering a critical phase. Populist nationalism is on the rise, fuelled largely by discontent over globalization’s distributional impacts and failure of conventional politics and markets to deliver on their promises (Kyle and Gultchin, 2018). An emerging economic superpower is disrupting the global order and its long incumbent power structures. Multilateralism is under threat, trade protectionism and tariff wars are escalating, many economies are struggling in the lingering aftermath of a severe global recession and the global system is under pressure generally from short- and longer-term crises (Guillen, 2015). World GDP and trade growth are slowing and there are predictions of greater political economic turbulence to come (World Bank, 2019; World Trade Organisation, 2019a). Worst still, the world may be on the brink of a major great power conflict. This scenario not only applies today but also to the late 19th century world. The eventual outcome of events in this period was escalating conflict that culminated in the outbreak of World War 1 (WW1). Whilst such an outcome was not necessarily inevitable by the 1890s it was a retrospectively proven possibility. Hence, avoiding a late 19th century world scenario is, at the very least, desirable.

Trade is central to understanding the political economies of the early 21st and late 19th centuries, making it a suitable empirical prism to make a comparative historical analysis (CHA) of the two periods. What follows is a trade political economy study that will examine various connections between the domestic and the international, focusing also on two significant cases that provide important comparative analytical insights. The result of Britain’s 2016 Brexit referendum and election of Donald Trump as US President in the same year have become emblematic of contemporary populism, economic nationalism and associated resistance against forms of internationalism and globalization.1

### 2AC --- AT --- Warming

#### Trade solves warming

**United Nations, 9** (United Nations, 6-26-2009, accessed on 2-24-2022, UN News, "Free trade can help combat global warming, finds UN report", https://news.un.org/en/story/2009/06/304772-free-trade-can-help-combat-global-warming-finds-un-report)//Babcii

Contrary to conventional wisdom, further liberalization of international trade can **help combat climate change** and support a low carbon economy, said a joint United Nations Environment Programme ([UNEP](http://www.unep.org/)) and World Trade Organization (WTO) report launched today in Geneva. The “Trade and Climate Change” report stressed that an increase and opening of trade could have a positive impact on greenhouse gases emissions by accelerating the spread of **clean technology** and providing opportunities for developing **economies to adapt those technologies**. “With a challenge of this magnitude, multilateral cooperation is crucial and a successful conclusion to the ongoing climate change negotiations is the first step to achieving sustainable development for future generations,” [said](http://www.unep.org/Documents.Multilingual/Default.asp?DocumentID=589&ArticleID=6236&l=en&t=long) [UNEP](https://www.unep.org/) Executive Director Achim Steiner and WTO Director General Pascal Lamy. According to a joint news release, Mr. Steiner and Mr. Lamy together urged the international community to “seal an equitable and decisive deal at the crucial UN climate convention meeting in Copenhagen, Denmark, in December,” when States aim to negotiate an ambitious new greenhouse gas reduction agreement to succeed the 1997 Kyoto Protocol. The two men also pressed nations to conclude the stalled Doha trade round, a series of international talks under the [WTO](http://www.wto.org/) that began in 2001 in a bid to reduce trade barriers which includes opening trade in environmental goods and services. The report noted that rising **incomes**, resulting from freer trade can also change social patterns and aspirations with wealthier societies having the opportunity **to demand higher environmental standards** including those relating to greenhouse gas emissions. In addition, the reports pointed to evidence suggesting that more open trade together with measures to combat climate change can accelerate innovation, including new products and processes **that create new clean technology businesses**. In a related development, Mr. Steiner also welcomed today the ‘Green Growth’ Declaration by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), saying it underscored the environment’s central role in economic discourse and policy-making. In the wide-ranging declaration, OECD ministers called for greater cooperation over low carbon, clean technology, including renewable energies and green information and communications technologies to assist in realizing a sustainable 21st century.

#### Warming doesn’t trigger extinction

* peer-reviewed journal shows IPCC exaggeration
* history proves resilience
* no extinction- warming under Paris goals
* rock breaking strategy could offset warming

IBD 18 [Investors Business Daily, Citing Study from Peer reviewed journal by Lewis and Curry, “Here's One Global Warming Study Nobody Wants You To See”, 4/25/18, https://www.investors.com/politics/editorials/global-warming-computer-models-co2-emissions/]

Settled Science: A **new study published in a peer-reviewed journal finds** that **climate models exaggerate** the global warming from CO2 emissions by as much as 45%. If these findings hold true, it's huge news. No wonder the mainstream press is ignoring it.

In the study, authors Nic Lewis and Judith Curry looked at actual temperature records and compared them with climate change computer models. What they found is that the planet has shown itself to be far less sensitive to increases in CO2 than the climate models say. As a result, they say, the planet will warm less than the models predict, even if we continue pumping CO2 into the atmosphere.

As Lewis explains: "Our results imply that, for any future emissions scenario, future warming is likely to be **substantially lower** than the central computer **model-simulated** level projected by the (United Nations **I**ntergovernmental **P**anel on **C**limate **C**hange), and highly unlikely to exceed that level.

How much lower? Lewis and Curry say that their findings show temperature increases will be 30%-45% lower than the climate models say. If they are right, then there's **little to worry about**, even if we don't drastically reduce CO2 emissions.

The planet will warm from human activity, but not nearly enough to cause the sort of end-of-the-world calamities we keep hearing about. In fact, the resulting warming would be **below the target** set at the Paris agreement.

This would be tremendously good news.

The fact that the Lewis and Curry study appears in the peer-reviewed American Meteorological Society's Journal of Climate

lends credibility to their findings. This is the same journal, after all, that recently published widely covered studies saying the Sahara has been growing and the **climate boundary** in central U.S. **has shifted 140 miles to the east** because of global warming.

The Lewis and Curry findings come after another study, published in the prestigious journal Nature, that found the **long-held view that a doubling of CO2 would boost global temperatures** as much as 4.5 degrees Celsius **was wrong.** The most temperatures would likely climb is 3.4 degrees.

It also follows a study published in Science, which found that rocks contain vast amounts of nitrogen that plants could use to grow and absorb more CO2, potentially offsetting at least some of the effects of CO2 emissions and reducing future temperature increases.

## 2AC --- Adv --- Development

### 2AC --- AT --- China says no/WTO Useless

#### 3. The WTO provides sufficient deterrence

**Perry, 18** -- Partner of Harris Bricken [William E., From 1980 to 1987, Mr. Perry worked in the Office of General Counsel at the U.S. International Trade Commission and the Office of Chief Counsel and the Office of Antidumping Investigations at the U.S. Department of Commerce, U.S. Antidumping Law and the *Vitamin C* Case: An Important but Forgotten Issue, 2 China Law Connect 47, Sept. 2018, <https://cgc.law.stanford.edu/commentaries/clc-2-201809-connect-5-william-perry/>, accessed 1-4-22]

Much of the discussion of the U.S. Supreme Court’s decision in Animal Science Products, Inc., et al. v. Hebei Welcome Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd., et. al. (commonly known as the “Vitamin C case”) is focused on the holding that a foreign government’s statement about its own law has no conclusive effect on the federal court determining the foreign law.1 The statement at issue was one provided by China’s Ministry of Commerce (“MOFCOM”) explaining that it had ordered Chinese vitamin C exporters and their trade association (i.e., the Chamber of Commerce of Medicines and Health Products Importers and Exporters; the “Chamber”) to set a price floor for vitamin C exports and that these parties should, therefore, be shielded from liability under U.S. antitrust law.

Lost in the proceedings in the Federal District Court, the Second Circuit, and the Supreme Court is the reason the Chamber and the Chinese companies set a price floor with the help of MOFCOM. It was not done to gouge U.S. importers but rather because of the Chamber’s, MOFCOM’s, and the Chinese companies’ **justified real fear** of a U.S. **antidumping** case, which could **wipe out** **all** Chinese vitamin C from the U.S. market for **decades** and expose the U.S. importers—the same parties who initiated the Vitamin C antitrust case—to millions of dollars in **retroactive liability**.\

## OFF

### 2AC --- T --- Prohibit

#### We meet --- cartel price fixing is per se

Mohr et al 94, Assistant Professor of Marketing in the College of Business at the University of Colorado-Boulder. (Jakki, with Gregory T. Gundlach is an Associate Professor of Marketing in the College of Business Administration at the University of Notre Dame and Robert E. Spekman is Professor of Business Administration at the University of Virginia, Legal Ramifications of Strategic Alliances; Legal ambiguity muddies the waters for collaborative ventures. SECTION: RELATIONSHIP MARKETING; Vol. 3, No. 2; Pg. 38, https://www.unf.edu/~ggundlac/pdfs/pub\_42.pdf)

Many cooperative ventures between competing firms give way to greater competition, even though the absolute number of competing firms might be reduced. A collaborative effort would be labeled as a cartel if horizontal competitors collaborated with respect to price or some other market policy that had a direct and substantial effect on price. Collaboration for such purposes has in the past been declared per se illegal, without elaborate inquiry as to the precise harm caused, or the business' reasons for collaborating.

#### Counter-interpretation---rule of reason is a prohibition.

Light 19, Sarah E. Light Assistant Professor of Legal Studies and Business Ethics, The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania., The Law of the Corporation as Environmental Law, 71 Stan. L. Rev. 137, 2019, Lexis/Nexis

While antitrust law can serve as an environmental mandate by prohibiting collusive behavior that keeps environmentally preferable goods from the market, there is also conflict between antitrust law's goals of promoting competition and environmental law's goals of promoting [\*177] conservation. 192 Because antitrust law's per se rule and rule of reason operate on a somewhat fluid continuum, 193 this Subpart discusses the two doctrines together. The per se rule operates as a prohibition, whereas the rule of reason operates as both a prohibition and a disincentive. As noted above, antitrust law generally prohibits certain types of market activity - price fixing, horizontal boycotts, and output limitations - as illegal per se, and harm to competition is presumed. 194 For example, if an industry association declines to award a seal of approval necessary for a product's sale without any good faith attempt to test the product's performance, but rather simply because that product is manufactured by a competitor, such an action would be illegal per se. 195 Under this Article's framework, a per se violation is thus a prohibition. The more fact-intensive inquiry under the rule of reason tests "whether the restraint imposed is such as merely regulates and perhaps thereby promotes competition or whether it is such as may suppress or even destroy competition." 196 While this extremely broad statement might suggest that any fact is relevant to the inquiry, the salient facts under the rule of reason are "those that tend to establish whether a restraint increases or decreases output, or decreases or increases prices." 197 If an anticompetitive effect is found, then the action is illegal and the rule of reason operates, like the per se rule, as a prohibition. 198 The rule of reason can also operate as a disincentive, even if no [\*178] court finds an anticompetitive effect, as uncertainty and litigation risk may discourage firms from undertaking legally permissible, environmentally positive industry collaborations. 199 Associations of firms have adopted numerous mechanisms of private environmental governance to address the management of common pool resources like fisheries, forests, and the global climate. 200 Examples include the Sustainable Apparel Coalition's Higg Index 201 and the American Chemistry Council's Responsible Care program. 202 But private industry standards raise special antitrust concerns. An agreement among competitors with respect to product or process specifications may exclude competitors who fail to meet such standards, raising the specter that such industry collaborations really constitute output limitations or efforts to limit competition. 203 While the U.S. Supreme Court has scrutinized private standard-setting associations carefully, 204 it has noted that if associations "promulgate … standards based on the merits of objective expert judgments and through procedures that prevent the standard-setting process from being biased by members with economic interests in stifling product competition … , those private standards can have significant procompetitive advantages." 205 In the absence of price fixing or a boycott, a rule of reason analysis generally applies to product standard setting by private associations. 206 The uncertain outcome [\*179] inherent in the application of antitrust law in this context could therefore serve as a potential disincentive to the adoption of private industry standards. 207 The challenge of course is that some form of explicit sanctions on noncompliant industry members may be necessary for private industry standards to be effective. In the context of private reputational mechanisms like the New York Diamond Dealers Club, 208 Barak Richman has pointed out that the Club's use of reputational sanctions and voluntary refusals to deal with actors who flout industry norms, while welfare enhancing, could nonetheless amount to violations of antitrust law. 209 This echoes the concern raised by Andrew King and Michael Lenox in their extensive empirical analysis of the Responsible Care program created by the Chemical Manufacturers Association (now the American Chemistry Council). 210 King and Lenox concluded that the absence of explicit sanctions on members who failed to meet the standards set by the program left the program vulnerable to "opportunism." 211 While they suggested that industry associations could look to third parties to enforce the rules, 212 an alternative way to facilitate the long-term environmental benefits of stronger sanctions would be to interpret antitrust law in conformity with the environmental priority principle presented below. 213 [\*180] In some instances, the conflict between the values of promoting competition and conserving environmental resources can be stark. 214 Jonathan Adler, for example, has identified this conflict in the context of fisheries - a tragedy of the commons situation in which some form of collective action is required to avoid overfishing. 215 He cites as an example Manaka v. Monterey Sardine Industries, Inc., in which a fisherman was excluded from a local fishing cooperative. 216 The fisherman sued the cooperative under the Sherman Act, and the court found an antitrust violation in his exclusion. 217 While the fishing cooperative's policies were no doubt exclusionary, Adler contends that they also promoted conservation by restricting catch. 218 The fishery collapsed by the 1950s, a collapse Adler hypothesizes might have been "inevitable" but that perhaps might not have occurred in the absence of the antitrust suit. 219 While a court performing a rule of reason analysis must consider whether a restraint on trade suppresses or destroys competition, Adler points out that courts may also "consider offsetting efficiencies from otherwise anticompetitive arrangements." 220 It is not clear, however, that the courts have consistently taken these factors into account. 221 Among other potential remedies, Adler argues that to resolve this tension between antitrust law, on the one hand, and private collective action to conserve environmental resources, on the other, courts should more actively consider the "ancillary conservation benefits of otherwise anticompetitive conduct." 222 Recognizing the long-term health of a fishery would be consistent with antitrust law's purpose of ensuring viable markets exist in the future, and consistent with the environmental priority principle introduced below. 223

#### Prohibit can mean ‘severely hinder’---doesn’t necessitate a ban.

Washington Court of Appeals 19 (KORSMO-judge. Opinion in State v. Kimball, No. 35441-5-III (Wash. Ct. App. Apr. 2, 2019). Google scholar caselaw. Date accessed 7/13/21).

His argument runs counter to the meaning of the word "prohibit." It means "1. To forbid by law. 2. To prevent, preclude, or severely hinder." BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY 1405 (10th ed. 2014). As "severely hinder" suggests, a "prohibition" need not be an all or nothing proposition.

#### **Anticompetitive practices are strategies that have anticompetitive effects.**

Wells 16, Executive Notes Editor, Washington University Global Studies Law Review, J.D., Washington University in St. Louis. (Todd Wells, “Exploring the Space for Antitrust Law in the Race for Space Exploration,” Washington University Global Studies Law Review, Vol. 15, 2016, LexisNexis)

Antitrust law attempts to fight anti-competitive actions. "Anticompetitive practices refer to a wide range of business practices in which a firm or group of firms may engage in order to restrict inter-firm competition to maintain or increase their relative market position and profits without necessarily providing goods and services at a lower cost or of higher quality." The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Glossary of Statistical Terms, Anticompetitive Practices http://stats.oecd.org.proxy.library.georgetown.edu/glossary/detail.asp?ID=3145. Obviously, with such a broad definition of anticompetitive practices, many types of actions can fall under the regulation of anticompetitive law. This can cover forms of collusion, price fixing, bid rigging, bid suppression, complementary bidding, bid rotation, subcontracting, and market divisions. Price Fixing, Bid Rigging, and Market Allocation Schemes: What They Are and What to Look For, U.S. Dep't of Justice, http://www.justice.gov/atr/ public/guidelines/211578.htm. An even broader approach would put patents under antitrust law. "All of these developments, in Congress and the Courts, are in the spirit of harmonizing patent and antitrust law, generally in the direction of subsuming patent law under antitrust law. From the perspective of providing clarity and certainty for those who are the targets of patent and antitrust suits, harmonization has much appeal." Robin Feldman, Patent and Antitrust: Differing Shades of Meaning,13 Va. J.L. & Tech. 1, 7 (2008).

### 2AC --- T --- Private

#### 1. The companies the aff is concerned about are private --- They make profits and are MNC’s

Qingxiu Bu, Commercial Law @ University of Sussex, formerly professor of transnational business @ Georgetown Law Center, ’20, ‘“Respectful Consideration, but Not Deference: Chinese Sovereign Amici in the US Supreme Court Vitamin C Judgment” Journal of European Competition Law & Practice, Vol. 11, No. 5–6

1. Public actors vis-à-vis private actors The act of state doctrine refers to a defence designed to avoid judicial inquiry into state officials’ conduct as opposed to private actors.86 The long-standing doctrine precludes courts from ruling on the validity of the public acts of a foreign sovereign within its own territory.87 **In Vitamin C, the privately set price does not qualify as state action**, and thus the doctrines of act of state **should not bar** plaintiffs’ **suit**. It may not meet the test of reasonableness, neither is the decision equitable. Otherwise, the effect would be to substantially impair antitrust enforcement and impose significant costs on US consumers.88 In the case of a foreign government ordering its firms to fix prices, the victims are at the will of the foreigners’ power and have no recourse.89 In order to apply the foreign state compulsion defence, the Restatement (Fourth) 2018 clarifies that, the sanctions for failing to comply with the foreign law must be severe, and the person in question must have ‘acted in good faith to avoid the conflict’.90 The **threshold is unlikely to be met** given the intertwining of public and private actions in China. In terms of the **private actors’** price fixing, the defendants in Vitamin C had strong incentive to **maximise their profits** at the expense of US consumers, who have even benefited from the mandate.91 **This happens when Chinese MNCs operating in a hybrid state capitalism pursue conduct in violation of the US antitrust laws**.92 Such a scenario takes place more often in some key industries that the Chinese government firmly controls. It is rare in China for the government to use plausibly state-sanctioned coordination.93

### 2AC --- Cap K --- F/L

#### 7. Growth is sustainable AND solves existential risks

hÉigeartaigh 17 – Professor @ Cambridge, PhD in Genomics from Trinity College Dublin (Sean, “Technological Wild Cards: Existential Risk and a Changing Humanity”, <https://www.bbvaopenmind.com/en/articles/technological-wild-cards-existential-risk-and-a-changing-humanity/>, Accessed 3-7-2019)

Technological progress now offers us a vision of a remarkable future. The advances that have brought us onto an unsustainable pathway have also raised the quality of life dramatically for many, and have unlocked scientific directions that can lead us to a safer, cleaner, more sustainable world. With the right developments and applications of technology, in concert with advances in social, democratic, and distributional processes globally, progress can be made on all of the challenges discussed here. Advances in renewable energy and related technologies, and more efficient energy use—advances that are likely to be accelerated by progress in technologies such as artificial intelligence—can bring us to a point of zero-carbon emissions. New manufacturing capabilities provided by synthetic biology may provide cleaner ways of producing products and degrading waste. A greater scientific understanding of our natural world and the ecosystem services on which we rely will aid us in plotting a trajectory whereby critical environmental systems are maintained while allowing human flourishing. Even advances in education and women’s rights globally, which will play a role in achieving a stable global population, can be aided specifically by the information, coordination, and education tools that technology provides, and more generally by growing prosperity in the relevant parts of the world. There are catastrophic and existential risks that we will simply not be able to overcome without advances in science and technology. These include possible pandemic outbreaks, whether natural or engineered. The early identification of incoming asteroids, and approaches to shift their path, is a topic of active research at NASA and elsewhere. While currently there are no known techniques to prevent or mitigate a supervolcanic eruption, this may not be the case with the tools at our disposal a century from now. And in the longer run, a civilization that has spread permanently beyond the earth, enabled by advances in spaceflight, manufacturing, robotics, and terraforming, is one that is much more likely to endure. However, the breathtaking power of the tools we are developing is not to be taken lightly. We have been very lucky to muddle through the advent of nuclear weapons without a global catastrophe. And within this century, it is realistic to expect that we will be able to rewrite much of biology to our purposes, intervene deliberately and in a large-scale way in the workings of our global climate, and even develop agents with intelligence that is fundamentally alien to ours, and may vastly surpass our own in some or even most domains—a development that would have uniquely unpredictable consequences.

### 2AC --- A5 CP --- F/L

#### 4. Congress AND Sherman key to certainty

Derrian Smith 19. J.D., 2019, Indiana University Maurer School of Law; B.A., 2016, Indiana University - Indianapolis. "Taming Sherman's Wilderness." Indiana Law Journal, vol. 94, no. 3, Summer 2019, p. 1223-1246. HeinOnline.

CONCLUSION

The Sherman Act, by its vague and sweeping language, is a broad delegation of authority to the Supreme Court. Congress sent us into the wilderness-law students and generalist judges alike. In light of swelling desire for the antitrust laws to be more effective against modern-day competition foes, Congress should update the Sherman Act. The common-law approach has not achieved the stability one would expect of a statute levying hefty criminal sanctions, and the Court appears to approximate agency rulemaking on an increasingly frequent basis. Delegating rulemaking authority to an antitrust agency may be a viable solution. But there are some draw backs-namely constitutional objections to which the Sherman Act may be vulnerable, especially if an agency delegation were not accompanied by some level of additional statutory clarity. Even if the agency solution proves unworkable, Congress should address head-on the growing need for clarity,

**Agencies create more confusion**

Alexander Paul **Okuliar et al. 21**. Morrison & Foerster LLP. "FTC Lays Groundwork For Rulemakings: Are New Substantive Competition Rules Coming?". No Publication. 3-25-2021. https://www.mondaq.com/unitedstates/antitrust-eu-competition-/1067906/ftc-lays-groundwork-for-rulemakings-are-new-substantive-competition-rules-coming

**The FTC's foray into rulemaking could lead to** a period of **uncertainty and legal challenges in** those **areas touched by a new agency rule. There is likely to be significant debate over the scope of** the FTC's **authority, the particulars of the rulemaking process, the substance** of any proposed rules, and**, when tested in court, the extent of** Chevron **deference** to which the agency is entitled. Substantive FTC competition rules could also create potential divergence in enforcement policy or activity between the DOJ and FTC brought about by the new rules.

#### 5. FTC act doesn’t have a PROA

\*Specific to the aff + 1AC solvency advocate  
\*Card is laughably good answering this CP

John B. Kirkwood 21, Professor of Law, Seattle University School of Law. American Law Institute. Executive Committee, AALS Antitrust and Economic Regulation Section. Advisory Board, American Antitrust Institute. Advisory Board, Institute for Consumer Antitrust Studies, "Tech Giant Exclusion," Florida Law Review, Forthcoming, pg. 42-43, 01/15/2021, SSRN.

1. No Private Treble Damage Actions

**The FTC Act contains no private right of action**. As a result, respondents do not face the possibility of treble damages and attorneys’ fees. **Nor can the FTC seek civil penalties** for an initial violation.229 While the agency once used restitution actions to impose financial sanctions, the Supreme Court recently held that the agency had no authority to pursue restitution.230 In none of its restitution cases, moreover, did the FTC ever challenge exclusion without alleging a section 2 violation. 231 In short, tech giant exclusion is highly **unlikely to result in treble damages, civil penalties, restitution, or other monetary sanctions in** a pure Section 5 case. Thus, if a tech giant concludes that it would be profitable to exclude a third party from its platform, the prospect of **a Section 5 action** would not materially change the calculus.

#### It’s k2 deterrence

Harrington ‘15 [Joseph; January 29; Patrick T. Harker Professor, Department of Business Economics & Public Policy, at The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania; *CPI Antitrust Chronicle*, “The Comity-Deterrence Tradeoff and the FTAIA: Motorola Mobility Revisited,” <https://www.competitionpolicyinternational.com/the-comity-deterrence-trade-off-and-the-ftaia-motorola-mobility-revisited/>; KS]

IV. THE POTENTIAL HARM CREATED BY THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT’S DECISION

Public and private antitrust enforcement can shut down existing cartels and deter future cartels from forming by influencing both the likelihood that a cartel is discovered and convicted and the extent of penalties brought to bear on convicted cartels. The higher is that likelihood, the more likely is the spigot of harm to be shut off. The higher is that likelihood and the more severe are the penalties, the more likely that firms will be deterred from ever turning the spigot on. If we take private damages out of the equation, how much is the disabling and deterring of cartels impacted?

In addressing that question, let us first consider the scenario in which, if there is a cartel, the government were to prosecute it. Presuming that they obtain a conviction, the cartel will be shut down and thus serve the objective of disabling cartels. However, the lack of private suits weakens the objective of deterring cartels as penalties are limited to jail time and government fines and lack potentially sizable private damages. It is well-recognized that current penalties— even with private damages—are very likely to be insufficient to deter. As this point is well-argued in a recent Amicus Curiae Brief16 and the point is not new, I will not dwell on it. Suffice it to say that the Court’s decision to prohibit companies like Motorola to sue will undoubtedly reduce the penalties levied on cartels and, because the full array of penalties are currently inadequate to deter many cartels, will contribute to antitrust enforcement further falling short of what is require to achieve the goal of deterrence.

The preceding analysis was predicated on the critical assumption that the government prosecutes the cartel, but this may not occur for two reasons. First, the government may be unaware of the cartel’s existence. Lacking the right to bring a private case, cartels are less likely to be discovered because those harmed have weaker incentives to monitor for collusion. Nevertheless, they still do have some incentive to monitor and report a suspected cartel to the government in order to disrupt the harm that is being inflicted upon them. It is then unclear whether the loss of antitrust standing will substantively weaken the incentive to monitor to the point that it warrants interfering with comity.

#### 6. Courts shut it down and Congress backlashes

Alison Jones 20 and William E. Kovacic. Alison Jones, King’s College London, London, United Kingdom. William E. Kovacic, King’s College London, George Washington University, and United Kingdom Competition and Markets Authority, "Antitrust’s Implementation Blind Side: Challenges to Major Expansion of U.S. Competition Policy". SAGE Journals. 3/20/2020. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0003603X20912884

One possible solution to rigidities that have developed in Sherman Act jurisprudence is for the FTC to rely more heavily on the prosecution, through its own administrative process, of cases based on Section 5 of the FTC Act and its prohibition of “unfair methods of competition.”93 This section allows the FTC94 to tackle not only anticompetitive practices prohibited by the other antitrust statutes but also conduct constituting incipient violations of those statutes or behavior that exceeds their reach. The latter is possible where the conduct does not infringe the letter of the antitrust laws but contradicts their basic spirit or public policy.95

There is no doubt therefore that Section 5 was designed as an expansion joint in the U.S. antitrust system. It seems unlikely to us, nonetheless, that a majority of FTC’s current members will be minded to use it in this way. Further, even if they were to be, the reality is that such an application may encounter difficulties. Since its creation in 1914, the FTC has never prevailed before the Supreme Court in any case challenging dominant firm misconduct, whether premised on Section 2 of the Sherman Act or purely on Section 5 of the FTC Act.96 The last FTC success in federal court in a case predicated solely on Section 5 occurred in the late 1960s.97

The FTC’s record of limited success with Section 5 has not been for want of trying. In the 1970s, the FTC undertook an ambitious program to make the enforcement of claims predicated on the distinctive reach of Section 5, a foundation to develop “competition policy in its broadest sense.”98 The agency’s Section 5 agenda yielded some successes,99 but also a large number of litigation failures involving cases to address subtle forms of coordination in oligopolies, to impose new obligations on dominant firms, and to dissolve shared monopolies.100 The agency’s program elicited powerful legislative backlash from a Congress that once supported FTC’s trailblazing initiatives but turned against it as the Commission’s efforts to obtain dramatic structural remedies unfolded.101

### 2AC --- !/D --- AI

#### AI doesn’t cause extinction

Shermer 17 — Michael Shermer (Publisher of Skeptic magazine, a monthly columnist for Scientific American, and a Presidential Fellow at Chapman University), April 2017, “Why Artificial Intelligence Is Not an Existential Threat,” Skeptic, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 29–35.

Why AI is not an Existential Threat First, most AI doomsday prophecies are grounded in the false analogy between human nature and computer nature, or natural intelligence and artificial intelligence. We are thinking machines, but natural selection also designed into us emotions to shortcut the thinking process because natural intelligences are limited in speed and capacity by the number of neurons that can be crammed into a skull that has to pass through a pelvic opening at birth, whereas artificial intelligence need not be so restricted. We don't need to compute the caloric value of foods, for example, we just feel hungry. We don't need to calculate the waist-to-hip ratio of women or the shoulder-to-waist ratio of men in our quest for genetically healthy potential mates; we just feel attracted to someone and mate with them. We don't need to work out the genetic cost of raising someone else's offspring if our mate is unfaithful; we just feel jealous. We don't need to figure the damage of an unfair or non-reciprocal exchange with someone else; we just feel injustice and desire revenge. Emotions are proxies for getting us to act in ways that lead to an increase in reproductive success, particularly in response to threats faced by our Paleolithic ancestors. Anger leads us to strike out, fight back, and defend ourselves against danger. Fear causes us to pull back, retreat, and escape from risks. Disgust directs us to push out, eject, and expel that which is bad for us. Computing the odds of danger in any given situation takes too long. We need to react instantly. Emotions shortcut the information processing power needed by brains that would otherwise become bogged down with all the computations necessary for survival. Their purpose, in an ultimate causal sense, is to drive behaviors toward goals selected by evolution to enhance survival and reproduction. AIs -- even AGIs and ASIs -- will have no need of such emotions and so there would be no reason to program them in unless, say, terrorists chose to do so for their own evil purposes. But that's a human nature problem, not a computer nature issue. To believe that an ASI would be "evil" in any emotional sense is to assume a computer cognition that includes such psychological traits as acquisitiveness, competitiveness, vengeance, and bellicosity, which seem to be projections coming from the mostly male writers who concoct such dystopias, not features any programmer would bother including, assuming that it could even be done. What would it mean to program an emotion into a computer? When IBM's Deep Blue defeated chess master Garry Kasparov in 1997, did it feel triumphant, vengeful, or bellicose? Of course not. It wasn't even "aware" -- in the human sense of self-conscious knowledge -- that it was playing chess, much less feeling nervous about possibly losing to the reigning world champion (which it did in the first tournament played in 1996). In fact, toward the end of the first game of the second tournament, on the 44th move, Deep Blue made a legal but incomprehensible move of pushing its rook all the way to the last row of the opposition side. It accomplished nothing offensively or defensively, leading Kasparov to puzzle over it out of concern that he was missing something in the computer's strategy. It turned out to be an error in Deep Blue's programming that led to this fail-safe default move. It was a bug that Kasparov mistook as a feature, and as a result some chess experts contend it led him to be less confident in his strategizing and to second-guess his responses in the subsequent games. It even led him to suspect foul play and human intervention behind Deep Blue, and this paranoia ultimately cost him the tournamentt.[ 13] Computers don't get paranoid, the HAL 9000 computer in 2001 notwithstanding. Or consider Watson, the IBM computer built by David Ferrucci and his team of IBM research scientists tasked with designing an AI that could rival human champions at the game of Jeopardy! This was a far more formidable challenge than Deep Blue faced because of the prerequisite to understand language and the often multiple meanings of words, not to mention needing an encyclopedic knowledge of trivia (Watson had access to Wikipedia for this). After beating the all-time greatest Jeopardy! champions Ken Jennings and Brad Rutter in 2011, did Watson feel flushed with pride after its victory? Did Watson even know that it won Jeopardy!? I put the question to none other than Ferrucci himself at a dinner party in New York in conjunction with the 2011 Singularity Summit. His answer surprised me: "Yes, Watson knows it won Jeopardy!" I was skeptical. How could that be, since such self-awareness is not yet possible in computers? "Because I told it that it won," he replied with a wry smile. Sure, and you could even program Watson or Deep Blue to vocalize a Howard Dean-like victory scream when it wins, but that is still a far cry from a computer feeling triumphant. This brings to mind the "hard problem" of consciousness -- if we don't understand how this happens in humans, how could we program it into computers? As Steven Pinker elucidated in his answer to the 2015 Edge Question on what to think about machines that think, "AI dystopias project a parochial alpha-male psychology onto the concept of intelligence. They assume that superhumanly intelligent robots would develop goals like deposing their masters or taking over the world." It is equally possible, Pinker suggests, that "artificial intelligence will naturally develop along female lines: fully capable of solving problems, but with no desire to annihilate innocents or dominate the civilization."[ 14] So the fear that computers will become emotionally evil are unfounded, because without the suite of these evolved emotions it will never occur to AIs to take such actions against us. What about an ASI inadvertently causing our extinction by turning us into paperclips, or tiling the entire Earth's surface with solar panels? Such scenarios imply yet another emotion -- the feeling of valuing or wanting something. As the science writer Michael Chorost adroitly notes, when humans resist an AI from undertaking any form of global tiling, it "will have to be able to imagine counteractions and want to carry them out." Yet, "until an AI has feelings, it's going to be unable to want to do anything at all, let alone act counter to humanity's interests and fight off human resistance." Further, Chorost notes, "the minute an A.I. wants anything, it will live in a universe with rewards and punishments -- including punishments from us for behaving badly. In order to survive in a world dominated by humans, a nascent A.I. will have to develop a humanlike moral sense that certain things are right and others are wrong. By the time it's in a position to imagine tiling the Earth with solar panels, it'll know that it would be morally wrong to do so."[ 15] From here Chorost builds on an argument made by Peter Singer in The Expanding Circle (and Steven Pinker in The Better Angels of Our Nature[ 16] that I also developed in The Moral Arc[ 17] and Robert Wright explored in Nonzero[ 18]), and that is the propensity for natural intelligence to evolve moral emotions that include reciprocity, cooperativeness, and even altruism. Natural intelligences such as ours also includes the capacity to reason, and once you are on Singer's metaphor of the "escalator of reason" it can carry you upward to genuine morality and concerns about harming others. "Reasoning is inherently expansionist. It seeks universal application," Singer notes.[ 19] Chorost draws the implication: "AIs will have to step on the escalator of reason just like humans have, because they will need to bargain for goods in a human-dominated economy and they will face human resistance to bad behavior."[ 20] Finally, for an AI to get around this problem it would need to evolve emotions on its own, but the only way for this to happen in a world dominated by the natural intelligence called humans would be for us to allow it to happen, which we wouldn't because there's time enough to see it coming. Bostrom's "treacherous turn" will come with road signs ahead warning us that there's a sharp bend in the highway with enough time for us to grab the wheel. Incremental progress is what we see in most technologies, including and especially AI, which will continue to serve us in the manner we desire and need. Instead of Great Leap Forward or Giant Fall Backward, think Small Steps Upward. As I proposed in The Moral Arc, instead of Utopia or dystopia, think protopia, a term coined by the futurist Kevin Kelly, who described it in an Edge conversation this way: "I call myself a protopian, not a Utopian. I believe in progress in an incremental way where every year it's better than the year before but not by very much -- just a micro amount."[ 21] Almost all progress in science and technology, including computers and AI, is of a protopian nature. Rarely, if ever, do technologies lead to either Utopian or dystopian societies. Pinker agrees that there is plenty of time to plan for all conceivable contingencies and build safeguards into our AI systems. "They would not need any ponderous 'rules of robotics' or some newfangled moral philosophy to do this, just the same common sense that went into the design of food processors, table saws, space heaters, and automobiles." Sure, an ASI would be many orders of magnitude smarter than these machines, but Pinker reminds us of the AI hyperbole we've been fed for decades: "The worry that an AI system would be so clever at attaining one of the goals programmed into it (like commandeering energy) that it would run roughshod over the others (like human safety) assumes that AI will descend upon us faster than we can design fail-safe precautions. The reality is that progress in AI is hype-defyingly slow, and there will be plenty of time for feedback from incremental implementations, with humans wielding the screwdriver at every stage."[ 22] Former Google CEO Eric Schmidt agrees, responding to the fears expressed by Hawking and Musk this way: "Don't you think the humans would notice this, and start turning off the computers?" He also noted the irony in the fact that Musk has invested $1 billion into a company called OpenAI that is "promoting precisely AI of the kind we are describing."[ 23] Google's own DeepMind has developed the concept of an AI off-switch, playfully described as a "big red button" to be pushed in the event of an attempted AI takeover. "We have proposed a framework to allow a human operator to repeatedly safely interrupt a reinforcement learning agent while making sure the agent will not learn to prevent or induce these interruptions," write the authors Laurent Orseau from DeepMind and Stuart Armstrong from the Future of Humanity Institute, in a paper titled "Safely Interruptible Agents." They even suggest a precautionary scheduled shutdown every night at 2 AM for an hour so that both humans and AI are accustomed to the idea. "Safe interruptibility can be useful to take control of a robot that is misbehaving and may lead to irreversible consequences, or to take it out of a delicate situation, or even to temporarily use it to achieve a task it did not learn to perform or would not normally receive rewards for this."[ 24] As well, it is good to keep in mind that artificial intelligence is not the same as artificial consciousness. Thinking machines may not be sentient machines. Finally, Andrew Ng of Baidu responded to Elon Musk's ASI concerns by noting (in a jab at the entrepreneur's ambitions for colonizing the red planet) it would be "like worrying about overpopulation on Mars when we have not even set foot on the planet yet."[ 25] Both Utopian and dystopian visions of AI are based on a projection of the future quite unlike anything history has given us. Yet, even Ray Kurzweil's "law of accelerating returns," as remarkable as it has been has nevertheless advanced at a pace that has allowed for considerable ethical deliberation with appropriate checks and balances applied to various technologies along the way. With time, even if an unforeseen motive somehow began to emerge in an AI we would have the time to reprogram it before it got out of control. That is also the judgment of Alan Winfield, an engineering professor and co-author of the Principles of Robotics, a list of rules for regulating robots in the real world that goes far beyond Isaac Asimov's famous three laws of robotics (which were, in any case, designed to fail as plot devices for science fictional narratives).26 Winfield points out that all of these doomsday scenarios depend on a long sequence of big ifs to unroll sequentially: "If we succeed in building human equivalent AI and if that AI acquires a full understanding of how it works, and if it then succeeds in improving itself to produce super-intelligent AI, and if that super-AI, accidentally or maliciously, starts to consume resources, and if we fail to pull the plug, then, yes, we may well have a problem. The risk, while not impossible, is improbable."[ 27]

### 2AC --- Aid CP --- F/L

#### 3. Aid does nothing

Acemoğlu 14, \*Kamer Daron Acemoğlu is a Turkish-born American economist who has taught at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology since 1993. He is currently the Elizabeth and James Killian Professor of Economics at MIT. He was named Institute Professor in 2019; (January 25th, 2014, “Why foreign aid fails - and how to really help Africa”, https://www.spectator.co.uk/article/why-foreign-aid-fails---and-how-to-really-help-africa)

David Cameron speaks compellingly about international aid. Eradicating poverty, he says, means certain institutional changes: rights for women and minorities, a free media and integrity in government. It means the freedom to participate in society and have a say over how your country is run. We wholeheartedly agree and were flattered to see the Prime Minister tell this magazine that he is ‘obsessed’ by our book on the subject, Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity, and Poverty. But diagnosing a problem is one thing; fixing it another. And we don’t yet see the political will — in Britain or elsewhere — that could turn this analysis into a practical agenda.

The British government is strikingly generous in foreign aid donations. It spent £8.7 billion on foreign aid in 2012 — which is 0.56 per cent of national income. This is to rise to £11.7 billion, or 0.7 per cent of national income, next year. But if money alone were the solution we would be along the road not just to ameliorating the lives of poor people today but ending poverty for ever.

The idea that large donations can remedy poverty has dominated the theory of economic development — and the thinking in many international aid agencies and governments — since the 1950s. And how have the results been? Not so good, actually. Millions have moved out of abject poverty around the world over the past six decades, but that has had little to do with foreign aid. Rather, it is due to economic growth in countries in Asia which received little aid. The World Bank has calculated that between 1981 and 2010, the number of poor people in the world fell by about 700 million — and that in China over the same period, the number of poor people fell by 627 million.

In the meantime, more than a quarter of the countries in sub-Saharan Africa are poorer now than in 1960 — with no sign that foreign aid, however substantive, will end poverty there. Last year, perhaps the most striking illustration came from Liberia, which has received massive amounts of aid for a decade. In 2011, according to the OECD, official development aid to Liberia totalled $765 million, and made up 73 per cent of its gross national income. The sum was even larger in 2010. But last year every one of the 25,000 students who took the exam to enter the University of Liberia failed. All of the aid is still failing to provide a decent education to Liberians.

One could imagine that many factors have kept sub-Saharan Africa poor — famines, civil wars. But huge aid flows appear to have done little to change the development trajectories of poor countries, particularly in Africa. Why? As we spell out in our book, this is not to do with a vicious circle of poverty, waiting to be broken by foreign money. Poverty is instead created by economic institutions that systematically block the incentives and opportunities of poor people to make things better for themselves, their neighbours and their country.

### 2AC --- DOJ DA --- F/L

#### 1. They don’t have the money for antitrust priorities

Leah Nylen 12/23/21, covers antitrust and investigations for POLITICO, 12/23/21, Potential DOJ suits against Apple and Google delayed amid budget woes, https://www.politico.com/news/2021/12/23/apple-google-doj-delay-526072

The Justice Department is still months away from deciding whether to sue Apple or file a new suit against Google over antitrust concerns, two people familiar with the discussions said — a question facing new financial complications after the collapse of President Joe Biden's social spending bill. DOJ antitrust prosecutors had earlier aimed to wrap up their probes of the two tech giants by Dec. 31, culminating years of scrutiny by the department into Apple's App Store and Google's command of the online ad market. But now the decision on going to court is likely to come in March or later because of continued discussions about where to file and who will make the call, the two people told POLITICO. They spoke anonymously to discuss internal DOJ deliberations. Another major concern for the department is the likely expense of a court battle with the two companies, each of which has a market value exceeding $1 trillion. That issue became more fraught this week when Sen. Joe Manchin (D-W.Va.) torpedoed Democrats' Build Back Better package, which would have given DOJ a $500 million boost for antitrust enforcement. Senate Democrats vow to hold a vote on the $1.7 trillion bill anyway in January. The department could also get extra cash in other upcoming legislative packages, such as a Senate-passed bill to aid U.S. competition with China. For now, however, DOJ is weighing what antitrust cases can move forward with its current funding, though the people emphasized that decisions will be based on the legal merits. Arlen Morales, a Justice Department spokesperson, declined to comment. Google and Apple didn't immediately respond to a request for comment. Google and Apple probes: The department has been investigating Google’s advertising technology business and Apple’s lucrative App Store since 2019, probes that continued even after DOJ sued Google in October 2020 over its online search business. During the past year, the department's team has drafted an antitrust complaint focused on Google’s dominance of the technology used to buy and sell the online display ads that fund many websites. The complaint is similar to one that attorneys general in Texas and other states filed last year, though the Justice Department’s version has some differences. Separately, antitrust prosecutors have been examining Apple and its tight control over the ecosystem for iPhone and iPad apps. DOJ attorneys virtually attended the May trial between Apple and Fortnite-maker Epic Games to glean any additional witnesses or evidence they might want for their probe. They also have scrutinized a September ruling from U.S. District Judge Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers, who found that Apple wasn't violating federal antitrust law but declared its limits on developers' communications with customers a violation of California state law. Who will decide, and when: Top DOJ decisions could make their final decisions on suing Google or Apple in the spring of 2022, the two people told POLITICO. Who will make that call also remains up in the air. DOJ ethics officials haven’t yet determined whether Assistant Attorney General for Antitrust Jonathan Kanter must recuse himself from those cases because of his previous work for critics of the two companies, they said. Either case would be expensive. Texas alone will require $43 million to pursue its piece of the multistate antitrust suit against Google, state Attorney General Ken Paxton has told legislators. Speaking of money: Congress’ fiscal 2022 funding bill for the Justice Department proposed giving antitrust prosecutors an extra $16 million. That money would help ease some of the DOJ’s budget crunch. But it could also get swallowed up by cases already in litigation, including the Google search suit and lawsuits aiming to block a major sugar merger and a proposed union between Penguin Random House and Simon & Schuster.

#### 2. Morale’s at an all-time low---the AFF saves it---that’s key to effective enforcement.

John Newman 21, associate professor with the University of Miami School of Law, “Morale At the DOJ’s Antitrust Division Has Plummeted. Here’s How to Fix It,” ProMarket, 3/17/21, https://promarket.org/2021/03/17/doj-antitrust-division-morale-biden-pay-funding/

The US Department of Justice Antitrust Division faces one of the most critical junctures in its long and storied history. A landmark case against Google, high concentration levels across a variety of industries, a projected wave of merger-driven consolidation, and an increasing likelihood of legislative reforms—amidst all of these, a healthy and robust Antitrust Division has never been more necessary. So it’s been especially troubling to see the drastic decline in Division morale over the past four years. In 2010, when I was a summer intern there, the Antitrust Division prided itself on being one of the best places to work in the entire federal government. That year, the Division ranked 22nd out of over 400 federal agency components included in the Office of Personal Management’s (OPM) annual Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey. But per the OPM’s latest results, morale at the Antitrust Division has plummeted, dragging the Division all the way down to 404th place out of the 420 agency components surveyed. Let that sink in: morale at the Antitrust Division dropped from a consistent top 10 percent ranking to a bottom 10 percent ranking in less than a decade. This can’t be explained away by an overall drop in morale at the Justice Department. It is specific to the Antitrust Division. The blue line below represents the Division; the gray line DOJ more broadly. After a temporary drop during 2011–12 (likely due to an internal restructuring effort), a marked divergence began in 2017. Over that time period, as highlighted by the New York Times, the Division was among the ten agencies experiencing the worst declines in employee morale. At the same time, antitrust law itself has skyrocketed in visibility. A well-functioning Antitrust Division is always important—these days, it’s crucial. What’s to Be Done? The Biden administration faces both challenges and opportunity. Citing interagency dysfunction between the Division and the FTC over the past four years, a number of observers have proposed stripping antitrust jurisdiction from one of the agencies. But why not fix existing structures instead of simply tossing them aside? Practicing with the Antitrust Division should be a positive, fulfilling experience. And, just as importantly, a re-energized Division will translate into more effective, innovative enforcement efforts.

#### 3. Winners win—the plan saves the FTC by making them appear successful.

Lopez-Galdos 21. Marianela 7-28-21. Global Competition Counsel at the Computer& Communications Industry Association, previously served as Director of Competition & Regulatory Policy, and is a professor at George Washington University Competition Law Center and at the University of Melbourne Law School. “Policy Decisions of Antitrust Institutions Series: The Future of the FTC and Its Perils”. Disruptive Competition Project. <https://www.project-disco.org/competition/072821-policy-decisions-of-antitrust-institutions-series-the-future-of-the-ftc-and-its-perils/>

One of the most challenging matters to tackle when it comes to leadership of antitrust authorities, or administrative agency for that matter, is legacy and the impact for the future of the agency. To put it simply, while antitrust leaders leave agencies, the side effects of leadership’s successes and failures condition the future of the agencies. Their leadership has consequences and sets precedent which will bind the agency well into the future. Under the current political context, it would not be surprising if the current Neo-Brandeisian FTC enjoyed political support and success with its decision to bring big cases, especially against leading tech companies. In the short term, if the FTC makes headlines for opening cases against “Big Tech”, policymakers pushing for antitrust reforms will surely applaud the new changes as they would reflect a commitment to enhanced enforcement outcomes notwithstanding the strength of the cases. However, in the mid-and long-term, if the FTC loses the big cases, the commitment to policy outcomes won’t be met. And then, it is unlikely that the question would be whether the antitrust norms are fit for today’s economy, but rather if the agency is capable of executing its mandate effectively. The recent decision in the FTC v. Facebook case is a good example of this paradigm, where the Judge expressed that the FTC had not carried out a sufficiently robust analysis supported by evidence, and therefore dismissed the case.

### 2AC --- !/D --- Cyber

#### Zero impact to cyber-attacks --- overwhelming consensus of qualified authors goes neg

- No motivation---can’t be used for coercive leverage

- Defenses solve---benefits of offense are overstated

- Too difficult to execute/mistakes in code are inevitable

- AT: Infrastructure attacks

- Military networks are air-gapped/difficult to access

- Overwhelming consensus goes neg

Colin S. Gray 13, Prof. of International Politics and Strategic Studies @ the University of Reading and External Researcher @ the Strategic Studies Institute @ the U.S. Army War College, April, “Making Strategic Sense of Cyber Power: Why the Sky Is Not Falling,” U.S. Army War College Press, http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/PUB1147.pdf

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS: THE SKY IS NOT FALLING¶ This analysis has sought to explore, identify, and explain the strategic meaning of cyber power. The organizing and thematic question that has shaped and driven the inquiry has been “So what?” Today we all do cyber, but this behavior usually has not been much informed by an understanding that reaches beyond the tactical and technical. I have endeavored to analyze in strategic terms what is on offer from the largely technical and tactical literature on cyber. What can or might be done and how to go about doing it are vitally important bodies of knowledge. But at least as important is understanding what cyber, as a fifth domain of warfare, brings to national security when it is considered strategically. Military history is stocked abundantly with examples of tactical behavior un - guided by any credible semblance of strategy. This inquiry has not been a campaign to reveal what cy ber can and might do; a large literature already exists that claims fairly convincingly to explain “how to . . .” But what does cyber power mean, and how does it fit strategically, if it does? These Conclusions and Rec ommendations offer some understanding of this fifth geography of war in terms that make sense to this strategist, at least. ¶ 1. Cyber can only be an enabler of physical effort. Stand-alone (popularly misnamed as “strategic”) cyber action is inherently grossly limited by its immateriality. The physicality of conflict with cyber’s human participants and mechanical artifacts has not been a passing phase in our species’ strategic history. Cyber action, quite independent of action on land, at sea, in the air, and in orbital space, certainly is possible. But the strategic logic of such behavior, keyed to anticipated success in tactical achievement, is not promising. To date, “What if . . .” speculation about strategic cyber attack usually is either contextually too light, or, more often, contextually unpersuasive. 49 However, this is not a great strategic truth, though it is a judgment advanced with considerable confidence. Although societies could, of course, be hurt by cyber action, it is important not to lose touch with the fact, in Libicki’s apposite words, that “[i]n the absence of physical combat, cyber war cannot lead to the occupation of territory. It is almost inconceivable that a sufficiently vigorous cyber war can overthrow the adversary’s government and replace it with a more pliable one.” 50 In the same way that the concepts of sea war, air war, and space war are fundamentally unsound, so also the idea of cyber war is unpersuasive. ¶ It is not impossible, but then, neither is war conducted only at sea, or in the air, or in space. On the one hand, cyber war may seem more probable than like environmentally independent action at sea or in the air. After all, cyber warfare would be very unlikely to harm human beings directly, let alone damage physically the machines on which they depend. The se near-facts (cyber attack might cause socially critical machines to behave in a rogue manner with damaging physical consequences) might seem to ren - der cyber a safer zone of belligerent engagement than would physically violent action in other domains. But most likely there would be serious uncertainties pertaining to the consequences of cyber action, which must include the possibility of escalation into other domains of conflict. Despite popular assertions to the contrary, cyber is not likely to prove a precision weapon anytime soon. 51 In addition, assuming that the political and strategic contexts for cyber war were as serious as surely they would need to be to trigger events warranting plausible labeling as cyber war, the distinctly limited harm likely to follow from cyber assault would hardly appeal as prospectively effective coercive moves. On balance, it is most probable that cyber’s strategic future in war will be as a contribut - ing enabler of effectiveness of physical efforts in the other four geographies of conflict. Speculation about cyber war, defined strictly as hostile action by net - worked computers against networked computers, is hugely unconvincing.¶ 2. Cyber defense is difficult, but should be sufficiently effective. The structural advantages of the offense in cyber conflict are as obvious as they are easy to overstate. Penetration and exploitation, or even attack, would need to be by surprise. It can be swift almost beyond the imagination of those encultured by the traditional demands of physical combat. Cyber attack may be so stealthy that it escapes notice for a long while, or it might wreak digital havoc by com - plete surprise. And need one emphasize, that at least for a while, hostile cyber action is likely to be hard (though not quite impossible) to attribute with a cy - berized equivalent to a “smoking gun.” Once one is in the realm of the catastrophic “What if . . . ,” the world is indeed a frightening place. On a personal note, this defense analyst was for some years exposed to highly speculative briefings that hypothesized how unques - tionably cunning plans for nuclear attack could so promptly disable the United States as a functioning state that our nuclear retaliation would likely be still - born. I should hardly need to add that the briefers of these Scary Scenarios were obliged to make a series of Heroic Assumptions. ¶ The literature of cyber scare is more than mildly reminiscent of the nuclear attack stories with which I was assailed in the 1970s and 1980s. As one may observe regarding what Winston Churchill wrote of the disaster that was the Gallipoli campaign of 1915, “[t]he terrible ‘Ifs’ accumulate.” 52 Of course, there are dangers in the cyber domain. Not only are there cyber-competent competitors and enemies abroad; there are also Americans who make mistakes in cyber operation. Furthermore, there are the manufacturers and constructors of the physical artifacts behind (or in, depending upon the preferred definition) cyber - space who assuredly err in this and that detail. The more sophisticated—usually meaning complex—the code for cyber, the more certain must it be that mistakes both lurk in the program and will be made in digital communication.¶ What I have just outlined minimally is not a reluc - tant admission of the fallibility of cyber, but rather a statement of what is obvious and should be anticipat - ed about people and material in a domain of war. All human activities are more or less harassed by friction and carry with them some risk of failure, great or small. A strategist who has read Clausewitz, especially Book One of On War , 53 will know this. Alternatively, anyone who skims my summary version of the general theory of strategy will note that Dictum 14 states explicitly that “Strategy is more difficult to devise and execute than are policy, operations, and tactics: friction of all kinds comprise phenomena inseparable from the mak - ing and execution of strategies.” 54 Because of its often widely distributed character, the physical infrastruc - ture of an enemy’s cyber power is typically, though not invariably, an impracticable target set for physical assault. Happily, this probable fact should have only annoying consequences. The discretionary nature and therefore the variable possible characters feasible for friendly cyberspace(s), mean that the more danger - ous potential vulnerabilities that in theory could be the condition of our cyber-dependency ought to be avoidable at best, or bearable and survivable at worst. Libicki offers forthright advice on this aspect of the subject that deserves to be taken at face value: ¶ [T]here is no inherent reason that improving informa - tion technologies should lead to a rise in the amount of critical information in existence (for example, the names of every secret agent). Really critical information should never see a computer; if it sees a computer, it should not be one that is networked; and if the computer is networked, it should be air-gapped.¶ Cyber defense admittedly is difficult to do, but so is cyber offense. To quote Libicki yet again, “[i]n this medium [cyberspace] the best defense is not necessarily a good offense; it is usually a good defense.” 56 Unlike the geostrategic context for nuclear-framed competition in U.S.–Soviet/Russian rivalry, the geographical domain of cyberspace definitely is defensible. Even when the enemy is both clever and lucky, it will be our own design and operating fault if he is able to do more than disrupt and irritate us temporarily.¶ When cyber is contextually regarded properly— which means first, in particular, when it is viewed as but the latest military domain for defense planning—it should be plain to see that cyber performance needs to be good enough rather than perfect. 57 Our Landpower, sea power, air power, and prospectively our space systems also will have to be capable of accepting combat damage and loss, then recovering and carrying on. There is no fundamental reason that less should be demanded of our cyber power. Second, given that cyber is not of a nature or potential character at all likely to parallel nuclear dangers in the menace it could con - tain, we should anticipate international cyber rivalry to follow the competitive dynamic path already fol - lowed in the other domains in the past. Because the digital age is so young, the pace of technical change and tactical invention can be startling. However, the mechanization RMA of the 1920s and 1930s recorded reaction to the new science and technology of the time that is reminiscent of the cyber alarmism that has flour - ished of recent years. 58 We can be confident that cyber defense should be able to function well enough, given the strength of political, military, and commercial motivation for it to do so. The technical context here is a medium that is a constructed one, which provides air-gapping options for choice regarding the extent of networking. Naturally, a price is paid in convenience for some closing off of possible cyberspace(s), but all important defense decisions involve choice, so what is novel about that? There is nothing new about accepting some limitations on utility as a price worth paying for security.¶ 3. Intelligence is critically important, but informa - tion should not be overvalued. The strategic history of cyber over the past decade confirms what we could know already from the science and technology of this new domain for conflict. Specifically, cyber power is not technically forgiving of user error. Cyber warriors seeking criminal or military benefit require precise information if their intended exploits are to succeed. Lucky guesses should not stumble upon passwords, while efforts to disrupt electronic Supervisory Con - trol and Data Acquisition (SCADA) systems ought to be unable to achieve widespread harmful effects. But obviously there are practical limits to the air-gap op - tion, given that control (and command) systems need to be networks for communication. However, Internet connection needs to be treated as a potential source of serious danger.¶ It is one thing to be able to be an electronic nuisance, to annoy, disrupt, and perhaps delay. But it is quite another to be capable of inflicting real persisting harm on the fighting power of an enemy. Critically important military computer networks are, of course, accessible neither to the inspired amateur outsider, nor to the malignant political enemy. Easy passing reference to a hypothetical “cyber Pearl Harbor” reflects both poor history and ignorance of contemporary military common sense. Critical potential military (and other) targets for cyber attack are extremely hard to access and influence (I believe and certainly hope), and the technical knowledge, skills, and effort required to do serious harm to national security is forbiddingly high. This is not to claim, foolishly, that cyber means absolutely could not secure near-catastrophic results. However, it is to say that such a scenario is extremely improbable. Cyber defense is advancing all the time, as is cyber offense, of course. But so discretionary in vital detail can one be in the making of cyberspace, that confidence—real confidence—in cyber attack could not plausibly be high. It should be noted that I am confining this particular discussion to what rather idly tends to be called cyber war. In political and strategic practice, it is unlikely that war would or, more importantly, ever could be restricted to the EMS. Somewhat rhetorically, one should pose the question: Is it likely (almost anything, strictly, is possible) that cyber war with the potential to inflict catastrophic damage would be allowed to stand unsupported in and by action in the other four geographical domains of war? I believe not.¶ Because we have told ourselves that ours uniquely is the Information Age, we have become unduly respectful of the potency of this rather slippery catch-all term. As usual, it is helpful to contextualize the al - legedly magical ingredient, information, by locating it properly in strategic history as just one important element contributing to net strategic effectiveness. This mild caveat is supported usefully by recognizing the general contemporary rule that information per se harms nothing and nobody. The electrons in cyber - ized conflict have to be interpreted and acted upon by physical forces (including agency by physical human beings). As one might say, intelligence (alone) sinks no ship; only men and machines can sink ships! That said, there is no doubt that if friendly cyber action can infiltrate and misinform the electronic informa - tion on which advisory weaponry and other machines depend, considerable warfighting advantage could be gained. I do not intend to join Clausewitz in his dis - dain for intelligence, but I will argue that in strategic affairs, intelligence usually is somewhat uncertain. 59 Detailed up-to-date intelligence literally is essential for successful cyber offense, but it can be healthily sobering to appreciate that the strategic rewards of intelligence often are considerably exaggerated. The basic reason is not hard to recognize. Strategic success is a complex endeavor that requires adequate perfor - mances by many necessary contributors at every level of conflict (from the political to the tactical). ¶ When thoroughly reliable intelligence on the en - emy is in short supply, which usually is the case, the strategist finds ways to compensate as best he or she can. The IT-led RMA of the past 2 decades was fueled in part by the prospect of a quality of military effec - tiveness that was believed to flow from “dominant battle space knowledge,” to deploy a familiar con - cept. 60 While there is much to be said in praise of this idea, it is not unreasonable to ask why it has been that our ever-improving battle space knowledge has been compatible with so troubled a course of events in the 2000s in Iraq and Afghanistan. What we might have misunderstood is not the value of knowledge, or of the information from which knowledge is quarried, or even the merit in the IT that passed information and knowledge around. Instead, we may well have failed to grasp and grip understanding of the whole context of war and strategy for which battle space knowledge unquestionably is vital. One must say “vital” rather than strictly essential, because relatively ignorant armies can and have fought and won despite their ig - norance. History requires only that one’s net strategic performance is superior to that of the enemy. One is not required to be deeply well informed about the en - emy. It is historically quite commonplace for armies to fight in a condition of more-than-marginal reciprocal and strategic cultural ignorance. Intelligence is king in electronic warfare, but such warfare is unlikely to be solely, or even close to solely, sovereign in war and its warfare, considered overall as they should be.¶ 4. Why the sky will not fall. More accurately, one should say that the sky will not fall because of hostile action against us in cyberspace unless we are improb - ably careless and foolish. David J. Betz and Tim Ste vens strike the right note when they conclude that “[i]f cyberspace is not quite the hoped-for Garden of Eden, it is also not quite the pestilential swamp of the imagination of the cyber-alarmists.” 61 Our understanding of cyber is high at the technical and tactical level, but re - mains distinctly rudimentary as one ascends through operations to the more rarified altitudes of strategy and policy. Nonetheless, our scientific, technological, and tactical knowledge and understanding clearly indicates that the sky is not falling and is unlikely to fall in the future as a result of hostile cyber action. This analysis has weighed the more technical and tactical literature on cyber and concludes, not simply on balance, that cyber alarmism has little basis save in the imagination of the alarmists. There is military and civil peril in the hostile use of cyber, which is why we must take cyber security seriously, even to the point of buying redundant capabilities for a range of command and control systems. 62 So seriously should we regard cyber danger that it is only prudent to as - sume that we will be the target for hostile cyber action in future conflicts, and that some of that action will promote disruption and uncertainty in the damage it will cause.¶ That granted, this analysis recommends strongly that the U.S. Army, and indeed the whole of the U.S. Government, should strive to comprehend cyber in context. Approached in isolation as a new technol - ogy, it is not unduly hard to be over impressed with its potential both for good and harm. But if we see networked computing as just the latest RMA in an episodic succession of revolutionary changes in the way information is packaged and communicated, the computer-led IT revolution is set where it belongs, in historical context. In modern strategic history, there has been only one truly game-changing basket of tech - nologies, those pertaining to the creation and deliv - ery of nuclear weapons. Everything else has altered the tools with which conflict has been supported and waged, but has not changed the game. The nuclear revolution alone raised still-unanswered questions about the viability of interstate armed conflict. How - ever, it would be accurate to claim that since 1945, methods have been found to pursue fairly traditional political ends in ways that accommodate nonuse of nuclear means, notwithstanding the permanent pres - ence of those means.¶ The light cast by general strategic theory reveals what requires revealing strategically about networked computers. Once one sheds some of the sheer wonder at the seeming miracle of cyber’s ubiquity, instanta - neity, and (near) anonymity, one realizes that cyber is just another operational domain, though certainly one very different from the others in its nonphysi - cality in direct agency. Having placed cyber where it belongs, as a domain of war, next it is essential to recognize that its nonphysicality compels that cyber should be treated as an enabler of joint action, rather than as an agent of military action capable of behav - ing independently for useful coercive strategic effect. There are stand-alone possibilities for cyber action, but they are not convincing as attractive options either for or in opposition to a great power, let alone a superpower. No matter how intriguing the scenario design for cyber war strictly or for cyber warfare, the logic of grand and military strategy and a common sense fueled by understanding of the course of strategic history, require one so to contextualize cyber war that its independence is seen as too close to absurd to merit much concern.

### 2AC --- Clog DA --- F/L

#### 1. Courts clogged now

**Witte, 12/18** (Griff Witte, Griff Witte is a national correspondent for The Washington Post. He has previously served as the paper’s deputy foreign editor and as bureau chief in Berlin, London, Jerusalem, Islamabad and Kabul., 12-18-2021, accessed on 1-3-2022, The Washington Post, "Long after the courts shut down for covid, the pain of delayed justice lingers", https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/covid-court-backlog-justice-delayed/2021/12/18/212c16bc-5948-11ec-a219-9b4ae96da3b7\_story.html)//Babcii

When the coronavirus struck American shores in early 2020, the red-brick courthouse that has stood sentry on Main Street in Newport, Vt., since the late 19th century abruptly shut down. So did courthouses nationwide. But unlike most, the one in Newport — a small, lakeside community nestled a short drive from the Canadian border — has never fully reopened. With jury trials still suspended, **cases are being dismissed by the dozen**. Defendants live with charges they can’t shake. And Dick Collier lies awake at night, wondering if he will die before the man accused of killing his daughter faces justice. “That’s my fear,” said Collier, 81, and in precarious health. “That I might not live long enough to see him go to trial.” Nearly two years after the American justice system was ~~paralyzed~~ (harmed) by a pandemic, the **repercussions continue to radiate** through communities nationwide, from tiny towns to the largest cities. District attorneys face some of **the longest case backlogs in living memory**. Defendants languish in jails that have become breeding grounds for the coronavirus. Others are set free — and, some prosecutors say, may be contributing to a spike in violent crime that is only compounding the pileup. Although the shutdown in Newport is extreme — most courthouses are back in action, even if **they are not yet at their pre-pandemic capacity** — legal officials from coast to coast say justice **delay**ed by covid-19 will continue to be a feature of the American landscape for several years to **come. And that’s assuming the courts don’t have to shut down again** for omicron or another new variant. “This is a three-year project to get the number of pending cases back to what it was. And I’m an optimist,” said Dan Satterberg, prosecuting attorney in King County, Wash., which includes Seattle. “It’s a historic challenge that we’re facing right now.” The backlogged system has had deadly consequences, officials say. In Wisconsin, Darrell Brooks was set to stand trial this year for allegedly firing a gun at his nephew. Prosecutors were ready, as was the defense. But there was no courtroom available. With the system unable to deliver the speedy trial that Brooks had requested — and that the state was required to deliver — he was released on $500 bail. While out, court records show, the 39-year-old allegedly tried to use his car to run over the mother of his child and was arrested once more. But an overburdened junior prosecutor juggling a jury trial and two dozen other felony cases set his new bail at $1,000 — an amount the district attorney would later call “a mistake” — and Brooks was released again. Just days later, on Nov. 21, prosecutors say Brooks plowed his car into the Christmas parade in the Milwaukee suburb of Waukesha, hitting 60 people — and killing six. This time, his bail was set at $5 million. While critics have focused on the low bail amounts, Milwaukee District Attorney John Chisolm said the case was better understood as the tragic consequence of when courts can’t keep up. “This is a system issue right now, and it’s only going to get worse,” Chisholm told reporters this month. “These **backlogs aren’t going to magically disappear.”** Delays in the U.S. court system are nothing new, of course. Long before the coronavirus, America stood out among its industrialized peers for the extensive wait times from charges filed to verdict delivered.

#### 4. There’s zero empirical support for the link.

Levy 13 [Marin, Assoc Prof of Law @ Duke, "Judging the Flood of Litigation," https://uchicagolawjournalsmshaytiubv.devcloud.acquia-sites.com/sites/lawreview.uchicago.edu/files/02\_Levy\_0.pdf]

Beginning with the purely empirical component, the preceding discussion reveals that the justices often invoke floodgates arguments without much support for why they believe a large number of cases will come. In Bivens, Justice Blackmun suggested that the Court’s decision would “open[ ] the door for another avalanche of new federal cases” on the theory that “[w]henever a suspect imagines, or chooses to assert, that a Fourth Amendment right has been violated, he will now immediately sue the federal officer in federal court”331 and nothing more. In Solem, Chief Justice Burger claimed that the Court’s decision to hold the petitioner’s sentence unconstitutional would lead to a “flood” of new cases with no additional support.332 Of course, it can be easy to hide one’s claims behind this kind of hyperbole—and there is reason to suspect that parties and justices have invoked this language at times precisely because, in the words of Justice Powell, a “‘floodgates’ argument can be easy to make and difficult to rebut.”333 But if a particular decision is made to avoid an influx of cases that could harm a coordinate branch of government or state court, then it should be based on something more than the suggestion that an “avalanche” or “flood” is imminent. Forecasting the number of cases that will follow a decision is no easy task and may be near impossible in some cases. For example, if one of the justices had been willing to accept the basic principle of President Clinton’s argument in Jones, that justice then would have needed to show why a decision by the Court not to stay civil litigation against the President would “spawn” a host of new litigation334—a particularly difficult undertaking given the sui generis nature of the case. But outside of a unique case such as Jones, we should expect the justices to have some extended discussion about why they think a flood is likely to come. This reasoning could be based on past experience with the same kind of claims, as in Michigan Academy of Family Physicians335 and Skinner,336 or experience with comparable claims, as in Bivens.337 Now to be clear, the point of this prescription is not to encourage the justices to become empiricists (an important caveat given that there will certainly be skepticism about the ability of the Court to make these kinds of forecasts even outside the most challenging cases 338). Rather, the point is that if claims about increases in litigation are to influence at least some decisions, the justices need to provide support for those claims—both for each other and for the public.

### 2AC --- Sua Sponte DA --- F/L

#### 1. Legitimacy is tubed --- Shadow docket

Vladeck 21 [Stephen I. Vladeck Charles Alan Wright Chair in Federal Courts University of Texas School of Law, 2-18-2021 https://www.justsecurity.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/Vladeck-Shadow-Docket-Testimony-02-18-2021.pdf]

8. Undermining the Court’s legitimacy. All of the above concerns tie together in respect to the final, and most significant objection: That the rise of the shadow docket, especially at the expense of the merits docket, has negative effects on public perception of the Court — and of the perceived legitimacy of the Justices’ work. If the Court is handing down a higher number of decisions affecting Americans in unsigned, unreasoned orders, both in absolute terms and relative to merits rulings, that necessarily exacerbates charges — fair or not — that the Justices are increasingly beholden to the politics of the moment rather than broader jurisprudential principles. As Justice Sotomayor has warned, all of these developments in the aggregate “erode the fair and balanced decisionmaking process that this Court must strive to protect.”43

#### 2. Sua sponte is the squo

Shannon 12 (Bradley Scott, Professor of Law, Florida Coastal School of Law, “Some Concerns About Sua Sponte,” 2012, <https://kb.osu.edu/bitstream/handle/1811/75482/OSLJ_Furthermore_V73_027.pdf>, DOA: 11-13-2021) //Snowball //footnote included, denoted by brackets

Quietly, and without much fanfare, sua sponte2 decisionmaking has become de rigueur. The Supreme Court of the United States has shown a particular interest in sua sponte decisionmaking, having confronted this issue in a number of recent cases.3 [BEGIN FOOTNOTE 3] 3 See, e.g., Wood v. Milyard, 132 S. Ct. 1826, 1835 (2012) (reversing a court of appeals’ sua sponte dismissal of a habeas corpus proceeding for expiration of the applicable statute of limitations); Greenlaw v. United States, 128 S. Ct. 2559, 2562 (2008) (vacating a court of appeals’ sua sponte increase in a criminal defendant’s sentence); Day v. McDonough, 547 U.S. 198, 202 (2006) (affirming a district court’s sua sponte dismissal of a habeas corpus proceeding for expiration of the applicable statute of limitations). [END FOOTNOTE 3] Further evidence of its growing popularity can be found in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56, which was recently amended to expressly approve of sua sponte consideration of summary judgment.4 For the most part, this movement toward a greater use of sua sponte decisionmaking has generated little opposition or scholarly criticism.5

# 1AR

### 1AR --- Trade O/V

#### Globalization prevents World War III, environmental destruction, runaway prolif threats that cause extinction

Michael F. Oppenheimer 21, Clinical Professor at the Center for Global Affairs at New York University, Senior Consulting Fellow for Scenario Planning at the International Institute for Strategic Studies, Former Executive Vice President at The Futures Group, Member of the Council on Foreign Relations, The Foreign Policy Roundtable at the Carnegie Council on Ethics and International Affairs, and the American Council on Germany, “The Turbulent Future of International Relations”, in The Future of Global Affairs: Managing Discontinuity, Disruption and Destruction, Ed. Ankersen and Sidhu, p. 23-30

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

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

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

Secular Stagnation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Illiberal Globalization

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

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

As such measures gain traction, it will become clear to states—and to companies—that a global trading system more responsive to raw power than to law entails escalating risk and diminishing benefits. This will be the end of economic globalization, and its many benefits, as we know it. It represents nothing less than the subordination of economic globalization, a system which many thought obeyed its own logic, to an international politics of zero-sum power competition among multiple actors with divergent interests and values. The costs will be significant: Bloomberg Economics estimates that the cost in lost US GDP in 2019- dollar terms from the trade war with China has reached $134 billion to date and will rise to a total of $316 billion by the end of 2020.19 Economically, the just-in-time, maximally efficient world of global supply chains, driving down costs, incentivizing innovation, spreading investment, integrating new countries and populations into the global system, is being Balkanized. Bilateral and regional deals are proliferating, while global, nondiscriminatory trade agreements are at an end.

Economies of scale will shrink, incentivizing less investment, increasing costs and prices, compromising growth, marginalizing countries whose growth and poverty reduction depended on participation in global supply chains. A world already suffering from excess savings (in the corporate sector, among mostly Asian countries) will respond to heightened risk and uncertainty with further retrenchment. The problem is perfectly captured by Tim Boyle, CEO of Columbia Sportswear, whose supply chain runs through China, reacting to yet another ratcheting up of US tariffs on Chinese imports, most recently on consumer goods:

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

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

Before the First World War started, powers great and small took a variety of steps to thwart the globalization of the 19th century. Each of these steps made it easier for the key combatants to conceive of a general war. We are beginning to see a similar approach to the globalization of the 21st century. One by one, the economic constraints on military aggression are eroding. And too many have forgotten—or never knew—how this played out a century ago.

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

…The primary lesson to draw from the years before 1914 is not that economic interdependence was a weak constraint on military conflict. It is that, even in a globalized economy, governments can take protectionist actions to reduce their interdependence in anticipation of future wars. In retrospect, the 30 years of tariff hikes, trade wars, and currency conflicts that preceded 1914 were harbingers of the devastation to come. European governments did not necessarily want to ignite a war among the great powers. By reducing their interdependence, however, they made that option conceivable.

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

### 1AR --- Climate

#### Any attempt to solve warming fails without addressing Chinese Cartels

**Barrasso, 21** (John Barrasso, John Anthony Barrasso III is an American physician and politician serving as the senior United States Senator from Wyoming. graduating Phi Beta Kappa in 1974 with a Bachelor of Science degree in biology. He received his M.D. degree from Georgetown University School of Medicine in 1978. He conducted his residency at Yale Medical School in New Haven, Connecticut., 4-30-2021, accessed on 5-24-2021, U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, "Barrasso Op-Ed: China's Goal is Domination, Not Cooperation. It's Playing Biden and America for Fools.", https://www.energy.senate.gov/2021/4/barrasso-op-ed-china-s-goal-is-domination-not-cooperation)//Babcii

Meanwhile, China is perfectly willing to exploit Western climate change concerns for its own ends. Fueled by subsidies, the Chinese solar industry has cornered the global market. They have stifled innovation and caused many cutting-edge companies in America and Europe to call it quits. China now supplies more than two-thirds of all solar modules. Chinese companies also make up seven of the top 10 wind turbine manufacturers. Key parts of Chinese solar panels are manufactured in Xinjiang province, where the Muslim Uyghur minority is used as forced labor. Though the Chinese government denies this, it has not permitted independent inspectors access to the manufacturing facilities. A big red flag for an entire green industry. Where it can’t innovate advanced energy technologies, China isn’t above stealing them. The recent Annual Threat Assessment from the Director of National Intelligence warned that the Chinese are specifically targeting the American defense, energy, and finance sectors. It reports the Chinese have no qualms with using espionage and theft as means to steal American technologies. Don't Surrender US Energy Advantage We’re seeing almost weekly news stories detailing how researchers connected to China’s military and intelligence services have penetrated our universities and research institutions. They are exploiting the free exchange of ideas to pilfer intellectual property. We need to wake up to the threat. China is also making an effort to control the critical materials used in many defense and energy technologies. It’s positioned itself as a critical cog in the mining and processing of copper, lithium, nickel, cobalt, and rare earths. It’s also heavily involved in the sectors that use these materials, like battery, solar panel, and wind turbine production. None of this is an accident. It’s a conscious geopolitical and commercial strategy. After achieving energy self-reliance, it would be a mistake to surrender America’s energy advantage. We should not turn our energy dominance over to the whims of foreign powers like China that are actively seeking America’s decline. Undermining America’s energy security will not solve climate change. Mr. Kerry’s pursuit of international cooperation with China on climate change is sadly predictable, but China is not in the cooperation business. It’s in the global domination business. China pretends it’s a developing country, steals technology, uses forced labor, and manipulates markets to its advantage. During his speech to Congress, President Biden said he wants to make “sure every nation plays by the same rules in the global economy, including China.” Yet his administration seems determined to fall for China’s grand deception. China is playing the United States for the fool.

#### Photovoltaic innovation is key to global decarbonization --- Global plans are already locked into solar
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Solar PV has many qualities that make it one of the most attractive options for low-carbon electricity generation. In addition to its low and falling cost, it is modular, durable, relatively easy to site, and low in lifecycle emissions. IEA’s SDS envisions 5 terawatts (TW) of PV capacity being deployed globally by 2040, ten times the total in 2018. A 2019 review in Science led by researchers from the U.S. National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) offers an even more ambitious scenario, in which 30–70 TW of PV capacity makes this technology “a central contributor to all segments of the global energy system” by 2050.5 Successful deployment on such a scale will require sustained innovation in the coming decades. PV innovation may be assessed with several metrics. Most energy forecasters measure it in terms of cost reduction. Varun Sivaram and Shayle Kann, for instance, have argued that the installed cost of complete PV systems, including modules and balance of system (BOS) components, will need to fall below $0.25 per watt for ambitious global goals to be achieved by 2050.6 Industry experts disagree about how likely this goal is to be achieved with first-generation PV technology made out of crystalline-silicon (c-Si). Advanced c-Si PV cells use more-efficient architectures and require less material than current ones, which in turn reduces the required capital cost of module manufacturing. NREL’s 2019 roadmap for continued innovation anticipates that the cost of c-Si modules will decline to $0.24 per watt between 2030 and 2040. As has typically been the case over the last decade, module prices have dropped much more quickly than expected since that roadmap was prepared, reaching an average of $0.36 per watt. A new roadmap under development may bring Sivaram and Kann’s 2050 target within striking distance.7 In his 2018 book Taming the Sun, Sivaram advances a more holistic vision of PV innovation and its vast potential. Rather than being assembled into rigid c-Si modules, PV cells will be “printed on flexible substrates en masse.” They may be made from advanced semiconductor materials such as quantum dots, organic materials, new materials such as perovskites, or hybrids of two or more of these alternatives. At a cost of just a few pennies per watt, such cells would enable massive reductions in balance of system costs, such as shipping and installation. They would open up new applications in heavy industry, hydrogen production, and direct air capture of carbon dioxide. They would bring solar power directly to cities through building integration (such as roofs and windows that generate electricity), eliminating the need to devote large land areas to solar farms, while drastically downsizing the impact on the power grid. Such innovation would be particularly beneficial for developing countries that will dominate global carbon emissions in the 21st century, which have limited available land and are urbanizing rapidly.8 Sustained PV innovation even promises to address variability, the technology’s Achilles’ heel, to some extent. PV systems generate at maximum power only when the sun is shining brightly; when the weather is cloudy, production declines. These variations create problems for the grid, which needs to balance supply and demand at all times. There are several solutions, including energy storage, larger grids, and demand response. An additional solution, overbuilding solar capacity so this resource can meet demand even during cloudy weather, will become more viable if cells become ultra-cheap along any technological pathway.9 Challenges hindering other low-carbon electricity-generation technologies, which scenarios such as the SDS rely on for deep decarbonization along with PV, may place even more weight on PV innovation moving forward. Nuclear power and fossil-fuel plants with carbon capture, utilization, and storage are costly and face significant public opposition. The growth of wind power may slow as the technology matures and the best sites are developed. Hydropower already faces similar constraints. Other renewables, such as concentrating solar and tidal power, have not yet been proven commercially viable. Investments in research, development, and demonstration (RD&D) that aim to break through barriers across a broad range of technologies should be sustained and expanded, but no prospect currently shines as brightly as solar PV.10