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### 1AC---Innovation Advantage

#### Advantage 1 is Innovation:

#### Standards-Setting Organizations are industry members who jointly establish standards for IT defined by the adoption of standard-essential patents, which are licensed to companies on Fair, Reasonable, and Non-Discriminatory terms. Current standards promote price gouging, FRAND enforcement is critical.

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.

#### Patent holdup is accentuated by the Ninth Circuit’s recent decision in *FTC v. Qualcomm* that permits ICT firms to engage in innovation-stifling conduct with antitrust impunity.

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.

#### Weakened antitrust enforcement emboldens firms to follow Qualcomm’s lead, which collapses FRAND integrity.

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.

#### Absence of domestic 5G competition cedes leadership in technical standards to China.

Duan 19, \*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; (February 5th, 2019, “Why China Is Winning the 5G War”, https://nationalinterest.org/feature/why-china-winning-5g-war-43347)

There is little doubt today that American superiority in the next generation of mobile communications, commonly called 5G, is a matter of extraordinary national concern. There is also little doubt that China is a strong competitor, already having outspent the United States by [$24 billion](https://www2.deloitte.com/content/dam/Deloitte/us/Documents/technology-media-telecommunications/us-tmt-5g-deployment-imperative.pdf#page=3) and planning [$411 billion](https://www.scmp.com/tech/china-tech/article/2098948/china-plans-28-trillion-yuan-capital-expenditure-create-worlds) in 5G investment over the next decade. The Chinese government has also laid out multiple national plans for establishing the country as a leader in mobile technology, and the Chinese firm Huawei is poised to be the [top smartphone manufacturer](https://www.cnbc.com/2018/11/16/huawei-aims-to-overtake-samsung-as-no-1-smartphone-player-by-2020.html) by 2020.

And what are United States companies doing about this? Bickering over patents.

For years, the leading American supplier of advanced mobile communications chips has been the San Diego-based Qualcomm. The company has been an innovator of mobile technology, but it has also been a remarkable innovator of convoluted legal strategies. As an ongoing Federal Trade Commission [lawsuit alleges](https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/press-releases/2017/01/ftc-charges-qualcomm-monopolizing-key-semiconductor-device-used), Qualcomm has used its dominant position as a chip supplier and its extensive patent holdings to weave an intricate web of patent licensing across the mobile industry. The effect of that complex licensing scheme, the FTC claims, has been to force competitor chipmakers out of the market and to extract concessions and high patent royalties from smartphone and mobile-device makers.

Qualcomm today faces only one major U.S. competitor—Intel, whose chips Apple recently [started using](https://www.cultofmac.com/484250/intel-reaping-rewards-apples-scrap-qualcomm/) instead of Qualcomm’s. Not surprisingly, Qualcomm has leveraged its patents to force a retaliatory investigation against Apple, the effect of which could be, as an administrative judge [recently determined](http://www.fosspatents.com/2018/10/itc-judge-didnt-buy-testimony-for-which.html), to boot Intel out of the mobile-chip market and leave Qualcomm as a monopoly.

It is hard to imagine that this infighting among Apple, Intel and Qualcomm is getting the United States very far in 5G, and it is harder to imagine that Qualcomm’s desired outcome would do so, either. The best path, instead, is the obvious one: allowing competition and expanding the number of firms working on 5G.

Competition encourages companies to out-innovate each other in order to grab market share. Of particular importance to 5G, competition leads to [better cybersecurity](https://morningconsult.com/opinions/in-the-race-to-5g-monopoly-considered-harmful/) in products, making them less vulnerable to hacking or misuse.

Competition is especially crucial when it comes to the technical standards that define how 5G works. These standards are the work of 3GPP, an international consortium of technology companies in the field. Chinese players such as Huawei and ZTE are major participants in 3GPP. Ensuring that 3GPP’s standards reflect American values requires having as many American companies at the negotiating table as possible—which is harder to achieve when those companies are trying to sue each other out of business.

Certainly patents themselves, as rewards for new inventions, are a driver of innovation in areas such as 5G. The problem, though, is not the existence of a patent system but the ever-expanding power of the patent laws, which encourage companies to pour dollars into complex patent licensing and assertion schemes—as companies like Qualcomm have done—rather than to perform the hard work of building new technologies. When innovation in patent strategy is more profitable than actual innovation, we lose the race to 5G and other technologies.

But don’t take my word for it. [Multiple members of Congress](https://www.patentprogress.org/2019/01/11/congress-weighs-in-on-qualcomm-and-apple-at-the-itc/), from both sides of the aisle, have denounced the use of patents to kick companies like Intel out of 5G development, predicting that such actions would “dampen the quality, innovation, competitive pricing, and in this case the preservation of a strong U.S. presence in the development of 5G and thus the national security of the United States.”

Or look to what China itself is doing. The Chinese government is handing out rewards left and right to encourage technology research and development. Indeed, it grants subsidies and financial benefits (ranging from the [ordinary](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2818503) to the [imperfect](https://funginstitute.berkeley.edu/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/patent_subsidy_Zhen.pdf) to the [bizarre](https://www.scmp.com/news/china/article/1681850/how-get-out-jail-early-china-buy-inventors-idea-and-patent-it)) to encourage its citizens to file for patents. But while China specifically encourages filing for patents, it does little to encourage using them: Patent infringement awards in court are peanuts—often only [five figures](https://scholarship.law.berkeley.edu/btlj/vol33/iss2/2/)—and most Chinese patent owners drop their patents [within five years](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2018-09-26/china-claims-more-patents-than-any-country-most-are-worthless) of getting them. The message in China is clear: You will be rewarded for innovating, but not for quibbling over patents.

The United States should take the same tack if it wants to match China in 5G. Ever-stronger patent rights encourage counterproductive disputes that are a drag on industry, a drag on research and development, and ultimately a drag on domestic competitiveness on the global stage. If America wants to lead in 5G, then it must clear the path for strong competition among leading American technology companies.

#### Standards leadership allows China to export digital authoritarianism.

Drew et al. 21, \*Dr Alexi Drew, Research Associate, The Policy Institute, King’s College London; (May 7th, 2021, “The Critical Geopolitics of Standards Setting”, https://www.transatlantic-dialogue-on-china.rusi.org/article/the-critical-geopolitics-of-standards-setting)

However, this previously ‘western’ domain is challenged by a Chinese bloc of private industry actors with centrally directed, strategic motivations for their efforts who have managed to leverage the flaws of this system for political and economic advantage.  The market-driven self-regulation model of technical standards has proven itself unsustainable given the geopolitical power achievable through the control of these standards. The marketised approach is easily abusable by a technologically developed nation-state with geopolitical intentions firmly in mind.

Obscurity Through Complexity

Technical standards have the immediate appearance of being both apolitical and ethically neutral. This seems to set them apart from the debate over standards of state behaviour in [cyber space concerning espionage and actions below the threshold of armed conflict](https://www.cfr.org/blog/unexpectedly-all-un-countries-agreed-cybersecurity-report-so-what). Yet, technological standards are unequivocally connected to normative practices of international behaviour and ethics. The extremely complex nature of the standards under consideration in bodies such as the International Organization for Standardization, the International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC), the International Telecommunications Union (ITU), and the Third Generation Partnership Project (3GPP) obscures the very tangible real-world impact that the standards they set have. The 3GPP is responsible for standards setting for mobile telecommunications. It covers everything from 5G through to autonomous vehicles and the Internet of Things. These are the bodies defining how the modern world is constructed.

On the one hand they appear quite benign, responsible for such banalities as the use of Universal Serial Bus (USB) connectors versus proprietary standards. This hardly seems a matter of national security importance. But the same process is responsible for what ultimately shape the basic operating parameters of facial recognition technology in closed circuit television systems, the level of centralised state control at the technical foundations of the internet, and the protections of personally identifiable data. These generate profound implications for international policy and ethics.

Internal Competition vs Strategic Direction

Technical standards setting processes have, historically, been dominated by private sector actors who have had both the capacity to develop a particular technology to the point of holding a significant market share, and the ability to use that market share to advocate for the standardisation of the technology in line with their own production. The market led approach has continued to be the prevailing model by which American companies have globalised the technical standards behind US dominated technological innovation. This privatised form of self-regulation for technology companies is only partially influenced by the approach taken within the EU where [some licensing of standards are controlled by state or EU led institutions.](https://www.ui.se/globalassets/ui.se-eng/publications/ui-publications/2019/ui-brief-no.-2-2019.pdf)

In contrast to this approach the Chinese model has involved a high level of state-oriented direction, oversight, and direct engagement on the creation and signing off technical standards. Efforts to harmonise and centralise technical standards domestically have become increasingly internationalised as the CCP takes this centralised, strategic approach to technical standards setting bodies such as the ITU, 3GPP, and IEC. Technical standards have also become an increasingly central component of the Digital Silk Road with the openly expressed goal of increasing uptake of Chinese technical standards in partner countries.

The implications of this clash between a system of technical standardisation that is driven by the market versus one driven by an authoritarian government subsidised model are a direct challenge to the development of free, open, and ethical technology. Standardisation mechanisms have become political, or rather there has been a gradual realisation of the political power to be gained from the control of technical standards. While the PRC might have come to this awareness first, the US and Europe have since had a rude awakening about the missed opportunity. The privatised model of technical standards setting favoured by European and US markets relies upon the dynamics of financial competition to regulate behaviour. This is in stark contrast to the statist Chinese model.

#### Causes global backsliding.

Kendall-Taylor et. al 20 \*Andrea Kendall-Taylor, senior fellow and director of the Transatlantic Security Program at the Center for a New American Security, co-author of Democracies and Authoritarian Regimes; Erica Frantz is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Michigan State University; Joseph Wright is Professor of Political Science at Pennsylvania State University; (March/April 2020, “The Digital Dictators,” Foreign Affairs, <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/china/2020-02-06/digital-dictators>)

The risk that technology will usher in a wave of authoritarianism is all the more concerning because our own empirical research has indicated that beyond buttressing autocracies, digital tools are associated with an increased risk of democratic backsliding in fragile democracies. New technologies are particularly dangerous for weak democracies because many of these digital tools are dual use: technology can enhance government efficiency and provide the capacity to address challenges such as crime and terrorism, but no matter the intentions with which governments initially acquire such technology, they can also use these tools to muzzle and restrict the activities of their opponents.

#### Democracy solves a litany of existential threats.

Diamond 19, Professor of Political Science and Sociology at Stanford University, Senior Fellow at the Hoover Institution, Senior Fellow at the Freeman Spogli Institute for International Studies, PhD in Sociology from Stanford University, (Dr. Larry, Ill Winds: Saving Democracy from Russian Rage, Chinese Ambition, and American Complacency, p. 199-202)

The most obvious response to the ill winds blowing from the world’s autocracies is to help the winds of freedom blowing in the other direction. The democracies of the West cannot save themselves if they do not stand with democrats around the world. This is truer now than ever, for several reasons. We live in a globalized world, one in which models, trends, and ideas cascade across borders. Any wind of change may gather quickly and blow with gale force. People everywhere form ideas about how to govern—or simply about which forms of government and sources of power may be irresistible—based on what they see happening elsewhere. We are now immersed in a fierce global contest of ideas, information, and norms. In the digital age, that contest is moving at lightning speed, shaping how people think about their political systems and the way the world runs. As doubts about and threats to democracy are mounting in the West, this is not a contest that the democracies can afford to lose. Globalization, with its flows of trade and information, raises the stakes for us in another way. Authoritarian and badly governed regimes increasingly pose a direct threat to popular sovereignty and the rule of law in our own democracies. Covert flows of money and influence are subverting and corrupting our democratic processes and institutions. They will not stop just because Americans and others pretend that we have no stake in the future of freedom in the world. If we want to defend the core principles of self-government, transparency, and accountability in our own democracies, we have no choice but to promote them globally. It is not enough to say that dictatorship is bad and that democracy, however flawed, is still better. Popular enthusiasm for a lesser evil cannot be sustained indefinitely. People need the inspiration of a positive vision. Democracy must demonstrate that it is a just and fair political system that advances humane values and the common good. To make our republics more perfect, established democracies must not only adopt reforms to more fully include and empower their own citizens. They must also support people, groups, and institutions struggling to achieve democratic values elsewhere. The best way to counter Russian rage and Chinese ambition is to show that Moscow and Beijing are on the wrong side of history; that people everywhere yearn to be free; and that they can make freedom work to achieve a more just, sustainable, and prosperous society. In our networked age, both idealism and the harder imperatives of global power and security argue for more democracy, not less. For one thing, if we do not worry about the quality of governance in lower-income countries, we will face more and more troubled and failing states. Famine and genocide are the curse of authoritarian states, not democratic ones. Outright state collapse is the ultimate, bitter fruit of tyranny. When countries like Syria, Libya, and Afghanistan descend into civil war; when poor states in Africa cannot generate jobs and improve their citizens’ lives due to rule by corrupt and callous strongmen; when Central American societies are held hostage by brutal gangs and kleptocratic rulers, people flee—and wash up on the shores of the democracies. Europe and the United States cannot withstand the rising pressures of immigration unless they work to support better, more stable and accountable government in troubled countries. The world has simply grown too small, too flat, and too fast to wall off rotten states and pretend they are on some other planet. Hard security interests are at stake. As even the Trump administration’s 2017 National Security Strategy makes clear, the main threats to U.S. national security all stem from authoritarianism, whether in the form of tyrannies from Russia and China to Iran and North Korea or in the guise of antidemocratic terrorist movements such as ISIS.1 By supporting the development of democracy around the world, we can deny these authoritarian adversaries the geopolitical running room they seek. Just as Russia, China, and Iran are trying to undermine democracies to bend other countries to their will, so too can we contain these autocrats’ ambitions by helping other countries build effective, resilient democracies that can withstand the dictators’ malevolence. Of course, democratically elected governments with open societies will not support the American line on every issue. But no free society wants to mortgage its future to another country. The American national interest would best be secured by a pluralistic world of free countries—one in which autocrats can no longer use corruption and coercion to gobble up resources, alliances, and territory. If you look back over our history to see who has posed a threat to the United States and our allies, it has always been authoritarian regimes and empires. As political scientists have long noted, no two democracies have ever gone to war with each other—ever. It is not the democracies of the world that are supporting international terrorism, proliferating weapons of mass destruction, or threatening the territory of their neighbors.

#### 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>)

III. CAN WE PLEASE STOP SEARCHING FOR SYSTEMIC HOLD-UP?

It is not the purpose of this article to critique the data or methodologies used by researchers who claim that there is no evidence of systemic hold-up. Though questions remain, the data presented in the cited studies finding no empirical evidence of systemic hold-up present plausible descriptions of current markets for products such as smart phones and other connected technology devices. Instead, this critique is directed at the core assumption that runs through each of these studies: that a lack of evidence of systemic hold-up means that hold-up does not represent a threat that justifies policy intervention. In this Part, I argue that, notwithstanding the findings of these studies, patent hold-up in standardized product markets may indeed be a threat that merits preventative policy measures, but that those measures should be directed toward the prevention of well-understood and actionable forms of anticompetitive conduct rather than the economic phenomenon of hold-up.

A. The Absence of Systemic Hold-Up Does Not Mean that Hold-Up Does Not Occur

In a 2017 article, Galetovic and Haber utilize an extended analogy drawn from the field of Mayan archeology to make the point that scholars sometimes ignore the facts in front of them in order to cling to pre-formed (and empirically unsupported) beliefs.92 In this analogical tradition, I will use a hypothetical from public health epidemiology to illustrate a related point. Let us consider the often fatal and highly contagious viral infection Ebola. U.S. public health officials, aware of the dangerous effects of Ebola, might propose the implementation of prophylactic measures to prevent the spread of Ebola in the United States. Such measures might include early detection systems at U.S. hospitals, a network of Ebola experts ready to investigate suspected cases, and potential vaccines for particularly vulnerable populations. All of these measures, of course, would come at a cost. Those opposing the incurrence of this cost might argue that such measures are unjustified because there is no empirical evidence that Ebola is a problem in the U.S. After all, there are no documented outbreaks of the disease, and the only reported cases have been sporadic and linked to other factors (such as health workers returning from abroad). In fact, both lifespan and overall health in the United States have been improving steadily over the past several decades. Most declines in population health can be traced to causes such as tobacco use, poor dietary choices, lack of exercise and the like, but not to Ebola. Thus, because there is no evidence that Ebola outbreaks have occurred in the United States nor any linkage between decreased health and Ebola, and because the overall health of the United States population continues to improve, there is no justification for preventative measures to stop Ebola outbreaks in the United States.

This reasoning is, of course, fallacious and, in the case of a disease like Ebola, dangerously so. In the field of public health, prophylactic measures are often taken before a health risk affects a significant portion of the population. This is the reason for prophylactic measures in the first place. In the field of public health, it is widely recognized that risks arising from any number of environmental and pathogenic sources can be assessed based on laboratory analysis and test cases, without population-level epidemiological data. In fact, once population level data for such outbreaks is available, it is often too late: an epidemic has broken out and millions are at risk. Luckily, it is doubtful that public health officials would apply the fallacious reasoning outlined above to important public health decisions.

Curiously, however, this “Ebola fallacy” has taken root in the debate over patent hold-up. As discussed above, the purported lack of empirical evidence of system-wide patent hold-up is used as a justification for abandoning or forestalling policy interventions aimed at reducing the risk of hold-up. Because hold-up has not been detected at a systemic level, so the argument goes, it must not be a problem. Therefore, measures designed to prevent hold-up from occurring must be the result of gratuitous or over-zealous policy making. The logical fallacies in this argument should be apparent.

In fact, there are numerous examples of anticompetitive conduct by individual firms in markets that are not otherwise overrun by anticompetitive behavior. For example, in 2009, the Federal Trade Commission brought an action against pharmaceutical manufacturer Solvay and a group of generic drug manufacturers for violating Section 5 of the FTC Act by entering into an arrangement whereby the generic manufacturers agreed not to challenge Solvay’s patent on its AndroGel product and not to market their generic versions of AndroGel, in exchange for a significant payment by Solvay to each of the generic manufacturers (a so-called “pay for delay” scheme).94 The Supreme Court held in 2013 that such conduct was actionable and reversed the Eleventh Circuit’s dismissal of the FTC’s claim.95 Yet even in 2009, the year in which the FTC brought its action, of the 68 agreements settling patent disputes filed by pharmaceutical manufacturers with the FTC,96 the FTC estimated that only 19 of these (28%) were potential pay for delay agreements; and by 2014, the year after the Actavis decision, only 21 out of 160 such agreements (13%) were deemed by the FTC likely to represent illegal pay for delay schemes.97 Thus, while pharmaceutical industry patent settlements have attracted significant attention as potentially anticompetitive arrangements, most such settlements do not merit investigation by the FTC.98

An even more telling example is found in the area of mergers and acquisitions. During fiscal year 2016, a total of 1,832 merger and acquisition transactions were reported to the FTC and DOJ under the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act.99 Of these, the FTC challenged only twenty-two (1.2%). 100 Thus, while some anticompetitive mergers may exist, the vast majority are not anticompetitive.101 But the absence of market-wide anticompetitive conduct in the area of mergers and acquisitions hardly excuses the handful of transactions that do present antitrust risks, nor does it suggest that mergers should not be subject to governmental monitoring and, when merited, enforcement.

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.

### 1AC---Cyber Advantage

#### Advantage 2 is Cybersecurity:

#### Aggressive patent strategies create structural flaws in 5G standardization that imperils domestic cybersecurity---market competition reduces 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.

#### Only maximizing redundancy and diversity prevents devastating attacks from single vulnerabilities.

Rajiv Shah 20, President of the Rockefeller Foundation. Former administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, graduate of the University of Michigan and the University of Pennsylvania, 2020, “Ensuring a trusted 5G ecosystem of vendors and technology,” https://www.aspi.org.au/report/ensuring-trusted-5g-ecosystem-vendors-and-technology

Why is cybersecurity seen as so critical for 5G networks? Because 5G isn’t just the next natural stage in the evolution of wireless networks. 5G is about more than movie downloads. The likely applications and use cases will become critical to the functioning of governments, companies and society, including cyber-physical and safety-critical systems that will rely on the network. Not only do we need to be concerned about the confidentiality of data and users on the network, but we also need to consider the impacts of an attacker potentially compromising the availability and integrity of the systems, including the risks of the attacker being able to take down the whole network at once.

Australian and many other governments have already identified telecommunications networks as critical national infrastructure that’s essential to the effective functioning of society and therefore requiring additional regulation and attention, and it’s easy to understand why.12 In Australia in recent months, we’ve seen the chaos caused by outages of electronic payment (EFTPOS) systems for a few hours, making it impossible for people to buy basic items because they’re unused to carrying cash.13

Now imagine the impact of a smart city suddenly losing all traffic sensor data and the ability to control traffic lights. An attacker could cause major accidents by maliciously changing the data being sent to traffic lights. In fact, given some of the potential applications enabled by 5G, it could be possible to cause major disruption by more subtle changes. If applications such as remote driving of vehicles rely on ultra-low latency, what would happen if an attacker introduced a small delay to some or all network traffic?

The increasing importance of the network, combined with the increased risk that a cyber breach will cause major real-world consequences, means that the cybersecurity of 5G networks must be a critical consideration, planned and accounted for from the outset. Risk management approaches should also consider the more sensitive functions that are used by national security and law enforcement authorities, such as compliance with legislation on telecommunications interception and data retention, which may create additional security risks.

Building an understanding of 5G security requires integrating security and the 5G network architecture. Both suffer from a major skills gap in Australia14 and globally,15 so we would expect a major shortage of professionals with a detailed understanding of both, exacerbated by the fact that 5G architectures are complex and still evolving.

One example is the debates about the separation of the ‘core’ and ‘edge’ components of a 5G network. Can they be effectively segregated so that a threat in the edge can’t affect the core? Australian authorities say they can’t be effectively segregated, whereas UK authorities appear to be suggesting they can. Without getting involved in the details of the debate here, it’s likely that the true answer is that it depends on architectural choices and complex overall system-level interactions. Concepts such as network slicing will make this even more complex. End users are given effective control and exclusive use of an end-to-end slice of the network, and attention will need to be paid to the security safeguards required to minimise the risk of them escaping their own virtual slice and getting access to other parts of the network.

Vendor trust and security

The issue of vendor trust and security has been prominent in discussions about 5G security. Australia and the US have announced decisions to bar certain vendors, the UK has been formulating a compromise approach,16 (although this seems to be still evolving) and active debates in Europe are seemingly close to reaching a conclusion.

The risks from using a particular vendor can be many and varied. Much commentary on the subject talks about hardware ‘backdoors’ being inserted by a vendor at the factory,17 but that’s probably not the biggest issue. In fact, it’s probably an unhealthy focus that can drive the debate onto specific component manufacturers, when the bigger risks probably come higher up the technology stack.

A much more worrying vendor risk occurs when carriers are critically dependent on vendors for maintaining the quality of service and so give the vendors access to the live network for support and maintenance. The nature of 5G networks as ‘software defined everything’ also means that there are security risks throughout the network that can be hidden in the complexity of software—vulnerabilities that are deliberately introduced by the vendor, or that come from genuine errors and oversights.

Different vendors have different approaches to and cultures of security. The extent to which they use approaches such as secure software development, system integrity validation and third-party supplier checks can be a useful guide, as well as their approach to the reporting and patching of security issues.

However, the control and ownership of vendors, in particular those from nation-states in which companies may be subject to extrajudicial direction, has, to date, been the main criterion used to measure vendor risk.18 This should be broadened to consider all sources of risk. As well as foreign ownership and control, vendor threats can come from insiders, such as rogue employees, even in a vendor from a trusted country, and also depend on the quality of the security culture and secure-by-design approaches used by a vendor. This leads to a spectrum of vendor risk levels that can be used to guide appropriate treatments.

We can sensibly decide to exclude very high risk vendors, but since no vendor will be zero-risk, other mitigation measures will be needed in addition. While, given the criticality of 5G networks, we should impose a high standard of cybersecurity control and risk management across the network even for the lowest risk vendors, additional measures may be needed for intermediate levels. It’s important that carriers understand these requirements and can factor the different security costs into their procurement decisions (so potentially avoiding the incentive to simply choose the cheapest supplier who isn’t excluded due to being very high risk).

Independent testing of vendor equipment may be of some use to assess and mitigate risk (see, for example the Huawei testing facility set up and used by the UK over the past few years), but it’s not just a matter of testing the product from the factory. For any software components, each new release will require retesting, and in a 5G world the software becomes the most critical layer. The public reports from the UK testing facility19 show a series of damning findings and a lack of any assurance that identified flaws are resolved effectively. This means that, at best, this approach can be only a small part of a broader strategy.

In some cases, architectural approaches can be used to mitigate the risk. For example, end-to-end encryption could be used to mitigate the risk that particular network equipment could have unnecessary access to user details and data on the network. However, if we look at the risk of an adversary seeking to completely disable a network, the vendor risk is much greater, as ultimately the end-to-end network works only if every component in the chain is working—RAN, core access and routing.

This means it isn’t just a matter of assessing and using a vendor with an acceptable level of risk. Any farmer will tell you to avoid monoculture—growing just one crop means that one disease can wipe you out overnight. Similarly, if a network is dependent on a single vendor and a vulnerability is found, the vendor becomes untrusted for some reason or the company collapses, the equipment will be almost impossible to replace, and entire networks can become at risk overnight.

Therefore, as well as vendor trust, we need to ensure vendor diversity and redundancy in design.

Operators need to have confidence that multiple vendors’ equipment can interoperate, and ideally have multiple vendors’ systems in service for each major function. This will provide resilience and options to reduce dependence on a particular vendor if circumstances change. In a given carrier’s network, there should be at least two vendors for each key equipment type, and across the market there should be four or more viable suppliers considered acceptable to use. These are bare minimums from a competition policy and resilience perspective; from a long-term resilience point of view, there should be as many vendors as possible, subject to ensuring that each has critical mass and is commercially sustainable in the long term.

#### 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/" \l "_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/" \l "_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/" \l "_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/" \l "_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/" \l "_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.

#### Cracking down on anticompetitive patent licensing reintroduces competition—solves cybersecurity

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>)

IV. LESSONS AND POLICY DIRECTIONS

The above discussion shows that patent protection can have mixed effects on national security: On the one hand, patents can encourage innovation that ensures domestic technological leadership and produces useful security-protective technologies; on the other hand, patents can stifle innovation-producing and cybersecurity-enhancing competition and can stymie the government’s own ability to achieve national security goals. To navigate the complex effects of patent policy on national security, policymakers may consider the following recommendations as guideposts.

A. Anticompetitive Patent Licensing

An area of particular concern should be the use of patents and patent licensing strategies to diminish competition or put up roadblocks to new entrants. Policymakers should certainly not support these abuses of the patent system, and indeed should take steps to prevent them.

In the mobile communications space, patent licensing already plays an outsized role. There are reportedly between 250,000 and 314,000 patents on the smartphone alone, and litigation over cell phone technologies has lasted decades by now. Patents will thus inevitably have an impact on technologies like 5G or the Internet of Things, so the question is what that impact will be.

Patents are supposed to encourage innovation, but research finds that patents alone will not do so; competition is another requirement. A 2015 study considered the impact of competition policy and patent strength on innovation among European firms, measured in terms of research and development spending.183 Initially, the study compared firms in countries with strong patent laws against those in countries with weaker patent laws, and found that patent protection has “no effect on R&D intensity,” a conclusion consistent with multiple other studies.184 However, the study found that when a major competition reform went into effect, strong-patent countries enjoyed a boost in innovation greater than that experienced in weak-patent countries.185 In other words, strong patent protection is complementary to strong competition; the former does not promote innovation without the latter. The practical import of this research is that patent protection is beneficial up to a point, but to the extent that patents—or, more commonly, legal strategies involving patents—overreach to suppress competition, that overreach should be cause for concern.

Yet today, strategic patent behavior contrary to competition is prevalent. The Federal Trade Commission’s ongoing lawsuit against mobile phone chip manufacturer Qualcomm, for example, challenges Qualcomm’s practice of refusing to sell chips to any phone manufacturer who does not first pay a hefty sum for patent licenses—even if the manufacturer does not actually have need for all those licenses.186 To the extent that Qualcomm’s “no license, no chips” practice is in fact anticompetitive—that is what the courts overseeing the case will decide—monopolization of that market could substantially harm cybersecurity for the reasons noted above.187 The company’s about-50% market share in the advanced mobile chip market 188 means that there is a virtual monoculture of Qualcomm chips already, and there are ongoing concerns about security vulnerabilities in those chips.189 It is thus puzzling that some have opposed the FTC litigation on the grounds that it is making the United States “less competitive in the global 5G arms race.”190 As one scholar explains, this rhetoric “smacks of ‘national champion’ thinking” and ultimately fails to ensure that “national security warnings are being balanced against competitive imperatives.”191

With respect to emerging information technologies, policymakers should be concerned that a leading firm could undertake similar patent licensing strategies to control the market. Indeed, the district court in the Qualcomm litigation found that Nokia and Ericsson already “have imitated Qualcomm’s practice” because it is “more lucrative.”192

### 1AC---Plan

#### Plan: The United States federal judiciary 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---Solvency

#### Solvency:

#### The plan strengthens FRAND effectiveness while enabling SEP holders to capture appropriate royalties---strikes the best competition-innovation balance.

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 pre- vent 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.

#### Threatening antitrust liability lures SSO’s into adopting best practices.

Lemley & Shapiro 13, \*Mark Lemley is the William H. Neukom Professor at Stanford Law School and a partner at Durie Tangri LLP; \*Carl Shapiro is the Transamerica Professor of Business Strategy at the Haas School of Business, University of California at Berkeley and a Senior Consultant at Charles River Associates; (2013, “A SIMPLE APPROACH TO SETTING REASONABLE ROYALTIES FOR STANDARD-ESSENTIAL PATENTS”, (https://faculty.haas.berkeley.edu/shapiro/frand.pdf)

Under our approach, many of these issues should become moot, since the patentee cannot obtain an injunction (or transfer the patent to someone who can) against a willing licensee, and since competitors are not involved in jointly setting the reasonable royalty rate. If SSOs set clear, reasonable rules following the best practices we recommend, and parties follow those rules, there should be little or no need for antitrust to intervene. Indeed, even the risk of non-disclosure of a patent is lessened, since the patentee has committed to license its essential patents whether or not it discloses them. For the most part, the rules we have described are self-executing, meaning that even if a party tries to break the rules set by the SSO there still may be no need for antitrust to intervene. Thus, we suggest that parties who abide by these procedures—patentees, implementers, and the SSOs themselves—should be immune from antitrust liability for activities that merely follow those rules.107 They have entered into an arrangement that is on balance good for competition, one that allows patentees to receive reasonable royalties but prevents holdup and reduces the risk of monopolization by trickery.

The fact that antitrust remains a last resort available when SSOs don’t follow best practices may have two practical benefits, however. First, under our approach the promise of avoiding the risk of antitrust liability will be a powerful incentive for both SSOs and patent owners to adopt the best practices we propose. Second, the risk of antitrust liability may be relevant when an individual patentee wants to adopt best practices but the SSO governing the standard has not yet done so. We propose that a patentee that unilaterally commits to the FRAND procedures we describe here should be immune from antitrust liability for following these procedures.108 A patentee’s unilateral binding commitment to arbitration could be enforced whether or not it was elicited by an SSO. Thus, just as the prospect of antitrust immunity might lure SSOs to adopt best practices, it might also lure patentees to implement those practices even if the SSO has not done so. Given the large number of standard-essential patents based on preexisting standards,109 and given that SSOs tend to update their IP rules rather slowly,110 this is not a small matter.

#### Only antitrust enforcement creates a consumer-action feature that counterbalances SSO’s conspiratorial incentives---private action fails.

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>)

2. Why Antitrust Enforcement Is Necessary

Some SSO members have an interest in ensuring that the SSO takes steps to minimize the potential harms from the SEP holders’ monopoly power, and this undoubtedly explains in part why most SSOs have adopted FRAND policies or similar requirements. But, as shown in the economic model in the Appendix,73 SSOs cannot in general be counted on to adopt effective FRAND policies. The bases for this conclusion, which is central to our argument for the applicability of Section 1 to SSO FRAND rules, can be summarized as follows.74

First, the SSO members collectively have an interest in permitting SEP holders to charge supracompetitive royalties that elevate the downstream price of compliant devices to the monopoly level. Doing so will enable the members in aggregate to collect increased revenues from consumers, and thus to generate increased profits that in theory could be shared by all the members. In other words, supracompetitive royalties can enrich industry participants as a group at the expense of final consumers. This fact alone should serve as a clear and strong signal regarding the dangers of counting on SSOs to implement effective FRAND policies: if the SSO members negotiate efficiently, the outcome will be just as bad for consumers as if the members agreed to fix downstream prices.75 The fundamental problem is that final consumers are not at the table when the SSO rules are negotiated.

Second, SSO members that own SEPs but earn little or no profits as implementers have a powerful self-interest in being able to exercise the ex post monopoly power associated with their SEPs. Because SSO policies are usually determined by a consensus process, these members will likely be able to block the adoption of fully effective FRAND policies. Moreover, these SSO members often have the greatest interest in SSO patent policies. Since much of their income may be attributable to patent licensing, they can be expected to devote substantial resources to block the adoption of FRAND policies that effectively prevent patent holdup.

Third, even SSO members that earn significant profits as implementers may have mixed incentives if they also own SEPs, which can also lead to weak or in-effective FRAND rules. In the Appendix, we show that, if the requisite share of votes in the SSO are cast by firms whose share of SEP royalties is at least as large as their share of downstream profits, and if these firms can coordinate their voting over the FRAND rules, then an SSO unconstrained by antitrust laws will establish FRAND rules leading to an outcome no better for consumers than would result from an integrated monopolist controlling all SEPs and all downstream sales.76

Fourth, even SSO members that are downstream implementers and own few, if any, SEPs may have only a modest interest in promoting effective policies to restrict ex post opportunism. Because all implementers will be subject to the opportunism, all of them will face increased licensing costs, and therefore will likely be able to pass on most or all of the increased costs to their customers.77 Furthermore, these implementers might not be especially active or effective in the standard-setting process for free-riding or public-good reasons, especially if SEP royalties constitute only a relatively small portion of the costs of their standard-implementing products. Public choice theory predicts that the highly motivated SEP holders are likely to have the greatest influence over patent policies.

Empirical evidence bears out these concerns. As a starting point, we find it striking that SSO FRAND rules are almost always quite vague.78 Notably, SSOs in which SEP holders are more prevalent tend to have weaker FRAND rules.79 Further, to our knowledge, SSOs have made almost no effort to enforce their FRAND rules and have, instead, left enforcement efforts to others.80 This evidence raises serious doubts about the effectiveness of the existing FRAND rules in preventing ex post opportunism.

# 2AC

## Ad 1

### 2AC---IL---Innovation

#### The monopolization of essential 5g technology destroys innovation— Qualcomm is refusing to share their technical knowledge and taxing new innovations which destroys the market--that’s Moss and Schwartz.

### 2AC---!---Democracy

#### Backsliding creates a confluence of escalatory factors---state collapse, civil war, WMD terrorism---that’s Diamond.

#### Anticompetitive patent licensing cedes technical leadership to China---that allows them to shape global parameters for facial recognition, totalitarian internet governance, and data intrusions---causes global backsliding---that’s Drew and Kendall-Taylor.

### 2AC---!---Warming

#### Warming causes extinction---adverse weather, drought, famine, and heat stroke threaten planetary habitability---that’s Huseien. 5G smart cities solve via emissions monitoring and revolutionizing efficiency

### Solvency---Ex Ante Determinations

#### Courts are experienced and competent at calculating fair royalties.

Cary et al. 08, \*George Cary is a partner in the Washington office of Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton LLP. He is a former Deputy Director of the Federal Trade Commission's Bureau of Competition and 1976 graduate of the Boalt Hall School of Law at the University of California-Berkeley. \*Larry Work-Dembowski is an associate in the Washington office of Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton LLP and a 2002 graduate of the Georgetown University Law Center. \*Paul Hayes is an associate in the Washington office of Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton LLP and a 2001 graduate of the New York University School of Law; (“Antitrust Implications of Abuse of Standard-Setting”, 15 GEO. Mason L. REV. 1241 (2008))

Although evaluation of FRAND commitments and licensing terms can be complex and fact-intensive, there should be no doubt that the courts and enforcement agencies are competent to apply antitrust law to deceptive FRAND commitments. Assessing whether a licensor has complied with its FRAND obligations does not require courts or agencies to make any determinations that they do not already commonly make in antitrust and intellectual property cases. Courts routinely calculate "reasonable royalties" in the patent litigation context 1 ' and compare the "but for" competitive market to the market in which a restraint of competition exists in order to determine damages in the antitrust context. 4 ' In assessing whether a licensor has met its FRAND obligations, a court would engage in similar calculations; it would compare the royalties charged in the ex post market to its assessment of what royalties would have prevailed in the competitive ex ante market.'43 In determining what royalties would have prevailed ex ante, a court would likely consider, among other things, the available alternatives to the technology at issue, the royalties charged to licensees practicing other standards for comparable technologies, and the royalties charged to licensees for comparable technologies in industries where there are no standards or FRAND commitments. Although this may be a demanding task in some cases, it is necessary because the alternative-concluding that FRAND obligations cannot be defined or enforced by the courts-would render FRAND obligations meaningless, would allow unfettered exercise of monopoly power by essential patent holders, and would cause debilitating un- certainty in the standard-setting process.

### 2AC---LD---Innovation Incentives

#### The link is wrong:

#### 1---FRAND is voluntary---SEP holders knowingly develop technology and commit to license on fair terms.

#### 2---ex ante valuation preserves profit due to mass licensing volume---that’s Melamed and Shapiro and…

Stern 18, \*Richard H. Stern, Professorial Lecturer in Law, The George Washington University Law School. A Washington, D.C. patent and antitrust attorney, Stern was Chief of the Patent Section of the US Justice Department’s Antitrust Division during the Nixon and Ford Administrations; (2018, “Who Should Own the Benefits of Standardization and the Value It Creates?”, https://scholarship.law.umn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1439&context=mjlst)

D. INCENTIVIZE ME OR I’LL DEFECT

A highly theoretical argument is often made by SEP owner spokesmen—that lessened compensation to SEP owners will “disincentivize” them from creating technology and contributing it to standardization, stagnating further standardization. For example:

If the SEP holder cannot capture any of the value from standardization that its technology creates for the standard, it will have a dampened incentive to continue contributing its best technologies to SSOs. In the long run, the quality of technologies contributed to a future standard—and the expected value of that new standard—would decrease. The SEP holder’s decision to contribute its technologies to a standard depends on the compensation that an SEP holder expects to obtain from such a contribution, compared with the SEP holder’s alternative option to monetize its invention outside the standard. . . . If the SEP holder expects not to be compensated fully for its contributions, it will not commit its most valuable technologies to the standard.431

But the amount of dampening of incentive (assuming that we do not already have enough or more than enough incentive for smartphones) may well be outweighed in impact by the prospect of nonetheless gaining first-user and head-start advantage from incorporation of one’s technology into a standard, and the opportunity to increase one’s equipment sales (anointed with the imprimatur of the standard),432 even if one cannot also obtain monopoly profits as well, from SEP royalties. In a sense, those advantages are a form of “the compensation that an SEP holder expects to obtain” from such a SEP contribution, but the commentator fails to take those significant incentives into consideration.433 Moreover, the supposed “SEP holder’s alternative option to monetize its invention outside the standard” may be a figment of the SEP holder spokesman’s imagination.434 If an alternative technology becomes standard, the only opportunity to monetize the withheld invention may be to incorporate the technology into unsaleable non-standard products. Defection may be a poor business strategy.

#### 3---under-compensation is empirically denied.

Stern 18, \*Richard H. Stern, Professorial Lecturer in Law, The George Washington University Law School. A Washington, D.C. patent and antitrust attorney, Stern was Chief of the Patent Section of the US Justice Department’s Antitrust Division during the Nixon and Ford Administrations; (2018, “Who Should Own the Benefits of Standardization and the Value It Creates?”, https://scholarship.law.umn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1439&context=mjlst)

Furthermore, a considerable amount of standardization activity has been coming from groups that prohibit the participating companies or individuals from collecting SEP royalties—so-called “RF-RAND” (royalty-free RAND)435 and “RAND-Zero” (RAND with zero royalties) groups or groups that rely on promises not to assert essential-patent claims436—as well as from SSOs that permit RAND licensing but whose members in practice collect royalties on few, if any, standards.437 The availability of these important, royalty-free technology sources is a factor in evaluating the threatened “disincentivization” and massive resistance against the policies reflected in the IEEE 2015 Patent Policy update.

Finally, the disincentivization argument is pure ipse dixit, for no analysis of comparative rates of return on alternative investment opportunities is offered. Nor is any empirical support provided.438 The rhetoric of “Incentivize me or I’ll defect” is completely unsupported and therefore not credible.

## Ad 2

### 2AC---!---Cyber

#### Cyber conflict goes nuclear---critical infrastructure causes tit-for-tat escalation, and ill-established redlines and use-it-or-lose-it mentality pressures advisors to assume the worst---that’s Klare.

### 2AC---Solvency---Cybersecurity

#### Plan reintroduces cybersecurity competition to the market---that’s key:

#### 1---monopolies irresponsibly divest from product security because market position is secured.

#### 2---multiple providers enables heterogenous network development that is insulated from catastrophic attacks---that’s Duan.

## Ad CP

### 2AC---AT: Federal Assistance CP---TL

#### Permutation do both.

#### Permutation do the counterplan.

#### The counterplan doesn’t solve advantage 1:

#### 1---monopoly pricing:

#### A---lower product output and taxes on follow-on innovation negate the benefits of federal assistance.

#### B---patent overclaiming means assistance would be wasted on suboptimal inventions---that’s Melamed and Shapiro.

#### 2---licensing discrimination---absent FRAND, the best 5G technologies will be driven out of the market through refusals to license---that’s Actonline.

#### And, doesn’t solve advantage 2---market competition is key to cybersecurity---motivates responsible investment and diversifies suppliers---that’s Duan.

### 2AC---AT: Public R&D

#### Public R&D causes crowd-out and impedes private investment.

Marino et al. 16, \*Marianna Marino and Stephane Lhuillery, ICN Business School, Department of Strategy and Entrepreneurship; \*Pierpaolo Parrotta and [Davide Sala](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048733316300555#!), Aarhus University, Tuborg Research Centre for Globalization and Firms; (June 17th, 2016, “Additionality or crowding-out? An overall evaluation of public R&D subsidy on private R&D expenditure”, https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048733316300555)

6. Discussion and conclusions

This paper is an overall evaluation of the public subsidies to R&D, which proposes an assessment of this policy in absence or combination with the R&D tax credit, an equally important policy instrument used to stimulate private R&D investments. Using a dataset of French companies that covers the period 1993–2009, we perform both inter-group and intra-group assessment of the outcome of this policy. The former analysis is directed to investigate a differentiated impact of R&D grants across differently funded firms, and is presented alongside utilization of the categorical matching method. The latter analysis investigates the implications of the current modulation of public intervention for similarly funded firms. Implemented by means of a continuous treatment evaluation method, the intra-group assessment allows us to investigate the likelihood of crowding-in and crowding-out effects within each tercile along the distribution of the public R&D support grant. Both methods are coupled with the DID approach to account for unobserved heterogeneity and results strengthened by a rich dataset featuring comprehensive information on the pre-treatment variables. In addition, exploiting the exogenous variation due to the sharp change in R&D tax [credit policy](https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/economics-econometrics-and-finance/credit-policy) that occurred in 2004, we compare [treatment effects](https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/economics-econometrics-and-finance/causality-analysis) on growth of R&D private expenditure between before- and after-reform periods, and therefore we identify the effects of such a policy change introduced by the government.

Our results show that substitution between private and public funds may occur, especially for medium-high levels of public subsidies, and under the regime of R&D tax credit. Recipients of larger doses appear not to outperform or to perform worse than recipients of lower doses or non-recipient firms. Crowding-out seems stronger and more significant in the after-reform period as reported in both the propensity score and exact matching analysis performed by year. In addition, we find evidence of more extensive negative effects for firms employing fewer than 100 employees or operating in low R&D intensive industries. When analyzing the intra-tercile distribution of public funds under R&D tax credit regime, we highlight a considerable reduction in the growth of private R&D expenditure among medium-high subsidy recipients, whereas additionality effects are found for a few top beneficiary companies (above EUR 10 million). In the sample of fully supported recipients, it seems to emerge – on average – that firms receiving subsidies between EUR 145 thousand and 1.8 million exhibit significant lower private contribution with respect to their counterfactual units. Subsidy-only recipients instead show significant substitution of private with public R&D resources for subsidy doses between EUR 20–55 thousand. Interestingly, when dividing the sample in before- and after-reform periods, we find that crowding-out effects seem to persist solely for recipients of subsidies under tax credit incentives after the 2004 reform.

Overall, our findings appear to suggest a substantial re-design of both the modulation and targeting of the public R&D subsidy policy, especially under R&D tax credit regime. Indeed, the substitution effects emerging from the inter-tercile and funded versus unfunded comparisons would motivate a better targeting of the recipient firms, especially among [small and medium size firms](https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/economics-econometrics-and-finance/sme) and in low R&D intense industries. Concerning the modulation of the public R&D subsidy provision, it appears opportune to move resources from medium-high to top beneficiary recipients to boost the growth of private R&D expenditure and rise the private contribution to R&D in the economy. Furthermore, the distinction between fully funded from subsidy-only recipient firms underlines the importance of accounting for “hidden treatments” that may otherwise affect the policy evaluation and favor misleading implications. In addition, the 2004 reform of R&D tax credit appears to have lowered the effectiveness of public R&D funding. Although this result shed some lights on the effects of the 2004 reform, it also asks for further research to investigate the opportune mix of such R&D policy tools. Finally, it is worth underlining that a potential limitation of our study is due to the fact that we do not observe companies with fewer than 20 employees in the manufacturing industries, a significant proportion of the French firm population.

This overall assessment indicates that an ex-post evaluation of the targets of an R&D policy is desirable, if not necessary in a time of downturns or economic stagnation. In fact, if R&D funding is seen as a valid policy instrument to support companies hit hard by a crisis and facing financial restrictions, it is inevitable that public resources should not be re-directed away from risky and promising research projects toward companies that would likely perform equally well without this funding.

#### Public R&D investment isn’t enough and can’t compensate for a lack of private industry competitiveness.

Clark 21, \*Laurie Clark is a senior reporter at Tech Monitor. Before this, she held reporting positions at NS Tech, Wired UK and IDG. She holds an undergraduate degree in psychology from UCL and a masters in media and journalism from the University of Glasgow; (June 10th, 2021, “Massive US tech bill needs to aim for more than countering China”, https://techmonitor.ai/policy/massive-us-tech-bill-needs-aim-more-than-countering-china)

One of the meatiest industrial policy bills in US history, the Innovation and Competition Act (ICA) would commit around $250bn in funding for scientific research, earmarking $52bn to shore up the US’s domestic semiconductor industry, and $120bn for investment in technologies such as AI and quantum computing, as well as overseeing an overhaul of the National Science Foundation (NSF). “The ICA will dramatically increase R&D for basic and applied research in the US,” says Sarah Bauerle Danzman, assistant professor of International Studies at Indiana University Bloomington, pointing out that at present, R&D spending in the US is [about .5% of GDP](https://www.aei.org/economics/us-federal-research-spending-is-at-a-60-year-low-should-we-be-concerned/) with the private sector contributing around 70% of that. “If passed, this bill will increase federal R&D spending by about 30% over the next five years.” How will the Innovation and Competition Act impact chip supply? Although the US is the world leader in semiconductor technologies, most of its manufacturing is outsourced to fabrication plants in Asia. A global chip shortage has highlighted the weakness in its supply chains, and China’s plans to [bolster its own domestic production](https://techmonitor.ai/silicon/silicon-cold-war-china-tech-self-sufficiency) abilities have increased calls for the US to bring chip manufacturing back within its borders. While the signposted federal funding was [applauded](https://www.semiconductors.org/senate-passage-of-usica-marks-major-step-toward-enacting-needed-semiconductor-investments/) by the Semiconductor Industry Association – which noted that the share of global semiconductor manufacturing capacity in the US has decreased from 37% in 1990 to 12% today – some remain sceptical that it will be sufficient. “Even a couple of hundred billion US dollars is not enough to bring about a rapid turnaround of the situation as the US sees it,” says Jonathan Liebenau, associate professor in Technology Management at the London School of Economics. “Semiconductor fabrication plants are hugely expensive and the rest of the supply chain that China built up over the past 30 plus years cannot simply be bought off-the-shelf.” He points out that the US doesn’t have the state-owned enterprises or the complex private-public business ecosystem that China does. “We can ramp up spending on research but under current legal, and treaty, conditions we cannot pick national technology champions anymore, we cannot boost chosen tech companies against their direct competitors, even foreign ones.” The US still narrowly leads in AI, but there are forecasts that China could soon take the edge. China itself has set the goal of becoming the world leader in AI [by 2030](https://multimedia.scmp.com/news/china/article/2166148/china-2025-artificial-intelligence/index.html). In quantum computing, an area considered to have important national security implications, China is said to be [slightly ahead](https://asia.nikkei.com/Spotlight/Datawatch/China-emerges-as-quantum-tech-leader-while-Biden-vows-to-catch-up) of the US. It has funnelled money into the sector, [spending $10bn](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2018-04-08/forget-the-trade-war-china-wants-to-win-the-computing-arms-race) on setting up the world’s largest quantum research facility.

## Regs CP

### 2AC---AT: Regulation CP---TL

#### Permutation do both.

#### Permutation do the counterplan---the counterplan still 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.”

#### Non-antitrust regulation fails---three deficits:

#### 1---competition-specific expertise---DOJ and FTC enforcement are key. Even if other agencies are granted authority to regulate, they will underenforce.

Dogan 08, \*Stacey L. Dogan, Professor of Law, Northeastern University; \*Mark Lemley, William H. Neukom Professor, Stanford Law School; of counsel, Keker & Van Nest LLP; (October 2008, “Antitrust Law and Regulatory Gaming”, https://scholarship.law.bu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1873&context=faculty\_scholarship)

I. The Relative Efficiency of Antitrust and Regulation

The growing antitrust deference to regulation is cause for concern. Both antitrust and regulation are economic responses to market failures.46 Implemented correctly, both are designed to serve the ends of economic efficiency.47 It is therefore reasonable to judge the relative efficacy of antitrust and regulation by economic criteria. And judged by those criteria, virtually all economists would agree that antitrust-overseen market competition is superior to industry regulation. In particular, none of the arguments the Court has offered as a reason to prefer regulation to antitrust withstand scrutiny.

Relative expertise.

It is true, as the Court emphasized in Trinko and Credit Suisse, that antitrust courts are generalist courts, while regulatory agencies tend to specialize in a particular industry and its problems. That specialization should, all other things being equal, mean that expert regulators will do a better job than judges or juries of reaching the right result. But other things are far from being equal. Antitrust courts have two significant advantages over regulatory agencies when it comes to promoting competition.

First, antitrust courts are trying to promote economic efficiency, while regulators often aren’t. For decades, efficiency has served as the sole criterion on which to judge antitrust rules. And courts have had over a century in which to hone those rules to achieve that end. Without question, courts have made mistakes in the past. But there is a strong consensus among antitrust scholars that the wave of cases in the last 30 years has largely moved antitrust in the right direction, eliminating any significant risk that antitrust enforcement will do more harm than good.48 Scholars may fight over whether a Chicago School or a post-Chicago School approach will achieve the right result in specific cases,49 but for the most part they are tinkering at the margins: the law and the scholarship have converged with respect to both the proper goals of antitrust and the general rules that will achieve those goals.

Regulation, by contrast, is frequently not even intended to achieve economic efficiency through competition. Occasionally that is because of a legislative judgment that competition is impossible, though the number of industries thought to be natural monopolies for which markets won’t work has shrunk dramatically in the past four decades.50 Industry regulation that excludes entry in order to promote a natural monopoly, as telephone regulation did before 1984, is not likely to achieve a competitive outcome.

More often, the goals of the legislators who establish regulatory agencies, or the goals of the regulators who run those agencies, are to achieve something other than competition. Indeed, many regulations are aimed precisely at eliminating competition, as was the government- sponsored raisin cartel in Parker v. Brown51 or any of its modern descendent crop-support programs administered by the Department of Agriculture. It should be obvious that regulations intended to reduce competition will not promote it. But even if the regulation is not directly inimical to competition, competition is frequently irrelevant to, or at best a minor consideration in, a regulator’s agenda. Regulators may care about the safety and efficacy of a drug, for example, and only incidentally about whether there is competition in the sale of that drug. They may seek to reduce traffic deaths or air pollution by mandating technology, regardless of the effect that mandate has on the price manufacturers can charge or the number of products they sell. These are laudable goals, to be sure, but they are not competition-related goals. An agency tasked with achieving these goals is likely to ignore threats to competition from the industry it regulates so long as those threats do not compromise its core mission. Thus, the state and local governments that enacted the privately-drafted National Fire Protection Code at issue in Allied Tube into law were interested in stopping fires; doubtless they thought little if at all about the competitive effects of the code, even though it turned out that the code was drafted by interested private parties with the purpose of impeding competition rather than promoting fire safety.52

Even those agencies whose mission expressly involves consideration of competition issues will not necessarily make it their first among potentially conflicting priorities. The SEC, for example, which as Justice Breyer pointed out is dedicated to improving market information and expressly considers competition among other issues in setting regulation,53 is first and foremost an investor-protection and information-disclosure agency, not an agency that investigates and weeds out cartels or other anticompetitive practices. It is unlikely to devote much in the way of time or resources to such issues, because even if it is tasked to consider such issues they do not reflect the agency’s primary purpose. Similarly, even an agency like the Federal Communications Commission that is directly focused on competitive conditions in a particular market may naturally pay attention primarily to that market, and give less if any attention to the effect its rules might have on competition in adjacent markets or competition from unanticipated new businesses. This arguably explains the FCC’s willingness to largely ignore the effects of its decisions on the Internet, for example: it is telecommunications, not the Internet, that the FCC is tasked to regulate.

Agencies that view competition as secondary, or view it through the lens of a particular industry’s characteristics and interests, are less likely to create and enforce rules that optimally encourage competition.54 At a bare minimum, therefore, the industry-specific expertise of an agency must be balanced against the competition-specific expertise of the specialist antitrust agencies: the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) and the Department of Justice Antitrust Division.

#### consumer-action deficit. Patent infringers have attenuated incentives to cough up high royalties because SSO’s can profit in aggregate by passing costs onto consumers---that’s Melamed and Shapiro. That means widening the plaintiff pool beyond implementers is key---which the counterplan CANNOT do.

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>)

2. Contract Law

The argument that antitrust should step aside because contract law “out-perform[s] antitrust when it comes to the successful identification and regulation of ex post opportunism associated with patent hold-up”127 fails for much the same reasons. A contract can only be enforced by its parties and by other to whom the parties clearly and explicitly intended to give enforcement rights.128 The victims of anticompetitive patent holdup, however, are also consumers and potential competitors who may not have been part of the SSO. Moreover, contracts can be modified and third parties generally have no enforcement rights as to the original contract. In implementing an industry-wide standard, the parties to the contract may actually prefer high royalty levels that hurt consumers. For example, if participants in the standard-setting process, who agreed collectively to support one technology over all others, mutually agree to license on FRAND terms but then, after the standard is adopted, each independently chooses to increase its royalty significantly, no party to the FRAND “contract” may have incentive to bring a breach of contract action, while implementers of the standard and users of standard-compliant products ultimately pay the bill. Antitrust should be available in such circumstances as a remedy for the parties harmed by the anticompetitive agreement.

#### SSO interests do not align with consumers. Contract law is an insufficient proxy for securing competition.

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.

#### B---targeting deficit---faulting the entire SSO is key to curtail monopolization---targeting individual SEP holders fails.

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)

Antitrust enforcement aimed only at SEP holders is not sufficient to prevent or remedy ex post opportunism. First, as described in Part I, that kind of enforcement must be implemented separately for each patent holder, and for many standards, there are hundreds or even thousands of SEP holders. Second, some of the most common kinds of opportunism are arguably beyond the reach of antitrust claims against SEP holders. 61 Moreover, enforcement aimed at SEP holders is not directed at the basic problem: the failure of the SSOs to take adequate steps to prevent the ex post opportunism that the SSOs’ conduct enabled.

#### C---deterrence deficit---only antitrust law creates a legitimate cost to misconduct---that’s 1AC Melamed and Shaprio---whereas the loss of a private lawsuit wouldn’t change SEP holder’s calculus.

Tsilikas 17, \*Haris Tsilikas is an IP and Antitrust Consultant, a Doctoral Candidate and Visiting Research Fellow at the Max Planck Institute for Innovation and Competition, Munich; (2017, Antitrust Enforcement and Standard Essential Patents: Moving beyond the FRAND Commitment”, https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/j.ctv941t01.9.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3A92dc720d1ebc7088811b40032a60f575)

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.

#### D---contract deficit---FRAND commitments aren’t considered contracts, so they can’t be enforced.

Contreras 14, \*Jorge L. Contreras teaches in the areas of intellectual property law, property law and genetics and the law at the University of Utah. He has recently been named one of the University of Utah's Presidential Scholars, and won the 2018-19 Faculty Scholarship Award from the S.J. Quinney College of Law. Professor Contreras has previously served on the law faculties of American University Washington College of Law and Washington University in St. Louis, and was a partner at the international law firm Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP, where he practiced transactional and intellectual property law in Boston, London and Washington DC; (September 14th, 2014, “Why FRAND Commitments are Not (usually) Contracts”, https://patentlyo.com/patent/2014/09/commitments-usually-contracts.html)

Nevertheless, as I discuss in [a forthcoming article](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2309023), common law contract is a poor fit for the enforcement of most FRAND commitments, and relying too heavily on it is likely to have unwelcome results.  Contract law fails as a general-purpose FRAND enforcement theory on several grounds.  First, the simplified offer-acceptance-consideration model laid out above does not reflect the actual manner in which most FRAND commitments are made.  Most of these commitments are not set forth in an agreement between the patent holder and the SDO.  Rather, they are contained in SDO policies, bylaws and other types of statements.  In addition, many of these policies (including those adopted by leading SDOs such as IEEE) do not actually require the patent holder to commit to license its patents on FRAND terms, but only to disclose to the SDO the terms on which it will, or on which it intends to, license its essential patents.  Moreover, FRAND commitments are typically a sentence or two in length, and fail to set forth any of the relevant details of the promised license agreement, whether they be royalty rates, grant-back requirements, terms on which the license may be suspended or terminated, and the like.  As such, whatever “contract” is formed is likely void for want of detail, a mere “agreement to agree”.  Finally, the attempt to extend third party beneficiary rights to every product vendor in the world, whether or not it competed in the relevant business, or even existed, when the promise was made, stretches this venerable doctrine beyond any sensible boundaries.

  As a result, except perhaps in a few cases in which standards are developed by small groups of firms that have actual contractual arrangements amongst themselves, common law contract is a poor choice as a general enforcement mechanism for FRAND commitments.

At least one Administrative Law Judge at the International Trade Commission has recently come to the same conclusion in the ITC’s case against Interdigital (337-TA-868, June 18, 2014), expressly ruling that the FRAND policy adopted by the European telecom SDO ETSI “is not a contract”, and merely “contains rules to guide the parties in their interactions with the organization, other members and third parties.”  I couldn’t agree more.

#### 2---regulatory capture---even honest agencies will subject to lobbying and industry pressure that diverts the counterplan’s purpose. Antitrust courts are superior and impartial.

Dogan 08, \*Stacey L. Dogan, Professor of Law, Northeastern University; \*Mark Lemley, William H. Neukom Professor, Stanford Law School; of counsel, Keker & Van Nest LLP; (October 2008, “Antitrust Law and Regulatory Gaming”, https://scholarship.law.bu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1873&context=faculty\_scholarship)

The problem with agencies is much greater than just their questionable mandate to promote competition, however. Agencies are famously subject to “capture” by the industries they are supposed to regulate.55 That capture can take many different forms. Sometimes regulators or legislators are captured in the most venal sense – they are bribed or otherwise given personal benefits in exchange for voting a particular way. This seems to have been the case in Omni Outdoor Advertising, for example. Regulators who accept bribes (or politicians who accept campaign contributions in exchange for a particular vote) are not acting in the public interest but in their private interest, a private interest that necessarily aligns with the industry participant doing the bribing. Even a regulator who would never accept bribes may still seek to maximize, not the public interest, but his own power or the power and interests of his agency, a fact that industry can often use to its advantage.

Capture need not be so brazen, however. Even honest regulators and legislators can be captured through the mechanism of public choice theory.56 A legislator that tries to maximize her constituents’ expressed preferences may still end up supporting legislation that benefits private firms at the expense of the public interest, because the private firms will frequently have a concentrated interest – and therefore show up to lobby on a particular issue – while the public is hard to organize even around issues that may affect a great many of them diffusely. Regulators are subject to the same effect. A notice and comment rulemaking is likely to produce more comments from people with a concentrated interest in the outcome, and fewer comments from those with a more diffuse interest. Thus, regulators who try in good faith to determine what the public thinks of a particular regulation may still end up with a skewed view of the pros and cons. This may be particularly likely with competition issues. While the public as a whole has a strong interest in unfettered competition, any individual member of the public is unlikely to be affected much by a particular regulatory decision. And particularly where the industry as a whole colludes to seek regulatory intervention that benefits them, as in Ticor Title, there are unlikely to be competitors who can stand as proxy for the interests of the public.

Finally, even legislators and regulators aware of the existence of public choice problems and determined to do the right thing are still susceptible to forms of what we might call “soft” capture. Acquiring accurate information about market conditions is often very difficult, for example. Companies with a vested interest in the outcome can hire lobbyists that provide information helpful to their side, and a regulator who cannot get information except from those lobbyists may have little choice but to accept that information as true. Even if there are competing sources of information, interested parties can and do hire as lobbyists former employees, colleagues, or friends of the regulator, and it is natural human instinct to trust those people more than strangers. And regulators tend to come from the industries they regulate, which may mean that they start out seeing things from the industry’s perspective.

Judges, by contrast, are much less subject either to having their purpose diverted or to capture. While some have tried to argue that judges face some of the same interest group constraints as legislators and administrative agencies,57 the fact is that antitrust courts are trying to achieve the goal of economic efficiency, they are doing it in industries in which they have no direct financial interest, they cannot act to benefit their “agency” in rendering a decision, and the structure of the litigation process helps ensure to the extent possible that both sides are presented in a relatively balanced way. Courts aren’t perfect, of course. But all advantages are comparative, and the fact that antitrust courts are trying to promote competition rather than to achieve some other end (whether legislated or self-motivated) provides a powerful counterweight to the industry expertise of administrative agencies. It is important to keep in mind, as Areeda and Hovenkamp summarize, that “it often turn[s] out that the principal beneficiaries of industry regulation were the regulated firms themselves, which were shielded from competition and guaranteed profit margins.”58 Courts should not assume that regulation will lead to competition merely because regulators know more than courts about the industries they regulate.

#### That’s especially true in the standard-setting context---regulatory gaming exacerbates monopoly pricing.

Dogan 08, \*Stacey L. Dogan, Professor of Law, Northeastern University; \*Mark Lemley, William H. Neukom Professor, Stanford Law School; of counsel, Keker & Van Nest LLP; (October 2008, “Antitrust Law and Regulatory Gaming”, https://scholarship.law.bu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1873&context=faculty\_scholarship)

2. Evading regulatory limits as antitrust harm

The second open question is whether antitrust injury occurs when a defendant’s misrepresentations prevent an agency from placing limits on an exercise of market power, rather than eliminating the market power altogether. In Rambus v. FTC,148 the D.C. Circuit effectively held that where market power resulted from a regulatory decision (there, the grant of a patent), antitrust law could not constrain the price the monopolist charged. Rambus involved alleged misrepresentations made in the course of a private standard-setting organization’s deliberations. The FTC claimed that Rambus had withheld material information about patent rights that it held over the relevant technology. The FTC alleged that if the SSO had known about Rambus’s patents, either it would have adopted a different standard, or it would have demanded some form of fair and nondiscriminatory licensing terms on Rambus’s patents. The D.C. Circuit found the second allegation legally inadequate, concluding that the mere exercise of market power (i.e., charging higher prices) does not violate the antitrust laws if the market power itself arose from a valid government grant.149

The Rambus court relied on NYNEX v. Discon,150 in which the Supreme Court refused to apply the per se rule to a kickback scheme involving a regulated utility. The regulated party in Discon awarded a contract for non-regulated services to a company that would charge higher prices that the regulated company could then pass on to consumers through rate regulation. The NYNEX Court rejected an antitrust claim alleging that the scheme constituted an unlawful group boycott, absent proof that it harmed competition (not just a competitor) in the non-regulated service market. The Court specifically acknowledged that consumers were injured by the conduct, because it resulted in higher prices in the regulated market. Because that injury came from the exercise of agency-granted market power, however, the Court deemed it beyond the reach of antitrust law. While NYNEX itself involved only the question of whether the per se rule applied, Rambus read it as going further and immunizing any conduct that owed its origin to a regulatory grant of market power.

Both NYNEX and its substantial new extension in Rambus are problematic as matters of antitrust law. The harm to competition in NYNEX did not stem solely from government-granted market power; it stemmed from the defendant’s effort to extend that market power in ways that deceived the regulatory agency and prevented it from controlling NYNEX’s behavior. Similarly, the harm to competition in Rambus did not stem solely from the government’s grant of a patent, but from the combination of that grant with Rambus’s deception of a standard-setting organization that would otherwise have restrained the ability of Rambus to charge a supracompetitive price for that patent. Both of these cases, in other words, involve deliberate and effective regulatory gaming. By refusing to apply antitrust law to private deceptive conduct that manipulates a regulatory process, or extends or exacerbates the anticompetitive effects of a regulatory decision, NYNEX and Rambus appear to condone a new and insidious form of implicit antitrust deference to regulation, one in which antitrust law must ignore conduct that exacerbates competitive harm because the company causing that harm wouldn’t have been in a position to do so but for regulation.151

Whatever one’s views of the substantive antitrust issues, the existence of antitrust injury is an antitrust question that should be decided by antitrust courts, and will not (and often cannot) be adequately addressed by regulatory agencies. And neither NYNEX nor Rambus discredits the notion that abuse of standard-setting processes can, in some circumstances, violate the antitrust laws. In particular, if the facts show that an agency relied upon misrepresentations in choosing a standard – and would have chosen a different standard but for the misrepresentations – then the defendant has caused a structural harm in the market even in the narrow Rambus view. In these circumstances, the defendant’s misrepresentations are the “but-for” cause of the defendant’s economic monopoly.152 While the D.C. Circuit refused to speculate on whether even this could constitute antitrust injury,153 it strains credulity to imagine any other outcome.

Like product-hopping, then, abuse of government standard-setting processes can cause competitive harm in markets. And like product-hopping, the harm may not be remediable through administrative recourse. The capture of government standard-setting processes offers yet another example of regulatory gaming, and another reason that antitrust courts should continue to play a role in regulated markets.

## Biz Con

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

#### Business confidence is non-unique. FRAND will collapse now---absence of FRAND creates uncertainty and lack of trust that destroys sustainable network innovation---that’s Bauer.

#### 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.

#### Monopoly pricing and selective licensing undermines investor certainty.

Actonline 20, the App Association represents more than 5,000 app companies and information technology firms across the mobile economy; (August 26th, 2020, “Save Our Standards: The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals Reverses Decision in FTC v. Qualcomm”, <https://actonline.org/2020/08/26/save-our-standards-the-ninth-circuit-court-of-appeals-reverses-decision-in-ftc-v-qualcomm/>), ability edited

Moreover, the FRAND agreement is a critical tool used by standard setting organizations to ensure the process enhances competition and does not run afoul of antitrust laws. Generally, a collaboration between competitors to choose market winners or set prices raises significant questions for competition regulators. Royalty free and FRAND licensing requirements were created by standards bodies to avoid potential antitrust scrutiny by limiting the market power and the potential for abuse by those involved in developing a standard. This is why the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) will not accredit any standards developing organization (SDO) that does not require standard-essential patent holders to provide licensing terms at least as favorable as FRAND.

The most important beneficiary of open interoperability standards and FRAND licensing requirements are the entrepreneurs and small businesses that have long fueled America’s innovation engine. They don’t have giant patent portfolios, market power, or the resources to hire legions of lawyers and spend years battling SEP abusers in civil court. Without some level of certainty about their ability to obtain licenses—let alone what they may cost—entrepreneurs will have trouble justifying the pursuit of any innovation that uses a standard and will certainly struggle to raise money from investors for such innovation. And Qualcomm’s vague and toothless promise simply “not to sue” smaller companies and component makers is no substitute for a license.

The adoption of 5G technology is expected to open unprecedented opportunities for innovation and economic growth as we move toward a world where everything from cars to tractors to buildings will connect to wireless networks. At every stage of the information technology revolution, America has been the undisputed leader because of the unparalleled entrepreneurial innovation ecosystem that we have built. If 5G SEP holders are able to arbitrarily refuse licenses to smaller firms, it would ~~cripple~~ undermine America’s innovation ecosystem at the start of the next big wave of innovation. As economic tensions continue to rise with China, Chinese-based companies could use their 5G SEPs as international economic weapons to thwart U.S. competitors.

The 5G standard is supposed to be a platform for competition, innovation, and entrepreneurship, but if the Ninth Circuit decision is allowed to stand, it will become a chokepoint for snuffing out competitors and demanding monopoly rents. Open standards and FRAND licensing commitments are fundamental to competition in the modern economy, and the idea that they aren’t a subject for antitrust enforcement is patently absurd.

## FTC DA

### 2AC---FTC DA---L/T

#### Non-unique and link turn---post *Qualcomm*, the FTC will devote more resources to litigation against SEP holders. The plan 1) makes cases these easier to win…

Angela Morris 9/17, litigation reporter at American Lawyer Media, reports on cases pending in the federal circuit, 9/17/2021, “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](https://www.wilmerhale.com/en/people/timothy-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.”

Wilmer Hale has represented Apple in high-profile disputes with Samsung, Nokia and Qualcomm, as well as other Big Tech companies in litigations that concern the intersection of patents and anti-trust.

Syrett 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.”

Many in US patent circles may disagree with Syrett's claims about hold-up and PAEs, but the concern will be that they  represent opinion inside the FTC.

The commission has indicated that it will investigate potential abuses of IP rights that create anti-competitive and deceptive conduct, identifying the pharmaceutical, technology and gasoline refining industries by name. Another stated FTC aim is to target alleged abuses of market power that stop entrepreneurs from competing with Big Tech.

These 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.

Section 5 prohibits business conduct that amounts to an unfair method of competition that impacts commerce. Historically, that has meant a violation of federal antitrust laws like the Sherman Antitrust Act or the Clayton Act. However, over the summer, the FTC issued an expanded interpretation of its Section 5 authority that opened room for the agency to use its standalone authority to bring Section 5 enforcements.

The “abuse of intellectual property” resolution would allow FTC staff quickly to conduct investigations into IP rights as a source of anti-competitive and deceptive conduct in the pharmaceutical, technology and gasoline refining industries, said the commission statement that announced the resolutions on 14 September.

[According to the resolution](https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/attachments/press-releases/ftc-streamlines-consumer-protection-competition-investigations-eight-key-enforcement-areas-enable/omnibus_resolutions_p859900.pdf), the agency plans to investigate people, partners or corporations that engage in “unfair, deceptive, anticompetitive, collusive, coercive, predatory, exploitative or exclusionary acts or practices”. The FTC will determine what action to take or remedy to grant, including injunctive or monetary relief that is in the public interest.

Another resolution on “monopolistic practices” addresses bipartisan concerns about market power abuses by tech companies and other large businesses, said the statement. It added that the resolution allows FTC staff to expeditiously investigate dominant players’ abuses that stop other businesses and entrepreneurs from competing – especially in digital markets.

The vote on the resolutions split the commission, with [chair Lina Khan](https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/documents/public_statements/1596260/p859900omnibuslmkrksconcur.pdf) and commissioners [Rohit Chopra](https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/documents/public_statements/1596280/p859900rcomnibusstmtomnibusmilitary.pdf) and Rebecca Kelly Slaughter in favour, and commissioners [Noah Joshua Phillips and Christine S Wilson](https://www.ftc.gov/public-statements/2021/09/dissenting-statement-commissioners-noah-joshua-phillips-christine-s-wilson) opposed.

Syrett says he can’t predict if the agency’s announcement is a prelude to more *FTC v Qualcomm* style investigations, but he does view it as another signal that the Biden Administration takes a different approach to SEP and FRAND issues compared with its predecessor. It goes hand-in-glove with [the president’s executive order in July](https://www.iam-media.com/frandseps/white-house-executive-order-seps-frand-europe) telling the attorney general and secretary of commerce to reconsider a 2019 statement that downplayed the risk of SEPs.

“The prior administration took a decidedly pro-patent holder view when it came to considering harm to competition from SEPs,” says Syrett. “The Biden Administration has shown that it’s willing to return to the consensus view that’s existed across multiple administrations, both Republican and Democratic, that SEPs pose a significant risk of holdup that can harm competition, innovation and consumers.”

#### AND 2) The plan deters violations so no cases have to be filed---that’s Melamed and Shapiro and…

Cheng 13, \*Thomas Cheng, B.A. (Yale), J.D. (Harvard), B.C.L. (Oxon); Attorney & Counsellor, New York State; Associate Professor, Faculty of Law, The University of Hong Kong; (2013, “Putting Innovation Incentives Back in the Patent-Antitrust Interface”, <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1195&context=njtip>), ability edited

Imposing a duty to license on opportunistic patentees may solve this problem. If these patentees know that the courts may step in and mandate licensing at a reasonable royalty rate,214 they will be induced to enter into negotiations with follow-on innovators in good faith.215 The threat of compulsory licensing may become a default background legal rule against which negotiations between initial and follow-on innovators take place. The instances in which the courts need to intervene could be few.

#### Antitrust fervor is at an all-time high---thumps.

Zanfagna 9/7/21, \* [Gary Zanfagna](https://www.paulhastings.com/professionals/garyzanfagna) is an antitrust and competition partner at Paul Hastings LLP; (September 7th, 2021, “Antitrust isn't headed to an inflection point; it's already there”, https://thehill.com/opinion/judiciary/571087-antitrust-isnt-headed-to-an-inflection-point-its-already-there)

The truth is most companies have not had to think too much about antitrust regulations. The basic rules are pretty well known. But that is potentially changing quickly as antitrust concerns focus on not only high-tech companies, but businesses across the economy, from startups to global conglomerates.

It means antitrust is at an important inflection point. Changes are occurring at multiple levels — from [rule reform](https://www.klobuchar.senate.gov/public/_cache/files/e/1/e171ac94-edaf-42bc-95ba-85c985a89200/375AF2AEA4F2AF97FB96DBC6A2A839F9.sil21191.pdf) to [new applications](https://www.hawley.senate.gov/senator-hawley-introduces-trust-busting-twenty-first-century-act-plan-bust-anti-competitive-big) of existing rules to [increased enforcement](https://www.klobuchar.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/news-releases?ID=A4EF296B-9072-4244-90AF-54FE43BB0876). Some of these changes are a reflection of the economic upheaval ushered in by the digital economy, which has prompted businesses and governments to look to antitrust rules to solve their problems. Witness [President Biden](https://thehill.com/people/joe-biden)’s [July 9 executive order](https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/presidential-actions/2021/07/09/executive-order-on-promoting-competition-in-the-american-economy/) whose 72 provisions include requests ranging from asking the FCC to reinstate net neutrality rules to directing the FDA to issue rules to allow more competition in the hearing aid market.

It’s a reflection of a general zeitgeist whose goal is to slow the onslaught of consolidation in technology across industries, from news media to healthcare to agriculture. And it’s gathering momentum as new rules are being proposed from both sides of the aisle.

Many look to the 449-page [“Investigation of Competition in Digital Markets”](https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/10/06/technology/house-antitrust-report-big-tech.html?action=click&module=RelatedLinks&pgtype=Article) report from the judiciary committee on antitrust as the opening salvo. The report took aim at Amazon, Apple, Facebook, and Google, outlining how those once scrappy startups now leverage their market position in ways not seen since “the era of oil barons and railroad tycoons.” The judiciary report’s conclusion: prevent big tech from acquiring smaller tech with tougher policing — and reform antitrust laws.

Both Democrats and Republicans have since voiced their support for such ideas.

Aimed at the seemingly intractable challenges of the digital era, Sen. [Amy Klobuchar](https://thehill.com/people/amy-klobuchar)’s (D-Minn.) “[Antitrust Law Enforcement Reform Act”](https://www.congress.gov/bill/117th-congress/senate-bill/225/text) would create barriers to prevent consolidation across industries, not just in tech, but in any business that might be connected to “dominant digital platforms.” The legislation would have a prescriptive force, creating a presumption against certain mergers, whether they be in biotech or burgers.

Meanwhile, on the Republican side, Sen. [Josh Hawley](https://thehill.com/people/joshua-josh-hawley) (R-Mo.) has rolled out a bill that looks even more severe, blocking some mergers and acquisitions outright. The [“Trust-Busting for the Twenty-First Century Act”](https://www.hawley.senate.gov/senator-hawley-introduces-trust-busting-twenty-first-century-act-plan-bust-anti-competitive-big) would ban any acquisitions by companies with a market cap of more than $100 billion. The act would also make it easier for the FTC to classify a company’s behavior as anti-competitive, and then extract penalties (including profits) based on that behavior.

And it’s not just the Federal government. Several states have proposed their own legislation to prevent and punish what they see as anti-competitive behavior. Arizona narrowly passed initial legislation that would prevent app store operators, specifically Apple and Google, from forcing developers to use their payment systems.

Meanwhile in New York State, the [Twenty-First Century Anti-Trust Act (S933)](https://www.nysenate.gov/legislation/bills/2019/s8700/amendment/a) includes a first-of-its-kind state merger notification of any deal in which the buyer would end up with more than $8 million in assets of the target. It would also create an “abuse of dominance” offense and give the N.Y. attorney general rulemaking authority — whether or not the company was based in New York.

These proposals have a long way to go before becoming law, but they demonstrate potentially significant antitrust adjustments coming.

Expanding antitrust view

The ripple effects will be profound, affecting transportation, communications, banking and healthcare companies. Incumbents looking to diversify their business are vulnerable, as are startups looking for profitable partners. Unhappy competitors who feel stymied may look to antitrust rules for remediation. And private equity moves to consolidate fledgling, fragmented industries will face tougher questions about overlap and industry concentration.

So, we are going to see antitrust being used in industries and in ways that haven’t been considered in many years, with views about market concentration expanding to encompass what used to be considered diverse or vertical markets. In fact, both Sen. Klobuchar’s and Sen. Hawley’s proposals specifically target consolidation across industries. Sen. Hawley’s $100 billion ban explicitly targets vertical acquisitions. It would certainly prevent deals like Facebook’s acquisition of WhatsApp or Google’s purchase of Fitbit.

### 2AC---Antitrust Thumper---Apple

#### Apple case thumps---it’s politicized, and has ripple effects across antitrust.

Albertgotti 9/10/21, \*[Reed Albergotti](https://www.washingtonpost.com/people/reed-albergotti/), Washington Post; (September 10th, 2021, “Judge’s ruling may take a bite out of Apple’s App Store, but falls short of calling the iPhone maker a monopolist”, https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2021/09/10/apple-epic-decision-judge-market-monopoly/)

A federal judge fundamentally altered Apple’s App Store business model on Friday in a landmark ruling that accused the iPhone maker of illegal anticompetitive behavior and is likely to have ripple effects across the U.S. antitrust landscape.

In a decision on an antitrust lawsuit brought by Fortnite maker Epic Games, U.S. District Judge Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers ruled that Apple must allow app developers to “steer” customers to alternatives to the tech giant’s payment processing service, which collects a 30 percent fee on most digital transactions. That was previously not allowed by the company, and marks a major victory for developers which have long complained of the tight grip the tech giant holds over its App Store on the roughly one billion iPhones currently in use.

[The blockbuster trial between Apple and the maker of ‘Fortnite’ goes out with a ‘hot tub’ session](https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2021/05/24/apple-epic-trial-hot-tubbing/?itid=lk_interstitial_manual_5)

Gonzalez Rogers also found that Apple was in violation of California state competition laws because of the way it forces developers into using Apple’s payment processing service without allowing them to tell customers there are alternatives, which are often cheaper.

She stopped short of ruling in favor of Epic‘s claims that Apple is a monopolist, although she left the door open by suggesting more evidence could have changed her decision.

“The court does not find that it is impossible; only that Epic Games failed in its burden to demonstrate Apple is an illegal monopolist,” she wrote.

Epic spokeswoman Elka Looks said the company plans to appeal the ruling. Tim Sweeney, chief executive of Epic, said in a tweet that, “Today’s ruling isn’t a win for developers or for consumers.”

Apple did not respond to requests for comment.

The ruling, one of the first major legal actions taken against a tech giant in a new era of antitrust scrutiny, is sure to echo loudly both in Washington, where a legislative effort to rein in the power of Big Tech is underway, and in the courts, which are facing the biggest test of existing antitrust laws in decades. Tech giants have come under the microscope in recent years as it became clear that current antitrust law does not effectively address their power, and regulators and lawmakers have been pushing to change that.

#### FTC does solve any other countries AI.

#### AI privacy regs fail---AI is too fast.

Michael **Spiro 20**. JD from the University of Washington School of Law. LLM in Innovation and Technology Law from Seattle University School of Law. 12/19/2020. “The FTC and AI Governance: A Regulatory Proposal.” https://digitalcommons.law.seattleu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1001&context=sjteil.

To date, very few laws or regulations specifically address the unique challenges that AI use poses.134 Looking forward, the legal system lacks the resources needed to make effective regulations that will keep up with AI’s rapid pace of research and development.135 The tech industry’s inherent complexities and tendency to reward “time-to-market at all cost” reinforce the pacing and other problems with governing AI effectively.136 A. AI and the Pacing Problem In addition to the sheer complexity of the technologies themselves, some of the major challenges to effective AI regulation are the scale, heterogeneity, and autonomous nature of many AI systems. 137 These challenges are further complicated by the uncertainties about how and in what directions AI will develop in the future.138 The possibility that many of the risks that AI poses are likely unknown and may even be unknowable further impedes traditional methods of regulation.139 Indeed, the uncertainty around AI’s potential makes even categorizing the various risks of implementing AI a complicated and arduous task.140 A major problem that regulators face regarding AI is that technological developments tend to outpace attempts to regulate them.141 Because of the increasing speed of innovation, the technology often disengages or decouples from regulation.142 This issue is known as the “pacing” problem, where attempts to “futureproof” legislation result in regulatory disconnect, whereby the adopted regulations end up being either too general or too vague to provide meaningful oversight or guidance.143 B. Regulators’ Disadvantages: Lack of Knowledge and Resources Of equal significance is the fact that many regulators do not have the resources to adequately address all of the issues that AI technologies present.144 This information and resource constraint can be particularly problematic in regard to new technologies, such as AI, because there is a steep learning curve and the ability to engage meaningfully with industry experts is necessary to gain the expertise needed to fully understand and act effectively in response to such advancements. 145 Even with sufficient knowledge and expertise, the speed of innovation in the field makes it difficult for regulators to react in a timely and appropriate manner. 146 Regulators also are at a disadvantage given that most of the world’s AI is being developed by a handful of large multinational corporations, whose capabilities in the area far outstrip other institutions, including the government.147 On one hand, this imbalance tends to exacerbate the opacity problem, since private firms are more apt to maintain secrecy over their technologies to safeguard their proprietary interests.148 These companies’ heavy investment in AI research and development also leads to “information asymmetries” between those companies and the regulators, the public, and others seeking to understand the technology.14 Compounding the problem of information asymmetry is even if regulators are able to obtain information, they likely will be unable to fully understand the technology or appreciate its impacts.150 Indeed, especially when an emerging technology, like AI, is in its beginning stages, only those directly involved in developing the technology may possess the necessary expertise to adequately assess its risks.151 Further, given demand for such expertise, regulators are less likely to be able to compete with industry for top talent. 152 As a result, regulators may be forced to overly rely on industry when attempting to regulate AI.153 C. Sectoral Issues, Autonomy, and Unforeseeability Another complicating factor is that governance of AI is likely to be overseen by more than one regulator, given that while a particular type of AI may be widely adopted, it will be used by different industries in different ways.154 Moreover, as AI systems become increasingly integrated and embedded into the social and economic environment, the potential for systemic risk becomes amplified, affecting multiple stakeholders, jeopardizing the effectiveness of traditional regulatory models.155 The nature of AI research and development also makes effective regulation more difficult. There are three general ex ante problems with regulating AI research and development: discreetness (AI projects can be developed with little physical infrastructure, and without the need for large-scale, integrated institutional frameworks); diffuseness (AI projects can be carried out by a variety of diffuse actors in widely dispersed geographic locations); and discreteness (parties can, without consciously coordinating with each other, make use of “discrete components and technologies ‘the full potential of which will not be apparent until the components come together’”). Traditional regulators are generally ill-equipped to handle these issues.157 Machine autonomy and algorithmic unpredictability pose other important regulatory concerns. It is inherently difficult trying to control the actions of autonomous systems, particularly when those systems’ decisions or actions are unforeseeable, even to their designers and operators.158 Indeed, the legal system is likely to struggle to manage these issues in such a way as to ensure aggrieved parties are adequately compensated when AI technologies cause harm.159 For instance, the legal system may view the behavior of some machine learning processes as so unforeseeable that it would be unfair to extend liability to their designers for harms they cause, leaving those injured thereby with little recourse.160 Moreover, because the workings of many AI systems are not visible to the public, it can be hard to detect when an AI system’s decision causes harm, or that the system even made the decision, making the concept of redress practically meaningless.161 A related issue concerns AI systems acting in ways that can make them difficult for humans to control.162 In the most extreme case, an AI system becomes so much smarter and faster than its human counterparts, that it can no longer be controlled by humans at all. 163 Flawed programming and design also can lead to loss of “local control,” which occurs when those humans who have the legal responsibility for controlling the AI system are no longer able to do so.164 Loss of control is especially problematic when the emergent nature of the AI system and the interests of its designers are no longer in alignment with each other.165 Given all of these challenges, new, innovative approaches to regulating AI are needed.166 The old state-centric, command-and-control regulatory model is no longer adequate.167 As discussed below, while this does not mean that there is no role for government oversight or that regulators do not have an important part to play–indeed they do–rather it is that the growth of machine learning and the emergence of AI calls for a more inclusive, or coregulatory, approach.

## 2AC---LPE K

### 2AC---Framework

#### The ballot is a referendum on the hypothetical consequences of the plan. Any links must be to the implementation of the plan and there must be an alt that causally solves their harms, with the inclusion of the plan precluding that solvency.

#### Key to fairness---plan-focus is the most predictable and non-arbitrary. Any other interp ex post shifts the goalposts which moots the 1AC.

### 2AC---Perms

#### Permutation do both.

#### Permutation do the aff then the alternative in all other instances.

#### Competition and pareto-optimal allocation are neccesary for innovation---only capitalist markets oriented around profit 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)

After these sad stories of frustrated inventors, we turn to the innovation phase. Surely, even in the socialist system, many individuals had entrepreneurial talent, but it was lying dormant. Perhaps a large project’s leader could, to a certain extent, unfold his talent, provided that he was picked for his position because of his abilities and not his party connections. Still, the inherent characteristics of the system did not allow the development of a Schumpeterian-type entrepreneurship. 22 Let us return, one by one, to the conditions reviewed earlier when discussing capitalism, and study the situation under the socialist system.

A. Centralization, bureaucratic commands, and permissions. The plan of technical innovation is one chapter in the state plan. The central planners set key changes to be carried out regarding the composition and the quality, together with the production technology, of the products. What follows is the disaggregation of the central-plan numbers into plans for sectors, for subsectors, and, at the end, to companies. The “command economy” means, among other things, that firms receive detailed orders about when they should replace one product with a new one, and which old machinery or technology should be replaced with a new one. Before the final approval of the plan, company managers are allowed to make suggestions, so, among other things, they can initiate the adaptation of a new product or a new technology; that is to say, they can join in the process of innovation diffusion. However, they must ask for permission for all significant initiatives. If an action happens to be on large scale, even their immediate superiors cannot decide by themselves, but, instead, they must turn to the higher levels of the hierarchy for approval. The more extensive an initiative is, the higher one has to go for the final decision, and the longer the bureaucratic process preceding the actual action. 23

As opposed to the situation just described, if, in capitalism, a very promising innovation is rejected by the first company, another one may be willing to embrace it. This is made possible by decentralization, private property, and the market. In the centralized socialist economies, the innovative idea follows the official pathways, and in the case of a declared negative decision, no appeal can be made.

B. No (or only insignificant) reward. If the higher authority deems a technical innovation in a factory unit successful, the manager and perhaps his immediate colleagues receive a bonus, an amount equal one or two months of salary, at best.

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

At this point, it is worth running through points A to E again about the description of the mechanisms of innovation, because these points are actually the consequences of the basic characteristics of the capitalist and the socialist systems. The reviewed phenomena are the direct results of private property and market coordination in one system and of public property and bureaucratic coordination in the other.

#### Markets and capitalist risk-rationing are key to innovation.

Schrager 20, \*Allison Schrager, a senior fellow at the Manhattan Institute and a City Journal contributing editor, where her research focuses on public finance, pensions, tax policy, labor markets, and monetary policy; (January 15th, 2020, “Why Socialism Won’t Work”, https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/01/15/socialism-wont-work-capitalism-still-best/)

Yet the very ills that socialists identify are best addressed through innovation, productivity gains, and better rationing of risk. And capitalism is still far and away the best, if not only, way to generate those outcomes.

Today’s socialism is difficult to define. Traditionally, the term meant total state ownership of capital, as in the Soviet Union, North Korea, or Maoist China. Nowadays, most people don’t take such an extreme view. In Europe, social democracy means the nationalization of many industries and very generous welfare states. And today’s rising socialists are rebranding the idea to mean an economic system that delivers all the best parts of capitalism (growth and rising living standards) without the bad (inequality, economic cycles).

But no perfect economic system exists; there are always trade-offs—in the most extreme form between total state ownership of capital and unfettered markets without any regulation or welfare state. Today, few would opt for either pole; what modern socialists and capitalists really disagree on is the right level of government intervention.

Modern socialists want more, but not complete, state ownership. They’d like to nationalize certain industries. In the United States, that’s health care—a plan supported by Democratic presidential candidates Elizabeth Warren (who does not call herself a socialist) and Bernie Sanders (who wears the label proudly). In the United Kingdom, Labour Party leader Jeremy Corbyn, who was trounced at the polls in mid-December, has set his sights on a longer [list of industries](https://labour.org.uk/manifesto/), including the water, energy, and internet providers.

Other items on the socialist wish list may include allowing the government to be the primary investor in the economy through massive infrastructure projects that aim to replace fossil fuels with renewables, as Green New Deal socialists have proposed. They’ve also floated plans that would make the government the employer of a majority of Americans by offering guaranteed well-paid jobs that people can’t be fired from. And then there are more limited proposals, including installing more workers on the boards of private companies and instituting national rent controls and high minimum wages.

For their part, modern capitalists want some, but less, state intervention. They are skeptical of nationalization and price controls; they argue that today’s economic problems are best addressed by harnessing private enterprise. In the United States, they’ve argued for [more](https://faculty.chicagobooth.edu/luigi.zingales/papers/research/A_New_Capital_Regulation_for_Large_Financial_Institutions.pdf) [regulation](https://fortune.com/2019/07/16/big-tech-regulations-luigi-zingales/) and [progressive taxation](https://review.chicagobooth.edu/economics/2019/article/would-elizabeth-warren-s-wealth-tax-actually-work-intended) to help ease inequality, [incentives](http://www.igmchicago.org/surveys/congestion-pricing-2) to encourage private firms to [use less carbon](https://gregmankiw.blogspot.com/2006/10/pigou-club-manifesto.html), and a [more robust welfare state](https://www.taxpolicycenter.org/taxvox/tax-reform-20-should-expand-childless-eitc-reduce-poverty) through tax credits. Over the past 15 years, meanwhile, capitalist Europeans have instituted reforms to improve labor market flexibility by making it easier to hire and fire people, and there have been attempts to reduce the size of pensions.

No economic system is perfect, and the exact right balance between markets and the state may never be found. But there are good reasons to believe that keeping capital in the hands of the private sector, and empowering its owners to make decisions in the pursuit of profit, is the best we’ve got.

One reason to trust markets is that they are better at setting prices than people. If you set prices too high, many a socialist government has found, citizens will be needlessly deprived of goods. Set them too low, and there will be excessive demand and ensuing shortages. This is true for all goods, including health care and labor. And there is little reason to believe that the next batch of socialists in Washington or London would be any better at setting prices than their predecessors. In fact, government-run health care systems in Canada and European countries are plagued by long wait times. A [2018 Fraser Institute study](https://www.fraserinstitute.org/studies/waiting-your-turn-wait-times-for-health-care-in-canada-2018) cites a median wait time of 19.8 weeks to see a specialist physician in Canada. Socialists may argue that is a small price to pay for universal access, but a market-based approach can deliver both coverage and responsive service. A full government takeover isn’t the only option, nor is it the best one.

Beyond that, markets are also good at rationing risk. Fundamentally, socialists would like to reduce risk—protect workers from any personal or economywide shock. That is a noble goal, and some reduction through better functioning safety nets is desirable. But getting rid of all uncertainty—as state ownership of most industries would imply—is a bad idea. Risk is what fuels growth. People who take more chances tend to reap bigger rewards; that’s why the top nine names on the [Forbes 400 list of the richest Americans](https://www.forbes.com/forbes-400/#69d71a817e2f) are not heirs to family dynasties but are self-made entrepreneurs who took a leap to build new products and created many jobs in the process.

Some [leftist economists like Mariana Mazzucato argue](https://time.com/4089171/mariana-mazzucato/) that governments might be able to step in and become laboratories for innovation. But that would be a historical anomaly; socialist-leaning governments have typically been less innovative than others. After all, bureaucrats and worker-corporate boards have little incentive to upset the status quo or compete to build a better widget. And even when government programs have spurred innovation—as in the case of the internet—[it took the private sector](https://www.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/serials/files/cato-journal/2015/9/cj-v35n3-7.pdf) to recognize the value and create a market.

And that brings us to a third reason to believe in markets: productivity. Some economists, [such as Robert Gordon](https://www.nber.org/papers/w18315), have looked to today’s economic problems and suggested that productivity growth—the engine that fueled so much of the progress of the last several decades—is over. In this telling, the resources, products, and systems that underpin the world’s economy are all optimized, and little further progress is possible.

But that is hard to square with reality. Innovation helps economies do more with fewer resources—increasingly critical to addressing climate change, for example—which is a form of productivity growth. And likewise, many of the products and technologies people rely on every day did not exist a few years ago. These goods make inaccessible services more available and are changing the nature of work, often for the better. Such gains are made possible by capitalist systems that encourage invention and growing the pie, not by socialist systems that are more concerned with how the existing pie is cut. It is far too soon, in other words, to write off productivity.

#### Capitalism is good and sustainable---technological progress has successfully dematerialized economic growth.

McAfee 19, \*Andrew Paul McAfee, a principal research scientist at MIT, is cofounder and codirector of the MIT Initiative on the Digital Economy at the MIT Sloan School of Management; (2019, “More from Less: The Surprising Story of How We Learned to Prosper Using Fewer Resources and What Happens Next”, https://b-ok.cc/book/5327561/8acdbe)

Capitalism and technological progress are the first pair of forces driving dematerialization. This statement will come as a surprise to many, and for good reason. After all, it’s exactly this combination that caused us to massively increase our resource consumption throughout the Industrial Era. As we saw in chapter 3, the ideas of William Jevons and Alfred Marshall point to the distressing conclusion that capitalism and tech progress always lead to more from more: more economic growth, but also more resource consumption.

So what changed? How are capitalism and tech progress now get ting us more from less ? To get answers to these important questions, let’s start by looking at a few recent examples of dematerialization.

Fertile Farms

America has long been an agricultural juggernaut. In 1982, after more than a decade of steady expansion due in part to rising grain prices, total cropland in the country stood at approximately 380 million acres. Over the next ten years, however, almost all of this increase was reversed. So much acreage was abandoned by farmers and given back to nature that cropland in 1992 was almost back to where it had been almost twenty-five years before. This decline had several causes, including falling grain prices, a severe recession, over-indebted farmers, and increased international competition.

A final factor, though, was the ability to get ever-more corn, wheat, soybeans, and other crops from the same acre of land, pound of fertilizer and pesticide, and gallon of water. The material productivity of agriculture in the United States has improved dramatically in recent decades, as we saw in chapter 5. Between 1982 and 2015 over 45 million acres—an amount of cropland equal in size to the state of Washington—was returned to nature. Over the same time potassium, phosphate, and nitrogen (the three main fertilizers) all saw declines in absolute use. Meanwhile, the total tonnage of crops produced in the country increased by more than 35 percent.

As impressive as this is, it’s dwarfed by the productivity improvements of American dairy cows. In 1950 we got 117 billion pounds of milk from 22 million cows. In 2015 we got 209 billion pounds from just 9 million animals. The average milk cow’s productivity thus improved by over 330 percent during that time.

Thin Cans

Tin cans are actually made of steel coated with a thin layer of tin to improve corrosion resistance. They’ve been used since the nineteenth century to store food. Starting in the 1930s, they began also to be used to hold beer and soft drinks.

In 1959 Coors pioneered beer cans made of aluminum, which is much lighter and more corrosion resistant than steel. Royal Crown Cola followed suit for soda five years later. As Vaclav Smil relates, “A decade later steel cans were on the way out, and none of them have been used for beer since 1994 and for soft drinks since 1996.… At 85 g the first aluminum cans were surprisingly heavy; by 1972 the weight of a two-piece can dropped to just below 21 g, by 1988 it was less than 16 g, a decade later it averaged 13.6 g, and by 2011 it was reduced to 12.75 g.”

Manufacturers accomplished these reductions by making aluminum cans’ walls thinner, and by making the sides and bottom from a single sheet of metal so that only one comparatively heavy seam was needed (to join the top to the rest of the can). Smil points out that if all beverage cans used in 2010 weighed what they did in 1980, they would have required an extra 580,000 tons of aluminum. And aluminum cans kept getting lighter. In 2012 Ball packaging introduced into the European market a 330 ml can that held 7.5 percent less than the US standard, yet at 9.5 g weighed 25 percent less.

Gone Gizmos

In 2014 Steve Cichon, a “writer, historian, and retired radio newsman in Buffalo, NY,” paid $3 for a large stack of front sections of the Buffalo News newspaper from the early months of 1991. On the back page of the Saturday, February 16, issue was an ad from the electronics retailer Radio Shack. Cichon noticed something striking about the ad: “There are 15 electronic gimzo type items on this page.… 13 of the 15 you now always have in your pocket.”

The “gizmo type items” that had vanished into the iPhone Cichon kept in his pocket included a calculator, camcorder, clock radio, mobile telephone, and tape recorder. While the ad didn’t include a compass, camera, barometer, altimeter, accelerometer, or GPS device, these, too, have vanished into the iPhone and other smartphones, as have countless atlases and compact discs.

The success of the iPhone was almost totally unanticipated. A November 2007 cover story in Forbes magazine touted that the Finnish mobile phone maker Nokia had over a billion customers around the world and asked, “Can anyone catch the cell phone king?”

Yes. Apple sold more than a billion iPhones within a decade of its June 2007 launch and became the most valuable publicly traded company in history. Nokia, meanwhile, sold its mobile phone business to Microsoft in 2013 for $7.2 billion to get “more combined muscle to truly break through with consumers,” as the Finnish company’s CEO Stephen Elop said at the time of the deal.

It didn’t work. Microsoft sold what remained of Nokia’s mobile phone business and brand to a subsidiary of the Taiwanese electronics manufacturer Foxconn for $350 million in May of 2016. Radio Shack filed for bankruptcy in 2015, and again in 2017.

From Peak Oil to… Peak Oil

In 2007 US coal consumption reached a new high of 1,128 million short tons, over 90 percent of which was burned to generate electricity. Total coal use had increased by more than 35 percent since 1990, and the US Energy Information Administration (the official energy statisticians of the US government) forecast further growth of up to 65 percent by 2030.

Also in 2007 the US Government Accountability Office (GAO), a federal agency known as “the congressional watchdog,” published a report with an admirably explanatory title: “Crude Oil: Uncertainty about Future Oil Supply Makes It Important to Develop a Strategy for Addressing a Peak and Decline in Oil Production.” It took seriously the idea of “peak oil,” a phrase coined in 1956 by M. King Hubbert, a geologist working for Shell Oil. As originally conceived, peak oil referred to the maximum amount of oil that we could annually produce for all of humanity’s needs.

The first oil wells pumped out the crude oil that was closest to the earth’s surface or otherwise easiest to access. As those wells dried up, we had to drill deeper ones, both on land and at sea. As the world’s economies kept growing, so did total demand for oil, which kept getting harder and harder to obtain. Peak oil captured the idea that despite our best efforts and ample incentive, we would come to a time after which we would only be able to extract less and less oil year after year from the earth. Most of the estimates summarized in the GAO report found that peak oil would occur no later than 2040.

The report did not mention fracking, which in retrospect looks like a serious omission. Fracking is short for “hydraulic fracturing” and is a means of obtaining oil and natural gas from rock formations lying deep underground. It uses a high-pressure fluid to cause fractures in the rock, through which oil and gas can flow and be extracted.

The United States and other countries have long been known to have huge reserves of hydrocarbons in deep rock formations, which are often called shales. Companies had been experimenting with fracking to get at them since the middle of the twentieth century, but had made little progress. In 2000 fracking accounted for just 2 percent of US oil production.

That figure began to increase quickly right around the time of the GAO report. Not because of any single breakthrough, but instead because the suite of tools and techniques needed for profitable fracking had all improved enough. A gusher of shale oil and gas ensued.

Thanks to fracking, US crude oil production almost doubled between 2007 and 2017, when it approached the benchmark of 10 million barrels per day. By September of 2018 America had surpassed Saudi Arabia to become the world’s largest producer of oil. American natural gas production, which had been essentially flat since the mid-1970s, jumped by nearly 43 percent between 2007 and 2017.

As a result of the fracking boom the United States has experienced peak coal rather than peak oil. And the peak in coal is not in total annual supply, but instead in demand. Fracking made natural gas cheap enough that it became preferred over coal for much electricity generation. By 2017 total US coal consumption was down 36 percent from its 2007 high point.

The phrase peak oil is still around, but, as is the case with coal, it usually no longer refers to supply. As a 2017 Bloomberg headline put it, “Remember Peak Oil? Demand May Top Out Before Supply Does.” Even though the extra supply from fracking has helped push down oil and gas prices, many observers now believe that energy from other sources—the sun, wind, and the nuclei of uranium atoms—is getting cheaper faster and becoming much more widely available. So much so that, as a 2018 article in Fortune about the future of oil hypothesized, “This wouldn’t be just another oil-price cycle, a familiar roller coaster in which every down is followed by an up. It would be the start of a decades-long decline of the Oil Age itself—an uncharted world in which… oil prices might be ‘lower forever.’ ” Analysts at Shell, the company from which the phrase peak oil originated, now estimate that global peak oil demand might come as soon as 2028.

Taking Stock of Rolling Stock

My friend Bo Cutter started his career in 1968 working for Northwest Industries, a conglomerate that owned the Chicago and North Western Railway. One of his first assignments was to help a team tasked with solving a problem that sounds odd to modern ears: figuring out where CNW’s railcars were.

These cars are massive metal assemblies, each weighing thirty tons or more. In the late 1960s CNW owned thousands of them, representing a huge commitment of both material and money. Across the railroad industry, the rule of thumb then was that about 5 percent of a company’s railcars moved on any given day. This was not because the other 95 percent needed to rest. It was because their owners didn’t know where they were.

CNW owned thousands of miles of track in places as far from Chicago as North Dakota and Wyoming. Its rolling stock (as locomotives and railcars are called) could also travel outside the company’s network on tracks owned by other railroads. So these assets could be almost anywhere in the country.

When the railcars weren’t moving, they sat in freight yards. At the time Cutter started his job, freight yards didn’t keep up-to-date records of the idle rolling stock they contained because, in the days before widespread digital computers, sensors, and networks, there was no way to cost-effectively know or communicate the location of each car. So it was impossible for CNW or any other railroad to systematically track its most important inventory, even though doing so would be hugely beneficial to the company’s bottom line. For example, Cutter’s team knew that if they could increase the percentage of cars moving each day from 5 percent to 10 percent, they would need only half as many of them. Even a single percentage point increase in freight-car use would yield major financial benefits.

When Cutter started his assignment, CNW and all other railroads employed spotters, who visited yards and watched trains pass, then telegraphed their findings to the head office. Other railroads passed on similar information to collect the demurrage charges they were owed for each CNW car on their tracks and in their yards. Cutter’s team improved on these methods by making them more systematic and efficient. They put in place a better baseline audit of where railcars were, employed more spotters, painted CNW cars differently so they were easier to see, and explored how to make more use of a new tool for businesses: the digital computer.

That tool and its kin are now pervasive in the railroad industry. In the early 1990s, for example, companies started putting radio-frequency identification tags on each piece of rolling stock. These tags would be read by trackside sensors, thus automating the work of spotting. At present over 5 million messages about railcar status and location are generated and sent throughout the American railway system every day, and the country’s more than 450 railroads have nearly real-time visibility over all their rolling stock.

The Rare Earth Scare

In September of 2010 the Japanese government took into custody the captain of a Chinese fishing boat that had collided with Japanese patrol vessels near a group of uninhabited islands in the East China Sea claimed by both countries. China responded by imposing an embargo on shipments of rare earth elements (REE) to the Land of the Rising Sun.

Even though Japan relented almost immediately and released the captain, a global panic began. This is because rare earths are “vitamins of chemistry,” as USGS scientist Daniel Cordier puts it. “They help everything perform better, and they have their own unique characteristics, particularly in terms of magnetism, temperature resistance, and resistance to corrosion.”

By 2010 China produced well over 90 percent of the world’s REE. Its actions in the wake of the maritime incident convinced many that it could and would take unilateral action to control the flow of these important materials, and panicked buying soon followed (along with its close cousin rampant speculation). A bundle of REE that would have sold for less than $10,000 in early 2010 soared to more than $42,000 by April of 2011. In September of that year the US House of Representatives held a hearing called “China’s Monopoly on Rare Earths: Implications for US Foreign and Security Policy.”

China didn’t attain its near monopoly because it possessed anything close to 90 percent of global reserves of REE. In fact, rare earths aren’t rare at all (one, cerium, is about as common in the earth’s crust as copper). However, they’re difficult to extract from ore. Obtaining them requires a great deal of acid and generates tons of salt and crushed rock as by-products. Most other countries didn’t want to bear the environmental burden of this heavy processing and so left the market to China.

In the wake of the embargo, this seemed like a bad idea. As Representative Brad Sherman put it during the congressional hearing, “Chinese control over rare earth elements gives them one more argument as to why we should kowtow to China.” But there was never much kowtowing. By the time of the hearing, prices for REE were already in free fall.

Why? What happened to the apparently tight Chinese stranglehold over REE? Several factors caused it to ease, including the availability of other supply sources and incomplete maintenance of the embargo. But as public affairs professor Eugene Gholz noted in a 2014 report on the “crisis,” many users of REE simply innovated their way out of the problem. “Companies such as Hitachi Metals [and its subsidiary in North Carolina] that make rare earth magnets found ways to make equivalent magnets using smaller amounts of rare earths in the alloys.… Meanwhile, some users remembered that they did not need the high performance of specialized rare earth magnets; they were merely using them because, at least until the 2010 episode, they were relatively inexpensive and convenient.”

Overall, the companies using REE found many inexpensive and convenient alternatives. By the end of 2017 the same bundle of rare earths that had been trading above $42,000 in 2011 was available for about $1,000.

What’s Going On?

There is no shortage of examples of dematerialization. I chose the ones in this chapter because they illustrate a set of fundamental principles at the intersection of business, economics, innovation, and our impact on our planet. They are:

We do want more all the time, but not more resources. Alfred Marshall was right, but William Jevons was wrong. Our wants and desires keep growing, evidently without end, and therefore so do our economies. But our use of the earth’s resources does not. We do want more beverage options, but we don’t want to keep using more aluminum in drink cans. We want to communicate and compute and listen to music, but we don’t want an arsenal of gadgets; we’re happy with a single smartphone. As our population increases, we want more food, but we don’t have any desire to consume more fertilizer or use more land for crops.

Jevons was correct at the time he wrote that total British demand for coal was increasing even though steam engines were becoming much more efficient. He was right, in other words, that the price elasticity of demand for coal-supplied power was greater than one in the 1860s. But he was wrong to conclude that this would be permanent. Elasticities of demand can change over time for several reasons, the most fundamental of which is technological change. Coal provides a clear example of this. When fracking made natural gas much cheaper, total demand for coal in the United States went down even though its price decreased.

With the help of innovation and new technologies, economic growth in America and other rich countries—growth in all of the wants and needs that we spend money on—has become decoupled from resource consumption. This is a recent development and a profound one.

Materials cost money that companies locked in competition would rather not spend. The root of Jevons’s mistake is simple and boring: resources cost money. He realized this, of course. What he didn’t sufficiently realize was how strong the incentive is for a company in a contested market to reduce its spending on resources (or anything else) and so eke out a bit more profit. After all, a penny saved is a penny earned.

Monopolists can just pass costs on to their customers, but companies with a lot of competitors can’t. So American farmers who battle with each other (and increasingly with tough rivals in other countries) are eager to cut their spending on land, water, and fertilizer. Beer and soda companies want to minimize their aluminum purchases. Producers of magnets and high-tech gear run away from REE as soon as prices start to spike. In the United States, the 1980 Staggers Act removed government subsidies for freight-hauling railroads, forcing them into competition and cost cutting and making them all the more eager to not have expensive railcars sit idle. Again and again, we see that competition spurs dematerialization.

There are multiple paths to dematerialization. As profit-hungry companies seek to use fewer resources, they can go down four main paths. First, they can simply find ways to use less of a given material. This is what happened as beverage companies and the companies that supply them with cans teamed up to use less aluminum. It’s also the story with American farmers, who keep getting bigger harvests while using less land, water, and fertilizer. Magnet makers found ways to use fewer rare earth metals when it looked as if China might cut off their supply.

Second, it often becomes possible to substitute one resource for another. Total US coal consumption started to decrease after 2007 because fracking made natural gas more attractive to electricity generators. If nuclear power becomes more popular in the United States (a topic we’ll take up in chapter 15), we could use both less coal and less gas and generate our electricity from a small amount of material indeed. A kilogram of uranium-235 fuel contains approximately 2–3 million times as much energy as the same mass of coal or oil. According to one estimate, the total amount of energy that humans consume each year could be supplied by just seven thousand tons of uranium fuel.

Third, companies can use fewer molecules overall by making better use of the materials they already own. Improving CNW’s railcar utilization from 5 percent to 10 percent would mean that the company could cut its stock of these thirty-ton behemoths in half. Companies that own expensive physical assets tend to be fanatics about getting as much use as possible out of them, for clear and compelling financial reasons. For example, the world’s commercial airlines have improved their load factors—essentially the percentage of seats occupied on flights—from 56 percent in 1971 to more than 81 percent in 2018.

Finally, some materials get replaced by nothing at all. When a telephone, camcorder, and tape recorder are separate devices, three total microphones are needed. When they all collapse into a smartphone, only one microphone is necessary. That smartphone also uses no audiotapes, videotapes, compact discs, or camera film. The iPhone and its descendants are among the world champions of dematerialization. They use vastly less metal, plastic, glass, and silicon than did the devices they have replaced and don’t need media such as paper, discs, tape, or film.

If we use more renewable energy, we’ll be replacing coal, gas, oil, and uranium with photons from the sun (solar power) and the movement of air (wind power) and water (hydroelectric power) on the earth. All three of these types of power are also among dematerialization’s champions, since they use up essentially no resources once they’re up and running.

I call these four paths to dematerialization slim, swap, optimize, and evaporate. They’re not mutually exclusive. Companies can and do pursue all four at the same time, and all four are going on all the time in ways both obvious and subtle.

Innovation is hard to foresee. Neither the fracking revolution nor the world-changing impact of the iPhone’s introduction were well understood in advance. Both continued to be underestimated even after they occurred. The iPhone was introduced in June of 2007, with no shortage of fanfare from Apple and Steve Jobs. Yet several months later the cover of Forbes was still asking if anyone could catch Nokia.

Innovation is not steady and predictable like the orbit of the Moon or the accumulation of interest on a certificate of deposit. It’s instead inherently jumpy, uneven, and random. It’s also combinatorial, as Erik Brynjolfsson and I discussed in our book The Second Machine Age. Most new technologies and other innovations, we argued, are combinations or recombinations of preexisting elements.

The iPhone was “just” a cellular telephone plus a bunch of sensors plus a touch screen plus an operating system and population of programs, or apps. All these elements had been around for a while before 2007. It took the vision of Steve Jobs to see what they could become when combined. Fracking was the combination of multiple abilities: to “see” where hydrocarbons were to be found in rock formations deep underground; to pump down pressurized liquid to fracture the rock; to pump up the oil and gas once they were released by the fracturing; and so on. Again, none of these was new. Their effective combination was what changed the world’s energy situation.

Erik and I described the set of innovations and technologies available at any time as building blocks that ingenious people could combine and recombine into useful new configurations. These new configurations then serve as more blocks that later innovators can use. Combinatorial innovation is exciting because it’s unpredictable. It’s not easy to foresee when or where powerful new combinations are going to appear, or who’s going to come up with them. But as the number of both building blocks and innovators increases, we should have confidence that more breakthroughs such as fracking and smartphones are ahead. Innovation is highly decentralized and largely uncoordinated, occurring as the result of interactions among complex and interlocking social, technological, and economic systems. So it’s going to keep surprising us.

As the Second Machine Age progresses, dematerialization accelerates. Erik and I coined the phrase Second Machine Age to draw a contrast with the Industrial Era, which as we’ve seen transformed the planet by allowing us to overcome the limitations of muscle power. Our current time of great progress with all things related to computing is allowing us to overcome the limitations of our mental power and is transformative in a different way: it’s allowing us to reverse the Industrial Era’s bad habit of taking more and more from the earth every year.

Computer-aided design tools help engineers at packaging companies design generations of aluminum cans that keep getting lighter. Fracking took off in part because oil and gas exploration companies learned how to build accurate computer models of the rock formations that lay deep underground—models that predicted where hydrocarbons were to be found.

Smartphones took the place of many separate pieces of gear. Because they serve as GPS devices, they’ve also led us to print out many fewer maps and so contributed to our current trend of using less paper. It’s easy to look at generations of computer paper, from 1960s punch cards to the eleven-by-seventeen-inch fanfold paper of the 1980s, and conclude that the Second Machine Age has caused us to chop down ever more trees. The year of peak paper consumption in the United States, however, was 1990. As our devices have become more capable and interconnected, always on and always with us, we’ve sharply turned away from paper. Humanity as a whole probably hit peak paper in 2013.

As these examples indicate, computers and their kin help us with all four paths to dematerialization. Hardware, software, and networks let us slim, swap, optimize, and evaporate. I contend that they’re the best tools we’ve ever invented for letting us tread more lightly on our planet.

All of these principles are about the combination of technological progress and capitalism, which are the first of the two pairs of forces causing dematerialization.