# 1AC

### Plan

#### Plan: The United States federal government should substantially increase prohibitions on private sector conduct that is more restrictive of competition than reasonably necessary to enable creation of information technology standards.

### 1AC---Innovation ADV

#### Advantage 1 is Innovation:

#### Current standard setting organization and FRAND enforcement is failing now

Melamed & Shapiro 18, \*A. Douglas Melamed is Professor of the Practice of Law at Stanford Law School; \*Carl Shapiro is the Transamerica Professor of Business Strategy at the Haas School of Business at the University of California at Berkeley; (May 2018, “How Antitrust Law Can Make FRAND Commitments More Effective”, https://www-cdn.law.stanford.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/How-Antitrust-Law-Can-Make-FRAND-Commitments-More-Effective.pdf)

I. Standard Setting and the Competitive Process

The fundamental economics in the information technology sector, driven by network effects, implies that there is enormous value associated with establishing compatibility standards. Popular standards include the mobile broadband standards used in cell phones, which are established by the 3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP), and the Wi-Fi technology for wireless local area networks, which is enabled by the 802.11 standard established by the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE).4

There are many SSOs, and their rules and procedures differ considerably. In addition to IEEE, leading SSOs include the International Organization for Standardization (ISO), the International Telecommunication Union (ITU), the European Telecommunications Standards Institute (ETSI), the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), and the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C).5 SSOs generally establish standards by holding a series of committee meetings among industry participants. These meetings culminate in a vote on a technical specification that describes what features or attributes a product must have in order to comply with the standard. Most SSOs are open to all industry participants and seek to operate on a consensus basis, applying certain voting rules. SSOs do not normally engage in patent licensing, nor do they specify how patent royalties will be divided up among patent holders. They leave that to their members, which in some cases form patent pools to address these issues.6

SSOs adopt specific policies relating to intellectual property rights (IPRs).7 These IPR policies are generally intended to enable the SEP holders to obtain reasonable royalties for licensing their patents, while prohibiting them from charging excessive royalties after other industry participants have committed to the standard. At that point, firms committed to implementing the standard— which we call “implementers”—would find it very costly to avoid using the patented technology. For this purpose, most SSOs require SEP owners to license their SEPs on FRAND terms.8

FRAND policies are especially necessary because negotiations between SEP holders and implementers generally take place only after the implementers have used and infringed the technologies claimed by the SEPs. Standards involving information and communications technology can involve hundreds or even thousands of SEPs, many with uncertain boundaries for infringement. In addition, a time lag exists between patent application and patent issuance. For these and other reasons, it is impractical for implementers to enter into negotiations for patent licenses with all SEP owners prior to the establishment of a standard and to their implementation of it.9

The fact that patent negotiations generally do not take place until after implementers have used and infringed the technologies has several critical implications. First, at the time of negotiation, implementers are locked into the standard and the technologies claimed by the SEPs—that is, the cost to switch to an alternative technology or standard at that point—ex post—is much greater than it was ex ante, before the patented technology was first included in the standard. Ex post, the patent holder is no longer competing to have its technology included in the standard, nor is it competing to have implementers of the standard use its technology. Instead, because the patent holder owns an asset that is essential to the standard, implementers have no choice but to use the patented technology.

If the standard is commercially successful, implementers are willing to pay a much larger royalty for use of the patented technology than they would have paid ex ante, when the SEP holder faced competition from other technologies. In these circumstances, the SEP holder can be said to have obtained monopoly power in the market in which the patented technology is licensed for use in implementing the standard.10

Second, because of lock-in and the implementer’s ongoing infringement, the potential for litigation looms large in licensing negotiations. In effect, the parties are negotiating about how to settle an infringement suit, and that negotiation is heavily influenced by their predictions as to what the court will do if they cannot agree. This situation is not unique to SEPs; it arises frequently when firms are faced with patent infringement claims for products they have independently developed or technologies they have inadvertently infringed. Patent law addresses such instances by specifying that patent holders are entitled to “reasonable royalties,” defined as the royalties that the parties would have negotiated prior to the infringement and thus prior to lock-in.11 Those hypothetical ex ante royalties reflect the market value of the patent license. Notwithstanding the law’s embrace of this principle, however, as a practical matter, patent holders are generally able to recover more than the ex ante value of the patent when litigation occurs after the implementers are locked in. Further, negotiations in the shadow of litigation after lock-in tend to result in royalties in excess of the ex ante or market value of the patented technology.12

Third, the shadow of litigation is particularly problematic in the communications and technology sector, in which products typically include hundreds or thousands of patented technologies. A court-ordered injunction involving such products would deprive the implementer of not only the value of the technology covered by the patent-in-suit, but also the value of the entire product.13 Implementers that are forced to bear the risk of an injunction are thus induced to agree to royalties greater than those that would be appropriate if only the value of the patented technology were at stake. Those royalties systematically provide SEP holders with excessive compensation in comparison with the benchmark of ex ante royalties.

These implications of lock-in and ex post dealings are well-understood: they represent an example of the general concept of lock-in and opportunism developed by Oliver Williamson.14 The Federal Circuit has also recognized the market distortions caused by the inclusion of patented technologies in public standards and the resulting danger of patent holdup involving SEPs.15

For these and other reasons, the SEP holder has ex post monopoly power that, if left unchecked, would enable it to obtain royalties far in excess of the royalties that it could earn in a competitive market.16 To address this common problem and limit ex post opportunism by SEP holders, SSOs typically require participants that own SEPs to make certain FRAND commitments. In particular, by requiring a commitment to license on “fair and reasonable” terms, the FRAND requirement aims to prevent, or at least reduce, the extent of monopoly pricing by SEP holders. And by requiring a commitment to license on “nondiscriminatory” terms, the FRAND requirement can prevent SEP holders from extracting monopoly premiums by selective licensing or, more important, migrating their monopoly power from the FRAND-regulated market to unregulated standard-implementing product markets by licensing to only one or a few implementers or licensing to selected implementers on discriminatorily favorable terms.

#### Holdup is accentuated by FTC v Qualcomm

Moss 20, \*Alex Moss is a Staff Attorney on EFF’s intellectual property team, before joining EFF, Alex practiced complex commercial litigation at Sullivan & Cromwell LLP in New York and Durie Tangri LLP in San Francisco; (August 26th, 2020, “Throwing Out the FTC's Suit Against Qualcomm Moves Antitrust Law in the Wrong Direction”, https://www.eff.org/deeplinks/2020/08/throwing-out-ftcs-suit-against-qualcomm-moves-antitrust-law-wrong-direction)

Standards can enhance competition and consumer choice, but they also massively inflate the value of patents deemed essential to the standard, and give their owners the power to sue companies that implement the standard for money damages or injunctions to block them from using their SEPs. When standards cover critical features like wireless connectivity, SEP owners wield a huge amount of “hold-up” power because their patents allow them to effectively block access to the standard altogether. That lets them charge unduly large tolls to anyone who wants to implement the standard.

To minimize that risk, standard-setting organizations typically require companies that want their patented technology incorporated into a standard to promise in advance to license their SEPs to others on fair, reasonable, and non-discriminatory (FRAND) terms. But that promise strikes at a key tension between antitrust and patent law: patent owners have no obligation to let anyone use technology their patent covers, but to get those technologies incorporated into standards, patent owners usually have to promise that they will give permission to anyone who wants to implement the standard as long as they pay a reasonable license fee.

Qualcomm is one of the most important and dominant companies in the history of wireless communication standards. It is a multinational conglomerate that has owned patents on every major wireless communication standard since its first CDMA patent in 1985, and it participates in the standard-setting organizations that define those standards. Qualcomm is somewhat unique in that it not only licenses SEPs, but also supplies the modem chips used by a wide range of devices. These include chips that implement wireless communication standards, which lie at the heart of every mobile computing device.

Although Qualcomm promised to license its SEPs (including patents essential to CDMA, 3G, 4G, and 5G) on FRAND terms, its conduct has to many looked unfair, unreasonable, and highly discriminatory. In particular, Qualcomm has drawn scrutiny for bundling tens of thousands of patents together—including many that are not standard-essential—and offering portfolio-only licenses no matter what licensees actually want or need; refusing to sell modem chips to anyone without a SEP license and threatening to withhold chips from companies trying to negotiate different license terms; refusing to license anyone other than original-equipment manufacturers (OEMs); and insisting on royalties calculated as a percentage of the sale price of a handset sold to end users for hundreds of dollars, despite the minimal contribution of any particular patent to the retail value.

In 2017, the U.S. Federal Trade Commission [sued](https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/press-releases/2017/01/ftc-charges-qualcomm-monopolizing-key-semiconductor-device-used) Qualcomm for violating both sections of the Sherman Antitrust Act by engaging in a number of anticompetitive SEP licensing practices. In May 2019, the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California agreed with the FTC, identifying numerous instances of Qualcomm’s unlawful, anticompetitive conduct in a comprehensive [233-page opinion](https://www.eff.org/document/ftc-v-qualcomm-district-court-opinion). We were pleased to see the FTC take action and the district court credit the overwhelming evidence that Qualcomm’s conduct is corrosive to market-based competition and threatens to cement Qualcomm’s dominance for years to come.

But this month, a panel of judges from the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit unanimously [overturned](https://www.eff.org/document/ninth-circuit-opinion-ftc-v-qualcomm) the district court’s decision, reasoning that Qualcomm’s conduct was “hypercompetitive” but not “anticompetitive,” and therefore not a violation of antitrust law. To reach that result, the Ninth Circuit made the patent grant more powerful and antitrust law weaker than ever.

According to the Ninth Circuit, patent owners don’t have a duty to let anyone use what their patent covers, and therefore Qualcomm had no duty to license its SEPs to anyone. But that framing requires ignoring the promises Qualcomm made to license its SEPs on reasonable and non-discriminatory terms—promises that courts in this country and around the world have consistently enforced. It also means ignoring antitrust principles like the essential facilities doctrine, which limits the ability of a monopolist with hold-up power over an essential facility (like a port) to shut out rivals. Instead, the Ninth Circuit held rather simplistically that a duty to deal could arise only if the monopolist had provided access, and then reversed its policy.

But even when Qualcomm restricted its licensing policies in critical ways, the Ninth Circuit found reasons to approve those restrictions. For example, Qualcomm stopped licensing its patents to chip manufacturers and started licensing them only to OEMs. This had a major benefit: it let Qualcomm charge a much higher royalty rate based on the high retail price of the end user devices, like smartphones and tablets, that OEMs make and sell. If Qualcomm had continued to license to chip suppliers, its patents would be “exhausted” once the chips were sold to OEMs, extinguishing Qualcomm’s right to assert its patents and control how the chips were used.

Patent exhaustion is a century-old doctrine that protects the rights of consumers to use things they buy without getting the patent owner’s permission again and again. Patent exhaustion is important because it prevents price-gouging, but also because it protects space for innovation by letting people use things they buy freely, including to build innovations of their own. The doctrine thus helps patent law serve its underlying goal—promoting economic growth and innovation. In other words, the doctrine of exhaustion is baked into the patent grant; it is not optional. Nevertheless, the Ninth Circuit wholeheartedly approved of Qualcomm’s efforts to avoid exhaustion—even when that meant cutting off access to previous licensees (chip-makers) in ways that let Qualcomm charge far more in licensing fees than its SEPs could possibly have contributed to the retail value of the final product.

It makes no sense that Qualcomm could contract around a fundamental principle like patent exhaustion, but at the same time did not assume any antitrust duty to deal under these circumstances. Worse, it’s harmful for the economy, innovation, and consumers. Unfortunately, the kind of harm that antitrust law recognizes is limited to harm affecting “competition” or the “competitive process.” Antitrust law, at least as the Ninth Circuit interprets it, doesn’t do nearly enough to address the harm downstream consumers experience when they pay inflated prices for high-tech devices, and miss out on innovation that might have developed from fair, reasonable, and non-discriminatory licensing practices.

We hope the FTC sticks to its guns and asks the Ninth Circuit to go en banc and reconsider this decision. Otherwise, antitrust law will become an even weaker weapon against innovation-stifling conduct in technology markets.

#### Don’t trust neg authors---Qualcomm funded their papers.

McLaughlin 21, Bloomberg, (David, March 12th, 2021, “One Tech-Funded University Helped Shape FTC’s Hands-Off Approach”, <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2021-03-12/how-george-mason-university-shaped-ftc-s-hands-off-approach-to-tech>)

* Alden Abbott, Jonathan Barnett are both fellows at George Mason University’s Center for Intellectual Property and Innovation Policy (funded by Qualcomm)
* Joshua Wright is a former FTC commissioner who taught at the institute and lobbied for Qualcomm

The [Tech Transparency Project](https://www.techtransparencyproject.org/) (TTP), a watchdog group in Washington, details in a new report an unusually close relationship between the law school at Virginia’s George Mason University and the Federal Trade Commission. By helping shape the workforce of the FTC, the group claims, the school infused it with a laissez-faire philosophy favorable to the school’s tech donors.

[The report](https://www.techtransparencyproject.org/articles/big-techs-backdoor-ftc) throws a harsh light on the FTC’s hands-off approach to tech companies over the past decade. As the agency prepares to argue the lawsuit against [Facebook Inc.](https://www.bloomberg.com/quote/FB:US) that it filed late last year, seeking to break up the social media giant, it must contend with an inconvenient fact: It approved Facebook’s acquisitions of Instagram in 2012 and WhatsApp in 2014—the very mergers it now seeks to undo. The FTC’s consent to those deals is cited by critics as evidence of a permissive attitude that allowed tech companies to grow into leviathans.

One explanation for its lenience, the TTP report charges, is that the industry used a corner of academia to capture the agency. According to the report, which was published on March 12, Silicon Valley donated substantial sums to George Mason’s Antonin Scalia Law School, which built a pipeline of professors and graduates who went to work at the FTC. Dozens of people went from the school to the regulator—commissioners, bureau heads, attorney-advisers, legal interns—during the Obama and Trump administrations.

Under President Trump alone, professors and graduates of Scalia Law, and heads of affiliated programs at George Mason, served as the FTC chair, general counsel, policy planning head, and leaders of its three main divisions: the bureaus of competition, consumer protection, and economics.

Katie Paul, who heads the TTP, says an investigation is needed into “whether George Mason University has effectively become Big Tech’s back door into the FTC, giving the companies an undisclosed way to sway its decision-making and hobble enforcement action.”

Revolving Door

Large tech companies have donated to two programs affiliated with Scalia Law, the Global Antitrust Institute and the Law & Economics Center. From January 2018 to the end of last year, [Google](https://www.bloomberg.com/quote/GOOGL:US) donated $900,000, [Amazon.com Inc.](https://www.bloomberg.com/quote/AMZN:US) contributed $925,000, and Facebook Inc. gave $675,000, according to documents obtained by Bloomberg Businessweek through a public records request. Google, Amazon, and Facebook declined to comment on their donations.

The law school says the ties between its faculty and the FTC aren’t unusual. Alison Price, a senior associate dean, says it’s common for professors to work for federal agencies and then return to their teaching jobs. “Since Scalia Law has special expertise and a relatively large faculty in antitrust, it’s logical that our faculty is called to serve with frequency,” she says. “But faculty don’t set policy; administrations do.”

The Tech Transparency Project is part of a larger watchdog group, [Campaign for Accountability](https://campaignforaccountability.org/). The TTP website cites several philanthropists as donors, including George Soros’s Open Society Foundations. Oracle Corp. had been a donor to a TTP predecessor group that focused mostly on Google, but the TTP says it no longer accepts corporate funding.

Both George Mason programs, which host conferences and offer training for judges and antitrust enforcers, promote the consumer-welfare standard articulated by Robert Bork, the late federal judge and Yale Law School professor. That standard, the guidepost for regulators and courts since the 1980s, looks to price increases as a gauge of competitive harm. It is blamed by some antitrust experts for handcuffing enforcers when it comes to policing tech companies.

The tech companies’ donations are drawing scrutiny. At a hearing on Feb. 25, New York Democratic Representative Mondaire Jones called Abbott “Tad” Lipsky, a former FTC official now at the [Global Antitrust Institute](https://gai.gmu.edu/), “a wolf in sheep’s clothing.” As he testified against proposals to give the antitrust laws more teeth, Lipsky drew Jones’s scorn. Programs such as the GAI “have worked to teach judges and regulators to let their guard down as corporate funders like yours came to dominate our economy,” Jones said. Lipsky responded that his antitrust views predated “any of these digital technology companies.”

A key figure in the law school-to-regulator pipeline is Lipsky’s boss, Joshua Wright, an FTC commissioner from 2013 to 2015. He now teaches antitrust law at George Mason while also running the GAI.

Wright wielded outsize influence at the agency, pushing through a 2015 policy statement in an attempt to rein in the agency’s enforcement power. After he left he improperly lobbied the agency on behalf of Qualcomm Inc., one of the law school’s largest donors, according to a report by the FTC inspector general that was obtained by TTP and verified by Bloomberg Businessweek. His name was redacted in the report, but Wright confirmed it was about him. He says he did nothing wrong.

The New York Times last year [reported that tech companies bankrolled the work of the GAI](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/07/24/technology/global-antitrust-institute-google-amazon-qualcomm.html) and that Wright had worked with corporate donors to fend off critics. The extent of the revolving door between the FTC and the law school, and Wright’s alleged violation of ethics laws, haven’t been previously reported.

Many companies support higher education, and many universities send professors and graduates to Washington. But George Mason is unique in cultivating a specific regulator, says Jeff Hauser, executive director of the [Revolving Door Project](https://therevolvingdoorproject.org/), which tracks government officials’ corporate ties.

“In terms of feeding directly into a government agency, I’m not aware of any equivalent at the SEC or the EPA or anything else,” he says, referring to the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Environmental Protection Agency.

A public university in the northern Virginia suburbs of Washington, George Mason is home to the free-market think tank the [Mercatus Center](https://www.mercatus.org/" \t "_blank" \o "Mercatus Center website). It is a leader in the study of applying economic analysis to the law, emphasizing that markets work best when government regulates less. The university became known as a haven for conservatives at the end of the Reagan administration in 1988. Even Bork taught there after stepping down from the bench in 1988.

The George Mason conduit was steady and robust, according to the TTP, which details dozens of examples of people moving between the FTC and the law school over the past decade. One is James Cooper, who directs an economics and privacy program at the Law & Economics Center. He simultaneously taught at the school and served as a deputy director for the FTC’s Bureau of Consumer Protection.

Cooper was among the academics who urged House lawmakers last year to reject proposals to break up tech companies and make merger approvals more difficult. George Mason’s Wright, Lipsky, and John Yun, a professor at the law school who was an economist at the FTC, joined the filing. Cooper didn’t respond to a request for comment, and Yun declined to comment.

But Wright, the former FTC commissioner, perhaps best embodies the ties linking the FTC to the law school and its donors. After leaving the agency in 2015, Wright simultaneously taught at George Mason, ran the GAI, and worked for the Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati law firm, where he represented Qualcomm.

The FTC sued Qualcomm in January 2017 in a monopoly case that was developed while Wright was an FTC commissioner. Wright tried to broker a settlement about four months after the case was brought. He met Lipsky, then the acting director of the FTC’s competition bureau, for lunch at a steakhouse in Washington and tried to set up an additional meeting with agency officials, according to the inspector general’s report.

In doing so, Wright violated an ethics law that bans officials for life from lobbying on issues they worked on “personally and substantially,” according to the inspector general. Those findings were referred to the Department of Justice’s public integrity section. The Justice Department, which decided not to prosecute, declined to comment.

Lipsky resigned two months after his lunch with Wright, who then hired him at the GAI. Lipsky didn’t respond to a request for comment.

“I never made any appearance at the FTC involving its enforcement action against Qualcomm or discussed the merits of the case with any FTC official,” says Wright, who declined to elaborate on the specifics of the investigation. “I immediately complied when the FTC ethics office informed me that I should not make any appearance based upon a single preliminary vote I had cast years before the case was filed.”

Qualcomm contributed almost $5.8 million to the George Mason law school programs from 2016 through 2020. Less than two months before Wright met with the FTC to try to settle the Qualcomm case, the company gave $525,000 to the GAI. The company didn’t respond to requests for comment.

Tech companies that donate to George Mason collaborate with the school’s professors on projects, according to emails obtained through a public records request.

#### Don’t trust Big Tech-funded academic papers---they’re not credible.

Mullins and Nicas 17, \*Brody Mullins is an investigative reporter in the Washington D.C. bureau of The Wall Street Journal where he covers business, lobbying and campaign finance; \*Jack Nicas covers Google and other companies owned by Alphabet Inc. He is based in The Wall Street Journal's San Francisco bureau; (July 14th, 2017, “Paying Professors: Inside Google’s Academic Influence Campaign”, https://www.wsj.com/articles/paying-professors-inside-googles-academic-influence-campaign-1499785286)

Ms. Feldman and other critics of the funding say even disclosing money received from a company that has benefited from the research can give the appearance of a conflict of interest and undermine academic credibility.

“Yeah, the money is good but it does get in the way of objective academic research,” said Daniel Crane, a University of Michigan law professor. He said he turned down Google’s offers to fund his research that opposed antitrust regulation of internet search engines. “If I am reading an academic paper, and they disclose an interest with a party with an interest in the outcome,” he said, “you take [the research] with a grain of salt.”

Paying for favorable academic research has long been a tool of influence by U.S. corporations in food, drug and oil industries. Scandals involving conflicts of interest in medical research have spurred many medical schools, scientific researchers and journals to require disclosure of corporate funding and to prohibit corporate sponsors from meddling with findings.

The tech industry now includes the world’s top five companies by market value: [Apple](https://www.wsj.com/market-data/quotes/AAPL) Inc., Google parent [Alphabet](https://www.wsj.com/market-data/quotes/GOOG) Inc., [Microsoft](https://www.wsj.com/market-data/quotes/MSFT) Corp. , [Amazon.com](https://www.wsj.com/market-data/quotes/AMZN) Inc. and [Facebook](https://www.wsj.com/market-data/quotes/FB) Inc.

Several of the companies also are active in funding academic research. Microsoft has paid Harvard business professor Ben Edelman, the author of papers saying Google abuses its market dominance. Chip maker [Qualcomm](https://www.wsj.com/market-data/quotes/QCOM) Inc. funded papers supporting its side of a fight against Google over patents. And telecommunication giants [Verizon Communications](https://www.wsj.com/market-data/quotes/VZ) Inc. and [AT&T](https://www.wsj.com/market-data/quotes/T) Inc. have funded various papers against Google. The companies either declined to comment or didn’t respond to requests for comment.

#### Big Tech bankrolls academic papers---compromises academic integrity in a manner identical to Big Tobacco.

Auslender 20, (June 10th, 2020, “This research was sponsored by Amazon: How ‘Big Tech’ is compromising academic integrity”, https://www.calcalistech.com/ctech/articles/0,7340,L-3854970,00.html)

Research with questionable backing

The entry of corporate money into controversial research fields has always raised concerns. In the 1950s and 1960s, it was the big tobacco companies that poured billions into universities and research centers to produce academic studies into why smoking or second-hand smoke was not a health concern, or that there was no link between smoking and various diseases.

In the 80s and 90s, the same model was adopted by the energy companies, who used it to build the foundations of global warming and climate change denial. The huge amounts of capital the companies poured into the research bodies enabled them to shape the science in such a way as to produce as many studies as possible that emphasized the lack of certainty regarding climate change and help make the argument that man-made global warming was nothing but a theory. In between, there were always the food companies who tried to bridle science to downplay the risks of sugar consumption or the dangers of processed food by sponsoring studies that confused consumers and regulators alike.

In retrospect, it is clear that the money invested by tobacco and energy companies in academic studies served them to help manipulate the public and the regulators put in place to defend it in order to ensure huge profits while ignoring the dangers to people’s health, human lives and the future of the planet. The lessons learned from the previous decades are apparent in the academic institutions’ readiness to accept more money from such companies. When Philip-Morris announced in 2018 that it was launching a research fund that will hand out a billion dollars over 15 years, a long line of researchers, scientists, and doctors spoke out against accepting funding from a company whose products kill millions of people a year. It’s a good start, but it’s only the beginning. There are now several organizations dedicated to tracking the secret donations of tobacco and oil companies to research centers and NGOs.

Small sums, a huge impact

In recent years technology giants have joined the ranks of organizations that infuse the scientific community, and even some in the non-profit and watchdog sector, with small, but well-targeted sums. At first glance, it is difficult to point out the benefit they seek from cutting the checks, but chances are it’s there just waiting to be cashed. There are many examples and Amazon is only the most recent. Last July, IBM announced it was granting Notre Dame $20 million to establish an ethics lab and last year it was exposed that Oxford University received 17 million GBP from Google, in part to fund research into the ethics of AI and the public responsibility of tech companies. Facebook, in turn, launched a giant campaign to fund 60 research projects across 30 institutions to examine the impact of social media on democracy and at the same time donated $7.5 million for the establishment of a computer science ethics center in Munich. Earlier this week [a study](https://www.wired.com/story/top-ai-researchers-financial-backing-big-tech/) by a researcher at the University of Toronto revealed that more than half of the faculties dealing with AI at four leading universities receive funding from large tech companies, including Alphabet, Amazon, Facebook, Microsoft, Apple, Nvidia, Intel, IBM, Huawei, Samsung, Uber, Alibaba, Element AI, and Elon Musk’s OpenAI. Moreover, not all donations are transparent. Last July, the [New York Times revealed](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/07/24/technology/global-antitrust-institute-google-amazon-qualcomm.html?auth=linked-google) that the Global Antitrust Institute, a part of the Antonin Scalia Law School at George Mason University in Fairfax, Va., which often host regulators and judges from all over the world at its functions, has received over the years donations from Google ($500,000), Amazon ($225,000) and Qualcomm ($2.9 million). Those sums may be small compared to the huge amounts available to the tech giants, but for research institutes and universities they are substantial, especially compared to the government grants they compete fiercely over. In such a way, with minimal but precise contributions, the tech giants purchase access and influence over the shaping of the collective knowledge surrounding such critical subjects as competition, ethical technologies, and long-term social and political impact.

Researchers wake up!

Even though the tech giants are buying influence over social issues that are of critical importance, their relationships with research bodies are nearly free of critique, mostly due to the fact that there are no set rules to protect scientific integrity in such situations. There is no question that technology companies should take part in the discussion over the shaping of the regulatory environment and the ethical frameworks within which they develop new technology and one can’t ignore the two-way flow of people from companies to independent research institutes throughout their careers or completely negate its reciprocal impact. But these bodies, both the tech giants and the research centers, must conduct the dialog in a transparent space, uncorrupted by the money various stakeholders have spread around.

Big Oil and Big Tobacco and now Big Tech too all operate within the limitations of the law, and the money they pour in is all permitted. But when the research bodies are seduced into taking their money, they cast a shadow on the already elusive concept of scientific integrity. No matter how much academic freedom the donors promise, when money is involved there is always a way to pressure the researchers into serving financial interests.

#### Weakened antitrust enforcement emboldens firms to follow Qualcomm’s lead

Hovenkamp 20, \*Herbert J. Hovenkamp is James G. Dinan University Professor at the University of Pennsylvania Law School and the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania; (2020, “FRAND and Antitrust”, <https://scholarship.law.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3095&context=faculty_scholarship>)

While the FRAND process has been highly productive, it is also fragile. Firms are tempted to make commitments at the beginning when the incentive to join is large, but renege on them later when they can profit by doing so. At least in this particular case, private FRAND enforcement had not worked very well. Qualcomm had been able to violate FRAND commitments in order to exclude rivals and obtain higher royalties than FRAND would permit, largely with impunity. Other firms will very likely follow Qualcomm’s lead. If that happens the FRAND system will fall apart, doing irreparable injury to the modern wireless telecommunications network or, at the very least, diminishing the leadership role of the United States in preserving effective network competition.

While governments can be heavily involved in standard set-ting,9 the implementation of technical standards in information technologies is largely the work of private actors. Government involvement is limited mainly to enforcement of contract, intellectual property, or antitrust law. As private actors, those involved in standard setting or compliance are fully subject to the federal antitrust laws.

This Article addresses one question: when is an SSO participant’s violation of a FRAND commitment an antitrust violation, and if it is, of what kind and what are the implications for remedies? It warns against two extremes. One is thinking that any violation of a FRAND commitment is an antitrust violation as well. In the first instance FRAND obligations are contractual, and most breaches of contract do not violate any antitrust law. The other extreme is thinking that, because a FRAND violation is a breach of contract, it cannot also be an antitrust violation. The question of an antitrust violation does not de-pend on whether the conduct breached a particular agreement but rather on whether it caused competitive harm. This can happen because the conduct restrained trade under section 1 of the Sherman Act, was unreasonably exclusionary under section 2 of the Sherman Act, or amounted to an anticompetitive condition or understanding as defined by section 3 of the Clay-ton Act.10 The end goal is to identify practices that harm com-petition, thereby injuring consumers.

The Ninth Circuit’s Qualcomm decision will make antitrust violations in the context of FRAND licensing much more difficult to prove, even in cases where anticompetitive behavior and consumer harm seem clear.11 Indeed, in this case the court itself acknowledged the harm to consumers but appeared to think that they were not entitled to protection.12 If this decision stands, FRAND obligations will to a larger extent have to be settled through private litigation and the federal antitrust enforcement agencies will have a diminished role. Anticompetitive behavior by one firm that is not effectively disciplined will lead others to do the same thing.

#### A trusted and credible system for ICT innovation is critical to rapid tech diffusion and economic growth---absent FRAND, the system will collapse.

Bauer et al. 17, \*Matthias Bauer is Senior Economist at ECIPE; \*Fredrik Erixon is a Swedish economist and writer. He has been the Director of the European Centre for International Political Economy (ECIPE) ever since its start in 2006; (October 2017, “Standard Essential Patents and the Quest for Faster Diffusion of Technology”, https://ecipe.org/publications/standard-essential-patents/)

It is easy to take a pessimistic view about whether the system will break. If the current trend continues, the system is likely to break at some point for the simple reason that companies will not trust it anymore. The series of legal disputes witnessed over the past years – sometimes referred to as the “smartphone patent wars” – has been fodder for a pessimistic reading of “the two tales of SEPs”. While it is common in the business world that disputes over patents and licenses are settled in courts, various SEP disputes have revealed problematic aspects of the SEP market that are different from those disputes that follow the normal stream of business and contracts. Often, the SEP disputes are less concerned about the rights and boundaries of patents, and more about antitrust limits to market behavior: they concern market abusive practices and restrictions to competition as much as they are about intellectual property.

If the SEP system actually does break at some point, the consequences would be felt throughout the economy. SEPs have been a critical part of the ICT revolution. SEPs have allowed for the fast rates of innovation diffusion that the world has witnessed over the past quarter of a century. All the computer and Internet related products and services that people are now dependent upon for their private and professional lives are intricate webs of intellectual property. As many as 250,000 patents can be used to claim ownership of some technical specification or design element in a single smartphone (NYT 2012). A laptop, suggests one calculation, implements more than 250 interoperability standards (Biddle et al. 2010), and the number of SEP holders for 3G and 4G standards grew from 2 in 1994 to 130 in 2013 while the number of SEPs rose from fewer than 150 in 1994 to more than 150,000 in 2013 (Galetovic and Gupta 2016). The standardization-body ETSI has registered more than 150,000 declarations of SEPs from companies, and ETSI is just one of many bodies in the world of ICT standardization. For the 3G standard, the same body has about 24,000 patents that have been declared essential. Now, with the economy yet again on the threshold of big technological change, a trusted and credible system for creators and users of technology to standardize proprietary technology would be a boon for innovation, interoperability and – ultimately – the consumers.

And there are reasons for optimism. Although many of the problems in the SEP regimes need to be addressed, the numbers above indicate that the SEP system is in fact attractive to patent holders and SEP implementers. It is easy to see why: neither holders nor implementers are presented with alternative options that on the face of it would be far more profitable for them. In other words, there simply would not be as many patents declared as essential if both creators and users of technology believed the SEP system worked to their disadvantage or was grossly unfair. While the reality for some companies may be that legal disputes and unpredictability prompt them to find other ways than SEPs to get access to key technologies for their products, it remains the case that most stakeholders have strong economic incentives to maintain a balanced SEP system that is trusted.

First, standard essential patents are an asset for creators of technology because, by becoming essential to a standard, their volumes of sales for technologies that users value rise significantly. As many holders want to raise more revenues for their SEPs and – ideally – have the freedom to contract with buyers on their terms, they can expand their customer base when they agree to sell patented technology in accordance with a set of rules that are designed to prevent SEP holders exploiting the weakness of a customer that has grown dependent on having access to their technology.

Second, SEPs are hugely beneficial also to those that buy the licenses – the implementers or users. Through the SEP system, they can access technologies that are interoperable and work with different products and functionalities – and they can do it under conditions that, if history is a guide, in most cases give them stable and predictable terms of contract. As a consequence, both creators and users can focus on their competitive advantages and profit on the economies of scale and specialization. Downstream firms do not need to develop their own upstream technology and upstream firms do not need to package their technologies in end-customer products in order to make their products valuable.

Third, standard-setting organisations (SSOs) also have a big stake in an SEP system that works well – and, like creators and users of technology, they would stand to lose significantly if the SEP system were to collapse.

Lastly, the biggest beneficiaries are individual consumers – those who buy the end products using FRAND-conditioned SEPs. The advent of SEPs and the rules represented by FRAND have enabled a development of fast technology creation and contributed to the rapid diffusion in ICT goods and ICT-based services. The SEP system has also allowed for new competition, both between existing technologies and brands, and from new ones that have stepped into the market with the ambition to disrupt it, again to the benefit of the consumer. It is difficult to imagine that the ICT and digital development would have been as fast as it has been if SEPs had not been a central feature of the market.

The changing fortunes of companies operating in the cellular and smartphone market would not have been possible if there had not been an SEP system that supported competition. Now that the world economy is on the doorstep of new innovations that are dependent on a great number of input technologies – e.g. the Internet-of-Things, transport connectivity and intelligent vehicles – it is crucially important for the consumer that a balanced and functioning SEP system is maintained and that actors in the system converge towards it – which would ultimately meet their economic interests.

#### ICT innovation is key to post-COVID economic recovery and long-term growth.

van Ark 21, \*Bart van Ark is a Senior Advisor of the Economy, Strategy and Finance (ESF) Center at The Conference Board; Bart van Ark, \*Klaas de Vries is an economist with The Conference Board; \*Abdul Erumban is an assistant professor at the University of Groningen, The Netherlands and a senior research fellow at The Conference Board; (2021, “HOW TO NOT MISS A PRODUCTIVITY REVIVAL ONCE AGAIN”, https://sci-hub.se/10.1017/nie.2020.49)

Introduction

As the global economy has entered recession in 2020, triggered by the COVID-19 pandemic, the human casualties, and economic damage are perceived to be very large. Even as the health crisis will gradually become manageable, the impact on economic growth can be long-lasting and the recovery path can take several years. In particular, growth drivers such as the pace of job creation, income generation and investment may take several years to get back to pre-crisis trends. Initially the productivity of those growth drivers may be of less concern as the mantra of ‘we’ll do what it takes to avoid worse’ is predominant in this phase of the crisis.

However, once the recovery gets underway the productive use of resources is key to sustained growth. While we do not ignore the short-term challenges of the economic recovery, our primary focus in this paper is on the productivity puzzle from a long-term perspective. Productivity is driven by technological change and innovation which, in turn, depends on investment in human and physical capital as well as in other ‘missing capitals’ often referred to as intangible assets. Indeed, those investments create a positive feedback effect, as the productivity it generates also helps to make more efficient usage of scarce resources in the future. When properly measured and valued, productivity also provides a critical yardstick to realise a fairer distribution of the gains from economic growth to those who bring the resources to bear. It thereby creates the incentives for people to produce and business to invest helping to drive economic growth and raise living standards.

Unfortunately, in the aftermath of the global financial crisis of 2008/2009, many economies around the world, especially advanced economies, have failed to recharge the economy by powering productivity as the key source of growth in the long term. Indeed the latest update of The Conference Board Total Economy Database (July 2020) points at significant weakening in labor productivity growth in Europe up to 2019 (figure 1a–c). While the United States experienced somewhat faster productivity growth from 2017 to 2019 than the Euro Area and the United Kingdom, it still has not recovered to the rates of productivity growth from before the global financial crisis either.

The slowdown in productivity growth over the past 15 years has been well documented. There are multiple causes including an exhaustion of catch-up potential in emerging markets impacting economies along entire global value chains, and the drag from the global financial crisis because of low demand and weak investment, too low interest rates causing misallocations an overreliance on cheap labor, and failing fiscal policies (Bauer et al., 2020; Cette et al., 2016; Crafts, 2018; Dieppe, 2020; Fernald et al., 2017; Syverson, 2016).1 Technical measurement issues regarding inputs and outputs may have played a role as well.

In our earlier work we have stressed the importance of time lags in the adoption of new technologies, and in particular the complexity in generating productivity growth from the latest round of new digital technologies since the early 2010s, including the move toward mobile, ubiquitous access to broadband, the rise of cloud storage and advances in artificial intelligence (AI) and robotics (van Ark, 2016a, 2016b; van Ark and O’Mahony, 2016; van Ark et al., 2016).

While the first priority for economic recovery from the COVID-19 crisis is to restore jobs, it is important that any employment-intensive growth path does go together with a productivity revival. In this paper, we argue that it is possible to avoid another productivity slowdown. Underneath the aggregate figures, there is evidence pointing toward a possible tipping point at which many advanced economies may expect to see more widespread impacts from the adoption and absorption of digital technology on productivity and GDP growth.

In Section 2 we review the latest literature on the productivity impacts of general purpose technologies (GPTs), including the notion of time lapses through which digital technologies result in faster productivity growth. We also look at patterns by which innovation and productivity effects GPTs emerge across industries and disperse across the economy. We explain why the New Digital Economy (NDE) is especially characterised by long lag effects.

In Section 3 we provide an empirical analysis of productivity growth by industry data to observe whether we can detect a distinct pattern across groups of industries pointing to a structural improvement in recent years. We use a taxonomy on digital intensity by industry which was recently developed by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (Calvino et al., 2018), showing that the most digital-intensive industries have experienced a relatively strong performance in terms of labor productivity growth since 2007 and especially since 2013.

In Section 4 of the paper, we discuss the connection between labor and skills in the digital economy, which we believe provides the key to a productivity revival. We developed a new metric on innovation competencies by occupation on the basis of data from the O\*Net database on occupation-specific descriptors in the United States (Hao et al., 2018). When applied to the United Kingdom, we find that innovation competencies point at stronger productivity effects by industry.

In Section 5 we focus on how productivity has been behaving in the short-term during the COVID-19 recession. In particular, we address the potential trade-offs between traditional pro-cyclical recovery effects and scarring effects the recession leaves, especially on the labor market. We argue that increased adoption and usage of digital technologies during the COVID-19 crisis may create a positive productivity effect. In the final section, Section 6, we will review our hypothesis that a productivity revival could be imminent in the light of the recovery from the COVID-19 crisis. In order not to miss this opportunity again, as happened a decade ago, we argue that a coordinated effort from business and policy is needed, and has to be delivered in such a way that the gains from productivity will be more widespread and such that those who provide the resources for growth are incentivised to deliver them in an efficient way.

2. The productivity paradox of the New Digital Economy

It is well known that General Purpose Technologies (GPTs), defined as new methods of producing and inventing new goods and services which are important enough to have a long-term aggregate impact on the economy, can take a significant amount of time to translate to faster productivity growth at the aggregate level of the economy. This is inherent to the three critical characteristics of a GPT as identified by Bresnahan and Trajtenberg (1995).2

1. Pervasiveness –The GPT should spread to most sectors.

2. Improvement –The GPT should get better over time and, hence, should keep lowering the costs of its users.

3. Innovation spawning –The GPT should make it easier to invent and produce new products or processes.

Historical analysis has focussed on productivity trends in previous technology phases (Bakker et al., 2019; Crafts, 2004). Recent literature has shown that the information and communication technology (ICT) revolution of the past 50 years can be characterised as a GPT and doesn’t pale with previous GPTs such as steam technology, electricity and the combustion engine. For example, Hempell (2005) concludes that ‘investment in information and communication technologies (ICT) are closely linked to complementary innovations and are most productive in firms with experience from earlier innovations’. In a more recent analysis of the evolution of the Internet, Simcoe (2015) argues that the modularity of the internet has prevented a fall in return to investments in innovation by ‘facilitating low-cost adaptation of a shared general-purpose technology to the demands of heterogeneous applications’. In a review of the data, Liao et al. (2016) conclude that:

‘...ICT investment does contribute to productivity but not in the usual manner –we find a positive (but lagged) ICT effect on technological progress. We argue that for a positive ICT role on growth to actually take place, a period of negative relationship between productivity and ICT investment together with ICT-using sectors’ capacity to learn from the embodied new technology was crucial. In addition, it took a learning period with appropriate complementary co-inventions for the new ICT-capital to become effective and its gains to be realised. Our findings provide solid, further empirical evidence to support ICT as a general purpose technology’.

#### Growth solves nuclear war.

Henricksen 17, \*Thomas H., emeritus senior fellow at the Hoover Institution; (March 23rd, 2017, “Post-American World Order,” Hoover Institution, <http://www.hoover.org/research/post-american-world-order>)

What Is To Be Done?

The first marching order is to dodge any kind of perpetual war of the sort that George Orwell outlined in  “1984,” which engulfed the three super states of Eastasia, Eurasia, and Oceania, and made possible the totalitarian Big Brother regime. A long-running Cold War-type confrontation would almost certainly take another form than the one that ran from 1945 until the downfall of the Soviet Union.

What prescriptions can be offered in the face of the escalating competition among the three global powers? First, by staying militarily and economically strong, the United States will have the resources to deter its peers’ hawkish behavior that might otherwise trigger a major conflict. Judging by the history of the Cold War, the coming strategic chess match with Russia and China will prove tense and demanding—since all the countries boast nuclear arms and long-range ballistic missiles. Next, the United States should widen and sustain willing coalitions of partners, something at which America excels, and at which China and Russia fail conspicuously.

There can be little room for error in fraught crises among nuclear-weaponized and hostile powers. Short- and long-term standoffs are likely, as they were during the Cold War. Thus, the playbook, in part, involves a waiting game in which each power looks to its rivals to suffer grievous internal problems which could entail a collapse, as happened to the Soviet Union.

Some Chinese and Russian experts predict grave domestic problems for each other. They also entertain similar thoughts about the United States, which they view as terminally decadent and catastrophically polarized over politics, ethnicity, and the future direction of the country. So, the brewing three-way struggle also involves a systemic contest, which will test the competitors’ economic and political institutions.

At this juncture, the world is entering a standoff among the three great and several not-so-great powers. Averting war, while defending our interests, will prove a challenge, calling for deft policy, political endurance, and economic growth, as well as sufficient military force to keep at bay aggressive states or prevail over them if ever a war breaks out.

#### Holdup threatens the entire IOT economy.

Morton 16, \*Fiona M. Scott Morton is an American economist, currently the Theodore Nierenberg Professor at Yale School of Management; \*Carl Shapiro is the Transamerica Professor of Business Strategy at the Haas School of Business at the University of California at Berkeley; (2016, “Patent Assertions: Are We Any Closer to Aligning Reward to Contribution?”, https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/full/10.1086/684987#\_i22)

G. Summary

However, our overall conclusions regarding SEPs are more mixed. Policy and legal changes that have reduced the ability of SEP owners to engage in patent holdup appear to have stalled out, especially as regards reform of the IPR rules at SSOs other than the IEEE. If so, this could have important effects on innovation and efficiency. For example, the “Internet of Things” is a new and growing area where royalty stacking and patent holdup appear to be very real dangers. Devices of all sorts, from thermostats to railroad cars to refrigerators, are being given connectivity using standards developed by SSOs. The price of those chips, and whether the IP contained in them costs $5 or $0.50 or $0.005, will determine the nature of new applications and the rate of adoption.

Failure to prevent patent holdup relating to tomorrow’s information technology and communications standards is likely to cause significant social welfare loss in the years ahead. If new and more effective private solutions relating to standard setting do not emerge to promote innovation and protect consumers, antitrust enforcement is one of the only remaining remedies that seems feasible.

V. Conclusions

Over the past five years, the rewards provided to patent owners in the United States have become more closely matched with the value of the technology they contribute. When rewards and contributions are aligned, economic efficiency is promoted because investments into developing new technologies are commensurate with benefits. These changes have come from legislation, the federal courts, and policy statements and enforcement actions by regulators of various types. However, at this juncture, we see a substantial gap persisting between the ability of some patent owners to monetize their patents and the contributions provided by the technology underlying those patents. With the “Internet of Things” poised to create economic growth, this is a problem worthy of further research and policy attention.

#### Emergence of smart cities depends on IoT applications of 5G interoperability standards---absent FRAND, excessive royalties will undermine sustainable development.

Schwartz 18, \*Matt Schwartz, Privacy Fellowship Coordinator at ACT, App Association; (March 2nd, 2018, “It’s Smart to be FRANDly: How the FRAND Commitment Will Determine the Future of Smart Cities”, https://actonline.org/2018/03/02/its-smart-to-be-frandly-how-the-frand-commitment-will-determine-the-future-of-smart-cities/)

In December, we [outlined](https://actonline.org/2017/12/18/smart-cities-connecting-your-community-through-technology/%5d) the emergence of Smart Cities – cities that harness technological innovations like internet of things (IoT) devices and data analytics to improve essential infrastructure in growing urban centers. The technological foundation of Smart Cities aims to improve public safety, better allocate resources, and meet the needs of citizens more quickly.

A central element to Smart Cities is the comprehensive network of sensors and devices implemented within buildings, roads, traffic signs, and parking meters that allows them to interact with public, and potentially private-owned, infrastructure. These sensors will “speak” to one another, communicating information about energy usage, traffic density, or other elements of city management that have traditionally either been analyzed separately or not tracked at all. The potential of Smart Cities allows data to flow from previously disconnected branches of the city and be processed in real-time, unlocking previously unknown insights.

The powerful interoperability of Smart Cities will rely heavily on standardized technologies developed in organizations like the IEEE, which is responsible for standardizing the wi-fi technology we use every day. Standardized technologies often include standard-essential patents (SEPs), which, like their name suggests, are patents declared essential to an industry standard by a standards-setting organization. In simple terms, one cannot implement the standardized technology without using the patent.

Like regular patents, the users of SEPs must pay royalties or licensing fees to the patent owner before they may use it. For example, if a manufacturing company wants to make an IoT device interoperable with a 5G network, the manufacturer must pay a licensing fee to the owner of the SEP that is essential to the 5G standard. SEPs play a vital role in the new innovations we enjoy and have come to expect, and because of the value of these patents, SEP holders have the ability to demand high license fees from those who wish to implement the standard. To offset this competition issue, many SEP holders voluntarily agree to license their SEPs to any willing licensee under fair, reasonable, and non-discriminatory (FRAND) terms.

While wi-fi and LTE are standards that will be vital to Smart City deployment, countless new standardized technologies are being developed that will be integral to any fully-operational Smart City. With reasonable access to SEPs, assured by the FRAND commitment, innovators can enjoy the legal and business certainty they need to compete. While the meaning of the FRAND commitment continues to be refined – as evidenced by the development of SEP best practices recently launched by the App Association in Europe – its foundations are well-established.

But what happens when SEP holders do not abide by the FRAND licensing commitment, or simply refuse to license at all? Sadly, small and medium-sized companies would be forced to accept untenable licensing terms, but more realistically, they would be priced out of using the standard altogether. As a result, it would impose a barrier to innovation that would result in fewer products offered to consumers or cities eager to implement IoT technologies. For example, many hope the rise of autonomous vehicles will be seamlessly integrated into the Smart City network. But how beneficial would it be if only some autonomous vehicle brands are able to license the technology needed to communicate with traffic lights, simply because of the market power of a chipmaker? The FRAND commitment is an important backstop to that unfortunate possibility.

It is vital for SEP holders to honor FRAND licensing terms, if not for small and medium-sized innovators, then for the sustainability of future Smart Cities. FRAND creates a platform for innovation, providing a floor on which companies can stand, innovate, and compete. If the foundation of the FRAND commitment is reneged, American innovators pay a steep price – not only do they lose a key component of product development and market entry, but they are also left with years of expensive negotiations and litigation if they choose to challenge the licensing practice. What’s more, the confidence developed in the open standards development system is shaken, and Smart Cities have fewer choices in IoT solutions for their future.

To achieve the promise of Smart Cities, a balanced standards ecosystem is essential. We must allow small and medium-sized developers to leverage industry standards for innovation and prevent cost-prohibitive royalty structures and negotiating practices that are detrimental to competition, while also ensuring that SEP owners can protect their intellectual property and be fairly compensated for its use. The FRAND commitment continues to be the best framework to achieve this balance, and adherence to its principles will determine the future and success of Smart Cities.

#### Climate change is anthropogenic and causes extinction---5G-enabled smart cities are critical for mitigation and adaptation.

Huseien 21, \*Ghasan Fahim Huseien is a research fellow at Department of Building, School of Design and Environment, National University of Singapore, Singapore; Dr. Kwok Wei Shah is presently an assistant professor and deputy program director with the Department of Building, School of Design and Environment, National University of Singapore, Singapore; (August 23rd, 2021, “Potential Applications of 5G Network Technology for Climate Change Control: A Scoping Review of Singapore”, https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/13/17/9720)

Currently, the entire planet is at risk due to continual climate change [1–3]. The recorded increase in average temperature across the world in the past hundred years, and the associated changes attributed to this, are known as global warming. Many scientists are convinced by the published evidence that this change is anthropogenic and resulted from the elevated emission levels of global greenhouse gases (GHGs) [4,5]. Gases such as water vapor, carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, and ozone are responsible for the absorption and emission of thermal radiation. These changes in the relative quantities of the GHGs induce a proportional change in the amount of preserved solar energy. Presently, the accepted indicator for global warming is the sustained rise in the mean temperature worldwide. This definition is designed to account for the fact that there may be some localized exceptions to this rise. For example, there may be cooling experienced in a region while the global temperature may increase altogether, hence the need for average temperature. A key concern with the GHGs trapping of more heat in the atmosphere is that it affects both climate and short scale weather patterns. Consequently, it results in greater numbers of adverse weather events such as storms, heat waves, cold snaps, droughts, and fires [6]. Climate-related risks to health, livelihoods, food security, water supply, human safety, and economic growth are projected to increase with global warming of 1.5 ◦C [7] and further increase further at 2 ◦C, as shown in Figure 1. In addition, the risks to global aggregated economic growth due to the climate change impacts are projected to be lower at 1.5 ◦C than at 2 ◦C by the end of this century.

Carbon dioxide has the most substantial effect on global warming [8]. Although it was once assumed to have an ~100 year lifespan in the atmosphere, careful studies revealed that the situation is far worse, with three-quarters of the gas expected to remain for a time in the region of up to ~1000 years, with the remainder lasting for an indefinite period of time [9]. It was indicated that the present impacts of humanity on the atmosphere can certainly cause a long term problem [10]. Carbon dioxide is released when oil, coal, and other fossil fuels are burnt for the energy we use to power our homes, cars, and smartphones. By lessening its usage, we can curb our own contribution to climate change while saving money. The first challenge is eliminating the burning of coal, oil, and, eventually, natural gas. Oil is the lubricant of the global economy as it is hidden inside such ubiquitous items as plastic and corn, fundamental to the transportation of both consumers and goods. Coal is the substrate, supplying roughly half of the electricity worldwide, a percentage that is likely to grow according to the International Energy Agency (IEA). In fact, buildings contribute up to 43% of all the greenhouse gas emissions worldwide [11], even though investing in thicker insulation and other cost-effective as well as temperature-regulating strategies can save money in the long run. Investment in new infrastructures, or radical upgradation of the existing highways and transmission lines, may help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, yielding economic growth in the developing countries.

Nations across the globe have kept very high targets to reducing their GHG discharges [12,13]. In order to meet these goals, considerable reductions in city energy usage is required. At a global scale, urban communities represent over half (55%) of the population, which is predicted to reach 68% by the middle of this century [14]. Urban areas claim ownership of the highest levels of energy use, gas emission, and also the largest local economy. As such, it is crucial for urban areas to reduce their consumption and utilize renewable sources wherever available to reduce their gas discharge levels. Smart cities often utilize digital sensors to measure and transmit data about the levels of GHGs in the city at that moment, as a means of tackling them [15]. The efficacy of such a system is thus reliant on the network used to collate and analyze the data collected as an extant network. The mobile telecommunications networks offer a convenient solution to this desire, as their pre-existence has the clear benefit of reducing costs compared to the design and implementation of a novel system. It is recognized that smart cities will certainly act as the key players meeting these ambitious targets [16,17]. In this study, we focused primarily on the potential applications of 5G network technology to control climate change in Singapore. In addition, a clear overview of the sustainability benefits of introducing 5G technology compatible smart cities, buildings, and farms in all aspects of urbanization is provided. Herein, the main purpose is to tackle the negative outcomes associated with anthropogenic climate change, with a particular focus on the contributions that are best made by the telecoms network operators.

Climate change is one of the most challenging problems that humanity has ever faced. Presently, hundreds of millions of lives, innumerable species, entire ecosystems, health, economy, and the future habitability of this planet are at risk. Fortunately, climate change is solvable, we just need to wisely exploit the existing technologies and sciences. Climate change mitigation is a pressing international need in which many management actions are required. The development of 5G technology has been largely driven by smart mobile devices and advanced communication technologies. It may thus serve as a technical enabler for a whole new range of business opportunities, energy, and facilities management, together with industrial applications. Moreover, it may enable different devices to work together seamlessly. Definitely, the 5G cellular network technology is expected to revolutionize the global industries with profound effects on the savings of energy, waste generation and recycling, and water resources management, thus reducing the climate change impacts.

#### Patent holdup is real and necessitates intervention, even if it can’t be systemically proven.

Contreras 19, \*Jorge Contreras, Professor, University of Utah S.J. Quinney College of Law; (2019, “MUCH ADO ABOUT HOLD-UP”, <https://www.illinoislawreview.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/Contreras.pdf>)

B. Protective Measures May Already Be Working to Reduce Hold-Up

Another important factor that should be considered regarding the purported lack of empirical evidence of systemic hold-up is the effect that existing policy measures have already had in reducing hold-up. As noted above, the threat of patent hold-up was a primary motivating factor for many SDOs to adopt policies requiring the disclosure and licensing of SEPs. These policies have been in place for decades. In the United States, the first such policy was adopted in 1959 by the American Standards Association (the predecessor to today’s American National Standards Institute (ANSI).102 Today, every one of the more than 200 ANSI-accredited developers of American National Standards must adhere to ANSI’s essential requirements, including the adoption of such a licensing policy for SEPs. Similar policies have existed in European and international standards organizations since at least the 1980s.103 These policies, which were developed by SDOs in large part to reduce the likelihood of hold-up within standard-setting systems, have had several decades to work, and it is likely that the lack of observed hold-up in some studies can be attributed to the successful operation of these policies.

Similarly, antitrust and competition enforcement agencies in the U.S. and Europe have been aware of the potential for hold-up connected with standardization for many years. Accordingly, they have brought enforcement actions when it has been alleged that hold-up behavior has resulted in a violation of the antitrust laws. High-profile enforcement actions against patent holders such as Rambus, 104 Google 105 and Qualcomm106 send powerful deterrent signals to the market and warn others not to engage in similar behavior lest they, too, become the subject of agency enforcement. Like SDO policies, it is likely that the general market awareness of agency interest in standard-setting and hold-up has, to a degree, limited the amount of hold-up that is actually attempted in the marketplace, thereby limiting the direct evidence of hold-up as a systemic problem.

But do the deterrent effects of SDO and agency efforts to reduce hold-up signify that hold-up is not a problem? Certainly not. To reach such a conclusion would be perverse: akin to claiming that burglary is not a problem in a neighborhood that experiences reduced burglary rates after it has implemented an active neighborhood watch program and enhanced policing.

C. Indicia of Healthy Markets do not Prove the Absence of Anticompetitive Conduct

As noted above, one of the principal arguments advanced by commentators seeking to refute the “hold-up theory” is that markets for telecommunications products, namely smart phones, are robust – evidenced by increasing product functionality, decreasing consumer prices and rapid innovation -- and that this degree of robustness indicates that hold-up cannot be a problem in these markets.107 If hold-up were a problem in these markets, they reason, we would see product stagnation, stable (but high) prices, and a lack of competition – features associated with classic examples of hold-up in markets for products such as natural resources and agricultural goods.108

But this argument relies on a false syllogism: hold-up results in market dysfunction; if a market functions well, then it cannot be subject to hold-up. The weaknesses in this argument are multifold. First, hold-up may exist in individual instances without sufficient weight to affect overall market characteristics, particularly in a large global market such as mobile telecommunications. Thus hold-up may exist, even in a market that outwardly appears to be functioning well. Second, there is no valid counterfactual to use to compare the health and robustness of the market for mobile telecommunications products.109 Other consumer electronics devices, such as televisions and DVD players, do not compare well with mobile telecommunications devices, which have taken on a unique character in the modern networked economy. Thus, observing the strength of the market fails to answer the critical questions “compared to what?” and how much stronger the market might be (through more product diversity, functionality, price reduction) without hold-up?

A simple historical illustration is useful in this context. During the decade leading up to the enactment of the Sherman Antitrust Act of 1890, several major U.S. commodity markets (e.g., steel, salt, petroleum, coal, sugar, lead, and others) came under intense scrutiny for a variety of allegedly anticompetitive industrial arrangements. One might have argued that these markets, had they been subject to the sorts of anticompetitive collusion that the Sherman Act sought to address, should have seen reductions of output and increases in price. Yet, between 1880 and 1890, U.S. output of salt, petroleum, steel, and coal all increased significantly, and prices of steel, sugar and lead all dropped significantly.110 Do these positive market indicia demonstrate that the subject markets were not subject to anticompetitive collusion, and that the Sherman Act was not necessary? Certainly, investigations of these industries revealed significant cartel behavior. I would suggest that few commentators today would argue that the coal, steel, sugar and other major industrial producers of the late nineteenth century were innocent of collusive and anticompetitive conduct, or that the Sherman Act was not a necessary and beneficial measure for the U.S. economy.111 Yet, had we relied solely on the positive characteristics exhibited by these markets as proof that anticompetitive conduct did not exist, then perhaps the Sherman Act never would have been enacted.

By the same token, the fact that global markets for standardized products such as computers and smart phones appear to be thriving does not itself refute the possibility of hold-up nor the existence of anticompetitive conduct in these markets. Nor does it allow regulators and policy makers to drop their guard or cease to monitor these important industries.

#### The plan requires SSO’s to administer reasonable action to prohibit ex post opportunism---that solves

Melamed & Shapiro 18, \*A. Douglas Melamed is Professor of the Practice of Law at Stanford Law School; \*Carl Shapiro is the Transamerica Professor of Business Strategy at the Haas School of Business at the University of California at Berkeley; (May 2018, “How Antitrust Law Can Make FRAND Commitments More Effective”, https://www-cdn.law.stanford.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/How-Antitrust-Law-Can-Make-FRAND-Commitments-More-Effective.pdf)

3. Application of the Basic Legal Principles

The antitrust principle is straightforward: industry-wide collaboration through SSOs to establish procompetitive standards is permitted only if it is no more restrictive of competition than reasonably necessary to enable creation of the standards. When standard setting predictably creates technology monopolies that, if unrestrained, will enable anticompetitive ex post opportunism that would otherwise not occur, an SSO that does not take effective measures to prevent or minimize such ex post opportunism engages in conduct that is more restrictive of competition than necessary. In that case, the SSO and, in appropriate cases, its members, may well violate Section 1 of the Sherman Act.

Under this principle, SSO procedures and FRAND rules should be evaluated based on whether they lead to reasonable SEP royalties, using the competitive ex ante licensing standard discussed above, which has been adopted by the courts in patent law. Put differently, FRAND rules should be evaluated based on their ability to prevent SEP holders from obtaining more than the ex ante value of their technology from implementers.

This limitation would not prevent a SEP holder from proﬁting, perhaps greatly, from participating in the SSO and having its patented technology included in the standard. The SEP holder continues to be rewarded for its technology because the inclusion of its technology in the standard can still greatly increase the volume of licensing opportunities available to the SEP holder.

Whether a particular set of FRAND rules are sufficiently effective in preventing ex post opportunism will depend on the particular circumstances. The procedural unfolding of the case will also depend upon the circumstances. As a general matter, the case would probably be structured as an ordinary Rule of Reason case.82

First, the plaintiff would have to demonstrate harm to competition as a result of the collaboration of the SSO’s members, many of which compete with one another. In this case, the harm to competition would stem from the ability of the SEP holder to exercise monopoly power by obtaining royalties in excess of the competitive, ex ante level. The decision to include patented technologies in the standard would be the allegedly unlawful agreement. Notably, the court need not determine what a FRAND royalty is; it would suffice to determine that market power has been created or exercised, and that existing SSO rules and policies were not adequate to prevent the competitive harm. The defendant, which could be the SSO or perhaps one or more SSO members, would win at this point if the plaintiff failed to show harm to competition. If might fail if the standard faces substantial competition and the court concludes that the SEP holder therefore does not have market power or if the SSO’s rules and policies are found to be effective in preventing ex post opportunism, even if the plaintiff or even the court thinks that other rules and policies would be preferable.

Second, if the plaintiff makes the requisite showing of harm to competition, the defendant(s) would then have to show some procompetitive justiﬁcation— in this case, the beneﬁts of the standard. These two initial steps should be straightforward.

Third, if as is likely the defendant is able to show a procompetitive justiﬁcation, the plaintiff would have to show that the SSO could have used available, reasonable alternatives to realize the efficiency beneﬁts with less or none of the competitive harms. The plaintiff might identify reasonable alternatives that would have led to a different standard, based on including unpatented technology in the standard or perhaps involving fewer SEPs or fewer owners of SEPs, which would be less subject to patent holdup. More likely, the plaintiff could suggest alternative SSO rules that would not change the standard, but would reduce the likelihood or extent of ex post opportunism. For example, the plaintiff might suggest more rigorous FRAND-type rules, such as rules that set forth more precise principles on which FRAND royalties are to be determined and the circumstances under which SEP holders might seek injunctions.

Fourth, the burden would then shift to the defendant(s) to show that the beneﬁts of the standard could not have been realized if the SSO had adopted any of the proffered alternatives or that those alternatives were unrealistic.83 The plaintiff would be entitled to judgment if the court concludes that those beneﬁts could have been realized with less competitive harm if the SSO had adopted the standard with different IPR rules or policies.

Our overall sense, based on experience and the empirical literature, is that the extant FRAND rules are generally useful, but tend to be inadequate because they are imprecise and leave unresolved such critical issues as (a) the meaning of a reasonable royalty, even conceptually; (b) the meaning of “non-discriminatory;” (c) to whom licenses must be offered; and (d) under what circumstances may a SEP holder obtain an injunction.84 These imprecise FRAND commitments are therefore not sufficient to adequately prevent ex post opportunism. The recent revisions to IEEE’s FRAND policy represent a signiﬁcant step in the right direction, but even this advance leaves important questions unanswered.85 If FRAND rules are inadequate in these ways, litigation involving extant FRAND rules would likely be resolved only at the ﬁnal, fourth step. The defendant would be able to demonstrate the beneﬁts created by the standard; the plaintiff would be able to demonstrate the creation of market power and that other reasonable and practical rules or policies would ameliorate the problem. The case would thus turn on whether the defendant is able to demonstrate that signiﬁcant beneﬁts associated with standardization could not have been realized if the SSO had adopted those other rules or policies.

The court would have available a variety of possible remedies if the plaintiff prevails. Implementers that paid supracompetitive royalties or were unlawfully excluded in whole or in part from product markets as a result of the inadequate FRAND policies would be entitled to damages and, in some cases, to treble damages.86 If the unlawful SSO conduct is regarded as the collective action of the SSO and its members, which is likely to be the case in most instances, SSO members would be jointly and severally liable for the damages. Forward-looking injunctive relief aimed at restoring competition would need to be fashioned to the requirements of the individual case. For example, a court could order the SSO to adopt a new rule or policy proposed by the plaintiff. If the court is reluctant to take on that governance role, it might give the SSO a period of time—maybe ninety days—to develop a rule, subject to the court’s ultimate approval, which would adequately ameliorate the competitive problem created by the SSO. Alternatively or in addition, the court might order the parties to attempt to negotiate a rule or policy on which they can agree. And, depending on the circumstances, the court might order SEP holders, including at least those that were defendants in the case, to comply with the new SSO rules and policies.

### 1AC---Cybersecurity ADV

#### Advantage 2 is Cybersecurity:

#### Aggressive patent strategies create structural flaws in 5G standardization that imperils domestic cybersecurity---market competition reduces the incidence of vulnerability and severity of attacks.

Duan 20, \*Charles Duan is a senior fellow and associate director of tech & innovation policy at the R Street Institute, where he focuses his research on intellectual property issues; (2020, “OF MONOPOLIES AND MONOCULTURES: THE INTERSECTION OF PATENTS AND NATIONAL SECURITY”, Santa Clara High Technology Law Journal, 36(4), 369-405. Retrieved from <https://www2.lib.ku.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/monopolies-monocultures-intersection-patents/docview/2442966690/se-2?accountid=14556>)

III. COMPETITION AND CYBERSECURITY

In addition to the historical review done so far, another approach to understanding the relationship among patents, competition, and national security is to consider the role of cybersecurity. There is little doubt that computer system vulnerabilities that enable hacking and spread of computer exploits are a threat to the nation’s defenses, so better cybersecurity is a key part of national security strategy.155

Strong competition can thus complement national security by enhancing domestic cybersecurity, and patent assertion that unduly weakens competition detracts from cybersecurity.156 Competition promotes better cybersecurity in at least two ways. First, multiple studies show that competition encourages firms to improve their products on multiple vectors including cybersecurity. Second, competition avoids a situation that security experts call a “monoculture,” which increases vulnerability to severe cyberattacks. As former Secretary of Homeland Security Michael Chertoff wrote recently, “We need competition and multiple providers, not a potentially vulnerable technological monoculture,” to guarantee national security.157 Thus, cybersecurity provides a useful lens for understanding how unfettered patent assertion and licensing can detract from national security.

A. Cybersecurity as Competitive Value-Add

Competition enhances national security by reducing the incidence of technical vulnerabilities. That effect is especially important for security sensitive systems such as mobile telecommunications.

Intuitively, a causal chain from competition to cybersecurity makes logical sense. Computer security is a value-added benefit to consumers, so firms in competitive markets are likely to use security to gain an edge over their competitors.158 In monopolized markets, though, there may be less external impetus to test products for flaws, and the monopolist may choose to focus less on security and more on new product features or increased product quality.

Economic research confirms these hypotheses about competition leading to better cybersecurity. A 2009 empirical study of web browsers considered the impact of market concentration on the amount of time that vendors took to fix security vulnerabilities as they were discovered.159 The study found that the presence of more competitors correlated with faster cybersecurity response—a reduction of 8–10 days in response time per additional market rival.160 Similarly, business researchers in 2005 modeled incentives for firms to engage in sharing of cybersecurity information, and concluded that the “inclination to share information and invest in security technologies increases as the degree of competitiveness in an industry increases.”161 Another study found that, where two software firms are in competition, at least one will be willing to take on some degree of risk and responsibility for cybersecurity, whereas a monopoly software firm will consistently fail to accept such responsibility.162 To be sure, an unpublished study from 2017 found that some market concentration can make firms more responsive to cybersecurity issues, but only to a point: “being in a dominant position reduces the positive effect of having less competitors on the responsiveness of the vendor,” and indeed the “more dominant the firm is, the less rapid it is in releasing security patches.”163 This research confirms that competition is more conducive to cybersecurity.

It is not hard to see how this applies to emerging communication technologies markets. In the absence of competition, the above research suggests that device manufacturers, chip makers, and software developers will lack incentives to respond to vulnerabilities, to share information about cybersecurity practices and issues, and to take responsibility for security matters. Mobile phone chips have had their share of cybersecurity failures already.164 The best way to flush out ongoing and future cybersecurity issues is to maintain competitive pressure at all levels of the supply chain.

B. Vulnerabilities of “Monocultures”

A second reason why monopoly undermines cybersecurity is that monopoly leads to a “monoculture” of single-vendor products, opening the door to massive systemic failure in the case of a cyberattack. Computer researchers developed the theory of software monocultures in the early 2000s, in response to the regular phenomenon of computer viruses and other attacks spreading rapidly by exploiting flaws in the dominant operating system at the time, Microsoft Windows.165 Where a computer system such as Windows has a commanding share of users, a virus that exploits a flaw in that system can quickly spread to infect a whole interconnected ecosystem. An operating system monopoly thus enables fast and easy spread of cyberattacks, and better cybersecurity would be achieved through greater diversity in online systems.166 As one research group posited, “a network architecture that supports a collection of heterogeneous network elements for the same functional capability offers a greater possibility of surviving security attacks as compared to homogeneous networks.”167

There has been considerable study of the theory that computer monocultures are naturally more vulnerable to attacks.168 In one study, computer science researchers reviewed a catalog of 6,340 software vulnerabilities recorded in 2007, to compare whether comparable software would share the same flaws.169 Of the 2,627 vulnerabilities applicable to application software (as opposed to operating systems, web scripts, and other software components), only 29 (1.1%) applied to substitute products from different vendors but providing the same functionality.170 By contrast, different versions of a single software product were found to share vulnerabilities 84.7% of the time.171 Thus, software monocultures share exploitable flaws even when there is some variation in versions across the monoculture; by contrast, diversity in software is almost guaranteed to prevent a single flaw from affecting all users.

In the case of 5G and wireless mobile communications, a monoculture is an especially concerning possibility. To the extent that systems such as smart city sensors or communication networks are widely deployed in a monoculture fashion, a widespread attack could have devastating consequences, potentially blacking out a region and affecting essential services such as 911.172 A monoculture that is vulnerable to so-called “rootkits” or “backdoors”—maliciously installed software that enable bad actors to commandeer systems—could also enable mass surveillance or spying by private hackers or foreign governments.173 The presence of systems from multiple vendors would mitigate these possibilities.

#### Insecure technical standards cause inevitable systemic grid collapse---extinction.

DeNardis 21, \*Dr. Laura DeNardis, PhD in Science and Technology Studies from Virginia Tech, Dean of the School of Communication at American University, and Gordon M. Goldstein, Adjunct Senior Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, (March 1st, 2021, “The Real Lesson of the Texas Power Debacle”, Lawfare, 3/1/2021, https://www.lawfareblog.com/real-lesson-texas-power-debacle)

The infrastructure was essential, ubiquitous and providing basic functionality for everything in daily life from water to heat and transportation. And in an instant it was gone, plunging tens of thousands of residents into a life-threatening crisis. This is, of course, the narrative of the recent debacle in Texas, where a winter storm overwhelmed the state’s electrical grid and brought the state to a near-total blackout. But it should also be interpreted as a preemptive warning of what Americans will face from the next generation of the internet and the new realm of cybersecurity risk it will dramatically amplify.

Both forms of infrastructure—a state-run electrical grid and the 5G and “internet of things” future to which we are rapidly hurtling—share three attributes. First, their construction reflects a lack of imagination about the danger that can quickly coalesce when seemingly remote threat scenarios become real. Second, compounding a lack of analytic imagination is an absence of preparedness. Third, for both the Texas electrical grid and the emerging internet, public policy protections are either meager or completely absent.

In planning for the resilience of its electrical grid, public officials in Texas discounted the potentially devastating disruption that could occur from unpredictable events—whether related to climate change or just a once-a-century anomaly. They also eschewed precautions other states take seriously by allowing for the interconnection of electrical grid supply chains across their borders, ostensibly because of their ideological rejection of federal regulatory oversight governing such arrangements.

As the United States builds out a new national 5G cyber-physical communications network through private service providers, Americans similarly discount the risks—myriad in their diversity and severity—that are orders of magnitude more significant than what Texas confronted recently. More physical things than people are already connected. The super empowered internet of tomorrow, known among some in the field as the “internet of everything,” will exceed by tens of billions of devices the number of connections between individuals simply communicating via social media or digital screens.

This confronts policymakers with an imminent threat: A cyber outage is no longer about losing digital communications but about losing basic societal functioning and even human life. The failure of imagination is to think of the SolarWinds attack on U.S. federal agencies and tech companies as a worst-case scenario. The failure of imagination is to think of cybersecurity through a content-centric lens rather than as possible attacks on the material world. The emergence of internet-connected cardiac devices, digitally dependent cars, and internet-connected agriculture systems portend the stakes of a cyberattack to health care, economic and social functioning, and food security.

The United States should be prepared for, and certainly not be caught by surprise by, such cyberattacks. Yet, the internet of everything is notoriously insecure. Internet-connected physical objects are not necessarily upgradeable. Nor do they come with adequate default security and encryption. The 5G infrastructure that helps connect digital objects has been at the center of debates over Chinese espionage. Industrial cyber-physical systems are based on technical standards that have not been collaboratively vetted for security and interoperability. One of the most infamous cyberattacks—the so-called Mirai botnet that took down major media sites and corporations—hijacked these insecure objects in homes to carry out the assault. The United States is not yet prepared.

Finally, in the race to conceive and deploy effective public policy responses, the U.S. government as a whole is hardly more anticipatory or synthesized in its response to potential calamity than the state of Texas. The focus of U.S. cyber policy remains on information policy issues such as disinformation, manipulation and violent speech rather than securing the digital world that now powers our material day-to-day lives. The Biden administration confronts an enormous challenge in crafting a comprehensive strategy to the cybersecurity risks foreshadowed by the ruinous experience in Texas and its management of vital infrastructure. While the digital world has leapt from two-dimensional to three-dimensional space, cyber policy has not at all jumped from 2D to 3D.

This failure of imagination, preparedness and policy protection must not be America’s cyber future; the stakes are far too high and the costs are far too great. The Texas disaster is a potent illustration of what has always been true: Our digital society and economy are extremely vulnerable and grow more porous and subject to penetration day by day. As digital sensors and cyber control systems become further embedded in physical infrastructure like energy systems, agriculture and transportation, there is no longer a separation between security of the “real” world and security of the online world. They are entangled and increasingly enmeshed—and policy has yet to catch up to either envisioning or mitigating the looming threats the U.S. confronts.

If the energy grid cannot weather a winter storm, how can it be expected to withstand a major cyberattack? What other vital forms of national infrastructure—ranging from water, bridges, highways and roads, and ultimately our day-to-day financial system—are comparably at risk? As Texas dramatizes, it is neither hyperbolic nor exaggerated to assert that our survival could now depend on securing the inevitable cyber-physical future that is accelerating with stunning rapidity.

#### Actors have the means and motivations to strike critical infrastructure.

Wintch 21, \*Timothy M. Wintch, an active-duty Major in the United States Air Force. He is currently a graduate student at the Oettinger School of Science & Technology Intelligence, National Intelligence University, in Bethesda, Maryland. Mr. Wintch has over 11 years of experience in command-and-control operations as an Air Battle Manager. He holds a Bachelor of Arts in Politics from the University of California, Santa Cruz, and a Master of Arts in Military Studies from American Military University. (April 20th, 2021, “PERSPECTIVE: Cyber and Physical Threats to the U.S. Power Grid and Keeping the Lights on”, https://www.hstoday.us/subject-matter-areas/infrastructure-security/perspective-cyber-and-physical-threats-to-the-u-s-power-grid-and-keeping-the-lights-on/)

Among critical infrastructure sectors in the U.S., energy is perhaps the most crucial of the 16 sectors defined by the Department of Homeland Security. This sector is so vital because it provides the energy necessary to run every other critical infrastructure sector. However, the U.S. power grid, the backbone of the energy sector, is built upon an aging skeleton that is becoming increasingly vulnerable every day. Whether from terrorists or nation-states like Russia and China, the power grid is susceptible to not just physical attacks, but also to cyber intrusion as well. However, much of this threat can be mitigated if the U.S. takes the appropriate steps to safeguard the power grid and avoid a potential catastrophe in the future.

Since Sept. 11, 2001, terrorism on U.S. soil has been at the forefront of American consciousness. Critical infrastructure provides an appealing target because of the disproportionally large impact even a small attack can have on the sectors. In particular, the power grid represents a particularly lucrative target, both in terms of the ease of access and the large impact it can make. The National Research Council stated that the U.S. power grid is “vulnerable to intelligent multi-site attacks by knowledgeable attackers intent on causing maximum physical damage to key components on a wide geographical scale.”[[1]](https://www.hstoday.us/subject-matter-areas/infrastructure-security/perspective-cyber-and-physical-threats-to-the-u-s-power-grid-and-keeping-the-lights-on/" \l "_ftn1) Additionally, the physical security of transmission and distribution systems is difficult due to the dispersed nature of these key components, which in turn is advantageous to attackers as it reduces the likelihood of their capture.[[2]](https://www.hstoday.us/subject-matter-areas/infrastructure-security/perspective-cyber-and-physical-threats-to-the-u-s-power-grid-and-keeping-the-lights-on/" \l "_ftn2) From 2002-2012, approximately 2,500 physical attacks occurred against transmission lines and towers worldwide and approximately 500 attacks against transformer substations.[[3]](https://www.hstoday.us/subject-matter-areas/infrastructure-security/perspective-cyber-and-physical-threats-to-the-u-s-power-grid-and-keeping-the-lights-on/" \l "_ftn3) Terrorists have the motivation to attack the U.S. power grid but the very nature of the grid makes it highly vulnerable. The power grid is not only at risk from physical attacks, but also nation-state cyberattacks.

One nation that has shown both the capability and intent to use attacks against critical energy infrastructure is Russia, as demonstrated in their 2015 annexation of Crimea from Ukraine. A Russian cyber threat group known as Sandworm, which used its BlackEnergy malware, attacked Ukrainian computer systems that provide remote control of the Ukraine power grid.[[4]](https://www.hstoday.us/subject-matter-areas/infrastructure-security/perspective-cyber-and-physical-threats-to-the-u-s-power-grid-and-keeping-the-lights-on/" \l "_ftn4) This attack, and another in 2016, each left the capital Kiev without power, prompting cyber experts to raise concern about the same malware already existing in NATO and the U.S. power grids.[[5]](https://www.hstoday.us/subject-matter-areas/infrastructure-security/perspective-cyber-and-physical-threats-to-the-u-s-power-grid-and-keeping-the-lights-on/" \l "_ftn5) In any conflict between Russia and NATO, not only would similar cyberattacks pose a threat, but so would potential physical attacks severing fuel oil and natural gas lines to Western Europe. Russia has both the capability and intent to attack critical infrastructure, particularly power grids, during future conflicts in their “hybrid warfare” approach.

Another nation that has the capability to attack critical energy infrastructure is China, representing a threat to not just the U.S. energy infrastructure but also that of our allies whose support would be vital in a major conflict. A recent NATO report highlighted this threat from China’s Belt and Road Initiative, stating that “[China’s] foreign direct investment in strategic sectors [such as energy generation and distribution] …raises questions about whether access and control over such infrastructure can be maintained, particularly in crisis when it would be required to support the military.”[[6]](https://www.hstoday.us/subject-matter-areas/infrastructure-security/perspective-cyber-and-physical-threats-to-the-u-s-power-grid-and-keeping-the-lights-on/" \l "_ftn6) Like Russia, China has been active with cyber intrusions in U.S. energy infrastructure. The Mission Support Center at Idaho National Laboratory characterized these as attacks as “multiple intrusions into US ICS/SCADA [Industrial Control Systems/Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition] and smart grid tools [that] may be aimed more at intellectual property theft and gathering intelligence to bolster their own infrastructure, but it is likely that they are also using these intrusions to develop capabilities to attack the [bulk electric system], as well.”[[7]](https://www.hstoday.us/subject-matter-areas/infrastructure-security/perspective-cyber-and-physical-threats-to-the-u-s-power-grid-and-keeping-the-lights-on/" \l "_ftn7) China, therefore, has both the capability and intent to conduct cyber intrusions and attacks for myriad reasons.

Another arm of this threat is the reliance the U.S. energy industry has on imports from China, especially transformers. In early 2020, federal officials seized a transformer in the port of Houston that had been imported by the Jiangsu Huapeng Transformer Company before sending it to Sandia National Laboratory in Albuquerque. Sandia is contracted by the U.S. Department of Energy for mitigating national security threats.[[8]](https://www.hstoday.us/subject-matter-areas/infrastructure-security/perspective-cyber-and-physical-threats-to-the-u-s-power-grid-and-keeping-the-lights-on/" \l "_ftn8) The Wall Street Journal reported that “Mike Howard, chief executive of the Electric Power Research Institute, a utility-funded technical organization, said that the diversion of a huge, expensive transformer is so unusual – in his experience, unprecedented – that it suggests officials had significant security concerns.”[[9]](https://www.hstoday.us/subject-matter-areas/infrastructure-security/perspective-cyber-and-physical-threats-to-the-u-s-power-grid-and-keeping-the-lights-on/" \l "_ftn9) Previously destined for the Washington Area Power Administration’s Ault, Colo., substation, the transformer is believed to have been seized due to “backdoor” exploitable hardware emplaced by the Chinese prior to shipment.[[10]](https://www.hstoday.us/subject-matter-areas/infrastructure-security/perspective-cyber-and-physical-threats-to-the-u-s-power-grid-and-keeping-the-lights-on/#_ftn10) Shortly after these events, President Trump issued Executive Order 13920, “[Securing the United States Bulk-Power System](https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/presidential-actions/executive-order-securing-united-states-bulk-power-system/),” essentially limiting the import of Chinese-built critical energy infrastructure components due to concerns about cybersecurity.[[11]](https://www.hstoday.us/subject-matter-areas/infrastructure-security/perspective-cyber-and-physical-threats-to-the-u-s-power-grid-and-keeping-the-lights-on/#_ftn11) Interestingly, Jiangsu Huapeng “boasted that it supported 10 percent of New York City’s electricity load.”[[12]](https://www.hstoday.us/subject-matter-areas/infrastructure-security/perspective-cyber-and-physical-threats-to-the-u-s-power-grid-and-keeping-the-lights-on/#_ftn12)

Franklin Kramer, the former Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, testified before a U.S. House of Representatives Energy and Commerce subcommittee during an energy and power hearing in 2011 and said that a “highly-coordinated and structured cyber, physical, or blended attack on the bulk power system, however, could result in long-term (irreparable) damage to key system components in multiple simultaneous or near-simultaneous strikes.” He added that “an outage could result with the potential to affect a wide geographic area and cause large population centers to lose power for extended periods.”[[13]](https://www.hstoday.us/subject-matter-areas/infrastructure-security/perspective-cyber-and-physical-threats-to-the-u-s-power-grid-and-keeping-the-lights-on/#_ftn13) Even the inclusion of features such as smart grids to the overall grid structure poses new vulnerabilities through their connectivity. Kramer stated that “such connectivity means that the distribution system could be a key vector for a national security attack on the grid.”[[14]](https://www.hstoday.us/subject-matter-areas/infrastructure-security/perspective-cyber-and-physical-threats-to-the-u-s-power-grid-and-keeping-the-lights-on/#_ftn14)

#### Those attacks cause accidental nuclear escalation.

Klare 19, \*Michael T. Klare is a professor emeritus of peace and world security studies at Hampshire College and senior visiting fellow at the Arms Control Association; (November 19th, “Cyber Battles, Nuclear Outcomes? Dangerous New Pathways to Escalation”, https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation)

Yet another pathway to escalation could arise from a cascading series of cyberstrikes and counterstrikes against vital national infrastructure rather than on military targets. All major powers, along with Iran and North Korea, have developed and deployed cyberweapons designed to disrupt and destroy major elements of an adversary’s key economic systems, such as power grids, financial systems, and transportation networks. As noted, Russia has infiltrated the U.S. electrical grid, and it is widely believed that the United States has done the same in Russia.[12](https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation#endnote12) The Pentagon has also devised a plan known as “Nitro Zeus,” intended to immobilize the entire Iranian economy and so force it to capitulate to U.S. demands or, if that approach failed, to pave the way for a crippling air and missile attack.[13](https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation#endnote12)

The danger here is that economic attacks of this sort, if undertaken during a period of tension and crisis, could lead to an escalating series of tit-for-tat attacks against ever more vital elements of an adversary’s critical infrastructure, producing widespread chaos and harm and eventually leading one side to initiate kinetic attacks on critical military targets, risking the slippery slope to nuclear conflict. For example, a Russian cyberattack on the U.S. power grid could trigger U.S. attacks on Russian energy and financial systems, causing widespread disorder in both countries and generating an impulse for even more devastating attacks. At some point, such attacks “could lead to major conflict and possibly nuclear war.”[14](https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation#endnote14)

These are by no means the only pathways to escalation resulting from the offensive use of cyberweapons. Others include efforts by third parties, such as proxy states or terrorist organizations, to provoke a global nuclear crisis by causing early-warning systems to generate false readings (“spoofing”) of missile launches. Yet, they do provide a clear indication of the severity of the threat. As states’ reliance on cyberspace grows and cyberweapons become more powerful, the dangers of unintended or accidental escalation can only grow more severe.

#### Cyber-compromised NC3 causes nuclear war.

Klare 19, \*Michael T. Klare is a professor emeritus of peace and world security studies at Hampshire College and senior visiting fellow at the Arms Control Association; (November 19th, “Cyber Battles, Nuclear Outcomes? Dangerous New Pathways to Escalation”, <https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation>)

The Nuclear-Cyber Connection

These links exist because the NC3 systems of the United States and other nuclear-armed states are heavily dependent on computers and other digital processors for virtually every aspect of their operation and because those systems are highly vulnerable to cyberattack. Every nuclear force is composed, most basically, of weapons, early-warning radars, launch facilities, and the top officials, usually presidents or prime ministers, empowered to initiate a nuclear exchange. Connecting them all, however, is an extended network of communications and data-processing systems, all reliant on cyberspace. Warning systems, ground- and space-based, must constantly watch for and analyze possible enemy missile launches. Data on actual threats must rapidly be communicated to decision-makers, who must then weigh possible responses and communicate chosen outcomes to launch facilities, which in turn must provide attack vectors to delivery systems. All of this involves operations in cyberspace, and it is in this domain that great power rivals seek vulnerabilities to exploit in a constant struggle for advantage.

The use of cyberspace to gain an advantage over adversaries takes many forms and is not always aimed at nuclear systems. China has been accused of engaging in widespread cyberespionage to steal technical secrets from U.S. firms for economic and military advantages. Russia has been accused, most extensively in the Robert Mueller report, of exploiting cyberspace to interfere in the 2016 U.S. presidential election. Nonstate actors, including terrorist groups such as al Qaeda and the Islamic State group, have used the internet for recruiting combatants and spreading fear. Criminal groups, including some thought to be allied with state actors, such as North Korea, have used cyberspace to extort money from banks, municipalities, and individuals.[4](https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation#endnote04) Attacks such as these occupy most of the time and attention of civilian and military cybersecurity organizations that attempt to thwart such attacks. Yet for those who worry about strategic stability and the risks of nuclear escalation, it is the threat of cyberattacks on NC3 systems that provokes the greatest concern.

This concern stems from the fact that, despite the immense effort devoted to protecting NC3 systems from cyberattack, no enterprise that relies so extensively on computers and cyberspace can be made 100 percent invulnerable to attack. This is so because such systems employ many devices and operating systems of various origins and vintages, most incorporating numerous software updates and “patches” over time, offering multiple vectors for attack. Electronic components can also be modified by hostile actors during production, transit, or insertion; and the whole system itself is dependent to a considerable degree on the electrical grid, which itself is vulnerable to cyberattack and is far less protected. Experienced “cyberwarriors” of every major power have been working for years to probe for weaknesses in these systems and in many cases have devised cyberweapons, typically, malicious software (malware) and computer viruses, to exploit those weaknesses for military advantage.[5](https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation#endnote05)

Although activity in cyberspace is much more difficult to detect and track than conventional military operations, enough information has become public to indicate that the major nuclear powers, notably China, Russia, and the United States, along with such secondary powers as Iran and North Korea, have established extensive cyberwarfare capabilities and engage in offensive cyberoperations on a regular basis, often aimed at critical military infrastructure. “Cyberspace is a contested environment where we are in constant contact with adversaries,” General Paul M. Nakasone, commander of the U.S. Cyber Command (Cybercom), told the Senate Armed Services Committee in February 2019. “We see near-peer competitors [China and Russia] conducting sustained campaigns below the level of armed conflict to erode American strength and gain strategic advantage.”

Although eager to speak of adversary threats to U.S. interests, Nakasone was noticeably but not surprisingly reluctant to say much about U.S. offensive operations in cyberspace. He acknowledged, however, that Cybercom took such action to disrupt possible Russian interference in the 2018 midterm elections. “We created a persistent presence in cyberspace to monitor adversary actions and crafted tools and tactics to frustrate their efforts,” he testified in February. According to press accounts, this included a cyberattack aimed at paralyzing the Internet Research Agency, a “troll farm” in St. Petersburg said to have been deeply involved in generating disruptive propaganda during the 2016 presidential elections.[6](https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation#endnote06)

Other press investigations have disclosed two other offensive operations undertaken by the United States. One called “Olympic Games” was intended to disrupt Iran’s drive to increase its uranium-enrichment capacity by sabotaging the centrifuges used in the process by infecting them with the so-called Stuxnet virus. Another left of launch effort was intended to cause malfunctions in North Korean missile tests.[7](https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation#endnote07) Although not aimed at either of the U.S. principal nuclear adversaries, those two attacks demonstrated a willingness and capacity to conduct cyberattacks on the nuclear infrastructure of other states.

Efforts by strategic rivals of the United States to infiltrate and eventually degrade U.S. nuclear infrastructure are far less documented but thought to be no less prevalent. Russia, for example, is believed to have planted malware in the U.S. electrical utility grid, possibly with the intent of cutting off the flow of electricity to critical NC3 facilities in the event of a major crisis.[8](https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation#endnote08) Indeed, every major power, including the United States, is believed to have crafted cyberweapons aimed at critical NC3 components and to have implanted malware in enemy systems for potential use in some future confrontation.

Pathways to Escalation

Knowing that the NC3 systems of the major powers are constantly being probed for weaknesses and probably infested with malware designed to be activated in a crisis, what does this say about the risks of escalation from a nonkinetic battle, that is, one fought without traditional weaponry, to a kinetic one, at first using conventional weapons and then, potentially, nuclear ones? None of this can be predicted in advance, but those analysts who have studied the subject worry about the emergence of dangerous new pathways for escalation. Indeed, several such scenarios have been identified.[9](https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation#endnote09)

The first and possibly most dangerous path to escalation would arise from the early use of cyberweapons in a great power crisis to ~~paralyze~~ undermine the vital command, control, and communications capabilities of an adversary, many of which serve nuclear and conventional forces. In the “fog of war” that would naturally ensue from such an encounter, the recipient of such an attack might fear more punishing follow-up kinetic attacks, possibly including the use of nuclear weapons, and, fearing the loss of its own arsenal, launch its weapons immediately. This might occur, for example, in a confrontation between NATO and Russian forces in east and central Europe or between U.S. and Chinese forces in the Asia-Pacific region.

Speaking of a possible confrontation in Europe, for example, James N. Miller Jr. and Richard Fontaine wrote that “both sides would have overwhelming incentives to go early with offensive cyber and counter-space capabilities to negate the other side’s military capabilities or advantages.” If these early attacks succeeded, “it could result in huge military and coercive advantage for the attacker.” This might induce the recipient of such attacks to back down, affording its rival a major victory at very low cost. Alternatively, however, the recipient might view the attacks on its critical command, control, and communications infrastructure as the prelude to a full-scale attack aimed at neutralizing its nuclear capabilities and choose to strike first. “It is worth considering,” Miller and Fontaine concluded, “how even a very limited attack or incident could set both sides on a slippery slope to rapid escalation.”[10](https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation#endnote10)

What makes the insertion of latent malware in an adversary’s NC3 systems so dangerous is that it may not even need to be activated to increase the risk of nuclear escalation. If a nuclear-armed state comes to believe that its critical systems are infested with enemy malware, its leaders might not trust the information provided by its early-warning systems in a crisis and might misconstrue the nature of an enemy attack, leading them to overreact and possibly launch their nuclear weapons out of fear they are at risk of a preemptive strike.

“The uncertainty caused by the unique character of a cyber threat could jeopardize the credibility of the nuclear deterrent and undermine strategic stability in ways that advances in nuclear and conventional weapons do not,” Page O. Stoutland and Samantha Pitts-Kiefer wrote in 2018 paper for the Nuclear Threat Initiative. “[T]he introduction of a flaw or malicious code into nuclear weapons through the supply chain that compromises the effectiveness of those weapons could lead to a lack of confidence in the nuclear deterrent,” undermining strategic stability.[11](https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation#endnote11) Without confidence in the reliability of its nuclear weapons infrastructure, a nuclear-armed state may misinterpret confusing signals from its early-warning systems and, fearing the worst, launch its own nuclear weapons rather than lose them to an enemy’s first strike. This makes the scenario proffered in the 2018 NPR report, of a nuclear response to an enemy cyberattack, that much more alarming.

# 2AC---Doubles

## ADV---Innovation

### 2AC---AT: No Patent Holdup---Not Systemic

#### 1---there’s no impact to winning this argument.

Cotter et al. 19, \*Thomas F. Cotter, Briggs and Morgan Professor of Law, University of Minnesota Law School; Innovators Network Foundation Intellectual Property Fellow; \*Erik Hovenkamp, Assistant Professor, USC Gould School of Law; \*Norman Siebrasse, Professor of Law, University of New Brunswick Faculty of Law; (2019, “Demystifying Patent Holdup”, https://scholarlycommons.law.wlu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=4667&context=wlulr)

B. Patent Holdup Is Not a Problem, Because It Is Not Systemic

A second, related argument is that there is no empirical evidence of patent owners engaging in pervasive, systemic patent holdup in the very industries holdup theorists are most concerned with (e.g., telecommunications).139 Indeed, according to the critics, if holdup were pervasive one would expect innovation and growth in the affected industries to “stagnate, wither, or die,”140 whereas if one looks “across human history, it is not clear that the commercialization of complex technologies has ever been faster than it is today in those industries that reform proponents point to as most plagued by the patent holdup ‘problem.’”141

Although we agree that whether, or to what extent, patent holdup occurs in the real world is ultimately an empirical matter, the implication that patent holdup is a problem only if it is “pervasive” or “systemic” is a non sequitur.142 If our analysis above is correct—that the ability to engage in patent holdup depends on path dependence, that settings conducive to patent holdup are not uncommon, and that the three components of a holdup royalty can exist independently of one another—patent holdup does not have to be systemic to be capable of reducing social welfare. Seeing how the empirical critiques of patent holdup do “not claim[ ] that individual firms never attempt to engage in behavior that can be characterized as holdup,”143 the conclusion that holdup is not systemic may well be accurate, for all we know, while still being of any limited relevance for purposes of determining whether injunctive relief should issue on the facts of any one particular case.144 If the choice were between always granting an injunction without tailoring or conditions, and never granting any form of injunctive relief, perhaps the question of whether holdup was systemic, at least in a particular industry, would be central. But the traditional approach to injunctive relief looks to the facts of the particular case.145

### 2AC---AT Walt

#### Walt is unsure at best- he says short term conflicts unlikely not long term economic decline

1NC Walt ‘20

Kansas reads blue

(Robert and Renée Belfer professor of international relations at Harvard University. (Stephen M., 5/13/20, “Will a Global Depression Trigger Another World War?”, *Foreign Policy*, https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/05/13/coronavirus-pandemic-depression-economy-world-war/)

If one takes a longer-term perspective, however, a sustained economic depression could make war more likely by strengthening fascist or xenophobic political movements, fueling protectionism and hypernationalism, and making it more difficult for countries to reach mutually acceptable bargains with each other. The history of the 1930s shows where such trends can lead, although the economic effects of the Depression are hardly the only reason world politics took such a deadly turn in the 1930s. Nationalism, xenophobia, and authoritarian rule were making a comeback well before COVID-19 struck, but the economic misery now occurring in every corner of the world could intensify these trends and leave us in a more war-prone condition when fear of the virus has diminished.

1nc walt starts here

On balance, however, I do not think that even the extraordinary economic conditions we are witnessing today are going to have much impact on the likelihood of war. Why? First of all, if depressions were a powerful cause of war, there would be a lot more of the latter. To take one example, the United States has suffered 40 or more recessions since the country was founded, yet it has fought perhaps 20 interstate wars, most of them unrelated to the state of the economy. To paraphrase the economist Paul Samuelson’s famous quip about the stock market, if recessions were a powerful cause of war, they would have predicted “nine out of the last five (or fewer).”   
Second, states do not start wars unless they believe they will win a quick and relatively cheap victory. As John Mearsheimer showed in his classic book Conventional Deterrence, national leaders avoid war when they are convinced it will be long, bloody, costly, and uncertain. To choose war, political leaders have to convince themselves they can either win a quick, cheap, and decisive victory or achieve some limited objective at low cost. Europe went to war in 1914 with each side believing it would win a rapid and easy victory, and Nazi Germany developed the strategy of blitzkrieg in order to subdue its foes as quickly and cheaply as possible. Iraq attacked Iran in 1980 because Saddam believed the Islamic Republic was in disarray and would be easy to defeat, and George W. Bush invaded Iraq in 2003 convinced the war would be short, successful, and pay for itself.

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

Third, and most important, the primary motivation for most wars is the desire for security, not economic gain. For this reason, the odds of war increase when states believe the long-term balance of power may be shifting against them, when they are convinced that adversaries are unalterably hostile and cannot be accommodated, and when they are confident they can reverse the unfavorable trends and establish a secure position if they act now. The historian A.J.P. Taylor once observed that “every war between Great Powers [between 1848 and 1918] … started as a preventive war, not as a war of conquest,” and that remains true of most wars fought since then.

The bottom line: Economic conditions (i.e., a depression) may affect the broader political environment in which decisions for war or peace are made, but they are only one factor among many and rarely the most significant. Even if the COVID-19 pandemic has large, lasting, and negative effects on the world economy—as seems quite likely—it is not likely to affect the probability of war very much, especially in the short term.

[NEGs reading ends here]

To be sure, I can’t rule out another powerful cause of war—stupidity—especially when it is so much in evidence in some quarters these days. So there is no guarantee that we won’t see misguided leaders stumbling into another foolish bloodletting. But given that it’s hard to find any rays of sunshine at this particular moment in history, I’m going to hope I’m right about this one.

## ADV---Cybersecurity

## T---Definitely Not Per Se

### 2AC---AT: T---Prohibit = Per Se---TL

#### We meet---the plan still increases prohibitions on anticompetitive conduct, the rule of reason is simply a test that decides whether certain conduct actually violates said prohibition.

Fishman 19, \*Todd Fishman, [Allen & Overy LLP](https://www.jdsupra.com/profile/Allen_Overy_docs/); (January 31st, 2019, “The Rule of Reason as a Bar to Criminal Antitrust Enforcement”, https://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/the-rule-of-reason-as-a-bar-to-criminal-87406/)

Antitrust law’s rule of reason was born of technical necessity. By its terms, §1 of the Sherman Act prohibits “[e] very contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade.” 15 U.S.C. §1. Despite the expansive language of the statutory prohibition, the Supreme Court has held that §1 prohibits only agreements that unreasonably restrain trade. *Board of Trade of Chicago v. United States*, 246 U.S. 231, 238 (1918); *Standard Oil Co. of N.J. v. United States*, 221 U.S. 1, 58-60 (1911). With the rule of reason, antitrust courts assumed a prudential role in administering the scope of antitrust violations, applying a factual inquiry weighing legitimate justifications for a restraint against any anticompetitive effects. Under the rule of reason, “the factfinder weighs all of the circumstances of a case in deciding whether a restrictive practice should be prohibited as imposing an unreasonable restraint on competition.” *Continental T.V. v. GTE Sylvania,* 433 U.S. 36, 49 (1977).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### 2---the ‘per se’ distinction is meaningless---rules always devolve into standards.

Crane 7 Daniel A. Crane is Assistant Professor, Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law, Yeshiva University, Rules Versus Standards in Antitrust Adjudication, 64 Wash. & Lee L. Rev. 49 (2007), https://scholarlycommons.law.wlu.edu/wlulr/vol64/iss1/3

Before proceeding much further, it is worth pausing to consider the possibility that a world of antitrust rules would be illusory because, in practice, rules always fade into standards. Take H.L.A. Hart's observation that "[n]atural languages like English are... irreducibly open-textured" when specifying "general classifying terms,' ' 0 0 or Wittgenstein's point that the problem with rules is that they do not tell you when they should be applied.' 0 ' Because language is irreducibly open-textured and indeterminate and because rules lack internal mechanisms to specify when they should be applied, even when the law is formally framed as a rule, it requires penumbral rules, canons of interpretation, and other secondary decisional criteria which end up swallowing the apparent simplicity of the rule. 10 2 Specifying the governing law as a simple, bright-line rule may merely conceal the fact that important balancing of social interests, weighing of probabilities, and choosing between competing ends and means lurk in the shadow of the rule. Declaring a legal rule thus appears misleading or even dishonest because it hides the social preferences that animate the decision-maker's conclusion. Under one interpretation, antitrust law provides the perfect illustration for Hart and Wittgenstein's point. In this view, there never have been such things as case-determinative antitrust rules-only standards clad in rule-bound rhetoric. The current march toward standards, then, is not so much a change in liability determinants as a dissipation of the mystery surrounding antitrust's concealed methodology. In a moment, I will dispute this possibility and argue that the specification of antitrust law as rule or standard has very important practical consequences. But first, it is worth acknowledging the extent to which Hart and Wittgenstein's observation rings true in antitrust. A case in point is antitrust law's long-standing per se prohibition against "price fixing." As any antitrust practitioner will recognize, price fixing appears in quotation marks because application of the per se rule depends not on the fact that competitors have literally fixed prices but that the challenged conduct falls within the antitrust category known as "price fixing." The judicial decision often thought to have established the per se rule against price-fixing did not involve price fixing either literally or figuratively but rather a gentleman's agreement by dominant oil producers to buy up distressed oil from small refineries and thereby stabilize the wholesale market. 1 03 The defendants never came close to agreeing on price. Nonetheless, the Supreme Court held that any "combination formed for the purpose and with the effect of raising, depressing, fixing, pegging, or stabilizing the price of a commodity in interstate or foreign commerce" amounts to "price fixing" in the relevant legal sense, whether or not the defendants have actually done the act that a lay person might suppose "price fixing" to be-fixing a price. 1 On the other hand, the Supreme Court has described an act of apparent price fixing by competitors-an agreement on prices for blanket licensing of musical repertoires-as something other than "price fixing" and hence subject to the rule of reason. 0 5 In BMI v. CBS, the Supreme Court rejected textual "literalism" and held that application of the per se rule against price fixing is not as "simplistic" as "determining whether two or more potential competitors have literally 'fixed' a 'price.'" 06 Rather, "[a] s generally used in the antitrust field, 'price fixing' is a shorthand way of describing certain categories of business behavior to which the per se rule has been held applicable."' 0 7 Application of the per se rule turns not on whether the conduct amounts literally to price fixing but on whether the "particular practice is one of those types or that it is 'plainly anticompetitive' and very likely without 'redeeming virtue."" 8 This flexibility in the per se rule invites endless pages of briefing on whether the conduct at issue should be properly characterized as "price fixing" because it unjustifiably tampers with the market mechanism for determining prices or as something else because it can be justified by efficiencies, a standard-favoring way of doing law.'0 9 Hence, Hart explains that rules inevitably dissolve into standards and Wittgentsein explains that rules do not tell us when to apply them.

## T---Scope

### 2AC---Scope

#### Counter-interpretation---scope is room for activities---the plan expands it by including un-FRAND-ly restrictions.

Levin 2 (LEVIN, United States Magistrate Judge. MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER in Dabertin v. HCR Manor Care, Inc., 235 F. Supp. 2d 853 (N.D. Ill. 2002). Google scholar caselaw. Date accessed 7/21/21).

Dabertin asserts that HCR Manor Care's "scope" rationale ignores the significant 864\*864 changes that occurred in her job involving her "space or opportunity for unhampered activity," "extent of activity or influence," or "range of operation," which are the ordinary meanings of the term "scope" (see Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary (1977), at 1035). (Pl.'s Reply at 1.) In addition, Dabertin contends that HCR Manor Care's "scope" rationale nullifies the reasonable expectations of Plan participants who relied on the ordinary, popular meaning of Article 1.8(i)'s language. (Id.)

## CP---Code of Conduct

### 2AC---AT: CP---Code of Conduct [NU]

#### The counterplan expands the scope of core antitrust laws by increasing prohibitions.

Bradford and Chilton 18 (Anu Bradford, Henry L. Moses Professor of Law and International Organization, Columbia Law School. Adam S. Chilton, Assistant Professor of Law and Walter Mander Research Scholar @ the University of Chicago. “Competition Law Around the World from 1889 to 2010: The Competition Law Index” , Columbia Law School Scholarship Archive Faculty Scholarship, <https://scholarship.law.columbia.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3519&context=faculty_scholarship> , 2018, date accessed 9/5/21)

The Scope Index is the closest to the CLI in that it also measures the law in the books, treating prohibitions as elements that increase the scope (or stringency) of the law and defenses as elements that reduce the scope (or stringency) of the law. Basic categories in the Scope Index and our CLI are also the same, even if somewhat differently labeled. For example, we refer to “anticompetitive agreements” where the Scope Index refers to “restrictive trade practices.”

#### Deficits:

#### 1---information capture---the counterplan causes regulators to be bombarded with industry information---undermines expertise and enforcement.

Shapiro et al. 13, \*Sidney Shapiro, University Chair in Law, Wake Forest University; \*Richard Murphy, AT&T Professor of Law, Texas Tech University; (Spring 2013, “Public Participation without a Public: The Challenge for Administrative Policymaking”, https://scholarship.law.missouri.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=4038&context=mlr)

B. The Asymmetry

A number of empirical studies have found that business interests dominate rulemaking, as measured by the number of rulemakings in which various interests filed comments or by the relative number of comments that were filed in rulemakings.59 The latest and most comprehensive study, by Professor Wendy Wagner and her coauthors, confirmed these results in a study of ninety hazardous air pollutant rulemakings at the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 60 On average, industry filed over 81% of the comments submitted concerning a proposed rule; 61 public interest groups filed comments in less than 50% of the rulemakings; 62 and industry interests had an average of at least 170 times more information communications with EPA staff (meetings, phone calls, letters, etc.) than did public interest groups during the period before the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (pre-NPRM period).63

White House review of significant rules, which occurs at OIRA, reinforces or even exacerbates existing pluralistic imbalances.64 Professor Rena Steinzor and her coauthors from the Center of Progressive Reform (CPR) found that 65% of the participants in 1,080 meetings at ORIA were from industry interests, which was 5 times the number of attendees who represented public interest groups.65 Of the lawyers, consultants and lobbyists who attended these meetings, nearly 95% represented business interests, as compared to 2.5% who represented public interest groups.66 Corporate interests also met alone with OIRA far more often. Seventy percent (70%) of the more than 1,000 meetings involved only industry interests, while only 7% involved only public interests.67

While the evidence is not conclusive, the evidence we have shows an imbalance between public interest and private interest representation in the rulemaking process. This imbalance occurs both at agencies and at OIRA concerning its review of proposed and final rules.

C. The Consequences

On either an interest-representation or a deliberative-democratic model, severe asymmetry in public participation is not a good thing. If agencies (and OIRA) are bargaining with stakeholders, industry interests have a greater opportunity to influence the rulemaking process. If agencies are relying on public comments for rulemaking information, the potential exists for “filter failure,” which Professor Wagner has identified as an ironic result of the reformation’s efforts to expand public participation. Because the courts expect an agency to respond to all significant comments,68 it cannot “shield itself from this flood of information and focus on developing its own expert conception of the project.”69 This expectation presents a problem in which asymmetrical information overwhelms the agency and influences the outcome. 70

#### Turns the net benefit---stakeholder participation creates the worst rules.

Shapiro et al. 13, \*Sidney Shapiro, University Chair in Law, Wake Forest University; \*Richard Murphy, AT&T Professor of Law, Texas Tech University; (Spring 2013, “Public Participation without a Public: The Challenge for Administrative Policymaking”, https://scholarship.law.missouri.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=4038&context=mlr)

In one important negative sense, our hypothetical reader is right, and the choice does not matter. Both theories fail if there is not a fair balance of stakeholders who participate in the process. As Part III explains, this lack of a fair balance is a real problem – the proverbial elephant in the room mentioned earlier. To our minds, however, the choice matters because it concerns the degree of politics that is appropriate in administrative policymaking.

These days, almost no one who thinks about the problem for more than a moment believes that significant administrative policymaking is merely a matter of adding expert knowledge of the facts to correct construction of the law.27 Perfect knowledge of every effect of a toxic pollutant at every level of exposure on everyone in the world cannot determine what level is low enough to be “safe.” Administrative policymaking demands that agencies make value choices, and in a democracy, the agency should be politically accountable for its choices. But accepting these facts of administrative life does not settle the question of how the agency should make its choices in the first place. Some bargaining is an inescapable part of regulating a complex and political world through complex and political bureaucracies; politics must bracket the discretion that an agency can exercise. Still, within this policy space, we prefer that agencies implement their best judgments about how to proceed. To put the matter another way, some agency rules, as appropriate as they may be, simply will not fly as a political matter. So be it. But, for the reasons we take up next, we prefer agencies to reach decisions without bargaining over the result with stakeholders.

Our definition of expertise is broad. We recognize that scientific and social scientific methodologies, in practice, cannot make complex policymaking into a completely objective affair. These methodologies, particularly costbenefit analysis, have not displaced the operation of politics, often lack accuracy, and are subject to being manipulated according to an analyst’s policy preferences.28 Moreover, claims about objectivity are simply “untenable in light of post-empiricism.”29 “[E]conomics (and other social sciences) [at best are] a mixture of empirical data and social construction.” 30 Following on from this, experts are not limited to persons trained in scientific methodologies but include other professionals, particularly lawyers and public administrators, who rely on qualitative analysis to identify and justify regulatory solutions.

Our preference for public administration over political bargaining is rooted in a stubborn insistence that both details and aspirations matter. Choosing the “best” rule may, in many cases, prove to be a fearsomely complex, uncertain, value-laden task. Still, we contend that administrative expertise located in a discursive process of consultation with the public is the process most likely to serve the public interest. We support democratically informed expert judgment over political trade-offs because we believe the former is more likely, generally speaking, to lead agencies to choose better, public-regarding outcomes than the latter, which encourages lowest common denominator policymaking and distortion in favor of powerful, parochial interests.

Why, however, think that an agency can determine the public interest better than other stakeholders? This query goes back to the point that expertise, sans values, cannot justify policy choices, or at least the type of policy choices that agencies must make. For instance, we know that ingesting too much arsenic is very bad for people. We do not have perfect information about this problem – i.e., we cannot track the dose response curve down to zero. Also, this information does not tell us how much to spend to address any problems of arsenic ingestion – e.g., it does not tell us how much to spend to limit arsenic levels in drinking water in the American Southwest, where relatively high levels are naturally occurring. Nonetheless, it should be easy for everyone to agree on a ban on adding arsenic to soft drinks for children.

Suppose, however, that an agency, after excluding such extreme possibilities, concludes that “reasonable” people might accept an upper limit of arsenic in drinking water at somewhere between X and Y parts per million. Given that we are now within the regulatory range where contestable values come into play, what could be more sensible than allowing interested parties to strike a deal somewhere between these two levels?

One problem with this approach is that it underestimates both the degree to which values and facts intertwine and the power of motivated reasoning (i.e., politics) to distort expert judgment. Senator Patrick Moynihan famously remarked, “[e]veryone is entitled to his own opinion, but not to his own facts.”31 He may have been correct as a matter of principle, but, in practice, people find the facts they want.32 We therefore should not be surprised if a regulatory system that aspires to deal-making finds that the political aims of its strongest actors distort expertise more than in a system that aspires to expert identification and implementation by public servants of a broad public interest.33

It also bears noting that maximizing the role of expert judgment (informed by public participation) and minimizing pluralistic bargaining is broadly consistent with the kind of democracy we learned about in grammar school. We’ve conducted no surveys on this point but nonetheless will hazard that people expect agencies to use their authority to create the best policies they can rather than to coordinate deals among interest groups.

Realistically, agencies operate in the pluralistic world of politics, requiring them to accommodate pressures from all directions, be they from the White House, Congress, agencies themselves, or outside stakeholders with political influence. Nonetheless, we submit that the aspiration of regulators should be to create rules based on their best judgments of the broad public interest, minimizing the distorting effect of special interests. The democratic deliberation model embraces this aspiration, and it is therefore preferable to the interest-group representation model with its aspiration of deal making.

## DA---FTC

### 2AC---UQ

#### FTC is excessively devoting resources to enforcing patent holdup now.

Morris 9/17/21, \*Angela Morris, Deputy editor at IAM Media; (September 17th, 2021, “The FTC creates a potential new US headache for SEP owners”, https://www.iam-media.com/frandseps/the-ftc-creates-potential-new-us-headache-sep-owners)

SEP owners that may already be wary of potential Biden Administration regulatory changes now have a new threat to keep them up at night.

Over the summer the Federal Trade Commission [announced an expanded view](https://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/the-ftc-expands-section-5-enforcement-7020931/) of its standalone enforcement authority to curb anti-competitive misconduct; and [now the agency has made it clear](https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/press-releases/2021/09/ftc-streamlines-investigations-in-eight-enforcement-areas) that priority targets include “abuse of intellectual property” and “monopolistic practices”.

The agency’s description of the “anticompetitive and deceptive conduct” it seeks to curtail in the technology sector most likely will encompass alleged misconduct by standards essential patent (SEP) owners and their commitments to licensing on FRAND terms, according to IP and antitrust attorney Tim Syrett.

“The FTC has previously conducted two investigations where it found that SEP holders seeking injunctions against licensees was anti-competitive and presented a threat to innovation,” Syrett, who is a partner in Wilmer Hale in Washington DC, explains via email. “That may be an area where the FTC wants to continue to devote resources and is certainly an area where there can be harm to competition because of the hold-up power of SEPs.”

He adds that investment-backed patent assertion entities and patent aggregation organisations may also have reason to fear ITC investigations.

“Investment-backed patent assertion entities can obscure information about who actually owns or has an interest in patents that can harm both licensing and litigation,” says Syrett. “Further, we have seen a concerning rise of patent assertions where the incentives of investors to obtain outsized returns from patents trump any reasonable valuation of the patents’ worth, which can harm competition in the licensing of patents.”

IP owners in the pharmaceutical, technology and gasoline refining industries should also take note of the development, since the commission indicated that it would investigate potential abuses of IP rights that create anti-competitive and deceptive conduct in those spaces.

Big Tech companies and other large businesses would be advised to pay attention as well, given that another stated FTC aim is to target alleged abuses of their market power that stop entrepreneurs from competing.

The two resolutions were among a group of eight that a divided commission passed this month on a 3-2 vote, as the agency seeks to handle increased workload from high merger filings. Both resolutions, effective for 10 years, direct the agency to use its compulsory processes to obtain documents and testimony through either demands or subpoenas to investigate allegations that would be a violation of Section 5 of the FTC Act.

### 2AC---Link Turn

#### private action---the plan buttresses private enforcement to remedy SSO patent holdup---that zeroes the link.

Speegle 12, \*Adam Speegle, J.D., (May 2012, “Antitrust Rulemaking as a Solution to Abuse on the Standard-Setting Process Setting Process”, <https://repository.law.umich.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1128&context=mlr>)

* Plan is not FTC activism
* Requiring SSO’s to administer rules lets the private sector self-manage
* No new staff/resources required
* No FTC monitoring required
* If the FTC does have to do anything, number of cases will be limited due to deterrence, which solves an excessive workload

This too is not fatal to the approach. The proposed rule uses a light touch in that it only buttresses rules established by SSOs. Because the rule would support actions by the private sector to manage their own activities rather than introducing additional agency oversight, Congress would be unlikely to react the way it did when the FTC's activism in the consumer protection arena evoked fears of excessive government intervention.

One final concern with the approach is that it will demand more of the FTC in a regulatory capacity than the FTC is capable of handling. For example, under any rule where the FTC would be called upon to enforce RAND terms, the FTC might fall into the role of license-rate regulator, determining which licensing fees are reasonable and which are unreasonable. But the FTC is a relatively small institution with limited resources.1 62 Some are concerned that under such a scenario the Commission would have to bring on new staff with expertise in the technology sector to monitor the reasonableness of licensing terms arising from SSO commitments.163

This concern is unlikely to be serious under the proposed formulation. As to the problem of determining "reasonableness," the FTC has already developed expertise in this area and, in fact, recently authored a report putting forth workable solutions to the problem of calculating "reasonableness" in the context of RAND commitments. 64 Further, the FTC would not need to establish itself as a monitoring body and would not incur the related costs of increases in staff and resources. Rather, enforcement of the proposed rule would operate similarly to the FTC's enforcement of its consumer protection rules. Under that regime, companies and individuals report fraudulent activity that violates one of the FTC's rules, which the Commission then investigates and, at its discretion, prosecutes. 16 Because the burden would be on the private sector to report in such a regime, the FTC would not need to monitor SSO activity. And as with consumer protection enforcement, a small number of decisive enforcement actions against abusive firms should act as a deterrent sufficient to decrease the FTC's litigation workload. 166 Thus, despite some legitimate concerns with the approach of enforcement by rule, those concerns are not fatal to the strategy. Moreover, the next Section demonstrates that there are also general benefits to enforcement by rule that weigh in favor of the approach.

### 2AC---Impact

#### Terrorism doesn’t escalate to the nuclear level.

Ward 18, analyst on the Defence, Security, and Infrastructure team at RAND Europe. Citing Dr Beyza Unal, a research fellow in nuclear policy at think tank Chatham House. (Antonia, 7/27/18, "Is Nuclear Terrorism Distracting Attention from More Realistic Threats?", *RAND*, https://www.rand.org/blog/2018/07/is-the-threat-of-nuclear-terrorism-distracting-attention.html)

Despite Obama's remarks in 2016 and these two incidents, experts and officials contest the viability of the nuclear terrorism threat. Dr Beyza Unal, a research fellow in nuclear policy at think tank Chatham House, argued there is currently no evidence that terrorist groups could build a nuclear weapon. Similarly, a report by the Council on Foreign Relations in 2006 emphasized how building a nuclear bomb is a difficult task for states, let alone terrorists. This is because of the issues involved in accessing uranium and creating and maintaining it at the correct grade (enriched uranium).

While nuclear terrorism is a concern, the majority of terrorist attacks are conducted with conventional explosives. The 2017 Europol Terrorism Situation and Trend Report states that 40 percent of terrorist attacks used explosives. These explosives originate from a wide variety of countries across the world. According to a study by Conflict Armament Research, large quantities of explosive precursor chemicals used to make bombs as seen in the 7/7 attack in London in 2005 and the 2017 Manchester Arena attack, have been linked to supply chains in the United States, Europe, and Asia via Turkey. The threat from the spread of chemical precursors prompted the EU to begin looking at ways to tighten the regulations of these chemicals (PDF).

A nuclear terrorist attack would have grave consequences, but it is currently not a realistic or viable threat given that it would require a level of sophistication from terrorists that has not yet been witnessed. The recent focus of terrorist groups has been on simplistic strikes, such as knife and vehicular attacks. If countries are concerned about nuclear terrorism, the best way to mitigate this risk could be to tighten security at civilian and government nuclear sites. But governments would be better off focusing their efforts on combatting the spread and use of conventional weapons.

## DA---Politics

### 2AC---NL---Courts

#### court action flies under the radar.

Lohier 16 - judge on the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and formerly an Assistant United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York (Raymond, “THE COURT OF APPEALS AS THE MIDDLE CHILD,” *Fordham Law Review*, Lexis)

In the meantime, almost all of the work of our circuit courts is off the congressional radar. Circuit opinions, with or without the intercession of the Supreme Court, so rarely prompt a ripple in Congress that it becomes memorable when they do. The few ripples more often arise in cases involving issues of national security. A recent example was our decision in ACLU v. Clapper,25 which stirred a vigorous debate in Congress in 2015 when we held that the text of section 215 of the USA PATRIOT Act did not plainly authorize the systematic bulk collection of domestic phone records by the National Security Agency.26 Even more recently, Senator Orrin Hatch of Utah cited our court’s decision in Microsoft Corp. v. United States,27 in which we held that the Electronic Communications Privacy Act (ECPA) did not authorize the government to obtain electronic communications stored outside the United States.28 Senator Hatch and other members of Congress pointed to both the majority opinion and a concurring opinion in that case to ask the Department of Justice to work with Congress on fixing the ECPA.29 On extremely rare occasions, specific congressional involvement arises in the context of a discrete case, as when individual Senators or Representatives seek to influence how we decide important legal issues, such as the indefinite detention provisions of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, by submitting amicus briefs pressing their points of view.30 There also are continuing efforts to get Congress’s attention on broader issues of statutory language. Fairly recently, for example, the Judicial Conference of the United States sought to revitalize and readvertise an excellent project to promote communications between federal courts of appeals and Congress.31 Under the project, “courts of appeals identify opinions that point out possible technical problems in statutes [such as ambiguities and gaps] and send those opinions to Congress for its information and whatever action it wishes to take.”32 Yet, for whatever reason, only three opinions were submitted to Congress under this project in 2015 and only fifty-two altogether have been submitted since 2007.33 Of course, other ways to solicit legislative attention exist short of using this formal mechanism. An opinion that cries for congressional action or decries congressional inaction is one example. But, as I explain later, that opinion is apt to be ignored by Congress if it comes from a circuit court, rather than even a lone dissenter on the Supreme Court.

### 2AC---Won’t Pass

#### Won’t pass---inflation concerns and CBO report

Antle 11-11-2021 (James, “Biden's big spending plans could sink if centrists jump ship,” *The Gazette*, https://gazette.com/news/bidens-big-spending-plans-could-sink-if-centrists-jump-ship/article\_c585a441-72ff-55b1-b3d7-e482c8c75631.html)

But if Sen. Joe Manchin of West Virginia and other centrists are looking for a reason to break with their party on the big spending bill, Wednesday's inflation numbers gave them yet another. "By all accounts, the threat posed by record inflation to the American people is not ‘transitory' and is instead getting worse," Manchin tweeted in response to the Labor Department's report. "From the grocery store to the gas pump, Americans know the inflation tax is real and DC can no longer ignore the economic pain Americans feel every day." The 6.2% spike in consumer prices for the year ending in October could enhance concerns that excessive federal spending is already overheating the economy before Democrats advance Biden's reconciliation measure. It is not, however, the only factor giving wary centrist lawmakers pause. Republicans swept the statewide offices in Virginia and made gains in the Legislature despite the fact Biden won the commonwealth by 10 points a year ago. The GOP also came close to upsetting Democratic New Jersey Gov. Phil Murphy and ousted the state Senate president, a Democrat, with a lightly funded challenger. These election results appear to confirm a raft of polling showing the president and the administration are unpopular. A USA Today/Suffolk University poll found Biden with a 38% job approval rating. Vice President Kamala Harris was even worse off at 28%. And Republicans led in the generic congressional ballot. Next year's midterm elections were always likely to be a struggle for Democrats. The president's party has lost seats in all but two midterm elections since 1938. Republicans gained 52 House seats and their first majority in 40 years in 1994, former President Bill Clinton's first midterm election. They picked up 63 House seats and another majority during former President Barack Obama's in 2010. Democrats don't need losses on that scale for Republicans to regain the majority next year. They hold just 222 seats in the House and the Senate is split 50-50, with Democratic control hinging on Harris's tiebreaking vote. In each of the previous elections, centrists were among the hardest hit. The 2022 contests figure to be no different because these Democrats tend to be the ones representing the reddest states and most competitive districts. Demonstrations of independence from Biden, Schumer, and Pelosi could save some of these Democrats, though it is not always enough. There is little evidence that the nearly $2 trillion American Rescue Plan Biden already signed into law after it was passed exclusively with Democratic votes through the reconciliation process helped the party at the polls. Manchin is more popular in West Virginia than Biden is. The same is true for Sen. Kyrsten Sinema, the other centrist holdout in the upper chamber, in Arizona. They have little incentive to capitulate to Biden unless they want to help his presidency succeed. Liberals worried that once the bipartisan infrastructure bill was passed, this would prove true of the party's centrists as a whole. But in the House, the surviving Blue Dogs agreed to vote on the bigger spending bill pending a Congressional Budget Office score. The CBO analysis could easily provide centrists with yet another reason to balk at Build Back Better, given some indications that the price tag will be scored as bigger than advertised. The most liberal Democrats in the House have always feared that whatever the CBO found, centrists would move the goalposts and find another reason to vote no. The same accusation has been leveled against Manchin and Sinema in the Senate, though Biden has attempted to assure Democrats they will both be there with them in the end. If this proves true, the centrists may already have all the ammunition they need to sink the bill. Unlike with infrastructure, no Republican defections are expected. Democrats can afford to lose no more than three votes in the House and zero in the Senate.

## DA---Industry Relations

### 2AC---AT: Business Confidence DA---TL

#### Turn---antitrust intervention strengthens business confidence---no evidence supports the DA.

Cary et al. 11, \*Messrs. George Cary and Alex Sistla are members of the California and District of Columbia Bars. Mr. Mark Nelson is a member of the New York and District of Columbia Bars. Mr. Steven Kaiser is a member of the New Jersey and District of Columbia Bars; (2011, “THE CASE FOR ANTITRUST LAW TO POLICE THE PATENT HOLDUP PROBLEM INSTANDARD SETTING”, <https://www.clearygottlieb.com/~/media/organize-archive/cgsh/files/publication-pdfs/the-case-for-antitrust-law-to-police-the-patent-holdup-problem-in-the-standard-setting.pdf>)

Other commentators believe that there are strong policy arguments against employing antitrust law to police the conduct of SSOs because it will undermine the incentives of SSO participants to innovate. For example, David Teece and Edward Sherry have argued that “antitrust intervention” could “re-duce the clarity of [SSO] rules thereby making participation in SSOs more risky and reducing the willingness of firms with valuable IP (and which there-fore presumably have much to contribute to selecting the appropriate standard) to participate.”44 As a result, they contend that there is a “significant risk of slowing down the standards-setting process, thus delaying the adoption of new standards and new products made in accordance with those standards, to the detriment of consumers and of society generally.”45 In effect, Teece and Sherry’s concern is one of delay—antitrust enforcement could delay innovation. In a commentary accompanying Teece and Sherry’s article, Michael Carrier found their claims to be overstated because they failed to engage in any serious antitrust analysis.46 We agree. But more importantly, Teece and Sherry make empirical claims without any evidence. In particular, they do not even offer anecdotal evidence that firms are discouraged from participating in SSOs because of the prospect of antitrust enforcement. Indeed, the opposite could be equally argued: participation in SSOs would be discouraged to the extent that participants could not rely on the commitments of their fellow participants to disclose and abide by other commitments intended to preclude opportunism. Teece and Sherry’s argument sounds a familiar refrain against antitrust: antitrust enforcement discourages procompetitive behavior and therefore should be limited. The conclusion rings hollow without facts.

### 2AC---Thumper

#### Prior Approval

Loughlin and Oliver 10-28-2021, (Chuck Loughlin, Leigh Oliver, “FTC establishes broad policy to require prior approval provisions in all merger divestiture orders,” <https://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/ftc-establishes-broad-policy-to-require-6917794>)

Analysis

The FTC’s Prior Approval Statement explains that the FTC is hoping that the more liberal use of prior approval provisions will discourage companies from moving ahead with “facially anticompetitive” deals, preserve Commission resources, and flag anticompetitive deals that fall below the Hart-Scott-Rodino (HSR) thresholds and do not trigger federal reporting requirements. Certainly, demanding prior approval provisions—which may extend beyond the relevant markets affected by the merger—will create uncertainty and increase the burden on merging parties. The effect could be that parties take more cases to litigation rather than agree to consent decrees with prior approval provisions that go beyond the scope of the challenged transaction. Moreover, the Commission’s suggestion that it may seek prior approval provisions even when parties abandon a merger would necessarily require the FTC to continue a litigation even after the parties abandoned the deal, using up important Commission resources on expensive litigation that is no longer needed to block the transaction at issue that allegedly has an imminent threat of harming competition. This provision, and others that stretch beyond the transaction at issue, could push more parties to litigate mergers that they would otherwise abandon. After all, if the FTC is going to litigate the issues in the case in order to secure a prior approval provision, then parties may be less willing to abandon the deal in the first place. The Commission appears to hope that these requirements result in less deal activity to begin with, but that is not at all certain.

## K---Capitalism

### 2AC---AT: K---Cap (Short)

#### Both advantages impact turn the K---they’re robust defenses of innovation, which the alt can’t solve.

Kornai 13, \*János Kornai is a Hungarian economist and the Allie S. Freed Professor of Economics Emeritus at Harvard and Professor Emeritus at Corvinus University of Budapest; (János, November 6th, 2013, “Dynamism, Rivalry, and the Surplus Economy”, DOI:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199334766.001.0001, Google Books)

C. There is no competition between producers and sellers. Production is strongly concentrated. Many companies enjoy monopolist positions, or at least a (regional) monopoly in producing an entire group of products. The chronic shortage of products creates monopolistic behavior even when many producers operate in parallel. The shortage economy, one of the strongest system-specific properties of socialism, ~~paralyzes~~ impedes the forceful engine of innovation, the incentive to fight for the favors of the customer ( Kornai 1971 ; 1980; 1992, chapters 11 – 12 ). The producer/seller is not compelled to attract the buyer by offering him a new and better product, since the latter is happy to get anything in the shop, even an obsolete and poor-quality product.

There are examples of inventive activities motivated by chronic shortages: ingeniously created substitutes for missing materials or machinery parts (Laki 1984 –1985). These results of the inventors’ creative mind, however, do not become widespread, commercially successful innovations in the Schumpeterian sense. 25 Table 2.1 features only one revolutionary innovation that did not appear first in a capitalist country but, rather, in the Soviet Union: synthetic rubber. Its inventor had been doing research on the subject for decades; the employment of it in industry was rendered necessary by the shortage of natural rubber.

D. The tight limits of experimenting. Capitalism allows for hundreds or thousands of barren or barely fruitful attempts, so that, afterward, one out of the hundreds or thousands would succeed and bring immense success. In the socialist planned economy, actors are inclined to avoid risks. As a result, the application of revolutionarily significant innovations are more or less excluded, since those always mean a leap into the dark, as success is necessarily unpredictable. As far as followers are concerned, some economies follow up quickly, others slowly. The socialist economies belong to the group characterized by the slowest pace. They prefer to maintain the already known, old production procedures, and produce the old well-tried products; new technologies and new products have too many uncertain characteristics making the planning of the directives difficult.

E. There is no capital waiting to be utilized; investment allocation is rigid. Central planning is not miserly with the resources devoted to capital formation. The share of investment carved out from the total output is typically higher than in the capitalist economies. However, this enormous volume is appropriated ahead of time to the last penny. Moreover, most of the time over-allocation takes place; in other words, the ensemble of all project plans prescribes the requisition of more resources than the required amount to execute the plan. It never happens that unallocated capital is waiting for someone with a good idea. The allocators do not search for an entrepreneur waiting to step forward with a proposal for innovation. Flexible capital markets are unknown. Instead, the rigid and bureaucratic regulation of project activities takes place, and to devote capital resources to activities with possibly uncertain outcomes is unconceivable. No foolish minister of industry or factory manager could be found who would demand money for ventures admitting in advance that the money may be wasted and the innovation may not succeed. 26
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### 1AR- W/M

#### Sagers saids courts implicitly limit the scope

Christopher L. **1NR** Sagers 15, James A. Thomas Distinguished Professor of Law and Faculty Director of the Cleveland-Marshall Solo Practice Incubator at the Cleveland-Marshall College of Law, Cleveland State University, “Chapter 1: Introduction,” Handbook on the Scope of Antitrust, American Bar Association, Section of Antitrust Law, 2015, pp. 1–12

B. Sources of the Scope of Antitrust Law

The scope of federal antitrust law is governed by three separate authorities-: (1) the U.S. Constitution, (2) the language of the antitrust statutes themselves, and (3) the language of other federal statutes and regulations.

The U.S. Constitution limits antitrust in two ways. First, the Constitution sets the power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce, the power on which federal antitrust laws are predicated. Under current constitutional law, as explained in Chapter II.A.l, the issue of whether the application of federal antitrust law in a particular instance will violate the Commerce Clause is not raised particularly often. While in principle an antitrust claim might be dismissed because the challenged conduct is local, and while there have been some recent indications that Commercej Clause limits could become somewhat more demanding in antitrust,37 the conduct ordinarily must be highly isolated and economically insignificant to fall outside of Congress’s commerce power.

Second, antitrust can be limited where it would violate defendants’! constitutional rights. Prominently, a pair of related rules—the “state action” doctrine, or Parker immunity, and the Noerr-Pennington immunity—preclude antitrust enforcement against political activities. I The state action rule protects state governments from liability when they act in their sovereign capacities, and largely frees them to restrain trade within their own borders, so long as they do not indiscriminately authorize private trade restraints without government oversight. The Noerr doctrine protects private persons when they participate in the political process, even if the government action that they request would be anticompetitive.

As explained in Chapter. V.B, there is some-controversy among commentators as to whether the political immunities are themselves rules of constitutional law—limits without which antitrust would violate the Constitution—or merely judicial constructions, of the antitrust, statutes. 1 Still, even if the political immunities are not themselves constitutionally required, ^"substantive rulesl of constitutional law plainly ido limit antitrust directly. Notably, antitrust enforcement against “expressive” 1 conduct and the conduct of religious organizations can violate the First Amendment.38

Next, the language of the federal antitrust laws imposes several j scope limits. Each of the major antitrust statutes applies only to “trade or commerce,”39 and that phrase has been held to exclude gratuitous or j charitable conduct and other conduct not involving the exchange of goods or services for consideration.40 The Sherman Act likewise applies only to “persons,” and while that term is construed broadly under the Sherman Act, it has some exceptions, notably for the federal government and its instrumentalities.41 Stricter limits appear in the Clayton, i Robinson-Patman, and Federal Trade Commission Acts (FTC Act), and these limits are quite complex. The Robinson-Patman Act and two of the Clayton Act’s substantive provisions, the limit on tying and exclusive dealing arrangements in section 3 and the limit on interlocking directorates in section 8, apply only to persons “engaged in commerce.”42 The Federal Trade Commission Act is subject to a few special peculiar scope limits of its own.43

Finally, in several distinct ways the language of other federal statutes can limit the scope of the federal antitrust laws. First, approximately three dozen statutes explicitly limit antitrust as it would otherwise apply in particular contexts. Statutory exemptions tend to concern either (1) industries that are already regulated by some agency, like insurers excepted by the McCarran-Ferguson Act, by virtue of their being regulated by state insurance commissioners,44 or ocean shipping firms regulated by the Federal Maritime Commission,45 or (2) specific kinds of conduct that Congress has chosen from time to time to favor with special freedom to collaborate, like technological research and development,46 the graduate medical resident program,47 or production joint ventures among competing newspapers.48

Second, the courts have sometimes held that other federal laws implicitly limit antitrust. This impulse is expressed in three different judge-made doctrines. Under the doctrine of “implied repeal,” the language of some federal statute may be so plainly inconsistent with the applicability of antitrust in a given case that courts will find that Congress implicitly stated an intent to repeal antitrust as to that case.49 (A closely related rule, called the “federal instrumentality” doctrine, holds that a defendant acting pursuant to a command or explicit approval of the federal government cannot violate antitrust law.) Traditionally, implied repeal was strongly disfavored, and though it has been applied somewhat more freely in recent decades, it still appears almost exclusively in two areas: federally regulated, exchange-listed securities, and labor union activities.50 Under the “filed rate” or Keogh doctrine, where Congress gives a regulatory agency authority to receive filed tariffs setting the rates that regulated firms may charge, courts hold that Congress intended to bar money damages for any harm caused by those rates.51 And under the rule of “primary jurisdiction,” antitrust courts will sometimes defer to the statutory authority of a federal agency to resolve matters entrusted to it by Congress, before proceeding to resolve antitrust issues.

#### Sagers agree’s non statutory exemptions are T

Christopher L. **1NR** Sagers 15, James A. Thomas Distinguished Professor of Law and Faculty Director of the Cleveland-Marshall Solo Practice Incubator at the Cleveland-Marshall College of Law, Cleveland State University, “Table of Contents,” Handbook on the Scope of Antitrust, American Bar Association, Section of Antitrust Law, 2015, <https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba-cms-dotorg/products/ecd/ebk/140535931/5030623-TOC.pdf>
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However, the fact that PAEs and privateers could produce anticompetitive effects by speculating on the standards-setting process does not necessarily imply that antitrust enforcement is the most effective solution to opportunistic behaviour. Indeed many scholars have attributed inefficiencies resulting from PAE activity to the patent system,161 or to civil procedure and litigation;162 others have proposed remedies based on contract law or on theories of promissory estoppel; increased transparency of ownership and encumbrances on patents might also mitigate problems of evasion of FRAND commitments.163 SSOs could also play an important role in regulating SEPs transfers and the effect of FRAND commitments on subsequent owners.164

A more thorough review of the above mentioned proposals is outside the scope of this thesis. Undoubtedly, valuable insights could be drawn from such contributions with regard to the exact nature of PAE activity and its sources. Indeed many of such proposals, if put into practice, would alleviate problems stemming from PAE activities and opportunism with SEPs in general. However, that should not lead to the conclusion that antitrust enforcement is less relevant.

Antitrust could play a meaningful role.165 The most important contribution of antitrust enforcement against abuses of SEPs is its deterrent effect.166 Although patent law reforms or contractual binding of subsequent SEPs-holders to FRAND licensing would provide to victims of hold-up useful defences in court, they do not sufficiently deter abusive assertion of SEPs in the first place. For instance, the contractual binding to FRAND could raise counterclaims of breach of contract or/and contractual performance; however, the opportunistic SEP-holder will, in case it loses on such grounds, be left no worse than with a licence on FRAND terms. In the end, a patent hold-up is indeed precluded, but contractual constraints can do little to prevent opportunistic assertion of SEPs in the first place. The victims still suffer the costs of uncertain and resource-draining litigation; most importantly, the reliability of the standards-setting process might still be at risk.

Antitrust enforcement on the other hand, in imposing tortfeasors positive monetary losses in the form of fines, alters the profit-cost calculus of opportunistic behaviour in the first place; opportunistic assertion of SEPs will come at a cost. Of course, a too-heavy-handed approach could have a chilling effect on legitimate patent assertions against implementers that are reluctant to pay FRAND royalties, thus leading to false positives. Antitrust enforcement should carefully examine the specificities of each case, such as the particular PAE conduct, the relationship between PAEs and practicing entities, the structure of downstream markets.167 More importantly, an economically informed antitrust analysis focusing on the actual and potential anticompetitive effects of opportunistic SEPs assertion should prohibit behaviour that is truly harmful to consumers. Safeguarding the inclusive and efficient character of the standards-setting process is a competition law problem. Informed antitrust analysis could provide adequate responses to opportunistic PAE behaviour and privateering.

#### SSO interests do not align with consumers.

Speegle 12, \*Adam Speegle, J.D., (May 2012, “Antitrust Rulemaking as a Solution to Abuse on the Standard-Setting Process Setting Process”, https://repository.law.umich.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1128&context=mlr)

Even assuming that SSO members are willing and able to engage in litigation with a firm attempting patent holdup, consumer welfare takes a backseat to the members' financial considerations.3 8 Because the incentives of the SSO members do not align with those of consumers, enforcement actions by firms in the private sector cannot be relied on to adequately protect consumers. 39 This concept is illustrated by a practice known as injunction threats, in which a patent holder threatens to bring an injunction against a manufacturer for violating its patent unless the manufacturer pays a substantial royalty.4 ° While the patent holder's threat may have questionable legal footing, the manufacturer will often pay the royalty instead of engaging in extended litigation.4 This happens for several reasons. First, the manufacturer has a disincentive to engage a patent holder in litigation because the manufacturer will bear the cost of the litigation, the result of which could benefit competitors. 42 Companies will tend to pay the royalty and wait for another company to challenge the practice. 43 Second, the costs associated with challenging injunction threats may be substantial." On top of ordinary litigation costs, if the manufacturer has already begun making and distributing goods based on the patented technology, a potential preliminary injunction could have a devastating effect on its business.4 5 While engaging a patent holder in litigation may collaterally benefit consumers in that increased royalties are not passed through to the price of the ultimate product, this benefit does not tip the scales in favor of manufacturers pursuing such a path.' Thus, reliance on litigation by SSO members or other third parties will not provide a complete solution to patent holdup, as these parties serve as poor proxies for consumers.

## Disad

### 1AR---Prior Approval

#### Statement creates confusion and timing uncertainty.

Schwarts et. al 10-28-2021, Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP. (Haidee Schwartz , Corey W. Roush , Ed Pagano and Taylor Daly, “FTC Makes Major Changes To Expand Prior Approval In Merger Consents, Creating Greater Risk For Merging Parties Subject To FTC Merger Review,” https://www.mondaq.com/unitedstates/antitrust-eu-competition-/1125562/ftc-makes-major-changes-to-expand-prior-approval-in-merger-consents-creating-greater-risk-for-merging-parties-subject-to-ftc-merger-review)

On Monday, October 25, the Federal Trade Commission (FTC or "Commission") issued a policy statement announcing that the Commission will require all parties that enter into a merger consent agreement to agree that the parties will for at least ten years seek and obtain prior approval from the FTC before closing any future transaction affecting each relevant market for which a violation was alleged. Unlike reviews under the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976 ("HSR Act") that provide a statutory timeline for U.S. antitrust agency review of proposed transactions and thus some timing certainty for merging parties, the prior approval provisions anticipated by the FTC will have no statutory or other timeline for transactions to receive prior approval. Thus, any company with a transaction subject to prior approval will face much greater timing uncertainty. The FTC policy statement also states that the FTC may require companies entering into merger consent orders to agree to a prior approval provision that covers product and geographic markets beyond those impacted by the merger. When making such determinations of additional relief in the future, the Commission's policy statement indicates that the agency will consider several factors, including (1) the nature of the transaction; (2) the level of market concentration; (3) the degree to which the transaction increases concentration; (4) the degree to which one of the parties had market power pre-acquisition; (5) the parties' history of acquisitiveness; and (6) evidence of anticompetitive market dynamics. Further, in the policy statement, the FTC announced it will require buyers of divested assets subject to a merger consent order to agree to seek prior approval of any future sale of those assets for a minimum of ten years. This will discourage some divestiture buyers and likely will decrease the value of divested assets. Finally, the Commission policy statement stated that in cases in which the Commission issues a complaint and the parties subsequently abandon the transaction, the agency will make a case-specific determination as to whether it will pursue a prior approval order. This would require a court order or party agreement. The Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice (DOJ) did not join the FTC's announcement on its prior approval policy, creating an additional area of divergence between the DOJ's and FTC's merger review policies and practices—a divergence that could have a significant impact on transactions.

#### Impacts all markets.

Litvack and Vooris 10-26-2021, (Douglas E Litvack is co-chair of the firm’s Antitrust and Competition Law Practice. He represents both plaintiffs and defendants in complex antitrust litigation and appeals, Lee K Van Vooris is co-chair of the firm’s Antitrust and Competition Law Practice and a member of the Corporate and Private Equity Practices, “Client Alert: FTC Reverses Quarter-Century of Enforcement Policy,” https://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/client-alert-ftc-reverses-quarter-8487547)

In a move widely expected after the Federal Trade Commission’s Democratic majority rescinded a 1995 policy in July, the FTC issued a policy statement yesterday requiring prior approval provisions for settlements in future transactions affecting any relevant market for which they alleged a violation. The 1995 policy was not to require prior approval provisions as part of a consent decree, settlement, or enforcement order absent extraordinary circumstances (typically where one of the parties to the decree had a history of doing anticompetitive transactions below the HSR threshold). Now, the FTC will require a prior approval provision for all merging parties that resolve antitrust issues subject to a Commission Order. The FTC also appears likely to pursue a prior approval order even when the parties abandon a transaction after substantially complying with a Second Request. Under a prior approval provision, the party must obtain the FTC’s permission before consummating any transaction subject to the provision. As the statement suggests, the FTC could simply reject the transaction without having to provide a court with sufficient evidence to show the transaction violates the law. Styled as a measure to “preserve Commission resources,” the overall effect of the policy on transactions may not be that clear. However, this new policy will certainly add additional risk to any transaction that could be resolved with a divestiture because the parties will need to give the FTC veto power over future deals in that relevant market – and perhaps even beyond that market, as the FTC bragged about in a consent decree also released yesterday. The new Commission policy states that in certain cases where “stronger relief is needed,” the prior approval order may include geographic and product markets beyond those in the instant transaction. Because of the veto power and the threat of an expansive prior approval provision, parties may be more likely to litigate a transaction’s legality rather than settle with the FTC and accept a provision that will hamstring their ability to do future deals. It therefore appears that this policy may inadvertently incentivize more costly merger litigation for both the FTC and defendants, opening the question of whether the policy change might actually cost more in Commission resources than the former policy, which did not penalize companies in this way for settling antitrust disputes with the FTC.