# 1NC

## OFF

### OFF

#### The United States federal government should interpret patent control over seeds is illegal per se including expanding the scope of core antitrust law to eliminate patent-tying arrangements involving seeds

#### The CP is a PIC out of the phrase “all living organisms” --- That destroys the bio-medical industry --- Patents of living organisms like cell lines used to cure cancer would be hammered

**Dabney, 13** (James Dabney, Jan-23-2013, accessed on 10-29-2021, Chamberlitigation, "BRIEF FOR AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES, INC., ILLUMINA, INC., LIFE TECHNOLOGIES CORP., PROMEGA CORP., QIAGEN N.V., AND ROCHE MOLECULAR SYSTEMS, INC. AS. AMICI CURIAE IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENTS,", https://www.chamberlitigation.com/sites/default/files/scotus/files/Agilent%20Technologies%20amicus%20brief%20-%20Bowman%20v.%20Monsanto%20Co.%20%28U.S.%20Supreme%20Court%29.pdf)//Babcii

The biotechnology and research tools industry (the “Industry”) is diverse, embracing public and private, non-profit and for-profit, and academic. and corporate institutions. The Industry **spends billions of dollars each year developing technologies** that support both research and development activities and diverse commercial and industrial activities. Commercial biotechnology products provide new sources of energy, more accurate techniques for identifying criminals or exonerating the innocent, improved food safety testing. and faster and more discriminating **methods for diagnosing, detecting, and treating diseases including cancer and infections**.

Amici rely heavily on 35 U.S.C. § 271(d) and the principles of divisibility and party autonomy that the statute implements. For example, amici frequently sell research tools to persons engaged in university research. Such sales are typically made on “research use only” conditions that exclude industrial or commercial activities. By retaining use and sale rights that university **researchers have no need to buy or pay for, research tool companies** are able to make patented research products available to biomedical re-searchers at prices that are tailored to the needs and economics of the persons engaged in research, and hence are more affordable than would be the case if researchers had to pay for manufacturing, commercial diagnostic, or other non-research use rights.

Divisibility of patent rights and party autonomy in contracting are also important to the federal government’s ability to maximize its **return on investment in biomedical research** and to carry out the purposes of the Bayl-Dole Act, 35 USC. §§ 200-212. By ‘**keeping prices lower for products** sold for re- search use only, conditional sale and license transactions allow more research to occur for every dollar of federal research funds that are granted. And where federal funding results in the United States owning patents, the Patent Act authorizes agencies to grant nonexclusive, exclusive, or partially exclusive lit censes under federally owned inventions, royalty-free or for royalties or other consideration,” and “on such terme and conditions aa the granting agency considers appropriate.” 35 U-S.C. §§ 207(a), 20008).

Divisibility of patent rights and party autonomy in contracting are also critical to the biotechnology technology transfer system that has developed over past decades. This technology transfer system gives members of the Industry, including teaching and research universities, flexibility to work with multiple parties in different fields, or at different levels or places within the same field, to put patented technology to its highest and best use with the best partner. This is particularly relevant where the patented technology has many uses but no single licensee could use, develop, or commercialize a technology for all possible uses and benefits.

Uses of biomedical technologies are often subject to restrictions in patent license agreements that limit licensees to uses in specific fields and allow other licensees the right to use in other fields. Patent right divisibility and party autonomy in contracting **help licensees navigate this often complex field of patent rights use restrictions.** When a licensee develops and sells a new product that comprises amici’s patented technology, conditional sale and license terms provide a mechanism that enables the licensee to comply with field of use and other restrictions in its contracts for the sale of products embodying amicis patented inventions. Without the ability to make selective waivers of **patent rights**, **the biomedical technology transfer system would be severely disrupted and thousands upon thousands of existing licenses would be undermined**. Divisibility of patent rights and party autonomy in contracting **are also critical to the commercialization of patents** disclosing readily replicable technologies. Many research tools are replicable, such as **cell lines and DNA vectors**. If a patentee could not retain certain **use and resale rights** when selling products embodying novel replicable technologies, a customer could buy a product once and **then easily replicate and resell** it an indefinite number of times, in either identical or modified form. **This would severely disrupt the network of limited use patent licenses for the technology, force higher prices, and deprive the Industry of incentives for developing and selling replicable research tools.**

#### Bio-med Innovation solves disease and ABR

Sonja Marjanovic and Carolina Feijao 20. \*Sonja Marjanovic; Director, Healthcare Innovation, Industry and Policy, RAND Europe. \*Carolina Feijao; Ph.D. in biochemistry, University of Cambridge; M.Sc. in quantitive biology, Imperial College London; B.Sc. in biology, University of Lisbon. “Pharmaceutical Innovation for Infectious Disease Management” RAND Corporation. 2020. https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/perspectives/PEA400/PEA407-1/RAND\_PEA407-1.pdf

As key actors in the healthcare innovation landscape, pharmaceutical and life sciences companies have been called on to develop medicines, vaccines and diagnostics for pressing public health challenges. The COVID-19 crisis is one such challenge, but there are many others. For example, MERS, SARS, Ebola, Zika and avian and swine flu are also infectious diseases that represent public health threats. Infectious agents such as anthrax, smallpox and tularemia could present threats in a bioterrorism context. The general threat to public health that is posed by antimicrobial resistance is also well-recognised as an area in need of pharmaceutical innovation. Innovating in response to these challenges does not always align well with pharmaceutical industry commercial models, shareholder expectations and competition within the industry. However, the expertise, networks and infrastructure that industry has within its reach, as well as public expectations and the moral imperative, make pharmaceutical companies and the wider life sciences sector an indispensable partner in the search for solutions that save lives. This perspective argues for the need to establish more sustainable and scalable ways of incentivising pharmaceutical innovation in response to infectious disease threats to public health. It considers both past and current examples of efforts to mobilise pharmaceutical innovation in high commercial risk areas, including in the context of current efforts to respond to the COVID-19 pandemic. In global pandemic crises like COVID-19, the urgency and scale of the crisis – as well as the spotlight placed on pharmaceutical companies – mean that contributing to the search for effective medicines, vaccines or diagnostics is essential for socially responsible companies in the sector. It is therefore unsurprising that we are seeing industry-wide efforts unfold at unprecedented scale and pace. Whereas there is always scope for more activity, industry is currently contributing in a variety of ways. Examples include pharmaceutical companies donating existing compounds to assess their utility in the fight against COVID19; screening existing compound libraries in-house or with partners to see if they can be repurposed; accelerating trials for potentially effective medicine or vaccine candidates; and in some cases rapidly accelerating in-house research and development to discover new treatments or vaccine agents and develop diagnostics tests. Pharmaceutical companies are collaborating with each other in some of these efforts and participating in global R&D partnerships (such as the Innovative Medicines Initiative effort to accelerate the development of potential therapies for COVID-19) and supporting national efforts to expand diagnosis and testing capacity and ensure affordable and ready access to potential solutions. The primary purpose of such innovation is to benefit patients and wider population health. Although there are also reputational benefits from involvement that can be realised across the industry, there are likely to be relatively few companies that are ‘commercial’ winners. Those who might gain substantial revenues will be under pressure not to be seen as profiting from the pandemic. In the United Kingdom for example, GSK has stated that it does not expect to profit from its COVID-19 related activities and that any gains will be invested in supporting research and long-term pandemic preparedness, as well as in developing products that would be affordable in the world’s poorest countries. Similarly, in the United States AbbVie has waived intellectual property rights for an existing combination product that is being tested for therapeutic potential against COVID-19, which would support affordability and allow for a supply of generics. Johnson & Johnson has stated that its potential vaccine – which is expected to begin trials – will be available on a not-for-profit basis during the pandemic. Pharma is mobilising substantial efforts to rise to the COVID-19 challenge at hand. However, we need to consider how pharmaceutical innovation for responding to emerging infectious diseases can best be enabled beyond the current crisis. Many public health threats (including those associated with other infectious diseases, bioterrorism agents and antimicrobial resistance) are urgently in need of pharmaceutical innovation, even if their impacts are not as visible to society as COVID-19 is in the immediate term. The pharmaceutical industry has responded to previous public health emergencies associated with infectious disease in recent times – for example those associated with Ebola and Zika outbreaks. However, it has done so to a lesser scale than for COVID-19 and with contributions from fewer companies. Similarly, levels of activity in response to the threat of antimicrobial resistance are still low. There are important policy questions as to whether – and how – industry could engage with such public health threats to an even greater extent under improved innovation conditions.

#### AND --- Xenobots are coming --- That solves toxic waste, cancer and propel nanobots

Coghlan, 20 (Simon Coghlan, Simon is a moral philosopher and a veterinarian. He is a senior research fellow in the Centre for AI and Digital Ethics (CAIDE) and the School of Computing and Information Systems (CIS)., 1-20-2020, accessed on 11-6-2021, Phys, "Not bot, not beast: Scientists create first ever living, programmable organism", <https://phys.org/news/2020-01-bot-beast-scientists-programmable.html)//Babcii>

A remarkable combination of artificial intelligence (AI) and biology has produced the world's first "**living robots**". This week, a research team of roboticists and scientists [published](https://www.pnas.org/content/early/2020/01/07/1910837117) their recipe for making a new lifeform **called xenobots** from [stem cells](https://phys.org/tags/stem+cells/). The term "xeno" comes from the frog cells (Xenopus laevis) used to make them. One of the researchers [described the creation](https://www.forbes.com/sites/simonchandler/2020/01/14/worlds-first-living-robot-invites-new-opportunities-and-risks/#379ef46c3caf) as "neither a traditional robot nor a known species of animal", but a "new class of artifact: a living, programmable organism". Xenobots are **less than 1mm long** and made of 500-1000 living cells. They have various simple shapes, including some with squat "legs". They can propel themselves in linear or circular directions, join together to act collectively, and move small objects. Using their own cellular energy, they can live up to 10 days. While these "reconfigurable biomachines" could vastly improve human, animal, and environmental health, they raise legal and ethical concerns. Strange new 'creature' To make xenobots, the research team used a supercomputer to test thousands of random designs of simple living things that could perform certain tasks. The computer was programmed with an AI "evolutionary algorithm" to predict which organisms would likely display useful tasks, such as moving towards a target. After the selection of the most promising designs, the scientists attempted to replicate the virtual models with frog skin or heart cells, which were manually joined using microsurgery tools. The heart cells in these bespoke assemblies contract and relax, giving the organisms motion. The creation of xenobots is groundbreaking. Despite being described as "programmable living robots", they are actually completely organic and **made of living tissue**. The term "robot" has been used because xenobots can be configured into different forms and shapes, and "programmed" to target certain objects—which they then unwittingly seek. They can also repair themselves after being damaged. Possible applications Xenobots may have great value. [Some speculate](https://www.technologyreview.com/f/615041/these-xenobots-are-living-machines-designed-by-an-evolutionary-algorithm/) **they could be used to clean our polluted oceans** by collecting microplastics. Similarly, they may be used to **enter confined or dangerous areas to scavenge toxins or radioactive materials**. Xenobots designed with carefully shaped "pouches" might be able to carry drugs into human bodies. Future versions may be built from a patient's own cells to repair tissue or target cancers. Being biodegradable, xenobots would have an edge on technologies made of plastic or metal. Further development of biological "robots" could accelerate our understanding of living and robotic systems. Life is incredibly complex, so manipulating living things could reveal some of life's mysteries—and improve our use of AI. Legal and ethical questions Conversely, xenobots raise legal and ethical concerns. In the same way they could help target cancers, they could also be used to hijack life functions for malevolent purposes. Some argue artificially making living things is unnatural, hubristic, or involves "playing God". A more compelling concern is that of unintended or malicious use, as we have seen with technologies in fields including nuclear physics, chemistry, biology and AI. For instance, xenobots might be used for hostile biological purposes prohibited under international law. More advanced future xenobots, especially ones that live longer and reproduce, could potentially "malfunction" and go rogue, and out-compete other species. For [complex tasks](https://phys.org/tags/complex+tasks/), xenobots may need sensory and nervous systems, possibly resulting in their sentience. A sentient programmed organism would raise additional ethical questions. Last year, the revival of a disembodied pig brain [elicited concerns about different species' suffering](https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-019-01216-4). Managing risks The xenobot's creators have rightly acknowledged the need for discussion around the ethics of their creation. The 2018 scandal over using CRISPR (which allows the introduction of genes into an organism) may provide an instructive lesson [here](https://www.technologyreview.com/s/614761/nature-jama-rejected-he-jiankui-crispr-baby-lulu-nana-paper/). While the experiment's goal was to reduce the susceptibility of twin baby girls to HIV-AIDS, associated risks caused ethical dismay. The scientist in question [is in prison](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2019/dec/30/gene-editing-chinese-scientist-he-jiankui-jailed-three-years). When CRISPR became widely available, some experts called for a [moratorium](https://www.theguardian.com/science/2019/mar/13/scientists-call-for-global-moratorium-on-crispr-gene-editing) on heritable genome editing. Others [argued](https://www.liebertpub.com/doi/10.1089/crispr.2019.0016?utm_source=miragenews&utm_medium=miragenews&utm_campaign=news&) the benefits outweighed the risks. While each new technology should be considered impartially and based on its merits, giving life to xenobots raises certain significant questions: Should xenobots have biological kill-switches in case they go rogue? Who should decide who can access and control them? What if "homemade" xenobots become possible? Should there be a moratorium until regulatory frameworks are established? How much regulation is required? Lessons learned in the past from advances in other areas of science could help manage future risks, while reaping the possible benefits. Long road here, long road ahead The creation of **xenobots had various biological and robotic precedents**. Genetic engineering has created genetically modified mice that become [fluorescent](http://www.understandinganimalresearch.org.uk/news/research-medical-benefits/glowing-mice/) in UV light. [Designer microbes](https://advances.sciencemag.org/content/1/4/e1500077) can produce drugs and food ingredients that may eventually [replace animal agriculture](https://solarfoods.fi/). In 2012, scientists created an [artificial jellyfish](https://blogs.scientificamerican.com/brainwaves/what-would-it-take-to-really-build-an-artificial-jellyfish) called a "medusoid" from rat cells. Robotics is also flourishing. Nanobots can [monitor people's blood sugar levels](http://news.mit.edu/2013/nanotechnology-could-help-fight-diabetes-0516) and may eventually be able to [clear clogged arteries](https://www.smithsonianmag.com/innovation/tiny-robots-can-clear-clogged-arteries-180955774/). **Robots can incorporate living matter**, which we witnessed when engineers and biologists created a [sting-ray robot](https://www.sciencemag.org/news/2016/07/robotic-stingray-powered-light-activated-muscle-cells) powered by light-activated [cells](https://phys.org/tags/cells/). In the coming years, we are sure to see more creations like xenobots that evoke both wonder and due concern. And when we do, it is important we remain both open-minded and critical.

### OFF

#### Our interpretation is that the aff can’t be the courts ---

#### Courts cannot create “antitrust law” and cannot “increase prohibitions”

Kalbfleisch 61 – Kalbfleisch, District Court judge. [Paul M. Harrod Co. v. A. B. Dick Co., 194 F. Supp. 502 (N.D. Ohio 1961)]//babcii

Defendant asserts that the term ‘antitrust laws,’ as used in the above section and as defined in 15 U.S.C.A. § 12, does not include a judgment or decree entered in connection with an antitrust case filed by the Government. Plaintiff, on the other hand, asserts that ‘the violation of the earlier decree of this court in itself gives rise to an independent cause of action under Section 4 of the Clayton Act.’ 15 U.S.C.A. § 15. Plaintiff's Brief, p. 7. Plaintiff concedes that ‘as far as he has been able to ascertain, this contention raises issues which have never before been decided by any appellate court.’ Plaintiff's Brief, p. 5. In Nashville Milk Co. v. Carnation Co., 1958, 355 U.S. 373, 78 S.Ct. 352, 2 L.Ed.2d 340, the Supreme Court held that the Robinson-Patman Act, 15 U.S.C.A. §§ 13-13b, 21a, was not included among the ‘antitrust laws' defined in Section 1 of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C.A. § 12) and that ‘the definition contained in § 1 of the Clayton Act is exclusive.’ Id., 355 U.S. at page 376, 78 S.Ct. at page 354. The definition of ‘antitrust laws' in 15 U.S.C.A. § 12, clearly embraces only the statutes described therein. Even without such a definition the term ‘antitrust laws' could not be construed as pertaining to a judgment or decree entered by a court in connection with an antitrust case filed by the Government. Such decrees do not necessarily reflect the **prohibitions** of the antitrust laws but may, by their terms, seek to dissipate the effects of the past conduct of the parties and, to this end, frequently enjoin performance of acts lawful in themselves. To permit a private party to recover damages for violation of any provision of such a decree is so obviously beyond the scope of the term ‘antitrust laws,’ as used in the statute, as to require no further discussion. Defendant's motion to dismiss that part of the complaint based on alleged violations of the 1948 consent decree in United States v. A.B. Dick Company will be sustained.

### OFF

#### The United States Supreme Court ought to, deploying the technique utilized in Great Northern Railway Company v. Sunburst Oil and Refining Company:

#### decline to rule that any patent control over living organisms is illegal per se including expanding the scope of core antitrust law to eliminate patent-tying arrangements involving seeds on the basis that such a decision would undermine judicial deference to reliance interest

#### announce that existing precedent in this area is no longer reliable and that relevant parties should be on notice that the reliance interests that caused it to be upheld in this case will not apply to future challenges

#### not deny certiorari in challenges on the issue

#### CP solves and avoids - sunbursting avoids the downfalls of an unpredictable decision but causes legal change

Faure 14 – Michael Faure, Professor of International and Comparative Environmental Law at Maastricht University and Professor of Comparative Private Law and Economics at the Rotterdam Institute of Law and Economics (RILE), Erasmus School of Law, Morag Goodwin, Associate Professor in European and International Law, Tilburg Law School, and Franziska Weber, Junior Professor for Civil Law & Law and Economics at the Institute of Law and Economics, University of Hamburg, “THE REGULATOR'S DILEMMA: CAUGHT BETWEEN THE NEED FOR FLEXIBILITY & THE DEMANDS OF FORESEEABILITY. REASSESSING THE LEX CERTA PRINCIPLE”, Albany Law Journal of Science and Technology, 24 Alb. L.J. Sci. & Tech. 283, Lexis

Prospective overruling is a judicial technique in which a [\*349] previous precedent or authority is overruled without the new ruling having retrospective effect. n386 It thus represents a departure from the fundamental notion that judicial decisions that develop or change the law necessarily have retroactive effect. n387 It is, or has been, used by a court wishing to overturn or amend bad law, but is wary of the consequences of the retrospective application of their finding. Such consequences may include the inherent unfairness that would result to an individual who had relied on the existing law in good faith n388 or because of reasons of practicality, where the decision would have sweeping consequences for the operation of the judicial system. n389 Although appearing similar, prospective overruling differs from obiter dicta in two significant ways. Firstly, while judges can use obiter dicta to declare certain rules to be bad law or to comment on the likely direction of necessary legal reform, such comments do not entail that the decision in the case before them will be inconsistent with a future case. n390 Secondly, obiter dictum, while possibly highly influential, does not benefit from stare decisis and therefore is not binding. n391

There are a number of different ways in which a court can use prospective overruling. n392 Firstly, a court can announce a new rule or standards that will apply only to future cases, i.e., not to the case before it in the instant dispute. The old rule would also govern any cases that arose from action taken prior to the [\*350] announcement of the new rule but determined after it. n393 This has been called "pure" prospective overruling. n394 A second approach would be to announce a new rule that is only applicable to future cases that arise after the announcement but, as an exception, to apply it to the instant case. n395 A third alternative is to apply the new rule not only to the case at hand but to all other cases already pending at the time of announcement. This third approach excludes those cases in which the action that motivated them predates the announcement but where proceedings had not already been commenced at the moment of declaration of the new rule. n396 Finally, a fourth possibility would be for a court to announce a new rule not having retroactive effect but to suspend the entry into force of that new rule until a future date. n397 This technique is used to allow those actors likely to be affected by the change to adapt their behavior accordingly and to give the legislature the opportunity to enact a different rule should they so wish. n398 Traynor termed this form of prospective overruling "prospective-prospective overruling." n399 In this version of prospective overruling, the new rule does not apply to the case in which it is announced, or to any other cause of action that arises before the delayed entry into force of the new rule. n400 The Court of Justice of the European Union, for example, has accepted the need to place temporal limitations on its rulings in the interests of justice, although it has declared that it does so only in exceptional circumstances. n401 A variation on this form of [\*351] prospective overruling has been suggested by Advocate General Jacobs, whereby both the retrospective and prospective effect of a ruling of the Court of Justice of the European Union could be subject to a temporal limitation; in that case until the Member State concerned has had a reasonable opportunity to consider the introduction of amending legislation. n402

In addition to the European Union, a number of jurisdictions have used or accepted the possibility, if only in principle, of prospective overruling in exceptional circumstances, including the United States, n403 India, n404 New Zealand, n405 Canada, n406 the United Kingdom n407 and Germany. n408 The European Court of Human Rights has been understood to issue prospective rulings, n409 although there is some doubt as to whether its "dynamic" approach to convention interpretation is properly classified as such; n410 however, it certainly accepts such rulings in domestic courts as compatible with the rule of law. n411 At its apogee in the United States, the United States Supreme Court ruled in the case of Linkletter v. Walker, that in both criminal and civil cases, "the accepted rule today is that in appropriate cases the Court may in the interests of justice make the rule prospective." n412 However, since the 1970s, the use of retrospective overruling in the United States has been in retreat. While it remains unclear as to whether the use of "pure" prospective overruling (where the new rule does not apply to the case at hand) has been abandoned in civil cases, n413 the Supreme Court [\*352] has overturned its earlier enthusiasm and now prohibits prospective overruling in criminal cases n414 and the use of selective prospective overruling (i.e., "non-pure") in civil cases. n415 Yet, despite the discrediting of prospective overruling as a technique in the US more than twenty years ago, it continues to attract the interest of senior common law judges. n416 In a 2005 case, In re Spectrum Plus, the House of Lords found that it was theoretically possible to overrule a judgment with prospective effect only; n417 and in 2007, two members of the New Zealand Supreme Court accepted the same possibility. n418

3. The Pros and Cons of Prospective Overruling

Given that the heyday of prospective overruling has, until recently, been behind us, what reasons are there for being suspicious of the technique? There are, it seems, two main reasons for rejecting prospective overruling in its entirety. The first has been articulated by the Australian High Court in its emphatic refusal to countenance the use of prospective overruling and concerns an understanding of the nature of judicial interpretation. In the case of Ha v. New South Wales, the Court ruled that, "it would be a perversion of judicial power to maintain in force that which is acknowledged not to be the law." n419 In this reading, where a court determines that the rule they are required to apply is bad law, i.e., that the "real law" is actually now a different standard, it is simply untenable to continue to apply the wrong standard, even where it results in a manifest injustice to one of the parties before it. n420 The notion that prospective overruling is "a perversion of judicial power" gains further credence from the commonly accepted understanding that the role of the judiciary is to interpret the law in light of the case before it, where the primary function of the courts is to [\*353] adjudicate between parties; going beyond the particular case by making a general statement about the law is seen by some as "blatantly legislative." n421 While the legislature looks forward, the proper direction of the courts' attention is backwards, applying the existing law to situations that have already happened. This view was echoed by the United States Supreme Court in Griffith v. Kentucky, in which it ruled, concurring with earlier minority opinions by Justice Harlan, that the "failure to apply a newly declared constitutional rule to criminal cases pending on direct review violates basic norms of constitutional adjudication." n422

The second reason for critics to reject prospective overruling concerns the impact upon individuals of arbitrariness to which prospective overruling gives rise. In Griffiths v. Kentucky, the United States Supreme Court stated quite simply that "selective application of new rules violates the principle of treating similarly situated defendants the same." n423 Once a rule or practice has been declared bad law or unconstitutional, it violates the central notion of equality before the law if the new rule is applied to benefit one individual but not another. n424 These concerns can be somewhat alleviated by applying the new rule to all cases stemming from action arising at or after the time of the cause of action of the case in which the new rule is announced, i.e., by limiting the normal retrospective effect of rulings only marginally, but to do so would be to reduce considerably the possible benefits of prospective overruling. n425 In effect, those parties who had relied in good faith on the previous standard in such actions would be held to a new, stricter standard and thus their legitimate expectation of and right to legal certainty would [\*354] be compromised. n426

What, then, are the benefits? In particular, would other, less dramatic, techniques do the same job without encountering the hostility that prospective overruling can inspire? Obiter dicta could be used, for example, to indicate a likely direction of legal reform without actually introducing a new rule. n427 However, it is in large part the binding nature of a prospective decision that makes it such a useful technique in balancing flexibility and foreseeability. n428 While obiter dicta could be used in a similar way, although such statements lack the ability to bind future courts, they reduce the foreseeability of parties the same way incentives for operators to adapt their behavior are reduced. Operators may instead play a waiting game in which they fail to carry out adaptations in the hope that a different court will continue to apply the existing standard. Prospective overruling, we suggest, cannot be replaced by the less controversial tool of obiter dictum. Moreover, obiter dictum would obviously only provide a solution in those legal systems where it exists, which is not the case for many civil law systems. n429

The first main benefit of prospective overruling follows from the assertion that it is a perversion of judicial power to uphold a law that is understood to be unsound. n430 Courts are rightly reluctant to overturn a precedent, even where they are convinced of the unsoundness of the rule in question, where the harm caused by retrospective change is greater than the supposed benefits. n431 Thus, Justice Traynor suggested, in his classic article on the topic, that the main benefit of the technique of prospective overruling is that it enables courts to "change[] bad law without upsetting the ... expectations of those who [have] relied upon it." n432 For Traynor, prospective overruling, in direct contrast to its critics, is a necessary tool for the proper administration of justice. n433 Allowing bad law to stand simply to overturn a [\*355] precedent would entail unacceptable and unreasonable hardship for one of the parties concerned is an equally perverse understanding of the judicial role. n434

### OFF

#### The United States, through a limited constitutional convention, ought to interpret patent control over living organisms as illegal per se – expanding the scope of core antitrust law to eliminate patent-tying arrangements involving seeds.

#### Conventions can change Antitrust law – avoids politics

**Berry, 87** (Mary Frances Berry, Geraldine R. Segal Professor of American Social Thought at the University of Pennsylvania and a member of the United States Commission on Civil Rights., 9-13-1987, accessed on 6-19-2021, The New York Times, "AMENDING THE CONSTITUTION; How Hard It Is To Change", https://www.nytimes.com/1987/09/13/magazine/amending-the-constitution-how-hard-it-is-to-change.html)//Babcii

The purpose of **Article V's convention** provision is to make it **possible** **for** amendments to be proposed that Congress does not want proposed, and it would be illogical indeed to assume that Congress could bind a convention's agenda. Even if the Congress decided to call a convention for the sole purpose of proposing amendments to balance the budget, and even if the convention agreed to this overall goal, the gathering **would** still **have great freedom**. The participants might decide that Congressional budgetary authority should be limited to support for the national defense. They could delete support for the general welfare from the Constitution, thus precluding such items as Social Security, Medicaid and Medicare. They could decide to amend Congressional power to regulate commerce, which now allows for such activities as environmental regulation, labor regulation **and antitrust enforcement**. This would, after all, abolish a whole series of Federal agencies and decrease the budget.

### OFF

#### The United States federal government should establish a framework for contingent international cooperation that interprets patent control over living organisms as illegal per se – expanding the scope of core antitrust law to eliminate patent-tying arrangements involving seeds.

#### The CP’s framework multilateralizes antitrust --- That spills over to deep economic integration

Dr. Daniel Francis 21, Climenko Fellow and Lecturer on Law at Harvard Law School, Doctorate of Laws Degree from the NYU School of Law, Master of Laws Degree from Harvard University, JD from Trinity College at Cambridge University, Former Deputy Director of the Federal Trade Commission, “Choices and Consequences: Internationalizing Competition Policy after TPP”, in Megaregulation Contested: The Global Economic Order After TPP, Ed. Kingsbury, Revised 8/26/2021, p. 40-48

B. Between Contracts and Networks: Frameworks

Another dichotomy that dominates the integration of competition policy pertains to the forms of internationalization, which in the competition policy space have generally been dominated by contract-style treaties on the one hand and by open networks on the other.166 Between these two models lies what seems to be an under-utilized alternative, which I call a “framework for contingent cooperation.” [FOOTNOTE] 166 This binary view dominates the literature. See, e.g., Edward M. Graham, “Internationalizing” Competition Policy: An Assessment of the Two Main Alternatives, 48 Antitrust Bull. 947, 949 (2003) (“[M]echanisms [for antitrust internationalization] range from bilateral treaties creating arrangements for cooperation between or among national competition law enforcement agencies to informal working arrangements among agencies.”); Eleanor M. Fox, International Antitrust and the Doha Dome, 43 Va. J. Int’l L. 911, 912 (2003) (contrasting “horizontalism” with “globalism”); Anu Piilola, Assessing Theories of Global Governance: A Case Study of International Antitrust Regulation, 39 Stan. J. Int'l L. 207, 247 (2003) (“Rather than drafting overarching multilateral agreements on antitrust laws, cooperation efforts in the immediate future are more likely to succeed in managing existing diversity and promoting voluntary convergence based on approximation of domestically applied standards. Networks of antitrust authorities are well-suited to facilitate this process of cooperation and voluntary convergence.”). [END FOOTNOTE] A “framework” in the sense that I am using that term is a facilitative arrangement that does not constitute a treaty under international law,167 and which does not carry the charge of international legal obligation, but which involves an exchange of specific and reciprocally contingent commitments by participant jurisdictions to engage in mutually beneficial conduct. Specifically, each party states that it will extend certain benefits to each other party so long as each other does likewise; the parties may also create supplementary mechanisms to monitor and/or adjudicate compliance with these commitments.168 A framework of this kind is not a treaty: it is what Kal Raustiala calls a “pledge,”169 and what Charles Lipson calls an “informal” agreement,170 involving no legal obligation, and it involves no commitment of the parties’ reputation for law-abiding behavior.171 On the other hand, it differs from an open, information-sharing network because it precisely specifies behavioral commitments, and because each of the parties shares an understanding that concrete consequences will promptly follow—exclusion from the benefits provided by others—if its behavior materially deviates from the terms of the commitment.172 A framework is therefore essentially a specific declaration of intention to engage in conduct that benefits others, contingent upon parallel behavior by other participating states, without obligatory status under international law. This is, in some sense, the direct opposite of the approach typically taken in competition policy chapters in trade agreements. The provisions of competition policy chapters partake of the substance of treaty law, but are generally framed in broad terms rather than specifics, and generally do not reflect a shared understanding that specific consequences will attend breach. By contrast, frameworks do not bind in international law, are framed in specific terms than aspirational generalities, and reflect an understanding that the benefits of cooperation will be withdrawn in the event of violation. Contingent cooperation thus depends for its effectiveness primarily upon three important dynamics. The first and most important of these is the rationality of strategic cooperation. A familiar mainstream view holds that to a significant extent states behave in international society in ways that rationally serve their interests.173 And when cooperation over a series of interactions is overall in the interests of each member of a group, but when each member faces a rational incentive to defect from the terms of cooperation in individual cases, familiar economic theory teaches that a strategic cooperative equilibrium can be maintained among the parties.174 In contingent cooperation, each party understands that if it defects materially from the terms of the framework, the other participants will withdraw the excludable benefits of cooperation, and this provides the incentive to comply.175 Contingent cooperation can be made more stable by the introduction of certain structures designed to monitor compliance (just as with a cartel among private companies).176 This might among other things involve the creation of a central “facilitator” that is responsible, in a general sense, for obtaining, collecting, and processing information necessary to sustain a cooperative equilibrium.177 Depending on the purpose and scope of the cooperation project, this could include (for example): reviewing the text of laws, regulations, and policy documents for consistency with the terms of the framework; conducting peer-review-style evaluations and certifications; hosting voluntary dispute resolution processes, including mediation and/or arbitration, to determine whether and when the framework has been violated; or even receiving and handling complaints of violations ombudsman-fashion (i.e., receiving the complaint, giving the subject of the complaint an opportunity to respond, and publishing findings and conclusions). A central facilitator could also go beyond a policing function and offer a common forum for certain forms of cooperation and information sharing. The nature of such broader functions, and the extent to which they would be useful or desirable, would depend on the nature and purpose of the cooperation. The second dynamic that powers contingent cooperation is the normative appeal of the project itself. The point here is not unlike what Gráinne de Búrca calls “mission legitimacy”: the normative force of the underlying purpose of a cooperative project, and specifically the power of that normativity to secure the acceptance and cooperation of those who participate.178 Parties joining projects of contingent cooperation can be expected to be in some sense self-selecting: they join such endeavors because, in part, they are genuinely committed to promoting and achieving the ends that the project represents, and they embrace the project of cooperation as worthwhile.179 It may sound a little naïve to suggest that a project of cooperation may be more likely to “stick” if it has some normative appeal to the participating polities, but legal scholarship has long recognized that states do what they undertake to do more often than strictly rational analysis would predict.180 And I think the proposition that genuine commitment to a goal can contribute to compliance is in truth somewhat less naïve than the converse idea that compliance is just as likely without it. The third source of a framework’s effectiveness is to be found in the acculturative and socializing effects of interaction in an environment in which values and practices are shared and reinforced as normative, and in which attention is paid to the existence and nature of violations. There is a rich and complex literature on the ways in which states, state actors, and the individuals within them may be “socialized” or “acculturated” by repeated engagement with others through common institutions and shared environments of normativity, eventually contributing to the emergence of obligations with genuine normative force.181 Jutta Brunnée and Stephen Toope have pointed out ways in which the force of legal obligation itself arises from shared communities of practice grounded in social reality and shared understandings, not formal commitments.182 As they put it, “[s]tability may be aided by explicit articulation of a norm in a text, but it is ultimately dependent upon [an] underlying shared understanding and a continuous practice of legality.”183 Participation in an endeavor of contingent cooperation may help to engender the development of such understandings and practices, and these may contribute to the effectiveness of the framework. In the longer term, this may even result in the creation of a legal instrument. But this progression is not necessary for acculturation to exert a reinforcing effect: for, as Anu Bradford accurately notes, there is no reason to think that “the pathway from nonbinding to binding rules” is an inevitable or even a natural one.184 The distinctive value of a framework is that it provides a low-cost way for jurisdictions to explore and participate in possible arrangements of mutual benefit that depend upon shared concrete understandings regarding future behavior, but without bearing the burden of an obligation under international law, without running the reputational risk of having to break a treaty, and without facing the domestic hurdles (or political scrutiny) that a treaty would necessitate.185 Use of such a framework may help to reduce the concerns grounded in political morality that might otherwise attend inter-jurisdictional action in sensitive areas:186 to use a term I have coined elsewhere, as contingent practices from which states could withdraw at any time, frameworks would benefit from considerable resources of “exit legitimacy.”187 Frameworks are not suited to every application. They seem particularly apt for types of international cooperation that generate excludable benefits for other participants and can be reasonably well monitored: in the sphere of competition policy, for example, this would include commitments to provide nondiscriminatory access to procurement markets as well as many forms of antitrust cooperation (including cooperation with one another’s investigations, coordination of enforcement activity, the operation of joint filing systems for merger review and cartel leniency programs, and so on). Certain guarantees of nondiscriminatory treatment by SOEs could also be extended on a selective basis. On the other hand, contingent cooperation is much less suitable for projects that require strong and highly credible guarantees of commitment from the participants (in which case a traditional treaty-contract would seem more appropriate188) or groups of parties still lacking the prerequisite agreement on the terms and ambit of desirable cooperation. Nor is it suitable in the absence of sufficient confidence in the ability or incentive of other parties to deliver on their commitments: in these cases, open dialogue and information exchange through a network would seem preferable. Nor, obviously, is it a good fit for projects in which the benefits of cooperation are non-excludable.189 To pick an obvious example, contingent cooperation would not recommend itself as a natural choice for an international project to introduce SOE discipline: the benefits are non-excludable (there is no obvious way to withdraw them selectively in the event of defection) and compliance is very difficult to monitor, so the use of a framework is unlikely to make much of a contribution.190

#### Normative convergence prevents extinction from resource depletion, human rights abuse, and war

Geoffrey A. Manne 13, Lecturer in Law at Lewis & Clark Law School, Executive Director of the International Center for Law & Economics, JD from the University of Chicago Law School, Former Olin Fellow at the University of Virginia School of Law, and Dr. Seth Weinberger, PhD and MA in Political Science from Duke University, MA in National Security Studies from Georgetown University, AB from the University of Chicago, Associate Professor in the Department of Politics and Government at the University of Puget Sound, “International Signals: The Political Dimension of International Competition Law”, The Antitrust Bulletin, Volume 57, Number 3, Last Revised 7/18/2013, p. 497-503

A. The international political environment At the root of international political theory is the fundamental maxim that relations between sovereign nations in the absence of mitigating factors is characterized by intense competition, mutual distrust, the inability to make credible commitments, and war.20 [FOOTNOTE] 20 Political scientists characterize the international system as “anarchic.” In the absence of world government (or other mitigating force), competition between states is largely unregulated by external laws or enforcement. The world is characterized by mistrust, the inability to contract, and the ultimate reliance on a state’s own devices. See THOMAS HOBBES, LEVIATHAN 80 (Edwin Curley ed., 1994) (in the state of nature “the condition of man . . . is a condition of war of everyone against everyone”). In fuller terms: There is no authoritative allocator of resources: we cannot talk about a ‘world society’ making decisions about economic outcomes. No consistent and enforceable set of comprehensive rules exists. If actors are to improve their welfare through coordinating their policies, they must do so through bargaining rather than by invoking central direction. In world politics, uncertainty is rife, making agreements is difficult, and no secure barriers prevent military and security questions from impinging on economic affairs. ROBERT O. KEOHANE, AFTER HEGEMONY: COOPERATION AND DISCORD IN THE WORLD POLITICAL ECONOMY 18 (1984). Efficiency-enhancing gains from trade are difficult to appropriate because trade itself (and any other form of exchange or agreement between nations) is characterized by the absence of credible commitments to future behavior. And underlying the problem is the ever-present threat of the use of force. See, e.g., Kenneth N. Waltz, Anarchic Orders and Balances of Power, in NEOREALISM AND ITS CRITICS 98, 98 (Robert O. Keohane ed. 1986) (“The state among states . . . conducts its affairs in the brooding shadow of violence . . . . Among states, the state of nature is a state of war.”). Although this dire characterization of the international environment is, of course, a stylized approximation of the real world—there are always overlying constraints on sovereign behavior in the form of norms, reputational effects, and customary international law, HEDLEY BULL, THE ANARCHICAL SOCIETY: A STUDY OF ORDER IN WORLD POLITICS (1977)—it is a useful and widely accepted heuristic for crafting a theory of international politics. [END FOOTNOTE] As one commentator notes, “Nations dwell in perpetual anarchy, for no central authority imposes limits on the pursuit of sovereign interests.”21 And states are “unitary actors who, at a minimum, seek their own preservation and, at a maximum, drive for universal domination.”22 As a result, states operating on the international stage are unable to judge the sincerity of each others’ stated intentions when those intentions are contrary to this manifest interest. Because of self-help rules, states are forced in the main to assess their own security environment by assessing the capabilities of competitors, downplaying their motives. Given that the nature of the competition can implicate the fundamental survival of one (or more) of the actors, actions taken by one state to improve its own security must necessarily decrease the security of its competitor; in the absence of mitigation, security is a zero-sum game.23 In a world where cooperation is exceedingly difficult (because there is no authority to enforce agreements, nor any basis for assessing the reliability of another state’s commitments), international relations are characterized by a continuous race to the bottom, a mindless arms race rather than the opportunity to realize gains from cooperation. It is obvious that not all relations between states are characterized by the security dilemma, however. Canada, for example, shares an unprotected border with the most powerful nation in the world without degenerating into a destructive and costly arms race. By some mechanism, then, Canada must be able reliably to judge U.S. intentions, even absent the apparent ability by the United States credibly to bind itself to a nonaggressive policy toward Canada. The key to mitigating the pressures of the security dilemma is the ability to distinguish a state with aggressive and expansionist tendencies from a benign one.24 States can be distinguished by their fundamental type. They can be classified as “revisionist,” that is, they seek to subvert the dominant order, or they can be classified as “status quo,” that is, they seek to support it.25 But, as noted, a state’s ability to judge another’s intentions (as opposed simply to counting its armaments) is extremely tenuous and comes at great cost. In fact, political science offers few well-understood mechanisms for judging a state’s propensity for aggression. At the same time, hegemonic states have an abiding interest in spreading and maintaining their dominant worldview.26 Not only is it imperative that dominant states receive credible signals about other states’ intentions, but it is also important that dominant states attempt to inculcate their norms within other states that, over time, might mount credible challenges to the dominant states’ security.27 The spread of hegemony through internalization of norms occurs for three reasons. First, states with similar institutions and sympathetic domestic norms are simply better and more reliable trading partners, and it is in the hegemon’s economic interest to instill its norms.28 Second, states with defensive military postures and that adhere to the status quo present significantly less security risk to dominant states.29 And finally, the hegemon has a normative interest in the spread of its culture, its worldview, and its norms.30 This conception of the playing field upon which states interact leads to the conclusion that, entirely apart from the immediate and substantial economic benefits to a state from well-ordered interactions with other states, hegemonic states also have a national security and a normative interest in the information to be gleaned from the fact that these interactions are, in fact, well ordered. In the absence of centralized enforcement, privately held and nonverifiable information as to a state’s fundamental type is the critical problem in assessing motives.31 [FOOTNOTE] 31 See KEOHANE, supra note 20, at 31 (“Order in world politics is typically created by a single dominant power [or hegemon].”). States are consequently classified as one of two types, “revisionist” or “status quo,” based on their acceptance and adherence to the political norms, institutions, and rules created by the hegemon. Status quo states are those that try to improve their condition from within the framework of the accepted world order. Revisionist states, by contrast, seek to gain position both by working outside that order and by working to subvert the hegemonic order itself. For instance, the existing world order is generally accepted to be that created by the United States after World War II. It comprises a liberal international economic order, the use of multilateral institutions (such as the United Nations and the WTO), negotiation for dispute resolution rather than the threat of violence, and the promotion of liberal democratic moral norms. See, e.g., Schweller, supra note 24, at 85; HANS J. MORGENTHAU, POLITICS AMONG NATIONS: THE STRUGGLE FOR POWER AND PEACE 32 (1948). Trade disputes between status quo states (like tariff disputes between the United States and Europe) are resolved through peaceful negotiation rather than the threat of war. Although status quo states do not entirely eschew the use of violence, they typically seek international authorization and legitimization before employing military force, as in the multilateral operations in Iraq, Kosovo, and Afghanistan. Revisionist states, on the other hand, such as North Korea, Iran, and China, will more readily use military force as a bargaining tool and are more reluctant fully to participate in transparent military, economic, and political negotiations. [END FOOTNOTE] States wishing to escape the pressures of the security dilemma and engage in cooperative behavior need a means of conveying their preferences to others in a credible manner. There are, in general, two means by which such information can be transmitted: states can either bind themselves in such a way that they are unable to deviate from a stated behavior (known as “hands tying” in Schelling),32 or they can signal their intention to engage in a specified course of action by incurring costs sufficiently large that they discourage the misrepresentation of preference.33 International institutions can play a crucial role in facilitating the transmission of this information.34 In particular, international agreements over the terms of trade, even without binding supranational enforcement authority, provide a means for states to bind themselves to a desirable course of behavior in the short run and, more importantly, to signal their acquiescence to the ruling world order in the long run. Because compliance with treaty obligations often requires signatories to alter their domestic laws to reflect the terms of the treaty, the costs of compliance can be substantial. In the short run, to the extent that states enforce their domestic laws they can bind themselves to a certain course of behavior. In the long run, a state’s willingness to incur the substantial costs of changing its laws, both the transaction costs inherent in changing domestic laws and the even more substantial costs in domestic political capital, signals a willingness to engage other states on the terms set by the reigning international power. Moreover, there may be unintended effects, as changes in domestic laws result in a new set of domestic incentives to which actors respond, and new windows of opportunity may open up through which policy entrepreneurs can push for the internalization of new norms.35 Competition laws in particular are susceptible to this mode of analysis. Most nations have adopted competition laws as a way to actualize (as well as to symbolize) a degree of commitment to the competitive process and to the prevention of abusive business practices . . . . The introduction of competition laws and policies has also gone hand in hand with economic deregulation, regulatory reform, and the end of command and control economies.36 The surest way to remove the threat of war, increase wealth, conserve resources, and protect human rights is through fundamental agreement between all states (or at least effective agreement between verifiably status quo states) under a normative umbrella that promotes all of those values. This normative convergence can be effected through the stepwise internalization of the sorts of economic and democratic values inherent in international economic liberalization, perhaps most notably through the adoption of principled international antitrust standards.37

### OFF

#### Growth high now – dependent on business investment and spending

Mutikani 21 (Lucia Mutikani, Economics correspondent @ Reuters, “U.S. corporate profits soar in second quarter; economic growth raised”, August 26, 21, Reuters, https://www.reuters.com/business/us-second-quarter-economic-growth-revised-slightly-higher-weekly-jobless-claims-2021-08-26/)//babcii

The level of GDP is now 0.8% higher than it was at its peak in the fourth quarter of 2019. The upward revisions to last quarter's GDP growth reflected a slightly more robust pace of consumer spending and business investment than initially estimated. Demand was driven by one-time stimulus checks from the government to some middle- and low-income households. The Federal Reserve has maintained its ultra-easy monetary policy stance, keeping interest rates at historically low levels and boosting stock market prices. Stocks were trading lower. The dollar [(.DXY)](https://www.reuters.com/quote/.DXY) rose against a basket of currencies. U.S. Treasury prices were mostly lower. Consumer spending, which accounts for more than two-thirds of the U.S. economy, appears to be cooling. Credit card data suggests spending on services like airfares, cruises as well as hotels and motels has been slowing. "This is a speed bump due to the interaction of Delta and supply-side constraints," said Michelle Meyer, chief U.S. economist at Bank of America Securities in New York. "We still believe the foundation for the economy is solid and all signs point to strong underlying demand." Bank of America Securities has slashed its GDP growth estimate for the third quarter to a 4.5% pace from a 7.0% rate. Growth is expected to pick up in the fourth quarter, in part driven by businesses replenishing inventories, which were drawn down in the first half of the year to meet the strong demand. Overall, economists expect growth of around 7% this year, which would be the strongest performance since 1984. Though the boost from fiscal stimulus is waning, demand remains underpinned by a strengthening labor market. A separate report from the Labor Department on Thursday showed initial claims for state unemployment benefits rose 4,000 to a seasonally adjusted 353,000 for the week ended Aug. 21. Adjusting the data for seasonal fluctuations is tricky around this time of the year, a task that has been complicated by the pandemic. That could account for the increase in applications last week. Unadjusted claims dropped 11,699 to 297,765 last week.

#### broadening antitrust causes rent-seeking and uncertainty – wrecks growth

Keating 21 (Raymond J. Keating – Small Business & Entrepreneurship Council chief economist, February 24 2021, “The Treacherous Turn on Antitrust Regulation of U.S. Tech Companies”, https://sbecouncil.org/2021/02/24/the-treacherous-turn-on-antitrust-regulation-of-u-s-tech-companies/, accessed 8/16/21, DL)

• Proposal: “Reasserting the anti-monopoly goals of the antitrust laws and their centrality to ensuring a healthy and vibrant democracy.” – “[T]he Subcommittee recommends that Congress consider reasserting the original intent and broad goals of the antitrust laws by clarifying that they are designed to protect not just consumers, but also workers, entrepreneurs, independent businesses, open markets, a fair economy, and democratic ideals.” Response: This proposal would toss out the consumer welfare standard, and replace it with a broad basis for undermining businesses that have earned considerable market share. Antitrust actions would return to a period in which politics, special interest influences, rent-seekers, and uncertainty held even greater sway over the realm of antitrust – even more so than it does today. By effectively giving more control over business decisions and models to a political class that often fails to understand current business and market conditions, never mind where industries and markets are headed in the future, there inevitably will be losses in terms of innovation, investment, efficiency, and growth. • Proposal: “Structural separations and prohibitions of certain dominant platforms from operating in adjacent lines of business.” – “Structural separations prohibit a dominant intermediary from operating in markets that place the intermediary in competition with the firms dependent on its infrastructure. Line of business restrictions, meanwhile, generally limit the markets in which a dominant firm can engage.” Response: Again, having government determine and dictate business decisions, rather than having decisions made by businesses and entrepreneurs subject to market competition and consumer sovereignty would mean lost innovation, productivity and consumer benefits.

#### Extinction – climate, pandemics, and fopo

**Baird, 20** (Zoë Baird, A.B. Phi Beta Kappa and J.D. from the University of California, Berkeley, Member of the Aspen Strategy Group, CEO and President of the Markle Foundation, Former Trustee at the Council on Foreign Relations and Partner in the law firm of O’Melveny & Myers, “Equitable Economic Recovery Is a National Security Imperative”, in Domestic and International (Dis)Order: A Strategic Response, Ed. Bitounis and King, October 2020, p. 89-90)

Broadly shared economic prosperity is a bedrock of America’s economic and political strength—both domestically and in the international arena. A strong and equitable recovery from the economic crisis created by COVID-19 would be a powerful testament to the resilience of the American system and its ability to create prosperity at a time of seismic change and persistent global crisis. Such a recovery could attack the profound economic inequities that have developed over the past several decades. Without bold action to help all workers access good jobs as the economy returns, the United States risks undermining the legitimacy of its institutions and its international standing. The outcome will be a key determinant of America’s national security for years to come. An equitable recovery requires a national commitment to help all workers obtain good jobs—particularly the two-thirds of adults without a bachelor’s degree and people of color who have been most affected by the crisis and were denied opportunity before it. As the nation engages in a historic debate about how to accelerate economic recovery, ambitious public investment is necessary to put Americans back to work with dignity and opportunity. We need an intentional effort to make sure that the jobs that come back are good jobs with decent wages, benefits, and mobility and to empower workers to access these opportunities in a profoundly changed labor market. To achieve these goals, American policy makers need to establish job growth strategies that address urgent public needs through major programs in green energy, infrastructure, and health. Alongside these job growth strategies, we need to recognize and develop the talents of workers by creating an adult learning system that meets workers’ needs and develops skills for the digital economy. The national security community must lend its support to this cause. And as it does so, it can bring home the lessons from the advances made in these areas in other countries, particularly our European allies, and consider this a realm of international cooperation and international engagement. Shared Economic Prosperity Is a National Security Asset A strong economy is essential to America’s security and diplomatic strategy. Economic strength increases our influence on the global stage, expands markets, and funds a strong and agile military and national defense. Yet it is not enough for America’s economy to be strong for some—prosperity must be broadly shared. Widespread belief in the ability of the American economic system to create economic security and mobility for all—the American Dream— creates credibility and legitimacy for America’s values, governance, and alliances around the world. After World War II, the United States grew the middle class to historic size and strength. This achievement made America the model of the free world—setting the stage for decades of American political and economic leadership. Domestically, broad participation in the economy is core to the legitimacy of our democracy and the strength of our political institutions. A belief that the economic system works for millions is an important part of creating trust in a democratic government’s ability to meet the needs of the people. The COVID-19 Crisis Puts Millions of American Workers at Risk For the last several decades, the American Dream has been on the wane. Opportunity has been increasingly concentrated in the hands of a small share of workers able to access the knowledge economy. Too many Americans, particularly those without four-year degrees, experienced stagnant wages, less stability, and fewer opportunities for advancement. Since COVID-19 hit, millions have lost their jobs or income and are struggling to meet their basic needs—including food, housing, and medical care.1 The crisis has impacted sectors like hospitality, leisure, and retail, which employ a large share of America’s most economically vulnerable workers, resulting in alarming disparities in unemployment rates along education and racial lines. In August, the unemployment rate for those with a high school degree or less was more than double the rate for those with a bachelor’s degree.2 Black and Hispanic Americans are experiencing disproportionately high unemployment, with the gulf widening as the crisis continues.3 The experience of the Great Recession shows that without intentional effort to drive an inclusive recovery, inequality may get worse: while workers with a high school education or less experienced the majority of job losses, nearly all new jobs went to workers with postsecondary education. Inequalities across racial lines also increased as workers of color worked in the hardest-hit sectors and were slower to recover earnings and income than White workers.4 The Case for an Inclusive Recovery A recovery that promotes broad economic participation, renewed opportunity, and equity will strengthen American moral and political authority around the world. It will send a strong message about the strength and resilience of democratic government and the American people’s ability to adapt to a changing global economic landscape. An inclusive recovery will reaffirm American leadership as core to the success of our most critical international alliances, which are rooted in the notion of shared destiny and interdependence. For example, NATO, which has been a cornerstone of U.S. foreign policy and a force of global stability for decades, has suffered from American disengagement in recent years. A strong American recovery—coupled with a renewed openness to international collaboration—is core to NATO’s ability to solve shared geopolitical and security challenges. A renewed partnership with our European allies from a position of economic strength will enable us to address global crises such as climate change, global pandemics, and refugees. Together, the United States and Europe can pursue a commitment to investing in workers for shared economic competitiveness, innovation, and long-term prosperity. The U.S. has unique advantages that give it the tools to emerge from the crisis with tremendous economic strength— including an entrepreneurial spirit and the technological and scientific infrastructure to lead global efforts in developing industries like green energy and biosciences that will shape the international economy for decades to come.
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#### The aff is sua sponte – it makes a decision in absence of arguments presented before the court – that crushes court legitimacy

Milani & Smith 02 (Adam and Michael, both are Assistant Professors, Mercer University School of Law, “Playing God: A Critical Look at Sua Sponte Decisions by Appellate Courts,” 69 Tenn. L. Rev. 245, Winter, lexis)

The heart of the American legal system is the adversary process in which trained advocates present the parties’ facts and arguments to neutral decision makers. The fundamental premise of the adversary process is that these advocates will uncover and present more useful information and arguments to the decision maker than would be developed by a judicial officer acting on his own in an inquisitorial system.3 The adversary process is also said to “promote[] litigant and societal acceptance of decisions rendered by the courts”4 because a party who “is intimately involved in the adjudicatory process and feels that he has [they have] been given a fair opportunity to present his case . . . is likely to accept the results whether favorable or not.”5 Indeed, the Joint Conference on Responsibility of the American Bar Association and the Association of American Law Schools stated that “[i]n a very real sense it may be said that the integrity of the adjudicative process itself depends upon the participation of the advocate.”6 Accordingly, most lawyers probably never think about the possibility that a court will decide a case on an issue that the court itself raises and which was neither briefed nor argued by the parties. But we all know it happens. We even have a name for such a decision: [is] sua sponte. Translated from its original Latin, “sua sponte” means “on his or its own motion.”7 In the legal setting, sua sponte describes a decision or action undertaken by a court on its own motion8 as opposed to an action or decision done in response to a party’s request or argument. As such, the concept of “sua sponte” is an important exception to two basic [the] principles of our adversary system of adjudication: (1) that the parties will control the litigation, and (2) that the decision maker will be neutral and passive.9 One of the clearest manifestations of these principles is that the parties themselves, not the decision maker, determine what issues will be adjudicated. In the context of judicial decision making, a court deviates from its traditional “passive” role in the adjudicatory process when it raises an issue not identified by the parties but which it deems relevant to the legal controversy before it. Nonetheless, raising issues sua sponte is not an uncommon practice.10 In fact, legal scholars have identified several kinds of issues that are commonly raised by courts on their own. First, both trial and appellate courts often raise jurisdictional issues such as standing, subject matter jurisdiction, and mootness sua sponte.1

#### That corrodes rule of law via abdicating judicial legitimacy.

Donaldson ’17 [Michael J; Partner at Burnet, Duckworth & Palmer, LLP, Master of Laws from Columbia; 2017; “Justice in Full Is Time Well Spent: Why the Supreme Court Should Ban Sua Sponte Dismissals”; http://www.bdplaw.com/publications/justice-in-full-is-time-well-spent-why-the-supreme-court-should-ban-sua-sponte-dismissals/; Quinnipiac Law Review, Vol 36; accessed 9/15/21; TV]

There is a lot wrong with sua sponte dismissals. They are inconsistent with the adversary system, and change the judge's role from referee to contestant.85 They can undermine respect for the legal system. And they increase the likelihood of errors, leading to unnecessary appeals and a waste of judicial resources." But most importantly, they lack the very due process the courts are supposed to safeguard.

A. Failure to Provide Due Process

Sua sponte decisions are inconsistent with due process.89 Period. There is no other way to look at it. 90 Not only does a plaintiff surprised by a sua sponte dismissal not receive "due" process, she receives no process at all.91 She has no idea her lawsuit is in jeopardy of being dismissed, no idea what the reasons for that dismissal might be, and no opportunity to respond. 92 This is the case whether the court's dismissal decision is right or wrong. 93 As Allan Vestal puts it:

When [issues are] considered sua sponte both parties are taken completely by surprise and the court decides the matter on grounds not urged by either. Neither has had any opportunity to consider the matter, and both are now bound by res judicata grounded on considerations which represent not well reasoned positions for the litigants, but rather only the fortuitous decision of a 94 wayward court.

The reference to res judicata here is important. As Milani and Smith point out, the res judicata doctrine requires a party or its privy to be a participant in the former proceeding before the court can bind him to the consequences of that proceeding because, according to the Supreme Court, "The opportunity to be heard is an essential requisite of due process of law in judicial proceedings."95 If this is the standard applied to former proceedings, how can it not apply to proceedings currently before the court? Lon Fuller once wrote of sua sponte decisionmaking:

[I]f the grounds for the decision fall completely outside the framework of the argument, making all that was discussed or proved at the hearing irrelevant ... the adjudicative process has become a sham, for the parties' participation in the decision has lost all meaning.9 6

The situation is even harder to defend when there is no hearing at all. 9

B. Undermining Respect for the Legal System

The perception that the courts are regularly failing to provide due process cannot do anything but undermine respect for the legal system.9 8 Sir Robert Megarry, in the speech quoted at the beginning of this article,99 underlined the importance of sending the unsuccessful litigant away feeling as though he has had a fair hearing.' Justice Harlan was obviously cognizant of this problem in his dissent in Mapp, when he warned that the Court's sua sponte decision in that case was "not likely to promote respect ... for the court's adjudicatory process."o

This is not a farfetched concern. Offenkrantz and Lichter note that in the Second Circuit's high-profile decision to "[sua sponte remove] Judge Shira Scheindlin from further proceedings in two stop-and-frisk cases," an order which left the Judge "completely blindsided," "newspapers were reporting that appellate courts had carte blanche to raise and decide important issues in a case without ever seeking the input of any of the parties to it."' 0 2

Megarry tells a story of a client of his who had a fatal flaw in his case, but insisted on going ahead anyway.10 3 Instead of seizing on the fatal flaw at the outset, the trial judge heard the case all the way through.1 0 4 The client won on his two collateral points, but, as expected, lost on the key issue. o Megarry tells the story of what happened next:

The course taken by the judge must have prolonged the hearing by an hour or two. But the effect on the defeated tenant was striking. True, he had lost the last point and the case as a whole; but he had been victorious on the other two points. All that nonsense about the agent's lack of authority and the letter not having been received in time had been blown away by the judge. It was a pity about the wording of the letter, of course; but he had seen his case being put in full, and none of his grievances had been left unheard or unresolved.

This is as it should be. Courts must not, as Megarry puts it, give in to "the temptation of brevity."'0 o Their very legitimacy hangs in the balance. A loss of respect for the courts marks the beginning of the unraveling of the rule of law. This is simply too high of a price to pay for efficiency.

#### Extinction.

Davis and Morse ’18 [Christina and Julia; September 19; Professor of Government at Harvard University; Professor of Political Science at the University of California at Santa Barbara; International Studies Quarterly, “Protecting Trade by Legalizing Political Disputes: Why Countries Bring Cases to the International Court of Justice,” vol. 62]

Trade, Conflict, and Adjudication

We argue that countries turn to international adjudication to protect trade flows under conditions of strong economic interdependence. This argument is built on two key assumptions. First, states believe that an international dispute over territory, fishing rights, or another salient issue could harm trade. Second, states view international adjudication as an effective way to end the dispute. Given the risk of harm to economic relations and the potential for courts to contribute to conflict resolution, states with high trade value vested in a relationship will be more willing to undertake costly litigation. This section elaborates on the general conditions of our theory and then explains why the ICJ is a good venue for testing the relationship between economic interdependence and international adjudication. The Adverse Impact of Conflict on Trade The premise that conflict disrupts trade is central to the theory of commercial peace. Russett and Oneal (2001) draw on the work of philosopher Immanuel Kant to argue that interdependence deters conflict by raising its costs. According to this reasoning, war interrupts trade while peace promotes stable commerce, leading states to calculate that the gains of peace are significant compared to the costs of war.4 Other perspectives focus on the informational role of interdependence to lower uncertainty between states (Reed 2003). Gartzke, Li, and Boehmer (2001) contend economic interdependence allows states to signal their resolve through their willingness to bear the economic costs of confrontation.5 A host of empirical studies supports the idea that conflict reduces trade (Keshk, Reuveny, and Pollins 2004; Long 2008). Several potential channels connect trade and conflict, including direct damage to infrastructure and transportation resulting from actual conflict, sanctions policies, and informal discrimination by governments or private actors. Glick and Taylor (2010) find that the effect of war on trade is significant and persistent. At a lower level, political tensions may also suppress trade (Pollins 1989; Fuchs and Klann 2013). Consumer boycotts and financial market reactions in some cases have led to adverse market impact (Fisman, Hamao, and Wang 2014; Heilmann 2016; Pandya 2016). Simmons (2005) finds that territorial disputes have a sizable negative impact on trade even in the absence of militarized action. Others suggest states anticipate the potential adverse impact of conflict on trade, and therefore trade less to begin with if they think that war is likely. In such a scenario, the marginal economic costs of war should be insufficient to change a state's calculation for going to war (Morrow 1999; Barbieri 2002). Gowa and Hicks (2017) contend that trade is largely diverted through third-party channels, which compensate for having less direct trade with the adversary. We assume that leaders and business constituencies on average believe that conflict damages trade relations. Political conflict could lead governments to adopt sanctions against an adversary or to restrict financial flows. Violence likely disrupts trading routes and slows the movement of goods. The potential for adverse financial market reactions and consumer response adds further unpredictability about the risk of spillover from political disagreement into economic harm. Substitution through third parties could alleviate the harm, but this would still increase trade costs. The expected harm to trade motivates states to pursue the resolution of disputes. Adjudication as a Conflict Resolution Mechanism When states want to resolve an interstate dispute, why would they choose adjudication rather than negotiations, economic sanctions, or militarized action? In some cases, the decision follows an episode of military conflict as part of an effort to normalize relations. In other disputes, countries may turn to a legal venue to prevent a problem from ever reaching the stage that could produce serious political tensions or threats of force. The literature offers three broad types of explanations for why states pursue adjudication: legitimacy, informational benefits, and domestic obstacles to settlement. At the systemic level, international norms support peaceful conflict resolution. Some contend that rule of law has come to shape the identities of states, forming norms about appropriate action in both the domestic and international spheres (Finnemore and Sikkink (1998, 902). When international law has been established through fair procedures and offers coherent principles, it forms a legitimate source of authority in international affairs that generates an independent “compliance pull” on state behavior (Franck 1990, 65). International courts combine both legitimacy and authority as they help states solve specific disputes about how to interpret international law; the growing role for international courts in international affairs represents an important trend (Alter 2014; Alter, Helfer, and Madsen 2016). Integration with national courts has reinforced states’ use of the European Court of Justice (ECJ), which stands out for its expansive caseload and impact on state behavior (Alter 1998). The ICJ has achieved a relatively strong record of compliance with rulings (Schulte 2004; Llamzon 2007; Mitchell and Hensel 2007; Johns 2012). Legal settlement can help states coordinate policies through the provision of information. Compared to bilateral negotiations or nonbinding third-party arbitration, adjudication conveys a government's willingness to reach an agreement (Helfer and Slaughter 2005; Gent and Shannon 2010). Having taken the public step to initiate legal action, a government would appear inconsistent and incur a reputational penalty if it also took unilateral measures such as sanctions or military actions before the legal process had reached a conclusion. This shapes the diplomatic context because participants know that the matter will neither escalate into violence nor disappear through neglect. A court ruling offers a focal point amidst uncertainty about how to interpret the terms of an agreement (Ginsburg and McAdams 2004; Huth, Croco, and Appel 2011). As the record-keeper of past actions, courts support systems of tit-for-tat and reputational enforcement (Milgrom, North, and Weingast 1990; Carrubba 2005; Mitchell and Hensel 2007). In these informational theories of courts, states may comply with court rulings in the absence of coercive measures or the threat of sanctions because the reputational costs of noncompliance are too high. Rather than simply interpret law, courts coordinate expectations about enforcement. Johns (2012) models the circumstances whereby mobilization of third-party actions in support of a court ruling generates endogenous enforcement that can affect outcomes. In this way, multilateral enforcement makes an international court different from the pressure available in bilateral negotiations. International courts also offer a way for states to frame settlements to appeal to domestic audiences (Fang 2008). Simmons notes that even when the same deal could be reached in negotiations or through a court decision, a negotiated settlement could be viewed as a sign of weakness while legal resolution would be a positive signal for future cooperation (Simmons 2002, 834). This dynamic occurs because “domestic groups will find it more attractive to make concessions to a disinterested institution than to a political adversary” (Simmons 2002, 834). In research on several prominent ICJ cases, Fischer (1982, 271) emphasizes the court has helped governments to save face. Consequently, those governments unable to reach agreements over domestic opposition may find it easier to do so with the involvement of a third-party ruling. Allee and Huth (2006a) show that governments with higher levels of domestic political constraints are more likely to choose adjudication over negotiation for settling territorial disputes. Domestic political constraints also increase the probability of filing complaints at the WTO (Davis 2012). The mobilization of domestic groups plays a critical role in litigation patterns at the ECJ (Alter and Vargas 2000).a

## Case

#### Extinction outweighs

Seth D. Baum & Anthony M. Barrett 18. Global Catastrophic Risk Institute. 2018. “Global Catastrophes: The Most Extreme Risks.” Risk in Extreme Environments: Preparing, Avoiding, Mitigating, and Managing, edited by Vicki Bier, Routledge, pp. 174–184.

2. What Is GCR And Why Is It Important? Taken literally, a global catastrophe can be any event that is in some way catastrophic across the globe. This suggests a rather low threshold for what counts as a global catastrophe. An event causing just one death on each continent (say, from a jet-setting assassin) could rate as a global catastrophe, because surely these deaths would be catastrophic for the deceased and their loved ones. However, in common usage, a global catastrophe would be catastrophic for a significant portion of the globe. Minimum thresholds have variously been set around ten thousand to ten million deaths or $10 billion to $10 trillion in damages (Bostrom and Ćirković 2008), or death of one quarter of the human population (Atkinson 1999; Hempsell 2004). Others have emphasized catastrophes that cause long-term declines in the trajectory of human civilization (Beckstead 2013), that human civilization does not recover from (Maher and Baum 2013), that drastically reduce humanity’s potential for future achievements (Bostrom 2002, using the term “existential risk”), or that result in human extinction (Matheny 2007; Posner 2004). A common theme across all these treatments of GCR is that some catastrophes are vastly more important than others. Carl Sagan was perhaps the first to recognize this, in his commentary on nuclear winter (Sagan 1983). Without nuclear winter, a global nuclear war might kill several hundred million people. This is obviously a major catastrophe, but humanity would presumably carry on. However, with nuclear winter, per Sagan, humanity could go extinct. The loss would be not just an additional four billion or so deaths, but the loss of all future generations. To paraphrase Sagan, the loss would be billions and billions of lives, or even more. Sagan estimated 500 trillion lives, assuming humanity would continue for ten million more years, which he cited as typical for a successful species. Sagan’s 500 trillion number may even be an underestimate. The analysis here takes an adventurous turn, hinging on the evolution of the human species and the long-term fate of the universe. On these long time scales, the descendants of contemporary humans may no longer be recognizably “human”. The issue then is whether the descendants are still worth caring about, whatever they are. If they are, then it begs the question of how many of them there will be. Barring major global catastrophe, Earth will remain habitable for about one billion more years 2 until the Sun gets too warm and large. The rest of the Solar System, Milky Way galaxy, universe, and (if it exists) the multiverse will remain habitable for a lot longer than that (Adams and Laughlin 1997), should our descendants gain the capacity to migrate there. An open question in astronomy is whether it is possible for the descendants of humanity to continue living for an infinite length of time or instead merely an astronomically large but finite length of time (see e.g. Ćirković 2002; Kaku 2005). Either way, the stakes with global catastrophes could be much larger than the loss of 500 trillion lives. Debates about the infinite vs. the merely astronomical are of theoretical interest (Ng 1991; Bossert et al. 2007), but they have limited practical significance. This can be seen when evaluating GCRs from a standard risk-equals-probability-times-magnitude framework. Using Sagan’s 500 trillion lives estimate, it follows that reducing the probability of global catastrophe by a mere one-in-500-trillion chance is of the same significance as saving one human life. Phrased differently, society should try 500 trillion times harder to prevent a global catastrophe than it should to save a person’s life. Or, preventing one million deaths is equivalent to a one-in500-million reduction in the probability of global catastrophe. This suggests society should make extremely large investment in GCR reduction, at the expense of virtually all other objectives. Judge and legal scholar Richard Posner made a similar point in monetary terms (Posner 2004). Posner used $50,000 as the value of a statistical human life (VSL) and 12 billion humans as the total loss of life (double the 2004 world population); he describes both figures as significant underestimates. Multiplying them gives $600 trillion as an underestimate of the value of preventing global catastrophe. For comparison, the United States government typically uses a VSL of around one to ten million dollars (Robinson 2007). Multiplying a $10 million VSL with 500 trillion lives gives $5x1021 as the value of preventing global catastrophe. But even using “just" $600 trillion, society should be willing to spend at least that much to prevent a global catastrophe, which converts to being willing to spend at least $1 million for a one-in-500-million reduction in the probability of global catastrophe. Thus while reasonable disagreement exists on how large of a VSL to use and how much to count future generations, even low-end positions suggest vast resource allocations should be redirected to reducing GCR. This conclusion is only strengthened when considering the astronomical size of the stakes, but the same point holds either way. The bottom line is that, as long as something along the lines of the standard riskequals-probability-times-magnitude framework is being used, then even tiny GCR reductions merit significant effort. This point holds especially strongly for risks of catastrophes that would cause permanent harm to global human civilization. The discussion thus far has assumed that all human lives are valued equally. This assumption is not universally held. People often value some people more than others, favoring themselves, their family and friends, their compatriots, their generation, or others whom they identify with. Great debates rage on across moral philosophy, economics, and other fields about how much people should value others who are distant in space, time, or social relation, as well as the unborn members of future generations. This debate is crucial for all valuations of risk, including GCR. Indeed, if each of us only cares about our immediate selves, then global catastrophes may not be especially important, and we probably have better things to do with our time than worry about them. While everyone has the right to their own views and feelings, we find that the strongest arguments are for the widely held position that all human lives should be valued equally. This position is succinctly stated in the United States Declaration of Independence, updated in the 1848 Declaration of Sentiments: “We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men and 3 women are created equal”. Philosophers speak of an agent-neutral, objective “view from nowhere” (Nagel 1986) or a “veil of ignorance” (Rawls 1971) in which each person considers what is best for society irrespective of which member of society they happen to be. Such a perspective suggests valuing everyone equally, regardless of who they are or where or when they live. This in turn suggests a very high value for reducing GCR, or a high degree of priority for GCR reduction efforts.

#### Their analytic is too abstracted and conflates a metaphysical constant with discrete events of oppression

Pappas 17 – PhD, Associate Professor of Philosophy at Texas A& M University (Gregory, “The Limitations and Dangers of Decolonial Philosophies: Lessons from Zapatista Luis Villoro,” *Radical Philosophy Review*, DOI: 10.5840/radphilrev201732768) --- ability edited

For decolonialists the sickness that afflicts Latin America is the global hegemony—economic, military, political, and cultural—of the West, first via Europe and then the United States, broadcast under the philosophy of the Enlightenment with Europe carrying the mission. As Vallega explains, “Latin America suffered and continues to suffer under western hegemonic modernity and its system of power and knowledge.”19 Villoro believed that at the turn of the twentieth century one of the modern ideas we inherited that must be questioned is “global explanations” because “general ideologies tend to slip into totalitarianism in our thinking.”20 I think Villoro’s reservations are warranted and can be extended to decolonial thought. Granted, a theory of grand historical evil and systematic sickness in the Americas can have great explanatory power and provide theoretical comfort,21 but where are we standing when we start with such large historical metanarratives? How is it this not a God’s-eye view of history? Is there a danger of slipping back into a form of universalism, which they have explicitly avoided? Isn’t there a danger that when a theory explains so much it becomes nonfalsifiable and therefore nonempirical? In any case, the quest for a comprehensive explanation and a grand historical narrative is also in danger of not capturing the historical and concrete particularity (pluralism, complexity, uniqueness) of actual injustices. When we start at the broad level of globality and history as decolonialists often do, there is a risk of oversimplifying and encouraging blindness [ignorance] about concrete injustices. Consulting recent rigorous research done by historians and social anthropologist about Latin America (more on this later) confirms what many know from simply living there: most injustices in different parts of the Americas are so complex that any simple explanation merits the suspicion of being wishful thinking. To be fair, compared to Marxism the decolonial turn added complexity and made a significant shift. Marxism as a tool was not sensitive enough to the realities on the ground in Latin America. It was a universal model that did not adequately address its particular problems. However, decolonialists do not seem to have abandoned or questioned a similar methodological starting point. As a result, decolonial theories may sometimes be presented with the same pretension of offering a universal diagnosis of the complex and tragic problems of Latin America. Perhaps a more pluralistic and context-sensitive approach could avoid some of the dangers I have presented. Here is where the contrast with Villoro is useful. To be sure, Villoro was critical of the same things as the decolonialists: the Eurocentric narrative, modernity, liberalism, and so on. However, when he takes a reflective historical perspective about these large historical and lumpy categories there is a difference in how he does it. He anchors his account in his local present situation, is very specific about what particular aspects of modernity or liberalism are problematic, and does not have one preferred category of analysis such as coloniality. For most decolonial theorists, however, the legacy of colonialism is central (understood broadly as coloniality), and the situation of the oppressed is to be analyzed in relation to a global narrative in which Europe is at its center or in relation to modernity or a global capitalist system. The decolonial project is centered on detecting plural manifestations of the single evolving domination (a social pathology) that started in 1492. Liberation is understood as decolonization via undoing “the coloniality of power” and affirming what has been “conceal[ed] by the Western modern epistemic hegemony.”22 In contrast, at the center of Villoro’s approach is liberation from domination, and the causes of domination are plural and contextual and therefore too complex to be articulated or framed by a global theory of domination. For Villoro liberation is a local event; one of its tools is to sometimes take a global perspective, and the complexity of the problems on the ground may not be fully captured by even our best academic global historical narratives and categories. He inquired into the history of a systematic injustice in order to facilitate inquiry into the present unique, context-bound injustice. If injustice is an illness then Villoro’s approach takes as its main focus diagnosing and treating the particular present illness, i.e., the particular injustice in a corner of Mexico, and not a global “social pathology” or some single transhistorical source of injustice. As concepts and categories, global hierarchies, white supremacy, and coloniality can be great tools that can have planetary significance. One could even argue that they pick out much-larger areas of people’s lives and injustices than the categories of class and gender. However, in spite of their reach and explanatory theoretical value they are nothing more than tools to make reference to and ameliorate particular injustices experienced (suffered) in the midst of a particular and unique relationship in a situation. Why is this important? In present situations (events) of injustice in the Americas there are not only intersecting histories of white supremacy, capitalist exploitation, and patriarchy; there are also unique events, multiple countries with different complex histories and present circumstances, as well as a variety of responsible agents—local and international governments, corporations, particular individuals and communities. Regardless of how much a theory of global domination that centers on coloniality can actually explain, it is reasonable to worry about what it leaves out and question the extent to which it really helps those who are victims of injustice. A wider net may bring more fish from the ocean, but I am not sure this applies to injustices. Such theories may lead to analysis or diagnosis that while true at some level, may actually have very little to offer in terms of more specific diagnoses and solutions that can be of any help to someone suffering an injustice. However, for Mignolo coloniality is “the underlying logic of the foundation and unfolding of Western civilization from the Renaissance to today”23 Coloniality helps explain how race and gender became the basis of classification in the Americas, but it remains an open question how these categories actually operate in particular countries or even in particular unjust events. We can say all we want that the oppressed live in power structures located in global hierarchies and a world-system, but that does not fully capture where they are. However useful and true that account may be about someone’s particular circumstances, it is still overabstracted. Knowing how people have been classified according to a colonial matrix of power is important, but only insofar as it may help us inquire about the present actual causes of an injustice. Moreover, it is not obvious how the use of a single name and the prism of a single cause helps in trying to ameliorate the particular and context-specific evils from which particular countries and people in Latin America suffer. One could reply that my worries are misplaced. Calling decolonization the cure may suggest that coloniality is some sort of single homogeneous cause, but the decolonialists have distinguished between different types of coloniality and have included in their diagnosis a plurality of causes such as exploitation of resources, political manipulation, and assimilation of people from other cultures. If this is the case then why not address these more particular evils, unless one is really committed to some unitary account in which all of these evils can be reduced to a singular cause?

#### Neurological, racial bias is flexible and determined by coalitional habit forming in the brain---orienting groups around institutional change best breaks down bias. This is offense because their theory rejects these solutions.

Mina Cikara and Jay Van Bavel 15. \*Mina Cikara is an Assistant Professor of Psychology and Director of the Intergroup Neuroscience Lab at Harvard University. Her research examines the conditions under which groups and individuals are denied social value, agency, and empathy. \*Jay Van Bavel is an Assistant Professor of Psychology and Director of the Social Perception and Evaluation Laboratory at New York University. “The Flexibility of Racial Bias” Scientific American. 6-2-15. <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/the-flexibility-of-racial-bias/>

It would be easy to see in all this powerful evidence that racism is a permanent fixture in America’s social fabric and even, perhaps, an inevitable aspect of human nature. Indeed, the mere act of labeling others according to their age, gender, or race is a reflexive habit of the human mind. Social categories, like race, impact our thinking quickly, often outside of our awareness. Extensive research has found that these implicit racial biases—negative thoughts and feelings about people from other races—are automatic, pervasive, and difficult to suppress. Neuroscientists have also explored racial prejudice by exposing people to images of faces while scanning their brains in fMRI machines. Early studies found that when people viewed faces of another race, the amount of activity in the amygdala—a small brain structure associated with experiencing emotions, including fear—was associated with individual differences on implicit measures of racial bias. This work has led many to conclude that racial biases might be part of a primitive—and possibly hard-wired—neural fear response to racial out-groups. There is little question that categories such as race, gender, and age play a major role in shaping the biases and stereotypes that people bring to bear in their judgments of others. However, research has shown that how people categorize themselves may be just as fundamental to understanding prejudice as how they categorize others. When people categorize themselves as part of a group, their self-concept shifts from the individual (“I”) to the collective level (“us”). People form groups rapidly and favor members of their own group even when groups are formed on arbitrary grounds, such as the simple flip of a coin. These findings highlight the remarkable ease with which humans form coalitions. Recent research confirms that coalition-based preferences trump race-based preferences. For example, both Democrats and Republicans favor the resumes of those affiliated with their political party much more than they favor those who share their race. These coalition-based preferences remain powerful even in the absence of the animosity present in electoral politics. Our research has shown that the simple act of placing people on a mixed-race team can diminish their automatic racial bias. In a series of experiments, White participants who were randomly placed on a mixed-race team—the Tigers or Lions—showed little evidence of implicit racial bias. Merely belonging to a mixed-race team trigged positive automatic associations with all of the members of their own group, irrespective of race. Being a part of one of these seemingly trivial mixed-race groups produced similar effects on brain activity—the amygdala responded to team membership rather than race. Taken together, these studies indicate that momentary changes in group membership can override the influence of race on the way we see, think about, and feel toward people who are different from ourselves. Although these coalition-based distinctions might be the most basic building block of bias, they say little about the other factors that cause group conflict. Why do some groups get ignored while others get attacked? Whenever we encounter a new person or group we are motivated to answer two questions as quickly as possible: “is this person a friend or foe?” and “are they capable of enacting their intentions toward me?” In other words, once we have determined that someone is a member of an out-group, we need to determine what kind? The nature of the relations between groups—are we cooperative, competitive, or neither?—and their relative status—do you have access to resources?—largely determine the course of intergroup interactions. Groups that are seen as competitive with one’s interests, and capable of enacting their nasty intentions, are much more likely to be targets of hostility than more benevolent (e.g., elderly) or powerless (e.g., homeless) groups. This is one reason why sports rivalries have such psychological potency. For instance, fans of the Boston Red Sox are more likely to feel pleasure, and exhibit reward-related neural responses, at the misfortunes of the archrival New York Yankees than other baseball teams (and vice versa)—especially in the midst of a tight playoff race. (How much fans take pleasure in the misfortunes of their rivals is also linked to how likely they would be to harm fans from the other team.) Just as a particular person’s group membership can be flexible, so too are the relations between groups. Groups that have previously had cordial relations may become rivals (and vice versa). Indeed, psychological and biological responses to out-group members can change, depending on whether or not that out-group is perceived as threatening. For example, people exhibit greater pleasure—they smile—in response to the misfortunes of stereotypically competitive groups (e.g., investment bankers); however, this malicious pleasure is reduced when you provide participants with counter-stereotypic information (e.g., “investment bankers are working with small companies to help them weather the economic downturn). Competition between “us” and “them” can even distort our judgments of distance, making threatening out-groups seem much closer than they really are. These distorted perceptions can serve to amplify intergroup discrimination: the more different and distant “they” are, the easier it is to disrespect and harm them. Thus, not all out-groups are treated the same: some elicit indifference whereas others become targets of antipathy. Stereotypically threatening groups are especially likely to be targeted with violence, but those stereotypes can be tempered with other information. If perceptions of intergroup relations can be changed, individuals may overcome hostility toward perceived foes and become more responsive to one another’s grievances. The flexible nature of both group membership and intergroup relations offers reason to be cautiously optimistic about the potential for greater cooperation among groups in conflict (be they black versus white or citizens versus police). One strategy is to bring multiple groups together around a common goal. For example, during the fiercely contested 2008 Democratic presidential primary process, Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama supporters gave more money to strangers who supported the same primary candidate (compared to the rival candidate). Two months later, after the Democratic National Convention, the supporters of both candidates coalesced around the party nominee—Barack Obama—and this bias disappeared. In fact, merely creating a sense of cohesion between two competitive groups can increase empathy for the suffering of our rivals. These sorts of strategies can help reduce aggression toward hostile out-groups, which is critical for creating more opportunities for constructive dialogue addressing greater social injustices. Of course, instilling a sense of common identity and cooperation is extremely difficult in entrenched intergroup conflicts, but when it happens, the benefits are obvious. Consider how the community leaders in New York City and Ferguson responded differently to protests against police brutality—in NYC political leaders expressed grief and concern over police brutality and moved quickly to make policy changes in policing, whereas the leaders and police in Ferguson responded with high-tech military vehicles and riot gear. In the first case, multiple groups came together with a common goal—to increase the safety of everyone in the community; in the latter case, the actions of the police likely reinforced the “us” and “them” distinctions. Tragically, these types of conflicts continue to roil the country. Understanding the psychology and neuroscience of social identity and intergroup relations cannot undo the effects of systemic racism and discriminatory practices; however, it can offer insights into the psychological processes responsible for escalating the tension between, for example, civilians and police officers. Even in cases where it isn’t possible to create a common identity among groups in conflict, it may be possible to blur the boundaries between groups. In one recent experiment, we sorted participants into groups—red versus blue team—competing for a cash prize. Half of the participants were randomly assigned to see a picture of a segregated social network of all the players, in which red dots clustered together, blue dots clustered together, and the two clusters were separated by white space. The other half of the participants saw an integrated social network in which the red and blue dots were mixed together in one large cluster. Participants who thought the two teams were interconnected with one another reported greater empathy for the out-group players compared to those who had seen the segregated network. Thus, reminding people that individuals could be connected to one another despite being from different groups may be another way to build trust and understanding among them. A mere month before Freddie Gray died in police custody, President Obama addressed the nation on the 50th anniversary of Bloody Sunday in Selma: “We do a disservice to the cause of justice by intimating that bias and discrimination are immutable, or that racial division is inherent to America. To deny…progress – our progress – would be to rob us of our own agency; our responsibility to do what we can to make America better." The president was saying that we, as a society, have a responsibility to reduce prejudice and discrimination. These recent findings from psychology and neuroscience indicate that we, as individuals, possess this capacity. Of course this capacity is not sufficient to usher in racial equality or peace. Even when the level of prejudice against particular out-groups decreases, it does not imply that the level of institutional discrimination against these or other groups will necessarily improve. Ultimately, only collective action and institutional evolution can address systemic racism. The science is clear on one thing, though: individual bias and discrimination are changeable. Race-based prejudice and discrimination, in particular, are created and reinforced by many social factors, but they are not inevitable consequences of our biology. Perhaps understanding how coalitional thinking impacts intergroup relations will make it easier for us to affect real social change going forward.

#### Industrial ag is sustainable

Ted Nordhaus & Dan Blaustein-Rejto 21. \*Founder and executive director of the Breakthrough Institute. \*\*Director of food and agriculture at the Breakthrough Institute. “Big Agriculture Is Best”. Foreign Policy. 4-18-2021. <https://foreignpolicy.com/2021/04/18/big-agriculture-is-best/>

Moreover, organic farms, large and small, don’t actually outperform large conventional farms by many important environmental measures. Scale, technology, and productivity make good environmental sense and economic sense. Because organic farming requires more land for every calorie or pound produced, a large-scale shift to organic farming would entail converting more forest and other land to farming, resulting in greater habitat loss and more greenhouse gas emissions. And while organic farming doesn’t use synthetic pesticides or fertilizers, it often results in greater nitrogen pollution because manure is a highly inefficient way to deliver nutrients to crops.

Another benefit of large-scale U.S. farms is that because they are so efficient, economically and environmentally, they are also able to produce vastly more food than Americans can consume, making the country the world’s largest agricultural exporter as well.

That benefits the U.S. economy, of course, but it also comes with an environmental benefit for the world. In the contemporary environmental imagination, highly productive, globally traded agriculture is a bad thing—poisoning the land at home and undermining food sovereignty abroad. But in reality, a pound of grain or beef exported from the United States almost always displaces a pound that would have been produced with more land and greenhouse gas emissions somewhere else.

#### No impact to bio-d loss

Kareiva 12 (Peter Kareiva et. al, – Chief Scientist and Vice President of the Nature Conservancy, Michelle Marvier, Robert Lalasz, “Conservation in the Anthropocene Beyond Solitude and Fragility”, The Breakthrough, http://thebreakthrough.org/index.php/journal/past-issues/issue-2/conservation-in-the-anthropocene/)

2.

As conservation became a global enterprise in the 1970s and 1980s, the movement's justification for saving nature shifted from spiritual and aesthetic values to focus on biodiversity. Nature was described as primeval, fragile, and at risk of collapse from too much human use and abuse. And indeed, there are consequences when humans convert landscapes for mining, logging, intensive agriculture, and urban development and when key species or ecosystems are lost.

But ecologists and conservationists have grossly overstated the fragility of nature, frequently arguing that once an ecosystem is altered, it is gone forever. Some ecologists suggest that if a single species is lost, a whole ecosystem will be in danger of collapse, and that if too much biodiversity is lost, spaceship Earth will start to come apart. Everything, from the expansion of agriculture to rainforest destruction to changing waterways, has been painted as a threat to the delicate inner-workings of our planetary ecosystem.

The fragility trope dates back, at least, to Rachel Carson, who wrote plaintively in Silent Spring of the delicate web of life and warned that perturbing the intricate balance of nature could have disastrous consequences.22 Al Gore made a similar argument in his 1992 book, Earth in the Balance.23 And the 2005 Millennium Ecosystem Assessment warned darkly that, while the expansion of agriculture and other forms of development have been overwhelmingly positive for the world's poor, ecosystem degradation was simultaneously putting systems in jeopardy of collapse.24

The trouble for conservation is that the data simply do not support the idea of a fragile nature at risk of collapse. Ecologists now know that the disappearance of one species **does not** necessarily lead to the extinction of any others, much less all others in the same ecosystem. In many circumstances, the demise of formerly abundant species can be inconsequential to ecosystem function. The American chestnut, once a dominant tree in eastern North America, has been extinguished by a foreign disease, yet the forest ecosystem is surprisingly unaffected. The passenger pigeon, once so abundant that its flocks darkened the sky, went extinct, along with countless other species from the Steller's sea cow to the dodo, with no catastrophic or even measurable effects.

These stories of resilience are not isolated examples -- a thorough review of the scientific literature identified 240 studies of ecosystems following major disturbances such as deforestation, mining, oil spills, and other types  of pollution. The abundance of plant and animal species as well as other measures of ecosystem function recovered, at least partially, in 173 (72 percent) of these studies.25

While global forest cover is continuing to decline, it is rising in the Northern Hemisphere, where "nature" is returning to former agricultural lands.26 Something similar is likely to occur in the Southern Hemisphere, after poor countries achieve a similar level of economic development. A 2010 report concluded that rainforests that have grown back over abandoned agricultural land had 40 to 70 percent of the species of the original forests.27 Even Indonesian orangutans, which were widely thought to be able to survive only in pristine forests, have been found in surprising numbers in oil palm plantations and degraded lands.28

Nature is so resilient that it can recover rapidly from even the most powerful human disturbances. Around the Chernobyl nuclear facility, which melted down in 1986, wildlife is thriving, despite the high levels of radiation.29 In the Bikini Atoll, the site of multiple nuclear bomb tests, including the 1954 hydrogen bomb test that boiled the water in the area, the number of coral species has actually increased relative to before the explosions.30 More recently, the massive 2010 oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico was degraded and consumed by bacteria at a remarkably fast rate.31

Today, coyotes roam downtown Chicago, and peregrine falcons astonish San Franciscans as they sweep down skyscraper canyons to pick off pigeons for their next meal. As we destroy habitats, we create new ones: in the southwestern United States a rare and federally listed salamander species seems specialized to live in cattle tanks -- to date, it has been found in no other habitat.32 Books have been written about the collapse of cod in the Georges Bank, yet recent trawl data show the biomass of cod has recovered to precollapse levels.33 It's doubtful that books will be written about this cod recovery since it does not play well  to an audience somehow addicted to stories of collapse and environmental apocalypse.

Even that classic symbol of fragility -- the polar bear, seemingly stranded on a melting ice block -- may have a good chance of surviving global warming if the changing environment continues to increase the populations and northern ranges of harbor seals and harp seals. Polar bears evolved from brown bears 200,000 years ago during a cooling period in Earth's history, developing a highly specialized carnivorous diet focused on seals. Thus, the fate of polar bears depends on two opposing trends -- the decline of sea ice and the potential increase of energy-rich prey. The history of life on Earth is of species evolving to take advantage of new environments only to be at risk when the environment changes again.

The wilderness ideal presupposes that there are parts of the world untouched by humankind, but today it is impossible to find a place on Earth that is unmarked by human activity. The truth is humans have been impacting their natural environment for centuries. The wilderness so beloved by conservationists -- places "untrammeled by man"34 -- never existed, at least not in the last thousand years, and arguably even longer.

#### Dalley a critique of settler fiction literature that uses extinction to describe the loss of the settlers dominance over colonized communities. It *does not* indict the *validity of our scenarios*, nor means that we should not take our impacts into consideration.

Dalley, Assistant Professor of English. B.A. University of Otago, 2016

Hamish “The deaths of settler colonialism: extinction as a metaphor of decolonization in contemporary settler literature” https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2016.1238160

I explore this question with reference to examples of contemporary literary treatments of extinction from select English-speaking settler-colonial contexts: South Africa, Australia, and Canada.15 The next section of this article traces key elements of extinction narrative in a range of settler-colonial texts, while the section that follows offers a detailed reading of one of the best examples of a sustained literary exploration of human finitude, Margaret Atwood’s Maddaddam trilogy (2003–2013). I advance four specific arguments. First, extinc- tion narratives take at least two forms depending on whether the ‘end’ of settler society is framed primarily in historical-civilizational terms or in a stronger, biological sense; the key question is whether the ‘thing’ that is going extinct is a society or a species. Second, bio- logically oriented extinction narratives rely on a more or less conscious slippage between ‘the settler’ and ‘the human’. Third, this slippage is ideologically ambivalent: on the one hand, it contains a radical charge that invokes environmentalist discourse and climate-change anxiety to imagine social forms that re-write settler-colonial dynamics; on the other, it replicates a core aspect of imperialist ideology by normalizing whiteness as equivalent to humanity. Fourth, these ideological effects are mediated by gender, insofar as extinction narratives invoke issues of biological reproduction, community protection, and violence that function to differentiate and reify masculine and feminine roles in the puta- tive de-colonial future. Overall, my central claim is that extinction is a core trope through which settler futurity emerges, one with crucial narrative and ideological effects that shape much of the contemporary literature emerging from white colonial settings. The forms of extinction narrative: historical-civilizational vs. biological annihilation Settler-colonial extinction narratives take two broad forms, depending on whether the end they depict is framed in historical-civilizational or biological terms (though the two overlap). The latter type is my primary focus in this article, but I will first briefly consider the former to provide contrast for the biologically inflected narrative. Historical-civiliza- tional visions of the end of settler colonialism invoke classical notions of the rise and fall of societies, plotting the white world’s development within a cyclical temporality that makes inevitable its eventual demise. Such narratives challenge the faith in progress found in stadial theories of development (such as those promulgated by Scottish Enlight- enment figures like Adam Ferguson16) and draw instead on parallels between the fate of modern and classical empires. Gibbon’s History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire becomes a model not only of the past, but also the future. The passage from Schreiner’s African Farm cited above belongs within this tradition, offering a vision of an empty, indif- ferent land (‘the stones will lie on’) populated by waves of humans (the ‘yellow face[d]’ Bushmen; the Boers; the English), each of which gives way to the other until a future in which none are left. J.M. Coetzee’s Waiting for the Barbarians (1980), published at the height of the struggle against white domination in South Africa, makes this narrative even more explicit. With a title drawn from the neo-classicist poet C.P. Cafavy that invokes the late-Roman parallel,17 Coetzee allegorizes apartheid South Africa as ‘the Empire’, a dying institution that can neither protect its own borders from ‘barbarian’ encroachment nor maintain the veneer of ideological consistency that would justify its violence. As the novel’s protagonist, the Magistrate, contemplates his society’s demise, he comes to realise how the problem of ends is intrinsic to the temporality of settler colonialism: What has made it impossible for us to live in time like fish in water, like birds in air, like chil- dren? It is the fault of Empire! Empire has created the time of history. Empire has located its existence not in the smooth recurrent spinning time of the cycle of the seasons but in the jagged time of rise and fall, of beginning and end, of catastrophe. Empire dooms itself to live in history and plot against history. One thought alone preoccupies the submerged mind of Empire: how not to end, how not to die, how to prolong its era.18 Within this temporality, the future can be glimpsed in the past, as a repetition of previous cycles of destruction and supersession, more or less deferred. The Magistrate thus finds evidence for his fate in archaeology, when he uncovers remnants of a lost civilization that both predates his own and portends its future: ‘Perhaps ten feet below the floor lie the ruins of another fort, razed by the barbarians, peopled with the bones of folk who thought they would find safety behind high walls.’19 As this example implies, historical-civilizational extinction narratives express ambiva- lence about endings that emerges from their affective register. Extinction becomes a fate to be contemplated with fear, but also resignation; because the future is a recapitula- tion of the past, the tone is elegiac rather than apocalyptic, and death becomes a matter of nostalgia more than terror. In Nadine Gordimer’s July’s People (1981), the white family that flees the collapse of apartheid understands its journey into black-dominated rural South Africa as a repeat of the interminable pattern of African history: they follow one of ‘hun- dreds of tracks used since ancient migrations (never ended; her family’s was the latest)’.20 This return to primordial nomadism thrusts Gordimer’s characters into circum- stances of material and agential deprivation, returning them to a condition preceding their accession to racial privilege. They must give up not only the physical comforts accorded by apartheid, but also the capacity to make meaningful decisions about their fate – decisions now made by their erstwhile black servant-turned-protector. This inversion allows the white protagonist Maureen to approach an understanding of how apartheid might have been experienced by its victims; she achieves some insight when she realizes that the historical rupture means she is no longer ‘in possession of any part of her life’.21 From this point of view, the overthrow of settler colonialism becomes an opportunity for settlers’ moral regeneration and subjective transformation. Since history is cyclical, the guilt and inauthenticity generated by settler colonialism becomes incidental to whiteness – once the structures that enshrined his or her control are destroyed, the settler is liberated into a no longer ethically compromised identity. Thus even as Coetzee’s Magistrate finds it ‘as hard as ever to believe that the end is near’,22 he also relishes with ‘elation’ the idea that, were he no longer part of the apparatus of empire, he would be a ‘free man’ who had attained ‘salvation’.23 Historical-civilizational narratives of extinction thereby literally enact what Tuck and Yang call a ‘move to innocence’. By looking beyond the end of settler colonialism, they imagine futures in which ‘settler guilt and complicity’ will be washed away, and the settler him- or herself will metamorphose into a liberated subjectivity.24 Many settler-colonial narratives operate purely within this historical-civilizational regis- ter. However, extinction becomes truly interesting when the metaphor’s biological impli- cations are unlocked. Hints of this can be found in Waiting for the Barbarians. While the Magistrate sees the overthrow of empire as an inevitable expression of the cyclical nature of history, he also finds society’s fate written in local ecology. The ‘barbarians’ are materially impoverished but live lightly on the land; the settlers’ wealth, by contrast, is predicated on an agriculture that is unsustainable in the long term: Every year the lake-water becomes a little more salty. [...] The barbarians know this fact. At this very moment they are saying to themselves, ‘Be patient, one of these days their crops will start withering from the salt, they will not be able to feed themselves, they will have to go.’ That is what they are thinking. That they will outlast us.25 Thus the historical-civilizational pattern of rise and fall – which amounts to a theory of world history that explains and to some extent exonerates settler colonialism – is reinforced by an environmental narrative of decay. The settlers will lose, eventually, because their mode of production is at odds with nature: a fact that violence can delay but never alter. An even more explicit example of such thinking can be found in Alex Miller’s Journey to the Stone Country (2002), a novel that explores the fate of settler colonialism in contemporary Australia. The story begins when the protagonist, Annabelle, is left by her husband and returns from Melbourne to her place of birth, near Townsville in Northern Queensland. Unlike the cosmopolitan metropolis, here Annabelle finds Australia’s settler-colonial dynamics intrusively apparent: ‘Here the past could not be ignored, was not covered over and obscured by the accretions of city life, but was laid bare, the open wounds still visible.’26 The land itself reveals these signs, marks made by the Indigen- ous Australians who are ‘a scattered population [that] had been dispersed and murdered long ago’.27 That visibility forces Annabelle to confront her identity as a settler, one whose existence is predicted on dispossession and for whom it would therefore be legitimate ‘to be hated [... f]or what we’ve stolen from them’.28 In confronting the truth of frontier gen- ocide, Annabelle has to consider the possibility of an end to settler dominion, for she has arrived at a moment when the Indigenous population is resurgent. The change in power relations is represented through a struggle for control of Ranna Station, a pastoral estate owned for five generations by the Biggs family – archetypal colonial settlers committed to the idea of themselves as builders of white civilization – but which has recently been bought by a consortium of Aboriginal groups. In other words, Annabelle is witnessing a historical reversal, the moment at which settler power is broken and control of the land reverts to its Indigenous inhabitants.Miller frames this ‘unimaginable revolution’ in ‘the great wheel of history’29 within the language of biological extinction, inverting its typical application to a presumed Aboriginal past by making it a prophecy of the settlers’ future. Thus Bo Rennie, an Aboriginal surveyor who becomes Annabelle’s lover, gleefully repurposes the language of settler triumph to describe the Biggs clan as having ‘died out’ – ‘Them Biggs turned out to be a vanishing race’, he observes on several occasions.30 The Aboriginal leader Les Marra is even more ambitious. His plan is to dam the valley and flood Ranna Station, obliterating all traces of settler presence and, in so doing, creating an exploitable water resource to fund future projects of Aboriginal enhancement. Marra’s goal is a ‘thousand year plan’ of anti- colonial resistance predicated on the belief that all Aboriginal people have to do to defeat the settlers is to wait for them to die out: This story’s not over yet. The old people not finished yet! That Les Marra and my Arner here, they gonna fight this war for another thousand years. Where’s the white feller gonna be in a thousand years? He’s the one gotta worry about that, not us. We still gonna be here.31 The thousand-year plan (with its ironic invocation of Hitler’s millennium of Aryan supremacy) frames settler colonialism within the radically extended temporality of ecological survival. From this perspective, the material aspects of settler domination are of little importance when compared to the enduring nature of biological life – to which Aboriginal people, by virtue of their 50,000 plus years of residence in Australia, are presumed to be better adapted. This ‘biological’ view of inevitable white extinction forces Annabelle to confront, for the first time, the full implications of the end of settler colonialism: She knew, with a little shock of dismay, with a feeling of personal affront, that Les Marra’s vision of the future would never be reconciled to her existence or to the decency of her own past, the lives of her parents and grandparents. Her existence, indeed, was of no conse- quence to him. There could be no place for her, or for her kind, in the victory he envisaged. Secretly she hoped Les Marra’s crusade would fail, but she knew it would not fail. For Les Marra had only to persist. He had forever. There was no time limit to his strategy.32 The trope of extinction thereby challenges the liberal belief in ‘reconciliation’ as a way out of the structural conflict between settlers and Aborigines.33 Annabelle is in many ways a model settler: she is normatively antiracist, respectful of Aboriginal ways, and self-aware about how she has benefitted from colonialism. But the biological connotations of extinc- tion render such moral-affective qualities irrelevant. The narrative Miller sets in motion frames settler colonialism as an unequal social relationship taking place over the longue durée, within a material, ecologically defined context. From this point of view, individual settlers’ desires and beliefs mean nothing; what matters is that settler colonialism is doomed to fail because it is not attuned to nature.
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#### 2. ‘Prohibitions’ must be legislative enactments

Benjamin Hill 7, Judge on the Georgia Appeals Court, “Rose v. State”, Court of Appeals of Georgia, 1 Ga. App. 596, 601-602, 58 S.E. 20, 22-23, 1907 Ga. App. LEXIS 47, 4/11/1907

The words "otherwise prohibited," relied on by the State, really mean nothing in this statute. When the legislature used the words "prohibited by law," it exhausted the subject, and the addition of the words "high license or [\*\*\*11] otherwise" was "wasteful and ridiculous excess." These general words are sometimes added to specific enumeration in statutes out of abundance of caution, but they usually mean nothing. Certainly such words must be "restricted to the same genus as the things enumerated," and the use of the word "otherwise," following the words "prohibited by law," meant that the "otherwise" prohibition of the sale of liquor was to be a legal prohibition, that is, prohibited by the law of high license, or otherwise prohibited by law. But we do not think this general word means anything in this statute. Whatever it was intended to mean, it could not by any rule of logic give to the failure of the commissioners to grant licenses the force and effect of a positive enactment prohibiting the sale. The word "prohibit" is an active, transitive verb. As defined by the Standard Dictionary, it means "to forbid, especially by authority or legal enactment; interdict; as, to prohibit liquor-selling, or a person from selling liquor." The word "prohibit," [\*\*23] in its legal sense, implies some legislative enactment forbidding something. "The laws of England, from the early Plantagenets, sternly prohibited the [\*\*\*12] conversion of malt into alcohol." "Prohibition," in the United States, specifically means "the forbidding [\*602] by legislative enactment of the manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquors for use as beverage." Giving, therefore, to the word "prohibited" its ordinary signification and its technical meaning, as applied to the particular subject-matter of the sale of spirituous liquors, it must involve some positive act done by authority.

#### 3. AND “the scope of antitrust law” is not governed by court action

**Utah Law Review, 63** (Utah Law Review, Leading law review for the university of Utah, 1963, accessed on 7-20-2021, Utah Law Review, "CASES NOTED" “GOVERNMENT CONTEMPT ORDER PROVIDES POSSIBLE PRIMA FACIE CASEFOR PRIVATE ANTITRUST ACTION", https://collections.lib.utah.edu/dl\_files/e6/34/e6346be7b172efa1c6d32d6e15d4f5094339c121.pdf)//Babcii

It does not, however, necessarily follow that the same is true for the purposes of a private litigant. It must be recognized that the private litigant's rights exist only by virtue of section 5. The term "antitrust laws" has been narrowly construed to **include only** the **statutory provisions** of the Sherman and Clayton Acts **and to exclude other** statutes which apply **broad antitrust policies** to specific segments of business. 22 If this interpretation be accepted, it is arguable that the term "antitrust laws" as used in section 5 excludes antitrust decrees on which the contempt violation was based. 23 Further, the statutory language here involved, "a final **judgment or decree** . . . rendered . . . under the antitrust laws to the effect that a defendant has violated said laws . . ." does not bear out the interpretation given the section by the instant court. From the literal language of the section it would appear that the complaint in the instant case was based upon a criminal contempt citation brought for violation of a court order and not for violation of the antitrust laws. In a similar case, another Federal District Court stated that "**the term 'antitrust laws' could not be construed as** pertaining to a judgment or decree entered by **a court** in connection with an antitrust case." 24

#### 4. AND Resolved implies a legislative instrument

LA House 5 (Lousiana House of Representatives, <http://house.louisiana.gov/house-glossary.htm>)

Resolution A legislative instrument that generally is used for making declarations, stating policies, and making decisions where some other form is not required. A bill includes the constitutionally required enacting clause; a resolution uses the term "resolved". Not subject to a time limit for introduction nor to governor's veto. ( Const. Art. III, §17(B) and House  Rules 8.11 , 13.1 , 6.8 , and 7.4)

### 2NC --- AT: by atleast

#### 2. By at least implies that the plan must expand law so as to increase prohibitions, not that all expansions of law *a priori* qualify as increased prohibitions

William H. Hanson, “The Formal-Structural View of Logical Consequence: A Reply to Gila Sher”The Philosophical Review , Apr., 2002, Vol. 111, No. 2 (Apr., 2002), pp. 243-258, Duke University Press on behalf of Philosophical Review

3. Logic, the A Priori, and the Empirical

The other major criticism I made in my 1997 of Sher's work was that FS violates the apriority criterion of my pretheoretic account of logical consequence. This is because under FS there are arguments we can know to be valid or invalid a posteriori but not a priori. As an example I gave an argument involving the quantifier 'Q\*', which I defined as behaving exactly like 'all' in models with domains of cardinality > n, but like 'at least one' in models with domains of cardinality < n, where the value of n is an integer we can know a posteriori but not a priori. (In my example n is the least number of whole seconds in which, up through the end of the twenty-first century, a human runs a mile.)9 The argument in question is:

(Q\*x) (Dog(x) → Black(x))

(Q\*x) Dog(x)

∴ (Q\*x) Black(x)

Since we know that n > 3, we know the argument is invalid, but we can't know this a priori. Yet 'Q\*' counts as a logical term according to FS, so FS violates my apriority criterion.10 [\*\*start footnote 10\*\* 10 That the operator expressed by 'Q\*' satisfies Sher's criterion for formal operators can be seen by consulting the account given in section 1 of how that criterion applies to unary quantifiers. Specifically, since for any two models with domains of the same car- dinality the operator expressed by 'Q\*' functions either as the operator expressed by 'all' in both models or as the operator expressed by 'at least one' in both, the operator expressed by 'Q\*' is formal for the same reasons these other two operator.\*\*end footnote 10\*\*]

This violation should be of concern to Sher, since my criterion is drawn directly from Tarski, whose work is in many ways the foundation of hers. Tarski wrote:

Certain considerations of an intuitive nature will form our starting-point. Consider any class K of sentences and a sentence X which follows from the sentences of this class. From an intuitive standpoint it can never happen that both the class K consists only of true sentences and the sentence X is false. Moreover, since we are concerned here with the concept of logical, i.e., formal, consequence, and thus with a relation which is to be uniquely determined by the form of the sentences between which it holds, this rela- tion cannot be influenced in any way by empirical knowledge, and in par- ticular by knowledge of the objects to which the sentence X or the sentences of the class K refer. The consequence relation cannot be affected by replacing the designations of the objects referred to in these sentences by the designations of any other objects. (1936, 414-15)

In formulating my apriority criterion, I was influenced by this passage, especially by the last part of the penultimate sentence: "[the logical consequence] relation cannot be influenced in any way by empirical knowledge, and in particular by knowledge of the objects to which the sen- tence Xor the sentences of the class Krefer" (emphasis added). This is, of course, somewhat obscure. Still it sounds compatible with, and I think even suggests, the standard I adopted, namely, that knowledge of whether the logical consequence relation holds in any particular case is knowledge that can be had a priori, if at all. Logic has long been held to be free, in some fundamental way, of all things empirical, and I believe many logicians have thought that logic achieves this freedom by meeting this (or a similar) standard.

## Multilat CP

### 2NC --- O/V (WIP)

#### Only harmonized transnational antitrust solves the case---compliance and competition require streamlining the regulatory drag of conflicting legal systems, but the plan’s ad hoc unilateralism proliferates it

Camilla Jain Holtse 20, Associate General Counsel in Maersk Line, LL.M in European Law from King’s College, Master’s Degree from University of Aarhus, “Navigating Through Uncertain Waters—The Importance of Legal Certainty, Predictability, and Transparency in Future Antitrust Enforcement”, Journal of European Competition Law & Practice, Volume 11, Issue 8, October 2020, p. 446-447

I. Global developments suggest increased need for legal certainty in rulemaking and enforcement

Companies today operate in an increasingly globalised world, interconnected via digital platforms and ecosystems. The technological revolution is accelerating at an ever-increasing speed. It promises to fundamentally alter both the competitive landscape and the tools by which competition is regulated. Against this backdrop, the world is facing substantial environmental challenges with mounting pressure on businesses to change the way they operate, including an increasing need for firms to collaborate to achieve social goals and increased efficiency that no one firm could achieve independently.

While some progress has been made towards a unified view of competition law, companies are also facing rising geopolitical tensions that have led to protectionist measures and the pursuit of industrial policy objectives under the guise of competition law enforcement. Concepts including national security, full employment, and ‘fair’ or ‘level’ pricing frequently introduce domestic protection concerns into traditional economic tests. With the proliferation of competition regimes, now well over 100, the potential for regulatory drag on the global markets increases exponentially. Having spent the last two decades as competition counsel, I can say with certainty that the complexity of the legal landscape and uncertainty and unpredictability as to compliance with competition law regulations have increased dramatically in recent years both at a global and EU level. Companies are struggling to achieve legal competition law compliance despite consistent efforts including scaling up their compliance departments.

As our markets continue to evolve in the face of technology and sustainability and other social goals, it is now more important than ever for the European Commission (‘the Commission’) to ensure legal certainty, both in rulemaking and in enforcement. The costs associated with uncertainty should not be underestimated, particularly as the Commission considers new enforcement tools designed to address competition structures and practices that may fall outside of traditional economic analyses. Not only is transparency and predictability vital for the proper functioning of the European Economic Area, but it would also send a much-needed signal to the rest of the world. Conversely, if, in any new enforcement system transparency and predictability do not prevail, the Commission’s efforts would likely serve to indirectly legitimise non-transparent and unpredictable protectionist systems in other countries, not founded on the rule of law and due process.

Even if one of the key roles of the Commission is to enforce competition law, it is important to keep in mind that competition policy and enforcement are tools of economic policy. Implemented well, competition policy can stimulate economic growth and competitiveness but, if not, it can be a significant regulatory brake on investment, economic development, and sustainability advances.

### 2NC --- AT: PDB

#### Each action must be interlinked and conditional---otherwise, it’ll collapse

Dr. Daniel Francis 21, Climenko Fellow and Lecturer on Law at Harvard Law School, Doctorate from the NYU School of Law, Master of Laws Degree from Harvard University, JD from Trinity College at Cambridge University, “Choices and Consequences: Internationalizing Competition Policy after TPP”, in Megaregulation Contested: The Global Economic Order After TPP, Ed. Kingsbury, Revised 8/26/2021, p. 40-48

A “framework” in the sense that I am using that term is a facilitative arrangement that does not constitute a treaty under international law,167 and which does not carry the charge of international legal obligation, but which involves an exchange of specific and reciprocally contingent commitments by participant jurisdictions to engage in mutually beneficial conduct. Specifically, each party states that it will extend certain benefits to each other party so long as each other does likewise; the parties may also create supplementary mechanisms to monitor and/or adjudicate compliance with these commitments.168

[FOOTNOTE] 168 It is almost universally appreciated that reciprocal behavior plays a crucial rule in compliance with international law more generally. See, e.g., Andrew T. Guzman, HOW INTERNATIONAL LAW WORKS: A RATIONAL CHOICE THEORY (Oxford 2008) 42 (“Reciprocity can serve as a powerful compliance-enhancing tool in the right circumstances.”). [END FOOTNOTE]

A framework of this kind is not a treaty: it is what Kal Raustiala calls a “pledge,”169 and what Charles Lipson calls an “informal” agreement,170 involving no legal obligation, and it involves no commitment of the parties’ reputation for law-abiding behavior.171 On the other hand, it differs from an open, information-sharing network because it precisely specifies behavioral commitments, and because each of the parties shares an understanding that concrete consequences will promptly follow—exclusion from the benefits provided by others—if its behavior materially deviates from the terms of the commitment.172 A framework is therefore essentially a specific declaration of intention to engage in conduct that benefits others, contingent upon parallel behavior by other participating states, without obligatory status under international law.

This is, in some sense, the direct opposite of the approach typically taken in competition policy chapters in trade agreements. The provisions of competition policy chapters partake of the substance of treaty law, but are generally framed in broad terms rather than specifics, and generally do not reflect a shared understanding that specific consequences will attend breach. By contrast, frameworks do not bind in international law, are framed in specific terms than aspirational generalities, and reflect an understanding that the benefits of cooperation will be withdrawn in the event of violation.

Contingent cooperation thus depends for its effectiveness primarily upon three important dynamics. The first and most important of these is the rationality of strategic cooperation. A familiar mainstream view holds that to a significant extent states behave in international society in ways that rationally serve their interests.173 And when cooperation over a series of interactions is overall in the interests of each member of a group, but when each member faces a rational incentive to defect from the terms of cooperation in individual cases, familiar economic theory teaches that a strategic cooperative equilibrium can be maintained among the parties.174 In contingent cooperation, each party understands that if it defects materially from the terms of the framework, the other participants will withdraw the excludable benefits of cooperation, and this provides the incentive to comply.175

#### Including the plan shreds U.S. leverage

Dr. Rachel Brewster 6, Bigelow Fellow & Lecturer in Law at the University of Chicago Law School, BA and JD from the University of Virginia, PhD in Political Science from the University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill, Received the John Patrick Hagan Award for Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching, Former Assistant Professor of Law and Affiliate Faculty Member of The Weatherhead Center for International Affairs at Harvard University, “Rule-Based Dispute Resolution in International Trade Law”, Virginia Law Review, Volume 92, 92 Va. L. Rev. 251, April 2006, p. 281-282

Congress can always eliminate the President's agenda-setting power by engaging in unilateral trade policies. The Constitution allocates to Congress the power to set international commercial policy. The President only has significant trade-policy power (beyond his veto power) because the United States has chosen to engage in multilateral trade negotiations. 84 If Congress wished to undertake unilateral free trade policies, then the President's bargaining leverage would be reduced to threatening a veto, the same as in the realm of domestic legislation. Congress is unlikely to take such steps, however, because reciprocal agreements are valuable political commodities. 85 International agreements offer domestic exporters greater access to foreign markets, which could be lost if Congress were to pursue the unilateral route.

### 2NC --- AT: PDCP

#### 1 --- The CP fiats an opt-in framework --- Solvency is a follow-on argument, not a reason it doesn’t compete --- Competition is based on mandate, not outcome, otherwise no CP is competitive cause any action could lead to the aff

Jamie Wood 13, Avatel EVP, “The Butterfly Effect – What a Fascinating Theory!”, 6-10, https://avatel.wordpress.com/2013/06/10/the-butterfly-effect-what-a-fascinating-theory/

Every action or decision has some kind of effect on something or someone, if only in an indirect way. How we approach these decisions or actions we take can have a huge impact, not just on those directly involved, but on others we could hardly fathom would be affected. You never know what little action may be the tipping point for another action and or reaction. butterfly effect When you hear the words “The Butterfly Effect”, most of you will probably think of the movie. That was about the chaos theory, meaning one series of events leads to another and the effect of changing the course of those events. Actually the term “The Butterfly Effect”, was a phenomenon proposed in a doctoral thesis written in 1963 by Edward Lorenz. It states that a butterfly, by flapping its wings in one place and time is able to create a major weather event in another place and time, eventually having a far-reaching ripple effect on subsequent events. The butterfly effect suggests that cause and effect are applicable in the universe even if the pattern is indecipherable and the precise cause of our predicaments, rooted far away in time and space, are ultimately unfathomable. More than just an esoteric science, the chaos theory works off the concept that the relation between any two things is rarely linear in nature, that any reaction is usually the result of an accumulation of causative factors small and large, intentional and accidental.

#### 2 --- Ownership --- ‘its’ means laws expanded must ‘belong to’ the US.

Oxford Dictionary—(English language dictionary). “Its”. <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/us/definition/american_english/its>. Accessed 9/3/21.

POSSESSIVE DETERMINER

1 Belonging to or associated with a thing previously mentioned or easily identified.

‘turn the camera on its side’

1.1 Belonging to or associated with a child or animal of unspecified sex.

‘a baby in its mother's womb’

#### ‘Antitrust law’ is U.S. domestic policy

Sean Murray 17, JD and Stein Scholar at the Fordham University School of Law, BA in Economics and Political Science from Vassar College, Associate at Case & White LLP, Research Assistant at the Fordham Competition Law Institute, Former Intern with the Federal Trade Commission, Former Intern with the U.S. Department of Justice, Former Junior Consultant with NERA Economic Consulting, “With A Little Help From My Friends: How A US Judicial International Comity Balancing Test Can Foster Global Antitrust Private Redress”, Fordham International Law Journal, Volume 41, Issue 1, 41 Fordham Int'l L.J. 227, November 2017, Lexis

For clarity's sake, the term "antitrust" is an American convention, whereas the more commonly employed synonymous term is "competition." See ELEANORA POLI, ANTITRUST INSTITUTIONS AND POLICIES IN THE GLOBALISING ECONOMY 2 (2016) (describing the genesis of the American "antitrust" as relating back to the late nineteenth century when US cartelists would label their joint activities "trusts" to conceal their collusive nature); PETER MORICI, ANTITRUST IN THE GLOBAL TRADING SYSTEM: RECONCILING U.S., JAPANESE, AND EU APPROACHES 3-4 (2000) (noting that though competition policy has a broader meaning than antitrust policy in most cases, the terms are used interchangeably); Diane P. Wood, The Impossible Dream: Real International Antitrust, 1992 U. CHI. LEGAL F. 277, 278 (1992) (noting that "antitrust" is synonymous with "competition" and "antimonopoly"). Labels may vary by country, such as in China where "antimonopoly" is used or in France where "concurrence" is used for the body of law. See "[THE ORIGINAL CHARACTER SET CANNOT BE REPRINTED HERE. PLEASE SEE TEXT IN ORIGINAL DOCUMENT] (Anti-Monopoly Law of the People's Republic of China) (promulgated by the Standing Comm. Nat'l People's Cong., Aug. 30, 2007, effective Aug. 1, 2008) 2007 STANDING COMM. NAT'L PEOPLE'S CONG. GAZ. 68 (China) (setting out China's antitrust law); CODE DE COMMERCE [C. COM.][COMMERCIAL CODE] arts. 410-1 to 470-8 (Fr.) (book IV entitled "de la liberté des prix et de la concurrence," or "Freedom of Prices and Competition").

#### I-law doesn’t ‘belong to’ countries—only the resultant ‘obligations’ do.

Kodra 17—(Head of Law Department, Faculty of Juridical and Political Sciences, Mediterranean University of Albania). Luljeta Kodra. Febuary 2017. “The Relationship Between International Law And National Law”. <https://www.eajournals.org/wp-content/uploads/The-relationship-between-international-law-and-national-law.pdf>. Accessed 9/3/21.

Gerald Fitzmaurice has also expressed in the debate about the international law and domestic law report the concept of supremacy of international law.7Systems of international law and domestic law in his view can not come into conflict because they belong to different kingdoms. A state that fails because of the supremacy of its domestic law in the implementation of its international obligations has committed a violation of its international obligations. The concept that Fitzmaurice presents is more like a description of a divergence between international law and domestic law than with a theory of reconciliation between these two types of rights.

#### It’s an alternative to the plan

Anu Bradford 3, Published under the Maiden Name of Anu Piilola, Henry L. Moses Professor of Law and International Organization at Columbia Law School, LLM from Harvard Law School, Master of Laws from University of Helsinki, JD from Harvard Law School, Licentiate in Laws from the University of Helsinki, Fulbright Scholar, “Assessing Theories of Global Governance: A Case Study of International Antitrust Regulation”, Stanford Journal of International Law, Volume 39, Issue 2, 39 Stan. J Int'l L. 207, Summer 2003, Lexis

Antitrust law is illustrative of the legal realms in which conflicting ideas of international and national regulatory frameworks have yet to find a satisfactory equilibrium. While competition among multinational enterprises has increasingly disregarded national borders, antitrust laws have remained predominantly national. The traditional, though perhaps most controversial, way to deal with international antitrust issues is to rely on a unilateral application of national antitrust laws. This type of extraterritoriality, however, has caused significant tension and resistance. 1 A more radical, equally controversial approach would be to harmonize national antitrust laws or establish unified supranational antitrust rules. This is a far-reaching solution that lacks adequate support in today's political climate. 2 Other alternative [\*208] routes to solving existing frictions would be, for example, to expand bilateral and regional cooperative arrangements or to establish a choice of law system.

Consequently, there is an ongoing debate over whether there is a need to create an international antitrust regime that could better respond to the new economic environment, increased cross-border business activity, and the integration of markets. Proponents of such a regime view international antitrust rules as necessary tools to reduce transaction costs, increase efficiency, and cultivate legal certainty. However, there is little agreement concerning the form, substance, or timeframe of the proposed regulatory reform. Those who oppose the creation of an international antitrust regime emphasize the divergent policy goals of different nations and the conflicting understandings of the role and extent of antitrust enforcement in different jurisdictions. They argue that discrete policy and enforcement concerns clearly hinder attempts at internationalization and highlight the necessity of maintaining regulatory diversity. In this view, countries should retain regulatory powers on the national level, as part of the exclusive right of sovereign states to design their market structures and economic policies.

#### 3 --- the framework is opt-in --- the only outcome is a voluntary commitment that’s not binding, even if later implementation is

Michael Ristaniemi 20, PhD Candidate in Commercial Law at the University of Turku, Vice President for Sustainability at the Metsä Group, Participant in the Visiting Scholar Programme at the University of California, Berkeley, “International Antitrust: Toward Upgrading Coordination and Enforcement”, Doctoral Dissertation, October 2020, https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/347180879.pdf

Structured cooperation, such as opt-in frameworks could be feasible, although binding commitments are likely to be difficult to agree on multilaterally. Such an approach could be particularly effective if combined with reporting obligations as is with the Global Compact – firms who have signed up must report annually on their efforts to comply in order to remain a member of the framework. Such comply-and-explain mechanisms are arguably effective, even if on a voluntary basis.280 Structured cooperation should focus on where sufficient common ground can be found, such as in procedural matters and concerning hard-core cartels. Other, more suitable fora exist for discussing points of divergence, such as how to treat firms in strong market positions, or how to address state aid and other industrial policy questions.

It is important for international antitrust to remain responsive. In the pluralist and polycentric environment that it is, norm collision will continue to occur. As such, fixed and binding constitutionalism is neither possible nor desirable, but rather ways should be found which preemptively coordinate the conduct of actors – competition agencies, policymakers, and firms alike – to avoid unnecessary conflict and to develop tools in which to reconcile and manage the remaining inevitable norm collision.281

#### ‘Prohibitions’ must be binding

Dr. Francis Jacobs 90, Member of the European Court of Justice, DPhil from the University of Oxford, Former Professor of European Law at the University of London and Director of the Centre of European Law for King's College London School of Law, “Commission of the European Communities v French Republic – Opinion of Mr Advocate General Roberts”, European Court Reports 1990 I-00925, Case C-62/89, 2/20/1990, p. 942

20. In my view, those arguments cannot be accepted. It is plain from the wording of Article 10(2) of Regulation No 2057/82 and from the scheme and objectives of the Community legislation that Member States are required to anticipate the exhaustion of the quota and to act to prohibit fishing provisionally before the quota is exhausted . That the exhaustion of the quota must be anticipated is indicated by the requirement in Article 10(2) that each Member State shall determine the date from which its vessels "shall be *deemed to have exhausted* the quota ..." ( emphasis added ). The use of the word "prohibit" in Article 10(2) and the mandatory wording of the second subparagraph of Article 10(3) (" Fishing vessels ... shall cease fishing ...") indicate that the measures taken to halt fishing provisionally must be of a binding nature. It is moreover apparent from the scheme of the legislation that the obligation imposed on Member States by Article 10(2) is of crucial importance for ensuring respect for quotas: the obligation must therefore be construed strictly. An interpretation of Article 10(2) which would permit Member States to wait until after the quota was exhausted before taking action, or to adopt measures of a non-binding nature, would be inconsistent with the binding character of the quotas. It would also undermine the underlying objective of quotas, i.e. the conservation of scarce fishing resources.

#### They must be immediately effective, not a result

Dr. Howard Newby 4, BA and PhD from the University of Essex, Chair of the Higher Education Funding Council for England, Former Vice-Chancellor of the University of Liverpool, “Joint Committee on the Draft Charities Bill - Written Evidence”, Memorandum from the Higher Education Funding Council for England, 9/30/2004, http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/jt200304/jtselect/jtchar/167/167we98.htm

9.1 The Draft Bill creates an obligation on the principal regulator to do all that it "reasonably can to meet the compliance objective in relation to the charity".[ 45] The Draft Bill defines the compliance objective as "to increase compliance by the charity trustees with their legal obligations in exercising control and management of the administration of the charity".[ 46]

9.2 Although the word "increase" is used in relation to the functions of a number of statutory bodies,[47] such examples demonstrate that "increase" is used in relation to considerations to be taken into account in the exercise of a function, rather than an objective in itself.

9.3 HEFCE is concerned that an obligation on principal regulators to "increase" compliance per se is unworkable, in so far as it does not adequately define the limits or nature of the statutory duty. Indeed, the obligation could be considered to be ever-increasing.

## Case

#### Extinction threats are real and outweigh---it’s the upmost moral evil and disavowal of the risk makes it more likely.

Burns 17 (Elizabeth Finneron-Burns is a Teaching Fellow at the University of Warwick and an Affiliated Researcher at the Institute for Futures Studies in Stockholm, What’s wrong with human extinction?, <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/00455091.2016.1278150?needAccess=true>, Canadian Journal of Philosophy, 2017)

Many, though certainly not all, people might believe that it would be wrong to bring about the end of the human species, and the reasons given for this belief are various. I begin by considering four reasons that could be given against the moral permissibility of human extinction. I will argue that only those reasons that impact the people who exist at the time that the extinction or the knowledge of the upcoming extinction occurs, can explain its wrongness. I use this conclusion to then consider in which cases human extinction would be morally permissible or impermissible, arguing that there is only a small class of cases in which it would not be wrong to cause the extinction of the human race or allow it to happen. 2.1. It would prevent the existence of very many happy people One reason of human extinction might be considered to be wrong lies in the value of human life itself. The thought here might be that it is a good thing for people to exist and enjoy happy lives and extinction would deprive more people of enjoying this good. The ‘good’ in this case could be understood in at least two ways. According to the first, one might believe that you benefit a person by bringing them into existence, or at least, that it is good for that person that they come to exist. The second view might hold that if humans were to go extinct, the utility foregone by the billions (or more) of people who could have lived but will now never get that opportunity, renders allowing human extinction to take place an incidence of wrongdoing. An example of this view can be found in two quotes from an Effective Altruism blog post by Peter Singer, Nick Beckstead and Matt Wage: One very bad thing about human extinction would be that billions of people would likely die painful deaths. But in our view, this is by far not the worst thing about human extinction. The worst thing about human extinction is that there would be no future generations. Since there could be so many generations in our future, the value of all those generations together greatly exceeds the value of the current generation. (Beckstead, Singer, and Wage 2013) The authors are making two claims. The first is that there is value in human life and also something valuable about creating future people which gives us a reason to do so; furthermore, it would be a very bad thing if we did not do so. The second is that, not only would it be a bad thing for there to be no future people, but it would actually be the worst thing about extinction. Since happy human lives have value, and the number of potential people who could ever exist is far greater than the number of people who exist at any one time, even if the extinction were brought about through the painful deaths of currently existing people, the former’s loss would be greater than the latter’s. Both claims are assuming that there is an intrinsic value in the existence of potential human life. The second claim makes the further assumption that the forgone value of the potential lives that could be lived is greater than the disvalue that would be accrued by people existing at the time of the extinction through suffering from painful and/or premature deaths. The best-known author of the post, Peter Singer is a prominent utilitarian, so it is not surprising that he would lament the potential lack of future human lives per se. However, it is not just utilitarians who share this view, even if implicitly. Indeed, other philosophers also seem to imply that they share the intuition that there is just something wrong with causing or failing to prevent the extinction of the human species such that we prevent more ‘people’ from having the ‘opportunity to exist’. Stephen Gardiner (2009) and Martin O’Neill (personal correspondence), both sympathetic to contract theory, for example, also find it intuitive that we should want more generations to have the opportunity to exist, assuming that they have worth-living lives, and I find it plausible to think that many other people (philosophers and non-philosophers alike) probably share this intuition. When we talk about future lives being ‘prevented’, we are saying that a possible person or a set of possible people who could potentially have existed will now never actually come to exist. To say that it is wrong to prevent people from existing could either mean that a possible person could reasonably reject a principle that permitted us not to create them, or that the foregone value of their lives provides a reason for rejecting any principle that permits extinction. To make the first claim we would have to argue that a possible person could reasonably reject any principle that prevented their existence on the grounds that it prevented them in particular from existing. However, this is implausible for two reasons. First, we can only wrong someone who did, does or will actually exist because wronging involves failing to take a person’s interests into account. When considering the permissibility of a principle allowing us not to create Person X, we cannot take X’s interest in being created into account because X will not exist if we follow the principle. By considering the standpoint of a person in our deliberations we consider the burdens they will have to bear as a result of the principle. In this case, there is no one who will bear any burdens since if the principle is followed (that is, if we do not create X), X will not exist to bear any burdens. So, only people who do/will actually exist can bear the brunt of a principle, and therefore occupy a standpoint that is owed justification. Second, existence is not an interest at all and a possible person is not disadvantaged by not being caused to exist. Rather than being an interest, it is a necessary requirement in order to have interests. Rivka Weinberg describes it as ‘neutral’ because causing a person to exist is to create a subject who can have interests; existence is not an interest itself.3 In order to be disadvantaged, there must be some detrimental effect on your interests. However, without existence, a person does not have any interests so they cannot be disadvantaged by being kept out of existence. But, as Weinberg points out, ‘never having interests itself could not be contrary to people’s interests since without interest bearers, there can be no ‘they’ for it to be bad for’ (Weinberg 2008, 13). So, a principle that results in some possible people never becoming actual does not impose any costs on those ‘people’ because nobody is disadvantaged by not coming into existence.4 It therefore seems that it cannot be wrong to fail to bring particular people into existence. This would mean that no one acts wrongly when they fail to create another person. Writ large, it would also not be wrong if everybody decided to exercise their prerogative not to create new people and potentially, by consequence, allow human extinction. One might respond here by saying that although it may be permissible for one person to fail to create a new person, it is not permissible if everyone chooses to do so because human lives have value and allowing human extinction would be to forgo a huge amount of value in the world. This takes us to the second way of understanding the potential wrongness of preventing people from existing — the foregone value of a life provides a reason for rejecting any principle that prevents it. One possible reply to this claim turns on the fact that many philosophers acknowledge that the only, or at least the best, way to think about the value of (individual or groups of) possible people’s lives is in impersonal terms (Parfit 1984; Reiman 2007; McMahan 2009). Jeff McMahan, for example, writes ‘at the time of one’s choice there is no one who exists or will exist independently of that choice for whose sake one could be acting in causing him or her to exist … it seems therefore that any reason to cause or not to cause an individual to exist … is best considered an impersonal rather than individual-affecting reason’ (McMahan 2009, 52). Another reply along similar lines would be to appeal to the value that is lost or at least foregone when we fail to bring into existence a next (or several next) generations of people with worth-living lives. Since ex hypothesi worth-living lives have positive value, it is better to create more such lives and worse to create fewer. Human extinction by definition is the creation of no future lives and would ‘deprive’ billions of ‘people’ of the opportunity to live worth-living lives. This might reduce the amount of value in the world at the time of the extinction (by killing already existing people), but it would also prevent a much vaster amount of value in the future (by failing to create more people). Both replies depend on the impersonal value of human life. However, recall that in contractualism impersonal values are not on their own grounds for reasonably rejecting principles. Scanlon himself says that although we have a strong reason not to destroy existing human lives, this reason ‘does not flow from the thought that it is a good thing for there to be more human life rather than less’ (104). In contractualism, something cannot be wrong unless there is an impact on a person. Thus, neither the impersonal value of creating a particular person nor the impersonal value of human life writ large could on its own provide a reason for rejecting a principle permitting human extinction. It seems therefore that the fact that extinction would deprive future people of the opportunity to live worth-living lives (either by failing to create either particular future people or future people in general) cannot provide us with a reason to consider human extinction to be wrong. Although the lost value of these ‘lives’ itself cannot be the reason explaining the wrongness of extinction, it is possible the knowledge of this loss might create a personal reason for some existing people. I will consider this possibility later on in section (d). But first I move to the second reason human extinction might be wrong per se. 2.2. It would mean the loss of the only known form of intelligent life and all civilization and intellectual progress would be lost A second reason we might think it would be wrong to cause human extinction is the loss that would occur of the only (known) form of rational life and the knowledge and civilization that that form of life has created. One thought here could be that just as some might consider it wrong to destroy an individual human heritage monument like the Sphinx, it would also be wrong if the advances made by humans over the past few millennia were lost or prevented from progressing. A related argument is made by those who feel that there is something special about humans’ capacity for rationality which is valuable in itself. Since humans are the only intelligent life that we know of, it would be a loss, in itself, to the world for that to end. I admit that I struggle to fully appreciate this thought. It seems to me that Henry Sidgwick was correct in thinking that these things are only important insofar as they are important to humans (Sidgwick 1874, I.IX.4).5 If there is no form of intelligent life in the future, who would there be to lament its loss since intelligent life is the only form of life capable of appreciating intelligence? Similarly, if there is no one with the rational capacity to appreciate historic monuments and civil progress, who would there be to be negatively affected or even notice the loss?6 However, even if there is nothing special about human rationality, just as some people try to prevent the extinction of nonhuman animal species, we might think that we ought also to prevent human extinction for the sake of biodiversity. The thought in this, as well as the earlier examples, must be that it would somehow be bad for the world if there were no more humans even though there would be no one for whom it is bad. This may be so but the only way to understand this reason is impersonally. Since we are concerned with wrongness rather than badness, we must ask whether something that impacts no one’s well-being, status or claims can be wrong. As we saw earlier, in the contractualist framework reasons must be personal rather than impersonal in order to provide grounds for reasonable rejection (Scanlon 1998, 218–223). Since the loss of civilization, intelligent life or biodiversity are per se impersonal reasons, there is no standpoint from which these reasons could be used to reasonably reject a principle that permitted extinction. Therefore, causing human extinction on the grounds of the loss of civilization, rational life or biodiversity would not be wrong. 2.3. Existing people would endure physical pain and/or painful and/or premature deaths Thinking about the ways in which human extinction might come about brings to the fore two more reasons it might be wrong. It could, for example, occur if all humans (or at least the critical number needed to be unable to replenish the population, leading to eventual extinction) underwent a sterilization procedure. Or perhaps it could come about due to anthropogenic climate change or a massive asteroid hitting the Earth and wiping out the species in the same way it did the dinosaurs millions of years ago. Each of these scenarios would involve significant physical and/or non-physical harms to existing people and their interests. Physically, people might suffer premature and possibly also painful deaths, for example. It is not hard to imagine examples in which the process of extinction could cause premature death. A nuclear winter that killed everyone or even just every woman under the age of 50 is a clear example of such a case. Obviously, some types of premature death themselves cannot be reasons to reject a principle. Every person dies eventually, sometimes earlier than the standard expected lifespan due to accidents or causes like spontaneously occurring incurable cancers. A cause such as disease is not a moral agent and therefore it cannot be wrong if it unavoidably kills a person prematurely. Scanlon says that the fact that a principle would reduce a person’s well-being gives that person a reason to reject the principle: ‘components of well-being figure prominently as grounds for reasonable rejection’ (Scanlon 1998, 214). However, it is not settled yet whether premature death is a setback to well-being. Some philosophers hold that death is a harm to the person who dies, whilst others argue that it is not.7 I will argue, however, that regardless of who is correct in that debate, being caused to die prematurely can be reason to reject a principle when it fails to show respect to the person as a rational agent. Scanlon says that recognizing others as rational beings with interests involves seeing reason to preserve life and prevent death: ‘appreciating the value of human life is primarily a matter of seeing human lives as something to be respected, where this involves seeing reasons not to destroy them, reasons to protect them, and reasons to want them to go well’ (Scanlon 1998, 104). The ‘respect for life’ in this case is a respect for the person living, not respect for human life in the abstract. This means that we can sometimes fail to protect human life without acting wrongfully if we still respect the person living. Scanlon gives the example of a person who faces a life of unending and extreme pain such that she wishes to end it by committing suicide. Scanlon does not think that the suicidal person shows a lack of respect for her own life by seeking to end it because the person whose life it is has no reason to want it to go on. This is important to note because it emphasizes the fact that the respect for human life is person-affecting. It is not wrong to murder because of the impersonal disvalue of death in general, but because taking someone’s life without their permission shows disrespect to that person. This supports its inclusion as a reason in the contractualist formula, regardless of what side ends up winning the ‘is death a harm?’ debate because even if death turns out not to harm the person who died, ending their life without their consent shows disrespect to that person. A person who could reject a principle permitting another to cause his or her premature death presumably does not wish to die at that time, or in that manner. Thus, if they are killed without their consent, their interests have not been taken into account, and they have a reason to reject the principle that allowed their premature death.8 This is as true in the case of death due to extinction as it is for death due to murder. However, physical pain may also be caused to existing people without killing them, but still resulting in human extinction. Imagine, for example, surgically removing everyone’s reproductive organs in order to prevent the creation of any future people. Another example could be a nuclear bomb that did not kill anyone, but did painfully render them infertile through illness or injury. These would be cases in which physical pain (through surgery or bombs) was inflicted on existing people and the extinction came about as a result of the painful incident rather than through death. Furthermore, one could imagine a situation in which a bomb (for example) killed enough people to cause extinction, but some people remained alive, but in terrible pain from injuries. It seems uncontroversial that the infliction of physical pain could be a reason to reject a principle. Although Scanlon says that an impact on well-being is not the only reason to reject principles, it plays a significant role, and indeed, most principles are likely to be rejected due to a negative impact on a person’s well-being, physical or otherwise. It may be queried here whether it is actually the involuntariness of the pain that is grounds for reasonable rejection rather than the physical pain itself because not all pain that a person suffers is involuntary. One can imagine acts that can cause physical pain that are not rejectable — base jumping or life-saving or improving surgery, for example. On the other hand, pushing someone off a cliff or cutting him with a scalpel against his will are clearly rejectable acts. The difference between the two cases is that in the former, the person having the pain inflicted has consented to that pain or risk of pain. My view is that they cannot be separated in these cases and it is involuntary physical pain that is the grounds for reasonable rejection. Thus, the fact that a principle would allow unwanted physical harm gives a person who would be subjected to that harm a reason to reject the principle. Of course the mere fact that a principle causes involuntary physical harm or premature death is not sufficient to declare that the principle is rejectable — there might be countervailing reasons. In the case of extinction, what countervailing reasons might be offered in favour of the involuntary physical pain/ death-inducing harm? One such reason that might be offered is that humans are a harm to the natural environment and that the world might be a better place if there were no humans in it. It could be that humans might rightfully be considered an all-things-considered hindrance to the world rather than a benefit to it given the fact that we have been largely responsible for the extinction of many species, pollution and, most recently, climate change which have all negatively affected the natural environment in ways we are only just beginning to understand. Thus, the fact that human extinction would improve the natural environment (or at least prevent it from degrading further), is a countervailing reason in favour of extinction to be weighed against the reasons held by humans who would experience physical pain or premature death. However, the good of the environment as described above is by definition not a personal reason. Just like the loss of rational life and civilization, therefore, it cannot be a reason on its own when determining what is wrong and countervail the strong personal reasons to avoid pain/death that is held by the people who would suffer from it.9 Every person existing at the time of the extinction would have a reason to reject that principle on the grounds of the physical pain they are being forced to endure against their will that could not be countervailed by impersonal considerations such as the negative impact humans may have on the earth. Therefore, a principle that permitted extinction to be accomplished in a way that caused involuntary physical pain or premature death could quite clearly be rejectable by existing people with no relevant countervailing reasons. This means that human extinction that came about in this way would be wrong. There are of course also additional reasons they could reject a similar principle which I now turn to address in the next section. 2.4. Existing people could endure non-physical harms I said earlier than the fact in itself that there would not be any future people is an impersonal reason and can therefore not be a reason to reject a principle permitting extinction. However, this impersonal reason could give rise to a personal reason that is admissible. So, the final important reason people might think that human extinction would be wrong is that there could be various deleterious psychological effects that would be endured by existing people having the knowledge that there would be no future generations. There are two main sources of this trauma, both arising from the knowledge that there will be no more people. The first relates to individual people and the undesired negative effect on well-being that would be experienced by those who would have wanted to have children. Whilst this is by no means universal, it is fair to say that a good proportion of people feel a strong pull towards reproduction and having their lineage continue in some way. Samuel Scheffler describes the pull towards reproduction as a ‘desire for a personalized relationship with the future’ (Scheffler 2012, 31). Reproducing is a widely held desire and the joys of parenthood are ones that many people wish to experience. For these people knowing that they would not have descendants (or that their descendants will endure painful and/or premature deaths) could create a sense of despair and pointlessness of life. Furthermore, the inability to reproduce and have your own children because of a principle/policy that prevents you (either through bans or physical interventions) would be a significant infringement of what we consider to be a basic right to control what happens to your body. For these reasons, knowing that you will have no descendants could cause significant psychological traumas or harms even if there were no associated physical harm. The second is a more general, higher level sense of hopelessness or despair that there will be no more humans and that your projects will end with you. Even those who did not feel a strong desire to procreate themselves might feel a sense of hopelessness that any projects or goals they have for the future would not be fulfilled. Many of the projects and goals we work towards during our lifetime are also at least partly future-oriented. Why bother continuing the search for a cure for cancer if either it will not be found within humans’ lifetime, and/or there will be no future people to benefit from it once it is found? Similar projects and goals that might lose their meaning when confronted with extinction include politics, artistic pursuits and even the type of philosophical work with which this paper is concerned. Even more extreme, through the words of the character Theo Faron, P.D. James says in his novel The Children of Men that ‘without the hope of posterity for our race if not for ourselves, without the assurance that we being dead yet live, all pleasures of the mind and senses sometimes seem to me no more than pathetic and crumbling defences shored up against our ruins’ (James 2006, 9). Even if James’ claim is a bit hyperbolic and all pleasures would not actually be lost, I agree with Scheffler in finding it not implausible that the knowledge that extinction was coming and that there would be no more people would have at least a general depressive effect on people’s motivation and confidence in the value of and joy in their activities (Scheffler 2012, 43). Both sources of psychological harm are personal reasons to reject a principle that permitted human extinction. Existing people could therefore reasonably reject the principle for either of these reasons. Psychological pain and the inability to pursue your personal projects, goals, and aims, are all acceptable reasons for rejecting principles in the contractualist framework. So too are infringements of rights and entitlements that we accept as important for people’s lives. These psychological reasons, then, are also valid reasons to reject principles that permitted or required human extinction.

#### Existential risks mitigation is a decolonial imperative of care.

Offord, 17—Faculty of Humanities, School of Humanities Research and Graduate Studies, Bentley Campus (Baden, “BEYOND OUR NUCLEAR ENTANGLEMENT,” Angelaki, 22:3, 17-25, dml) [ableist language modifications denoted by brackets]

You are steered towards overwhelming and inexplicable pain when you consider the nuclear entanglement that the species Homo sapiens finds itself in. This is because the fact of living in the nuclear age presents an existential, aesthetic, ethical and psychological challenge that defines human consciousness. Although an immanent threat and ever-present danger to the very existence of the human species, living with the possibility of nuclear war has infiltrated the matrix of modernity so profoundly as to paralyse [shut down] our mind-set to respond adequately. We have chosen to ignore the facts at the heart of the nuclear program with its dangerous algorithm; we have chosen to live with the capacity and possibility of a collective, pervasive and even planetary-scale suicide; and the techno-industrial-national powers that claim there is “no immediate danger” ad infinitum.8 This has led to one of the key logics of modernity's insanity. As Harari writes: “Nuclear weapons have turned war between superpowers into a mad act of collective suicide, and therefore forced the most powerful nations on earth to find alternative and peaceful ways to resolve conflicts.”9 This is the nuclear algorithm at work, a methodology of madness. In revisiting Jacques Derrida in “No Apocalypse, Not Now (Full Speed Ahead, Seven Missiles, Seven Missives),”10 who described nuclear war as a “non-event,” it is clear that the pathology of the “non-event” remains as active as ever even in the time of Donald Trump and Kim Jong-un with their stichomythic nuclear posturing. The question of our times is whether we have an equal or more compelling capacity and willingness to end this impoverished but ever-present logic of pain and uncertainty. How not simply to bring about disarmament, but to go beyond this politically charged, as well as mythological and psychological nuclear algorithm? How to find love amidst the nuclear entanglement; the antidote to this entanglement? Is it possible to end the pathology of power that exists with nuclear capacity? Sadly, the last lines of Nitin Sawhney's “Broken Skin” underscore this entanglement: Just 5 miles from India's nuclear test site Children play in the shade of the village water tank Here in the Rajasthan desert people say They're proud their country showed their nuclear capability.11 As an activist scholar working in the fields of human rights and cultural studies, responding to the nuclear algorithm is an imperative. Your politics, ethics and scholarship are indivisible in this cause. An acute sense of care for the world, informed by pacifist and non-violent, de-colonialist approaches to knowledge and practice, pervades your concern. You are aware that there are other ways of knowing than those you are familiar and credentialed with. You are aware that you are complicit in the prisons that you choose to live inside,12 and that there is no such thing as an innocent bystander. You use your scholarship to shake up the world from its paralysis, abjection and amnesia; to unsettle the epistemic and structural violence that is ubiquitous to neoliberalism and its machinery; to create dialogic and learning spaces for the work of critical human rights and critical justice to take place. All this, and to enable an ethics of intervention through understanding what is at the very heart of the critical human rights impulse, creating a “dialogue for being, because I am not without the other.”13 Furthermore, as a critical human rights advocate living in a nuclear armed world, your challenge is to reconceptualise the human community as Ashis Nandy has argued, to see how we can learn to co-exist with others in conviviality and also learn to co-survive with the non-human, even to flourish. A dialogue for being requires a leap into a human rights frame that includes a deep ecological dimension, where the planet itself is inherently involved as a participant in its future. This requires scholarship that “thinks like a mountain.”14 A critical human rights approach understands that it cannot be simply human-centric. It requires a nuanced and arresting clarity to present perspectives on co-existence and co-survival that are from human and non-human viewpoints.15 Ultimately, you realise that your struggle is not confined to declarations, treaties, legislation, and law, though they have their role. It must go further to produce “creative intellectual exchange that might release new ethical energies for mutually assured survival.”16 Taking an anti-nuclear stance and enabling a post-nuclear activism demands a revolution within the field of human rights work. Recognising the entanglement of nuclearism with the Anthropocene, for one thing, requires a profound shift in focus from the human-centric to a more-than-human co-survival. It also requires a fundamental shift in understanding our human culture, in which the very epistemic and rational acts of sundering from co-survival with the planet and environment takes place. In the end, you realise, as Raimon Panikkar has articulated, “it is not realistic to toil for peace if we do not proceed to a disarmament of the bellicose culture in which we live.”17 Or, as Geshe Lhakdor suggests, there must be “inner disarmament for external disarmament.”18 In this sense, it is within the cultural arena, our human society, where the entanglement of subjective meaning making, nature and politics occurs, that we need to disarm. It is 1982, and you are reading Jonathan Schell's The Fate of the Earth on a Sydney bus. Sleeping has not been easy over the past few nights as you reluctantly but compulsively read about the consequences of nuclear war. For some critics, Schell's account is high polemic, but for you it is more like Rabindranath Tagore: it expresses the suffering we make for ourselves. What you find noteworthy is that although Schell's scenario of widespread destruction of the planet through nuclear weaponry, of immeasurable harm to the bio-sphere through radiation, is powerfully laid out, the horror and scale of nuclear obliteration also seems surreal and far away as the bus makes its way through the suburban streets. A few years later, you read a statement from an interview with Paul Tibbets, the pilot of “Enola Gay,” the plane that bombed Hiroshima. He says, “The morality of dropping that bomb was not my business.”19 This abstraction from moral responsibility – the denial of the implications on human life and the consequences of engagement through the machinery of war – together with the sweeping amnesia that came afterwards from thinking about the bombing of Hiroshima, are what make you become an environmental and human rights activist. You realise that what makes the nuclear algorithm work involves a politically engineered and deeply embedded insecurity-based recipe to elide the nuclear threat from everyday life. The spectre of nuclear obliteration, like the idea of human rights, can appear abstract and distant, not our everyday business. You realise that within this recipe is the creation of a moral tyranny of distance, an abnegation of myself with the other. One of modernity's greatest and earliest achievements was the mediation of the self with the world. How this became a project assisted and shaped through the military-industrial-technological-capitalist complex is fraught and hard to untangle. But as a critical human rights scholar you have come to see through that complex, and you put energies into challenging that tyranny of distance, to activate a politics, ethics and scholarship that recognises the other as integral to yourself. Ultimately, even, to see that the other is also within.20

#### 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.
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#### 1. Disease causes extinction --- the risk is categorically underestimated.

Dennis Pamlin & Stuart Armstrong 15. \*Executive Project Manager Global Risks, Global Challenges Foundation. \*\*James Martin Research Fellow, Future of Humanity Institute, Oxford Martin School, University of Oxford. February 2015, “Global Challenges: 12 Risks that threaten human civilization: The case for a new risk category,” Global Challenges Foundation, p.30-93. https://api.globalchallenges.org/static/wp-content/uploads/12-Risks-with-infinite-impact.pdf

A pandemic (from Greek πᾶν, pan, “all”, and δῆμος demos, “people”) is an epidemic of infectious disease that has spread through human populations across a large region; for instance several continents, or even worldwide. Here only worldwide events are included. A widespread endemic disease that is stable in terms of how many people become sick from it is not a pandemic. 260 84 Global Challenges – Twelve risks that threaten human civilisation – The case for a new category of risks 3.1 Current risks 3.1.4.1 Expected impact disaggregation 3.1.4.2 Probability Influenza subtypes266 Infectious diseases have been one of the greatest causes of mortality in history. Unlike many other global challenges pandemics have happened recently, as we can see where reasonably good data exist. Plotting historic epidemic fatalities on a log scale reveals that these tend to follow a power law with a small exponent: many plagues have been found to follow a power law with exponent 0.26.261 These kinds of power laws are heavy-tailed262 to a significant degree.263 In consequence most of the fatalities are accounted for by the top few events.264 If this law holds for future pandemics as well,265 then the majority of people who will die from epidemics will likely die from the single largest pandemic. Most epidemic fatalities follow a power law, with some extreme events – such as the Black Death and Spanish Flu – being even more deadly.267 There are other grounds for suspecting that such a highimpact epidemic will have a greater probability than usually assumed. All the features of an extremely devastating disease already exist in nature: essentially incurable (Ebola268), nearly always fatal (rabies269), extremely infectious (common cold270), and long incubation periods (HIV271). If a pathogen were to emerge that somehow combined these features (and influenza has demonstrated antigenic shift, the ability to combine features from different viruses272), its death toll would be extreme. Many relevant features of the world have changed considerably, making past comparisons problematic. The modern world has better sanitation and medical research, as well as national and supra-national institutions dedicated to combating diseases. Private insurers are also interested in modelling pandemic risks.273 Set against this is the fact that modern transport and dense human population allow infections to spread much more rapidly274, and there is the potential for urban slums to serve as breeding grounds for disease.275 Unlike events such as nuclear wars, pandemics would not damage the world’s infrastructure, and initial survivors would likely be resistant to the infection. And there would probably be survivors, if only in isolated locations. Hence the risk of a civilisation collapse would come from the ripple effect of the fatalities and the policy responses. These would include political and agricultural disruption as well as economic dislocation and damage to the world’s trade network (including the food trade). Extinction risk is only possible if the aftermath of the epidemic fragments and diminishes human society to the extent that recovery becomes impossible277 before humanity succumbs to other risks (such as climate change or further pandemics). Five important factors in estimating the probabilities and impacts of the challenge: 1. What the true probability distribution for pandemics is, especially at the tail. 2. The capacity of modern international health systems to deal with an extreme pandemic. 3. How fast medical research can proceed in an emergency. 4. How mobility of goods and people, as well as population density, will affect pandemic transmission. 5. Whether humans can develop novel and effective anti-pandemic solutions.

#### 2. The next pandemic will be worse --- action now is key.

Andy Plump 21. President for research and development at Takeda Pharmaceuticals and a cofounder of the Covid R&D Alliance. “Luck is not a strategy: The world needs to start preparing now for the next pandemic” 05-18-21. https://www.statnews.com/2021/05/18/luck-is-not-a-strategy-the-world-needs-to-start-preparing-now-for-the-next-pandemic/

As countries grapple with the worst global pandemic in a century, it’s hard to think about preparing for the next one. But if we don’t, it could be worse than Covid-19. Over the last 30 years, infectious disease outbreaks have emerged with alarming regularity. The World Health Organization lists an influenza pandemic and other high-threat viral diseases such as Ebola and dengue among the top 10 biggest threats to public health. The rate of animal-to-human transmission of viruses has been increasing, with the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimating that 75% of new infectious diseases in humans come from animals. These zoonotic infections can have profound effects on human life. The overall infection fatality rate is around 10% for severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS), between 40% and 75% for Nipah virus, and as high as 88% for Ebola. While the infection fatality rate for Covid-19 is lower — likely less than 1% — the overall burden of death has been significantly higher since it has affected so many people, more than 160 million people as I write this. Luck is not a pandemic strategy Although the Covid-19 pandemic has been a human and health care disaster, by scientific measures the world was lucky this time. Covid-19 was far less lethal than its predecessors, less contagious than previous pandemic viruses, and we were able to quickly develop a cadre of effective vaccines. But luck is not a strategy. The same way the U.S. invests in and prepares for national defense, it must also prepare for another pandemic. Though the next viral outbreak cannot be prevented, the next pandemic can — but only with better preparation.

#### 1. Toxic waste causes extinction

**Cribb 17** - (Julian Cribb, Fellow of the Australian Academy of Technological Sciences and Engineering, former Director, National Awareness, CSIRO, “The Poisoner,” Surviving the 21st Century Chapter 6)

There are two essential points about the Earthwide chemical flood. First it is quite new. It began with the industrial revolution of the late nineteenth century, but expanded dramatically in the wake of the two world wars—where chemicals were extensively used in munitions—and has exploded in deadly earnest in the past 50 years, attaining a new crescendo in the early twenty-first century. It is something our ancestors never faced—and to which we, in consequence, lack any protective adaptations which might otherwise have evolved due to constant exposure to poisons. Second, the toxic flood is, for the most part, preventable. It is not compulsory—but is an unwanted by-product of economic growth. Though driven by powerful industries and interests, it still lies within the powers and rights of citizens, consumers and their governments to demand it be curtailed or ended and to encourage industry to safer, healthier products and production systems. The issue is whether, or not, a wise humanity would choose to continue poisoning our children, ourselves and our world. Regulatory Failure Despite the fact that around 2000 new chemicals are released onto world markets annually, most have not received proper health, safety or environmental screening—especially in terms of their impact on babies and small children. Regulation has so far failed to make any serious curtailment of this flood: only 21 out of 144,000 known chemicals have been banned internationally, and this has not eliminated their use. At such a rate of progress it will take us more than 50,000 years to identify and prohibit or restrict all the chemicals which do us harm. Even then, bans will only apply in a handful of well-regulated countries, and will not protect the Earth system nor humanity at large. Clearly, national regulation holds few answers to what is now an out-of-control global problem. Furthermore, the chemical industry is relocating from the developed world (where it is quite well regulated and observes its own ethical standards) and into developing countries, mainly in Asia, where it is largely beyond the reach of either ethics or the law. However, its toxic emissions return to citizens in well-regulated countries via wind, water, food, wildlife, consumer goods, industrial products and people. The bottom line is that it doesn’t matter how good your country’s regulations are: you and your family are still exposed to a growing global flood of toxins from which even a careful diet and sensible consumer choices cannot fully protect you. The wake-up call to the world about the risks of chemical contamination was issued by American biologist Rachel Carson when she published Silent Spring in 1962, in which she warned specifically about the impact of certain persistent pesticides used in agriculture. Since her book came out, the volume of pesticide use worldwide has increased 30-fold, to around four million tonnes a year in the mid-2010s. Since the modern chemical age began there has been a string of high-profile chemical disasters: Minamata, the Love Canal, Seveso, Bhopal, Flixborough, Oppau, Toulouse, Hinkley, Texas City, Jilin, Tianjin. Most of these display a familiar pattern of unproductive confrontation between angry citizens, industry and regulators, involving drawn-out legal battles that deliver justice to nobody. By their spectacular and local nature, such events serve to distract from the far larger, more insidious and ubiquitous, universal toxic flood. Chemists and chemical makers often claim that their products are ‘safe’ because individual exposure (e.g. in a given product, like a serve of food) is too low to result in a toxic dose, a theory first put forward by the mediaeval scholar Paracelsus in the sixteenth century. This ‘dose related’ argument is disingenuous, if not dishonest—as modern chemists well know—for the following reasons: Most chemicals target a receptor or receptors on certain of your body cells, to cause harm. There may be not one, but hundreds or even thousands of different chemicals all targeting the same receptor, so a particular substance may contribute an unknowable fraction to an overall toxic dose. That does not make it ‘safe’. Chemicals not known to be poisonous in small doses on their own can combine with other substances in water, air, food or your body to create a toxin. No manufacturer can truthfully assert this will not happen to their products. Chemical toxicity is a function of both dose and the length of time you are exposed to it. In the case of persistent chemicals and heavy metals, this exposure may occur over days, months, years, even a lifetime in some cases. Tiny doses may thus accumulate into toxic ones. Most chemical toxicity is still measured on the basis of an exposed adult male. Babies and children being smaller and using much more water, food and air for their bodyweight, are therefore more at risk of receiving a poisonous dose than are adults. Chemicals and minerals are valuable and extremely useful. They do great good, save many lives and much money. No-one is suggesting they should all be banned. But their value may be for nothing if the current uncontrolled, unmonitored, unregulated and unconscionable mass release and planetary saturation continues. Chemical Extinction Two billion years ago, excessive production of one particular poisonous chemical by the inhabitants of Earth caused a colossal die-off and threatened the extermination of all life. That chemical was oxygen and it was excreted by the blue-green algae which then dominated the planet, as part of their photosynthetic processes. After several hundred million of years, the planet’s physical ability to soak up the surplus O2 in iron formations, oceans and sediments had reached saturation and the gas began to poison the existing life. This event was known as the ‘oxygen holocaust’, and is probably the nearest life on Earth has ever come to complete disaster before the present (Margulis and Sagan 1986). Since it developed slowly, over tens of millions of years, the poisonous atmosphere permitted some of these primitive organisms to evolve a tolerance to O2—and this in time led to the rise of oxygen-dependent species such as fish, mammals and eventually, us. The takehome learning from this brush with total annihilation is that it is possible for living creatures to pollute themselves into oblivion, if they don’t take care to avoid it or rapidly adapt to the new, toxic environment. It’s a message that humans, with our colossal planetary chemical impact, would do well to ponder. While it is unlikely that human chemical emissions alone could reach such a volume and toxic state as to directly threaten our entire species with extinction (other than through carbon emissions in a runaway global warming event) or even the collapse of civilisation, it is likely they will emerge as a serious contributing factor during the twenty-first century in combination with other factors such as war, climate change, pandemic disease and ecosystem breakdown. Credible ways in which man-made chemicals might imperil the human future include: Undermining the immune systems, physical and mental health of the population through growing exposure to toxins Reducing the intelligence of current and future generations through the action of nerve poisons on the developing brains and central nervous systems of children, rendering humanity less able to solve its problems and adapt to major changes; and by increasing the level of violent crime and conflict in society, which is closely linked to lower IQ. Bringing down the economy through the massive healthcare costs of having to nurse, treat and maintain a growing proportion of the population disabled by lifelong chronic chemical exposure. By poisoning the ecosystem services—clean air, water, soil, plants, insects and wildlife—on which humanity depends for its own survival and thereby contributing to potential global ecosystem breakdown By augmenting the global arsenal of weapons of mass destruction and hence the risk of their use by nations or uncontrollable fanatics.

#### 2. Nano solves human mortality

**Gaudin 9** (Sharon Gaudin is a science writer at Worcester Polytechnic Institute and an experienced technology reporter. Citing Ray Kurzweil, received the 1999 National Medal of Technology and Innovation, the United States' highest honor in technology, inducted into the National Inventors Hall of Fame, established by the U.S. Patent Office, received 21 honorary doctorates, BS in Computer Science from MIT. <KEN>"Nanotech could make humans immortal by 2040, futurist says," Computerworld. October 1, 2019. DOA: 1/1/20. https://www.computerworld.com/article/2528330/nanotech-could-make-humans-immortal-by-2040--futurist-says.html)

In 30 or 40 years, we'll have microscopic machines traveling through our bodies, repairing damaged cells and organs, effectively wiping out diseases. The nanotechnology will also be used to back up our memories and personalities.

In an interview with Computerworld, author and futurist Ray Kurzweil said that anyone alive come 2040 or 2050 could be close to immortal. The quickening advance of nanotechnology means that the human condition will shift into more of a collaboration of man and machine, as nanobots flow through human blood streams and eventually even replace biological blood, he added.

That may sound like something out of a sci-fi movie, but Kurzweil, a member of the Inventor's Hall of Fame and a recipient of the National Medal of Technology, says that research well underway today is leading to a time when a combination of nanotechnology and biotechnology will wipe out cancer, Alzheimer's disease, obesity and diabetes.

It'll also be a time when humans will augment their natural cognitive powers and add years to their lives, Kurzweil said.

"It's radical life extension," Kurzweil said. "The full realization of nanobots will basically eliminate biological disease and aging. I think we'll see widespread use in 20 years of [nanotech] devices that perform certain functions for us. In 30 or 40 years, we will overcome disease and aging. The nanobots will scout out organs and cells that need repairs and simply fix them. It will lead to profound extensions of our health and longevity."

Of course, people will still be struck by lightning or hit by a bus, but much more trauma will be repairable. If nanobots swim in, or even replace, biological blood, then wounds could be healed almost instantly. Limbs could be regrown. Backed up memories and personalities could be accessed after a head trauma.

#### 3. AND --- Solves warming

**Aithal & Aithal 18** (Dr. P. S. Aithal – Director, Srinivas Institute of Management Studies, Srinivas University. Dr. Shubhrajyotsna Aithal – Assistant Professor, College of Engineering & Technology, Srinivas University. <KEN> “Nanotechnology based Innovations and Human Life Comfortability –Are we Marching towards Immortality?” International Journal of Applied Engineering and Management Letters (IJAEML), (2018), 2(2), 71-86. DOA: 1/1/20. <https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3289262>)

Experts all over the world are in consensus that one of the major factors that will determine the future of human health is the health of our environment and the planet. In the environmental sciences, nanotechnology is a very hot topic, especially when addressing environmental sustainability and reversal of environmental damage caused by the actions of mankind. Nanotechnologists alongside environmental experts have been able to utilize nanomotor degradation and removal of contaminants from water sources. Environmentalists are excited about the use of this technology for water quality monitoring and eventually would like to see “sense and destroy” applications. Future directions in this field even entail immunology influenced chemotactic abilities capable of allowing nanomachines to track contamination back to its source for clearance and reporting to the appropriate authorities. In environmental applications of nanotechnology, a kind of nanorobots called nanomachines can self-replicate under pre-determined, set conditions, can potentially help people to control the changes in the environment. Nanorobots can be programmed to act like a buffer to prevent environmental changes, and help to maintain predetermined temperatures and pressure conditions. Nanomachines also have the ability to act like a chemical factory to process excessive levels of CO2 from the air or produce nontoxic endothermic or exothermic reactions to heat or cool the environment. Thus, nanomachines can be used to cool the oceans to prevent further melting of artic ice. The light reflective properties of nanomaterials added to the oceans can be altered and hence by decreasing or increasing the oceans ability to absorb sunlight could have considerable effects on global warming. Such possibilities for solving various environmental problems and pollutions are truly endless and exciting to for further research. Nanotechnology not only has tremendous implications for the monitoring of human health but also in real time monitoring of the environment and its purification in ways before never thought possible.

### 2NC --- AT --- Patents bad for innovation

#### 1. Immunity --- There’s a precedent of patents being immune to antitrust --- that’s key to innovation.

Schuster ’21 [W. Michael and Gregory Day; 2021; Professors at the University of Georgia’s Terry College of Business; Wisconsin Law Review, “Colluding Against a Patent,” Forthcoming Volume]

Courts have struggled to determine when, if ever, patent strategies may constitute an antitrust offense. In hopes of harmonizing patent and antitrust laws, the general rule is that a patent grants a zone of antitrust immunity, though questions persist about the scenarios in which a rightsholder has exceeded their patent's scope. 35Consider the competing functions of patent and antitrust laws.

1. Patent Law, Exclusion, and Innovation

The patent system is meant to promote innovation by granting twenty years of exclusive rights. 36Experts have long thought that society would lack incentives to create if third parties could copy and sell an inventor's device without incurring the costs of creation. 37To avoid this outcome, a patent confers exclusive rights, allowing the patent holder to charge monopoly prices (to the degree that consumers are willing to pay high [\*546] prices). 38If a party employs another's patented technology without acquiring a license, the patent owner may recover damages and seek injunctive relief, estopping the infringer from using the device altogether. 39Because patent law lacks a general defense of innocent or accidental infringement, firms must exercise significant caution in creating, employing, and selling technology. 40

Since a patent embodies "the right to exclude," it may come as little surprise that the system impedes degrees of competition. 41This has generated allegations that some patentees have sought to erect barriers to competition rather than to protect original technology. 42If patent owners undermine enough competition and innovation, critics contend that the abuse of patent rights should, at some point, constitute an antitrust offense. 43But antitrust's application to such innovation has so far posed a host of practical and theoretical problems.

2. Antitrust Law in the Shadow of Patents

Antitrust has struggled where it collides with patent law. To resolve this tension, courts have sought to draw clear lines about when patent owners can legally exclude competition or, in the alternative, when antitrust law may condemn exclusionary acts. The key to defining antitrust's scope stems from the historical difficulties of identifying anticompetitive conduct regardless of patent rights.

Uncertainty has long prevailed over the types of practices that antitrust law bans. This is due to the broad text of the Sherman Antitrust Act (Sherman Act) which facially forbids vast swaths of acceptable activity. 44Section 1 bans every trade restraint, as in "every contract, [\*547] combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce," 45while Section 2 makes it illegal to "monopolize, or attempt to monopolize ... any part of the trade or commerce." 46The courts, in turn, have struggled to identify when the elimination of firms was due to anticompetitive practices or valid competition. 47

To resolve confusion, courts in the 1970s leaned on scholarship (notably, the "Chicago School" 48) to reinterpret and narrow antitrust law into its modern form: the "consumer welfare prescription." 49The movement's leaders asserted that antitrust's sole purpose is to foster competition for the benefit of consumers. 50Because consumers are primarily concerned about prices, quality, and innovation, modern antitrust may only condemn exclusionary practices that raised prices, diminished quality, eroded innovation, or rendered similar effects in a defined market. 51To violate antitrust law, the reduction of competition [\*548] must derive from an exclusionary act rather than the innovation of superior goods or other legitimate means. 52

Since the patent system grants the legal right to exclude competition, 53the consensus is that patent owners enjoy antitrust immunity so long as they act within their patent's scope. 54Examples of where a rightsholder exceeds its patent and thereby offends antitrust law include the tying of a non-patented item with a patented good (which extends one's patent to the non-patented item) 55and sham infringement litigation. 56However, when a rightsholder refuses to license a patent or charges fortunes to do so, courts have largely characterized these acts as squarely within one's exclusive rights. 57The principle is that a patent owner - or anyone else - owes no duty to help their rival. 58

Also informing this rule, antitrust enforcement might threaten innovation. A theory is that firms would tepidly invest in research and development (R&D) if they feared exercising their right to exclude. 59Along the same lines, it is thought that courts are ill-equipped to identify whether an act of innovation was meant to produce a superior good or, instead, suppress competition. 60Thus, for practical and policy reasons, the exploitation of patent rights has not typically been considered an exclusionary act. Undeterred, plaintiffs have sought to impose antitrust liability on patent holders under an array of theories, as explained next.

#### 2. Suits --- Antitrust suits are uniquely time consuming and expensive --- That drains R&D efforts

Osenga '21 [Kristen; 6/7/21; Professor of Law at the University of Richmond School of Law; J.D. from the University of Illinois College of Law, Visiting Professor at Emory University School of Law and at William & Mary School of Law; "Opinion: We Must Win the Race to 5G," https://prescottenews.com/index.php/2021/06/07/opinion-we-must-win-the-race-to-5g/]

America must swiftly act to ensure we win the race to 5G. One of the biggest barriers to American development of 5G is antitrust law and enforcement, both domestically and internationally. A combination of domestic rulings and efforts by foreign governments have left many of our most innovative companies dangerously exposed. We need to respond to these anti-competitive measures to ensure American companies are competing on a level playing field.

Aggressive antitrust enforcement by both foreign and domestic forces threatens innovation by forcing American companies to engage in expensive litigation. The lawsuits often result in these companies being unable to exercise their legally granted intellectual property rights. Qualcomm – one of the most active companies in the 5G space – is embroiled in a years-long legal battle that jeopardizes its business model and could force it to sell its groundbreaking wireless chips at a steep discount. The problems American technology companies face overseas are even more extensive, as foreign governments like China prioritize technological supremacy over the rule of law.

China’s government and courts regularly disregard due process guidelines. American companies often face pressure to settle out of court because they know the process is rigged. In some instances, American companies weren’t allowed to view all the evidence against them or retain appropriate legal counsel. Without legal baselines, American companies are powerless to resist theft and wrongdoing by the CCP.

Another example of these manipulative legal maneuvers against U.S. companies by China occurred when the American company InterDigitial filed a suit in India alleging that Xiaomi, a Chinese tech giant, was infringing its patents. The Chinese Wuhan Intermediate Court stepped in and demanded InterDigital drop its case and not sue Xiaomi in any jurisdiction or face a hefty fine. Clearly, the CCP was putting its hand on the scales of justice to protect a domestic company.

Research by the Office of the United States Representative has found the laws that China chooses to enforce are often overly broad and essentially allow Chinese companies to seize intellectual property if American companies won’t hand it over at a steep discount.

These actions, in the U.S. and especially in China, can have devastating impacts on America’s role in 5G development. Historically, American companies have been the forerunners of innovation, and America has reaped the benefits. This process may not occur with 5G because only a handful of American companies, like Qualcomm, are heavily investing in 5G. These companies may be forced out of the market by expensive litigation costs or the outright theft of their products.

#### 3. Competence --- Antitrust courts are inept --- That chills innovation

Sipe ’17 [Matthew; December of 2016, published in the 2017 edition; J.D. at Yale Law School; American University Law Review, “Patents v. Antitrust: Preempting Conflict,” Vol. 66]

IV. RISK OF CONFLICT

The previous two Parts examined the existing sources of regulatory authority in the patent context--the PTO, the ITC, and the Federal Circuit--to create a hierarchy of potentially anticompetitive patent activities, categorizing them based on the degree to which they are already under patent-specific supervision. Where that alternative supervision exists, as the Credit Suisse Court recognized, the benefits of overlapping antitrust intervention are marginal. Of equal--if not greater--concern, however, are the costs of overlapping antitrust intervention.

The bulk of the Court's analysis in Credit Suisse was dedicated to calculating those costs in the securities context. Due to the "fine, complex, detailed line" separating activity the SEC permits and activity the SEC forbids, the "contradictory inferences" that might arise from identical behavior, the "need for securities-related expertise" in adjudication, the "risk of inconsistent court results," and the danger of permitting plaintiffs to "dress what is essentially a securities complaint in antitrust clothing," the Credit Suisse Court determined that "antitrust courts are likely to make unusually serious mistakes" where they intervene with securities law. 193 As a result, the Court stated, permitting antitrust law and securities law to overlap would likely "produce conflicting guidance, requirements, duties, privileges, or standards of conduct." 194 This Part extends that analysis to the patent context where the costs are equally substantial. Each of the above concerns is just as pressing in the patent sphere--if not moreso.

[\*451] A. The Fine Lines of Patent Law

In Credit Suisse, the Court characterized the line separating permissible and impermissible securities activity as "fine, complex, [and] detailed." 195 Accordingly, allowing antitrust and securities law to apply simultaneously would be particularly likely to produce conflicting guidance and requirements. The Court illustrated this dilemma:

It will often be difficult for someone who is not familiar with accepted syndicate practices to determine with confidence whether an underwriter has insisted that an investor buy more shares in the immediate aftermarket (forbidden), or has simply allocated more shares to an investor willing to purchase additional shares of that issue in the long run (permitted). And who but a securities expert could say whether the present SEC rules set forth a virtually permanent line, unlikely to change in ways that would permit the sorts of . . . conduct that it now seems to forbid? 196

Patent law is similarly replete with fine doctrinal lines separating the permissible and the forbidden. To provide just a few key examples, the frameworks governing patent misuse, exhaustion, inequitable conduct, and contributory infringement are highly complex and continue to develop and evolve.

As explained in Part III, patent misuse and exhaustion are equitable defenses to infringement. 197 The former applies where a patentee "impermissibly broadened the 'physical or temporal scope' of the patent grant with anticompetitive effect." 198 The patent then becomes "unenforceable until the misuse is purged." 199 The latter applies where a patented item has been "lawfully made and sold," after which "there is no restriction on [its] use to be implied for the benefit of the patentee." 200 An infringement claim based on downstream use or sale will therefore be dismissed as a matter of law. 201 The Federal Circuit, reviewing these defenses, 202 is forced to thus grapple with complex, "murk[y]" questions. 203 In terms of patent misuse: What is outside [\*452] the scope of any given patent grant? Has this particular patent been "leveraged" as part of the alleged anticompetitive scheme? How should courts analyze and resolve portfolio--rather than individual patent--misuse? 204 In terms of exhaustion: Does the article sold sufficiently embody the "essential features" of the patent? 205 To what extent can parties contract around exhaustion? 206 As a result, there is already "foreseeable polymorphism" in the doctrines of patent misuse and exhaustion, and "unforeseeable strains of potential misbehaviors" are likely to emerge. 207 Allowing generalist antitrust courts to intervene would only produce greater uncertainty and, ultimately, conflicting and inconsistent results.

Inequitable conduct is another equitable defense to patent infringement. 208 To successfully assert a claim of inequitable conduct, the accused infringer must show that the patentee failed to disclose information, such as prior art, in its patent application. 209 The patentee must also have "specific intent to deceive the PTO," such that the "PTO would not have granted the patent but for [the] failure to disclose." 210 The remedy, as expressed by the Federal Circuit, is the "'atomic bomb' of patent law": "inequitable conduct regarding any single claim renders the entire patent unenforceable." 211 The result is a fine line to adjudicate. Because the Federal Circuit has determined that "intent and materiality are separate elements . . . that . . . should not be put on a sliding scale with one another," the crucial--and highly technical--question of whether or not the patentee's alleged deception was the "but for" cause of the PTO's grant must be addressed fully in every case. 212 Again, inconsistency and uncertainty would mar this already complex doctrine if antitrust courts were left to adjudicate these claims.

[\*453] As opposed to direct infringement, contributory infringement covers situations where a party does not sell the patented article or practice the patented process, but instead

offers to sell or sells . . . a material or apparatus for use in practicing a patented process, constituting a material part of the invention, knowing the same to be especially made or especially adapted for use in an infringement of such patent, and not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial noninfringing use . . . . 213

For a plaintiff's claim of contributory infringement to succeed, the plaintiff must demonstrate that the defendant "knew that the combination for which its components were especially made was both patented and infringing," and that the "components have 'no substantial noninfringing uses.'" 214 In practice, contributory infringement claims can be incredibly complex, not only in technical terms--understanding how components may be used together or separately in infringing or noninfringing ways--but doctrinally as well. For example, there is a delicate line between raising a successful contributory infringement claim and impermissibly trying to extend the scope of one's patent over unpatented devices--potentially triggering misuse. 215 With the risk of a finding of unenforceability on one side and the possibility of rampant third-party infringement on the other, the costs of antitrust courts generating conflicting guidance or contributing to uncertainty in this doctrine would be quite high.

Altogether, the degree of complexity associated with patent doctrines, such as misuse, exhaustion, inequitable conduct, and contributory infringement, weigh in favor of preemption under Credit Suisse's analysis. If permitted instead to overlap, there is a significant risk that patent law and antitrust law would produce conflicting guidance and requirements. Just as generalist antitrust courts would struggle to distinguish permissible and forbidden securities arrangements--and fail to accurately forecast potential changes in securities law 216--they would struggle with the equally delicate and fine lines of patent doctrine.

### AT --- Tech bad

#### Don’t refuse colonial technologies, repurpose them.

Paperson ‘17

[La Paperson, aka K. Wayne Yang, UC San Diego. 2017. “A Third University is Possible”. <https://manifold.umn.edu/read/a-third-university-is-possible/section/ba50806d-ff18-4100-9998-784aecb42ae4>] Pat

Everywhere land resists and refuses—whales that destroy ships, bees that refuse to work, bombed islands that reconstitute themselves. The land also resists in the form of people; Indigenous peoples’ resistance is the land’s resistance. Indigenous people continue to subvert legal and capitalist technologies as part of that resistance. And technologies and technological beings resist too.

Patent law is patently designed to favor corporations, a legal technology whose colonizing functions are particularly evident when considering how Monsanto and other GMO producing giants are patenting seeds and genes they “find” throughout the world. Yet Indigenous communities are fighting this biopiracy by refusing the systems that permit corporations to patent life and that document knowledge for expropriation in the first place, by creating digital libraries of traditional knowledges, and sometimes by subverting patent law to claim rights to their own life worlds and knowledges.

Treaties are technologies of colonial coercion and yet also of Indigenous survivance. As Scott Lyon says, an x-mark that signs the treaty “is a sign of consent in a context of coercion.... And yet there is always the possibility of slippage, indeterminacy, unforeseen consequences, or unintended results; it is always possible, that is, that an x-mark could result in something good. Why else, we must ask, would someone bother to make it?” Since 1948, the Oneida Indian Nation has pursued restoration of sovereignty over historical reservation lands via a complex set of avenues involving treaty law, U.S. courts, casinos, and excise taxes, resulting in a landmark 13,004 acres of land taken into trust by the Department of the Interior in 2014.

Sometimes settlers return land to Indigenous tribes and nations. Hopefully, they/we might do so without conditions. As I write, the Kashia Band of Pomo Indians are getting back 688 acres of coastal lands in California. I am not saying wealthy settlers who return land are decolonizing. I am saying that some colonizing technology has been hotwired; something scyborg is happening.

The truth is that any return of land is not just due to the good graces and benevolence of wealthy settlers; it is a scyborg possibility foretold by an x-mark. About Hollywood star Johnny Depp’s purported promise to buy land for Comanche, Sonny Skyhawk, a Sicangu Lakota actor and founder of American Indians in Film and Television, said, “If it’s from the heart, we accept it. If it’s not from the heart, we’ll accept it anyways.”

Developed as weapons of surveillance and assassination, drones are hard to imagine as decolonizing instruments; yet these machines we hate may serve a function before we discard them. Originally a wind-powered device similar to the childhood wind toys of its Afghani creator Massoud Hassani, the Mine Kafon drone “can autonomously map, detect, and detonate land mines” and could contribute to demilitarizing mine-filled lands within a generation. Dynamite, which left Alfred Nobel rich and many dead, and which abetted in U.S. westward imperial expansion, blew up the Elwha and Glines Canyon dams and restored the Elwha River. A giant, autonomous artificial coastline could assist the ocean to clean herself of the great Pacific Garbage Patch. Oysters made “plantable” by farming technologies detoxify the Hudson and so become too poisonous to eat, but because of them, the frogs will return. Wind-powered strandbeests—originally devised to restore Dutch beaches—now roam almost autonomous, almost free. Toxic and explosive and wind-willed machine animals, you, scyborg, might read about and feel some odd sense of recognition.

Figure out how technologies operate. Use a wrench. Technologies can be disrupted and reorganized—at least for a machine cycle. Rather than thinking of ourselves as just subjects of those technologies, think about how we are the drones, the explosives, the toxified, the operative parts of those technologies—and ideally, how we might operate on ourselves and other technologies and turn these gears into decolonizing operations.

If this sounds easy and obvious, then my writing has failed you. Listen: you will need to remember this when you are accused of destruction. Attach a pacemaker to the heart of those machines you hate; make it pump for your decolonizing enterprise; let it tick its own countdown. Ask how, and how otherwise, of the colonizing machines. Even when they are dangerous.

# 2NR

#### 2. The plan could ONLY be the courts --- It says interpret --- That has to be the courts

White House, ND (White House, No Date, accessed on 11-6-2021, The White House, "The Judicial Branch | The White House", <https://www.whitehouse.gov/about-the-white-house/our-government/the-judicial-branch/>)//babcii

Federal **courts enjoy the sole power to interpret the law**, determine the constitutionality of the law, and apply it to individual cases. The courts, like Congress, can compel the production of evidence and testimony through the use of a subpoena. The inferior courts are constrained by the decisions of the Supreme Court — once the Supreme Court interprets a law, inferior courts must apply the Supreme Court’s interpretation to the facts of a particular case.