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#### The Supreme Court’s ruling in *Empagran* denied standing to foreign plaintiffs seeking remedy for antitrust injury sustained abroad.
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In F. Hoffman LaRoche Ltd. v. Empagran S.A., 542 US 155 (2004), the Supreme Court limited access to American courts by foreign plaintiffs suing under the Sherman Act based on foreign transactions. Jurisdiction over foreign antitrust claims is governed by the Foreign Trade Antitrust Improvements Act (“FTAIA”). However, rather than parsing this opaque and poorly drafted statute, the Court drew on the doctrine of prescriptive comity and held that where a statute is vague, it should be construed narrowly so as not to interfere with the prerogatives of co-sovereigns. Alternatively, the Court concluded that if the conduct in question would have been beyond the reach of the Sherman Act prior to the enactment of FTAIA, it would not be cognizable under the FTAA because that statute was designed to limit—not expand—jurisdiction over foreign claims. The Court found that there were no pre-FTAIA cases to support jurisdiction.

On remand, the D.C. Circuit ruled that even if foreign plaintiffs could show that “but for” participation of U.S. firms in the conspiracy, they would not have been injured, their claims would still be barred. The FTAIA contemplates that (1) the illegal foreign have a “direct, substantial and reasonably foreseeable effect” on U.S. commerce; and (2) such adverse effect on foreign commerce gives rise to claims by foreign plaintiffs. Incidental or “but for” linkage does not suffice; proximate cause is the standard.

Moreover, foreign claims based on foreign transactions are also barred under the doctrines of standing and antitrust injury. Antitrust courts have traditionally denied standing to firms that were neither competitors nor consumers in the U.S. market. Similarly, the doctrine of antitrust injury limits the universe of antitrust plaintiffs to those who have suffered injury of the kind that the antitrust laws are met to protect against and that flows from that which makes the conduct unlawful. The U.S. antitrust laws were not meant to protect plaintiffs who were not participants in the U.S. market. Empagran may not eliminate antitrust actions by foreign purchasers, but the decision is a major hurdle to their successful prosecution.

IN EMPAGRAN, 1 THE SUPREME COURT construed the Foreign Trade Antitrust Improvements Act 2 (FTAIA) to severely limit the extraterritorial reach of the Sherman Act. In the wake of Empagran and the D.C. Circuit’s subsequent ruling on remand in that case, 3 foreign plaintiffs asserting claims under U.S. antitrust laws for injuries based on transactions consummated abroad have been largely shut out of federal courts. Foreign plaintiffs, however, have not abandoned their efforts to obtain relief in American courts for anticompetitive acts committed in the international arena. Rather, they have turned to claims under various state laws, including state antitrust laws, state unfair trade practice laws, and common law relief under theories of unjust enrichment and restitution.

This article analyzes the viability of these state law claims and concludes that state law remedies are likely to be unavailable for injuries based on transactions consummated abroad, for the same reasons the FTAIA bars antitrust claims under federal law. Additionally, these state law claims are barred by the Supremacy Clause of the U.S. Constitution, the Foreign Commerce Clause, the Due Process Clause, and the doctrine of prescriptive comity.

Background

Historically, U.S. courts have been hesitant to apply American antitrust laws to conduct occurring outside of the country. In American Banana Co. v. United Fruit Co., the Supreme Court ruled that the Sherman Act must be “confined in its operation and effect to the territorial limits over which the lawmaker has general and legitimate power.”4 As American traders became increasingly involved in the international arena, courts began to relax the hard-line view of American Banana. In Alcoa, the Second Circuit held that the Sherman Act does proscribe extraterritorial acts that are “intended to affect imports [into the United States] and did affect them.”5 At the same time, Alcoa made clear that “[w]e should not impute to Congress an intent to punish all whom its courts can catch, for conduct which has no consequences within the United States.”6 Still, the court made no attempt to identify the point at which foreign acts were qualitatively and quantitatively sufficient to affect domestic commerce to confer jurisdiction on U.S. courts.

Congress enacted the FTAIA in 1982 to clarify the reach of the Sherman Act in matters involving foreign commerce. The statute, however, was inartfully drafted and led to more confusion than clarity among courts and litigants. The Supreme Court in Empagran granted certiorari to resolve a dispute among the circuits on construction of the FTAIA. 7 The D.C. Circuit had concluded that the FTAIA allowed subject matter jurisdiction over claims by plaintiffs located in the Ukraine, Australia, Ecuador, and Panama, each of whom alleged that they had suffered injuries from a global price-fixing cartel when they bought vitamins for delivery outside of the United States. The Supreme Court vacated, holding that the FTAIA bars the exercise of subject matter jurisdiction over Sherman Act claims by foreign plaintiffs claiming illegal conduct that “significantly and adversely affects both customers outside the United States and customers within the United States” if “the adverse foreign effect is independent of any adverse domestic effect,” that is, if “the conduct’s domestic effects did not help to bring about that foreign injury.”8

The Court articulated a two-pronged rationale for its interpretation of the FTAIA. First, under principles of prescriptive comity, ambiguous statutes—and the FTAIA is, at the very least, ambiguous—should generally be interpreted so as to “avoid unreasonable interference with the sovereign authority of other nations.”9 The Court concluded that the Sherman Act may not supersede a foreign nation’s determination of how best to protect its citizens in cases where foreign conduct causes foreign injury independent of domestic injury and that foreign injury alone gives rise to foreign plaintiffs’ claims. 10 The Court further observed, citing amici filings by foreign governments, that allowing foreign plaintiffs to proceed with treble damage claims under these circumstances “would unjustifiably permit their citizens to bypass their own less generous remedial schemes, thereby upsetting a balance of competing considerations that their own domestic antitrust laws embody.”11

Second, the Court found plaintiffs’ argument for expansive construction of the FTAIA unpersuasive. As a threshold matter, the FTAIA was meant to limit—not to expand—the reach of the Sherman Act in matters involving foreign commerce. Moreover, the Court found no case decided prior to the enactment of the FTAIA that would have upheld the exercise of jurisdiction over similar foreign claims. 12 Although the Court acknowledged that plaintiffs’ argument favoring jurisdiction presented “the more natural reading of the statutory language,” considerations of comity and history made clear that plaintiffs’ reading “is not consistent with the FTAIA’s basic intent.”13 Instead, the Court adopted the narrower reading championed by defendants because “[t]hat reading furthers the statute’s basic purposes, it properly reflects considerations of comity, and it is consistent with Sherman Act history.”14 The Court emphasized that its holding “assumed that the anticompetitive conduct here independently caused foreign injury; that is, the conduct’s domestic effects did not help to bring about that foreign injury.”15

On remand, the plaintiffs argued that their injury was not unrelated to the anticompetitive effects of the cartel on U.S. commerce, urging that but for defendants’ price-fixing activities in the United States, the international cartel would have collapsed. The plaintiffs maintained that, given the fact that vitamins are fungible and readily transportable, without U.S. participation in the conspiracy, foreign purchasers would have bought vitamins in the United States at competitive prices, instead of dealing with the cartel at supracompetitive prices. By incorporating the U.S market, the cartel cut off that avenue of arbitrage. Accordingly, the plaintiffs argued that the domestic effect of the cartel caused the plaintiffs’ foreign injury.

The D.C. Circuit disagreed. The court did acknowledge that the plaintiffs had painted a plausible scenario that but for supracompetitive prices in the United States resulting from cartel activities in the United States, they would not have been injured. 16 Nevertheless, the court held that “ ‘but-for’ causation between the domestic effects and the foreign injury claim is simply not sufficient to bring anticompetitive conduct within the FTAIA exception.”17 Rather, the statutory formulation calls for “a direct causal relationship, that is, proximate causation,” between domestic effects and foreign injury, a standard that is not satisfied by establishing a mere “but-for ‘nexus.’”18 The proximate cause standard under the FTAIA has proven to be a formidable barrier to foreign plaintiffs who seek to bring antitrust suits under U.S. law in American courts.

#### Where foreign entities are unwilling or unable to prosecute cartels, the presumption against extraterritoriality leaves much of the Global South defenseless to anticompetitive predation and widens gaps in international cartel enforcement.

Michaels 16, \*Ralf Michaels, the Arthur Larson Professor of Law at Duke University School of Law; (2016, “SUPPLANTING FOREIGN ANTITRUST”, <https://scholarship.law.duke.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=4808&context=lcp>) //rhetoric modified

Why should American law supplant, for example, Canada’s or Great Britain’s or Japan’s own determination about how best to protect Canadian or British or Japanese customers from anti-competitive conduct engaged in significant part by Canadian or British or Japanese or other foreign companies?1

Thus asked Justice Breyer in his 2004 opinion in F. Hoffman-La Roche, Ltd. v. Empagran, SA,2 a case brought in U.S. federal court as a class action on behalf of purchasers of certain vitamin products on foreign (non-U.S.) markets against members of a cartel. The question was, of course, rhetorical. There seems to be, at least prima facie, no good reason to impose U.S. antitrust law on other highly developed countries with their own functioning antitrust regimes, especially without or even against these countries’ will.3

But the question was also strangely misplaced. Although Canada, Great Britain, and Japan—the countries Breyer named—had urged the Court to dismiss the claims by foreign plaintiffs,4 the countries from which the named plaintiffs stemmed—Ecuador, Panama, and Ukraine—had remained silent.5 These last three countries are representatives of less developed countries, many of which do not have very effective antitrust regimes.6 With this in mind, Breyer’s question would better have read something like this: Why should American law supplant, for example, Ecuador, Panama, or Ukraine’s antitrust regimes, insofar as these countries are unable to protect their customers from anti-competitive conduct engaged in significant part by foreign companies?

This question is harder to dismiss. Arguably, supplanting these countries’ ineffective competition regimes would serve a purpose. The question would not be one of superseding foreign regimes when there are none. The question would be one of filling regulatory gaps. Vis-à-vis countries with functioning antitrust regimes, the question is which of several countries should regulate the cartel. Vis- à-vis countries without functioning antitrust regimes, the question is whether the cartel is regulated at all. If the developed country does not regulate, no other country does. Hence, the issue is not whether to defer to a foreign antitrust agency. Instead, the question is whether to defer to the cartel’s impunity. This policy decision would require quite a different justification.

~~Developing countries~~ [the Global South] would likely do better if they had effective antitrust regimes, and other articles in this issue discuss what is required for success. But we also need solutions for situations in which ~~developing countries do~~ [the Global South does] not (yet) have such regimes, or in which they are for other reasons incapable of dealing with an international cartel. This is the situation this article addresses. It develops an argument for when and why a developed country’s antitrust regime should supplant the regime of a developing country. The question is, essentially, when and why the developed country should take over, in part, regulation of the developing country’s market.

Some limitations should be mentioned. First, the article focuses on the regulation of cartels. Although supplanting antitrust law might well work also for other issues—for example, merger control or abuse of a dominant position— these issues would require different considerations, which the article does not address. Second, for purposes of the article, a developed country is defined as a country with, and a developing country as a country without, a functioning antitrust regime. The analysis is therefore not directly applicable to developing countries that have effective regimes. By contrast, some of the arguments may be applicable to small developed countries with limited resources.7

Part II begins by laying out the tension between the need for antitrust in developing countries and the obstacles these countries face in building their own regimes. It then argues for the possibility of one country’s antitrust institutions regulating another country’s market, as long as a jurisdictional basis exists. Part III discusses this idea of supplanting antitrust, its legal background, and the factors relevant for its justifiability. Part IV applies the idea of supplanting antitrust in three constellations: multinational cartels that affect markets in both developed and developing countries; transnational cartels in which cartels from developed countries target markets in developing countries; and domestic cartels that remain confined within the boundaries of the developing country. Part V discusses a number of possible objections.

II DEVELOPING COUNTRIES AND ANTITRUST REGULATION

A. Challenges

Once, establishing antitrust regimes was thought not to benefit developing countries.8 That view is no longer prevalent. Today, more than half of the ~~developing~~ [Global South] countries in the world have antitrust regimes.9

Having laws on the books represents, however, only a first step. A greater problem for many developing countries lies in building institutions 10 and enforcing existing antitrust laws. Here, the data are somewhat unclear. Levenstein and Suslow found in 2004 that actual enforcement of existing antitrust law was widely lacking.11 Waked, by contrast, suggests that developing countries do allocate resources to the enforcement of antitrust laws, though the degree depends on, amongst others, general macroeconomic development, openness to trade and imports, and level of corruption.12 Büthe and Aydin identify several factors that constrain ~~developing~~ countries [in the Global South]: limits in financial resources and expertise, unsupportive or hostile political–legal environments, limitations to legal culture, a lack of competition culture, and underdeveloped markets 13

The enforcement problem is exacerbated for transboundary cartels with actors from outside the ~~developing countries~~ [Global South] targeting the country’s markets.14 Often, less developed countries do not even appear to recognize the impact these cartels have on their economies.15 If cartel members act outside the country, agencies have difficulties detecting and scrutinizing the cartel.16 Where they do, the global market power of firms is often badly matched by the antitrust regimes of ~~developing countries~~ [Global South].17 Even if ~~developing countries~~ [Global South] have the resources and expertise to regulate small and midsize local cartels, they may well be unable to regulate bigger and transnational or multinational cartels.18 It may often be preferable for them to allocate scarce resources to the regulation of domestic cartels.

#### Instead, foreign plaintiffs were encouraged to rely on trickle-down enforcement from developed antitrust regimes---that form of patchwork enforcement creates impunity for a host of transboundary and multinational cartels.

Martyniszyn 21, \*Dr. Marek Martyniszyn is a Senior Lecturer in Law at Queen’s University Belfast (UK). Previously he was a Senior Research Fellow in the Institute for Consumer Antitrust Studies at Loyola University Chicago. He holds a PhD from University College Dublin (completed on a prestigious Ad Astra Scholarship), an LLM (with specializations in EU Economic and World Trade Law) from the Saarland University’s European Institute, and Master degrees from the Warsaw School of Economics; (September 2021, “Competitive Harm Crossing Borders: Regulatory Gaps And A Way Forward”, <https://academic.oup.com/jcle/article/17/3/686/6095856#303280629>) //rhetoric modified

III. PART III: SHORTCOMINGS OF THE STATUS QUO

The current regulatory patchwork works relatively well for the key ~~developed~~ countries. The established competition agencies could overcome the hurdles of transnational cases if they so choose.[48](javascript:;) They have the necessary financial and human resources and expertise. This state of affairs may explain why the developed world stopped investing efforts in finding a multilateral solution to the problem of transnational anticompetitive conduct such as international cartels.

Even when foreign violators do not have assets in the ~~developed~~ states, they are unlikely to react to unfavourable enforcement outcomes by exiting the market because such markets are too important. The economic weight of a market helps to realize the potential of extraterritoriality. Economies that are less important from the violators’ perspective face a particularly uphill and unequal battle when challenging anticompetitive conduct.

In this regulatory context, the smaller and less developed countries are advised to focus their enforcement on domestic violations.[49](javascript:;) When it comes to transnational violations, such as international cartels, they are often recommended to rely on the enforcement efforts of [more] developed regimes.[50](javascript:;) That is, they are to depend on what can be called ‘trickle-down enforcement’. The implicit argument is: should an international cartel be investigated and sanctioned by one or more developed agencies, it will be disbanded and cause no further competitive harm. In other words, enforcement by more developed agencies can generate positive externalities, or spill-over effects for other regimes. Hence, there is an opportunity for enforcement free-riding. While this certainly happens, this proposition assumes that transnational violations affect developed and developing countries in a similar manner. This may be true when it comes to violations affecting virtually all world markets; in such casesprosecution effectively deals with the totality of the underlying anticompetitive conduct. For example, in the case of the Southeast Asian cartel of LCD screen manufacturers, enforcement by a number of agencies led to the restoration of competition.[51](javascript:;) Similarly, the operation of the vitamins cartel was global and attracted significant attention of enforcers in several jurisdictions.[52](javascript:;) However, not all transnational violations are omnipresent with sufficient impact on key economies to provoke vigorous enforcement and a complete discontinuation of the harmful practice. For example, the American Soda Ash Export Cartel (ANSAC), a U.S.-based export cartel, was found in breach of EU competition law in 1990.[53](javascript:;) However, this decision did not lead to its abandonment. ANSAC reorganized its activities in relation to the EU and continued operating in a business-as-usual manner in other markets. In 1996 it was challenged in India. The case failed due to the lack of an explicit textual basis in Indian law allowing for extraterritoriality. The judgment was rendered under severe pressure exerted by the United States. In 1999 the same cartel was challenged in South Africa, where—after nearly ten years of litigation—ANSAC settled.

Enforcement in the EU, India and South Africa did not lead to the break-up of ANSAC, which continues operating in various markets. This case underlines the gaps in the current regulatory framework. It shows that enforcement free-riding will not necessarily work. There may be no trickle down benefit to countries that forego domestic enforcement.

Moreover, reliance on enforcement activities of developed countries by other states is not always an option. While some transnational violations are truly global, many types of anticompetitive conduct are more limited in scope, depending on the nature and characteristic of the goods or services involved. There may be regional arrangements (for example, a regional cement cartel) or arrangements that affect only a specific group of countries (for example, a cartel concerning a good which is no longer sold in the ~~developed~~ [Global North] economies, but which is still offered in ~~developing countries~~ [the Global South]). In such cases there would be no enforcement by developed agencies to piggy-back on and therefore no trickle-down benefit, given that markets in developed economies would not be affected.

Due to the existing gaps in the regulatory framework, the recommendation to focus on domestic violations has had perhaps unintended, and somewhat perverse, consequences. Domestic infringements—which typically do not lead to transfer of wealth abroad—are pursued while transnational violations escape scrutiny, despite generally causing much greater harm [54](javascript:;) and often leading to outflow of wealth from the domestic economy. Even in cases of successful reliance on enforcement by agencies of other states (for example, in cases of truly global cartels) the transfer of wealth is not remedied. The rents extracted through supra-competitive prices are not even partially remedied by fines imposed on the violators, given that no sanctions are imposed in relation to the harm to the domestic market. Rather, the benefit is the prevention of future harm. This is only a partial success, but even this is not present in cases in which the foreign enforcement is either not robust enough to lead to discontinuation of the anticompetitive conduct in question or when such enforcement is simply missing. Hence, passive reliance on trickle-down enforcement is unsatisfactory.

Furthermore, even if free-riding on enforcement by other states can prevent future harm, this setup provides no deterrence, which is considered crucial in modern competition law. Transnational violators can feel safe and act with impunity. Any sanctions they may face will relate only to harm caused in the enforcing jurisdictions. Hence, there is no reason for them not to continue with existing—and not to create new—anticompetitive arrangements that extract wealth from markets in states that do not challenge transnational violations.[55](javascript:;) The situation is particularly grim in the case of anticompetitive practices that do not affect any major jurisdiction enforcing competition law robustly, since there will be no agency to piggy-back on and no possibility of a trickle-down benefit. The violation may remain completely off the radar should domestic agencies focus solely on domestic conduct. Moreover, even if the viability of a particular anticompetitive arrangement requires it to be global in scope, prospective violators may still find it profitable, even after taking into account any sanctions they may face in the key jurisdictions that actively challenge such transnational violations. Profits extracted from the non-enforcing jurisdictions may offset ‘related’ costs, that is sanctions imposed in the relatively few jurisdictions which do pursue such cases. This argument was made before the US Supreme Court in Empagran.[56](javascript:;) Such sanctions—especially if only financial in nature—can be seen as no more than just a selectively imposed tax on transnational anticompetitive activities. The availability of individual criminal sanctions in the form of imprisonment in some countries changes that dynamic, but does not fundamentally resolve the problem.

#### Cartels undermine good-faith market competition---that’s a precondition for recurrent economic development.
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Introduction

Microeconomic theory defines the market as perfect competition when firms provide goods at a price that equals their marginal cost. Some common characteristics of a perfectly competitive market include homogenous products, all buyers and sellers as price takers, there is complete information, and no entry and exit barriers. Under the assumption of prices equal marginal costs, firms would have no or little incentive to innovate.

It is reasonable to expect that most industries are characterized by some degree of heterogeneity and product differentiation. In this situation, the competition encourages profit-maximizing firms to innovate to achieve abnormal returns.

Rooted in management literature known as the resource-based view of the firm, Barney (1991) argues that sustainable competitive advantage derives from the resources and capabilities a firm controls that are valuable, rare, imperfectly imitable, and not substitutable. It is arguable that the firm's sustainable competitive advantage should be connected with the environment where the firm operates. Good faith competition incentivizes firms to build sustainable competitive advantages through R&D investments, product differentiation, advertising, and capital- and cost-efficiencies. Firms need to invest in tangible and intangible resources to create competitive advantages and generate abnormal returns (returns on equity higher than the cost of equity). Firms also need to continue investing in maintaining those advantages over time to create long-term value.

Kline and Rosenberg (2010) define the process of innovation as a series of changes that affect not only hardware but also production, markets, and organizations. In fair competition markets, a firm's search for creating competitive advantages provides a continuous investment process and stimulates innovation, providing economic growth, employment, and welfare enhancement (Baumol and Strom 2007, OECD 2007, Daniels 1996).

Sustainable economic growth has important implications for society. In the long run, economic growth is mainly explained by technological progress. Sustained economic growth has an amplified effect on per capita income, and it is an effective mechanism to reduce poverty rates (Barro and Sala-i-Martin 2004, Sala-i-Martin 2006, Dollar et al. 2013). United Nations' 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development1 includes eradicating poverty as an indispensable requirement for sustainable development. In fair markets, firms competing for competitive advantages take a crucial role, bringing the power of innovation that generates economic growth, resulting in an improved standard of living for the wider society. However, some firms may have incentives to collude to obtain extra-profits, harming consumers and, at the same time, negatively affecting the power of innovation. Regulators have to ensure the fair functioning of markets.

II. Advantages of good faith competition

The positive effect on society of firms' rivalry is based on three central ideas. The first one is that firms pursue a profit maximization strategy and expect to achieve abnormal returns. The second one is that industries have some degree of heterogeneity and product differentiation. Lastly, firms compete in fair markets. In this scenario, firms pursuing abnormal returns will make investments in order to develop competitive advantages. Investment in R&D is one of the most important activities driving competitive advantage, and firms in competitive industries enter into innovation races to differentiate their products. Innovation affects long-term economic growth through technological progress. The European Central Bank supports innovation as an essential driver of economic progress that benefits consumers, businesses, and the economy as a whole.

Fair market competition is one of the pillars for obtaining positive effects from rivalry. National and supranational organizations acknowledge the benefits of good faith competition. The Autorité de la concurrence, the competition regulator in France, argues that competition forces companies to be innovative and to stimulate growth and jobs. The European Union states that having firms competing fairly in the market benefits society. Consumers receive higher quality products at better prices, and competition incentivizes firms to innovate to differentiate their products and make firms more competitive in global markets.

In fair markets, the search for competitive advantages stimulates innovation and strengthens long-term economic growth. The Presidency Report to the Council of the EU (September 20th, 2019) on developing long-term strategies of sustainable growth identifies Research and Innovation (R&I) as a critical driver in response to the main challenges of the European economic growth model. Economic growth does not need to be explosive but recurrent over the long term. An example of the positive effects of long-term economic growth on income per capita is the U.S. economy. The US GPD per capita grew at a yearly rate of 1.8% between 1870 and 2000, resulting in an increase of 10 times, from $3,340 to $33,330 measured in 1996 dollars. However, reducing the yearly growth rate to 0.8%, the per capita rent in 2000 would have been $9,450, only 2.8 times the value of 1870, and the U.S. would be ranked in 45th position instead of 2nd out of 150 countries (Barro and Sala i Martin 2004). Arguably, designing good faith competition markets is a natural mechanism to promote sustainable economic growth.

Fair competition stimulates innovation, which is the main contributor to sustainable economic well-being.

III. Market failures and the need for regulation to avoid firms' misconduct

Collusion is a market failure that occurs when firms in a market coordinate, restricting competition and negatively affecting prices, outputs, and innovation. Public institutions are making a great effort in detecting firms' collusion practices that harm competition. Research on cartel overcharge shows a significant increase in price attributable to collusion (Connor 2010; Smuda 2014; Boyer and Kotchoni 2015). Among other adverse effects, collusion may provoke an extraction of consumers' welfare in favor of the cartel firms, reducing firms' incentives to invest in innovation. It is important to contextualize the relevance of collusion agreements. Private International Cartels (PIC) database, developed by Professor John M. Connor, contains detailed information for price-fixing cartels detected between 1990 and 2017. Relative to the GDP, cartels operating in Europe are triple those operating in North America, while the affected sales' size is equal between both markets, with affected sales' totaling about $900 billion, of which global cartels account for 37%.

One clear example of market manipulation is the truck cartel. In July 2016, the European Commission ("E.C.") imposed a record fine of €3 billion to MAN, Volvo/Renault, Daimler, Iveco, and DAF for continuing collusion in the medium and heavy truck market. Over 14 years, the firms colluded on pricing, the introduction of new emission technologies, and passing on compliance costs with stricter emission rules. Scania was part of the cartel practices but did not accept the fine and initiated a separate legal proceeding to defend itself from the accusations. Scania was eventually declared guilty by the E.C. and received a fine of €880m2.

One essential piece to improving good faith competition is an efficient competition law that avoids firms' misconduct. Antitrust is considered as one of the most important public policies that has aimed at protecting a public good as well as protecting consumers from predatory business practices: good faith competition. There are substitute arguments on the necessity of governments' intervention. The theory of "public interest" is based on the assumption that government can solve inefficiencies caused by monopolistic conduct and externalities through intervention. The second stream of thought states that competition and private enforcement mitigate market failures within strong legal systems and well functioning courts (Coase 1960). Shleifer (2005) highlights that the enforcement environment determines the optimal intervention system (public regulation or court-based system).

In antitrust cases, victims can initiate an action from scratch (stand-alone) or after the competition body adopts an infringement decision (follow-on). Claimants initiating a standalone action have to prove the infringement, while in follow-on actions, the claimants benefit from the antitrust resolutions. Stand-alone damage actions have high barriers for victims due to the difficulties obtaining evidence of the infringement conduct. These actions are highly costly and risky. Therefore, it may not achieve the deterrence function for colluding firms.

Private enforcement is the necessary complement for public enforcement to have efficient competition law. However, a study commissioned by the EU in 2004 identified actions for damages against antitrust infringement were totally undeveloped. In 2014, the EU adopted antitrust actions for damages to eliminate obstacles to compensation for antitrust victims and better define the relationship between public and private enforcement. The Directive 2014/104/EU facilitates private enforcement through follow-on actions for damages on European Commission or national competition bodies' resolutions.

Among other changes, the Directive establishes that the competition regulators' final decision is binding before courts. It also states that there is a presumption that cartels cause harm3 , and cartel victims have to prove in national courts the amount of loss they suffered from an infringement. The Directive establishes a time-barred period of five years to bring cases to courts since the infringement has ceased, so victims will have had sufficient time to bring an action. Before the Directive enaction, limitation periods differed considerably among member states, and the starting period cannot be precisely identified.

While this new regulation facilitates victims' actions and incentivizes private enforcement, it is still complex in time and cost. The main difficulties that claimants face are related to proving and quantifying this misconduct's effects on their specific situation. The quantification of the economic effects usually requires a large sample of data and a high level of expertise to deal with it properly. It is difficult to prove the economic effects of the misconduct with single-case data.

The limitations associated with single enforcements have generated an opportunity for funds who are willing to invest in damage claims. Currently, litigation funds provide complete financing for the process under a profit-sharing structure, and even some investors are directly acquiring such claims4 .

In December 2020, the European Union adopted the Directive 2020/1828 on representative actions to protect consumers' collective interests. It is one additional step in the regulation process to protect consumers' interests against infringement actions.

The new regulation, jointly with the interest of funds to support these claims, enhances private enforcement in Europe, and it is an important element in promoting the good faith competition disincentivizing firms to collude.

IV. Conclusion

Within perfect competition, profits are zero at the maximum, and firms have little or no incentives to innovate because they cannot create sustainable competitive advantages. However, most industries have some degree of heterogeneity and differentiation. In product-differentiation markets and under good faith competition, profit-maximization firms have incentives to obtain abnormal returns through value-creating strategies that competitors cannot replicate. This search for competitive advantage creates a virtuous cycle of innovation, which is the pillar for economic growth, employment, and welfare enhancement.

Poverty reduction is one of the main goals of governments and multilateral organizations. Sustained economic growth is a powerful mechanism to reduce poverty providing new employment opportunities and making education more accessible to the wider population. It also incentivizes entrepreneurship. All these factors improve competitiveness, which results in more economic growth.

Markets have to operate in good faith to achieve the advantages of innovation. Governments have to ensure the fair-functioning of the markets. However, firms may try to extract consumers' welfare through anti-competitive agreements. Cartels are situations in which firms decide to cooperate and not compete, thereby injuring customers by rising prices, restricting production, or reducing their investments in R&D. These anti-competitive agreements reduce innovation and negatively affect economic growth.

Competition law plays an essential role in disincentivizing firms to collude. The interaction of antitrust regulation and private enforcement is a powerful instrument in deterring future antitrust violations and supporting good faith competition.

Sustainable growth is one dimension of sustainable development. The evaluation of sustainable development requires the inclusion of other relevant factors in the equation, such as reducing carbon emissions and global warming, reducing « with-in » countries' inequality, and ensuring equal opportunities for all.

There is an open discussion on the correct balance between the three dimensions of sustainable development- economic, environmental, and social. One example of the adequacy of the sustainability indicators is the recent research developed by Einsenmenger et al. (2020) that criticizes the overweight of economic growth versus ecological integrity in the SDGs of the U.N.'s 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Some economic models offer a new approach for including sustainability factors in the equation. The so-called Doughnut Economy (Raworth 2017) includes planetary and social as upper and lower boundaries for economic growth. The planetary boundaries assure that economic growth does not put too much pressure on the planet's health and includes, among other concepts, climate change, ocean acidification, and the loss of biological diversity. The social boundaries include life's essentials, from food to healthcare and education. Lastly, there is a sweet spot area for economic growth within those two boundaries, environmentally friendly and socially.

In sum, there are multiple potential trade-offs between economic growth and social and environmental impacts, and each generation will have to decide what is the right balance. But whatever the chosen balance is, we argue that good faith competition is still a minimum requirement to promote long-term sustainable growth that helps reduce poverty and improve people's standard of living and well-being around the world.

#### The upside of market competition outweighs and solves alt causes to economic development.

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

A persistent challenge that faces the governments of least-developed countries as well as policy advisors at the Bretton Woods Institutions, the United Nations, and aid agencies is: how to foster sustainable broad-based economic growth, development, and poverty reduction. During the past two decades or more, various policy approaches have been explored. In the “first-generation reforms,” the World Bank Group and the International Monetary Fund (IMF), among others, focused on promoting the macroeconomic stability and trade integration of countries. Second-generation reforms moved from the broad policy environment to encourage more microeconomic changes, namely, improvements in the administrative, legal, and regulatory functions of the State. Of late, particular emphasis has been placed on the role of the public sector in establishing an “investment climate” conducive to promoting private sector-led investment, growth, and poverty alleviation.

The quality of a country’s investment climate determines the risks and transaction costs of investing in and operating a business. These risks and costs are in turn determined by the legal and regulatory framework, barriers to entry-exit, and conditions prevailing in markets for labor, finance, infrastructure services, and other productive inputs. Essentially, the quality of the investment climate will determine the mobility and speed with which resources can be redeployed from lower to higher productive uses. For this to occur effectively, the nature and degree of competition in markets plays a pivotal role. In this regard, there is significant economic evidence suggesting that private investment has grown faster in countries with better investment climates. Also, economies with competitive domestic markets tend to attract more domestic and foreign direct investment, have higher levels and rates of growth in per capita gross domestic product (GDP), and lower rates of poverty.1

Promoting effective competition is often argued on grounds that it spurs firms to focus on efficiency and improve consumer welfare by offering greater choice of higher-quality products and services at lower prices. However, it also promotes greater accountability and transparency in government-business relations and decision making, and contributes to reducing corruption, lobbying, and rent-seeking behavior. Additionally, by lowering barriers to entry, it provides opportunities for broad-based participation in the economy and for sharing in the benefits of economic growth. Without effective competition, firms are more likely to possess considerable market power, which enables them to earn excess profits and wield political influence to tilt public policy in their favor. There are also likely to be distorted price and profit signals and increased risk of misguided investment and output decisions, which can lead to economy-wide repercussions.

The merits and benefits of fostering open and competitive markets have been recognized in many countries that have adopted various macro- and microeconomic reforms. However, there is wide variation in the economic growth and development of nations. Casual observations indicate that there is also a wide variation in the nature and extent of competition prevailing within and across countries. Moreover, notwithstanding the merits and benefits of competition, there is no consensus or widespread support for promoting competition within and across countries—especially developing nations. This stems in part from the lack of understanding or appreciation of what effective competition can tangibly contribute to the betterment of the lives of ordinary citizens, and in part from ideological differences and the influence wielded by vested interest groups in both government and the economy at large. Although the differences in the economic growth and development of nations cannot purport to be explained by the differences in the prevailing degrees of competition, this paper argues that it is one of the important, if not critical explanatory factors. It is well established that least-developed economies are encumbered by limitations of human and physical capital, governance and institutional structures, and other resource constraints. But they are also prevented from achieving their potential by various types of public policy-based and private sector anticompetitive business practices. The primary message of this paper is that these countries need to take concrete, consistent, and coherent measures to integrate and promote effective competition policy as part of their overall government economic and regulatory framework. An effective competition policy should be viewed as the “fourth cornerstone” of this framework— along with sound monetary, fiscal, and commercial (international trade) policies.

#### Sustainable development defuses a confluence of threats to global security---extinction.

UNSC 17, \*United Nations Security Council, (December 20th, 2017, “Prevention, Development Must Be at Centre of All Efforts Tackling Emerging Complex Threats to International Peace, Secretary-General Tells Security Council”, https://www.un.org/press/en/2017/sc13131.doc.htm)

Prevention, Development Must Be at Centre of All Efforts Tackling Emerging Complex Threats to International Peace, Secretary-General Tells Security Council

Prevention and development must be at the centre of all efforts to address both the quantitative and qualitative changes that were emerging in threats around the world, the Secretary‑General of the United Nations told the Security Council today, as some 60 Member States participated in an all‑day debate tackling complex contemporary challenges to international peace and security.

António Guterres said the perils of nuclear weapons were once again front and centre, with tensions higher than those during the Cold War.  Climate change was a threat multiplier and technology advances had made it easier for extremists to communicate.  Conflicts were longer, with some lasting 20 years on average, and were more complex, with armed and extremist groups linked with each other and with the worldwide threat of terrorism.  Transnational drug smugglers and human traffickers were perpetuating the chaos and preying on refugees and migrants.

The changing nature of conflict meant rethinking approaches that included integrated action, he said, stressing that prevention must be at the centre of all efforts.  Development was one of the best instruments of prevention. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development would help build peaceful societies. Respect for human rights was also essential and there was a need to invest in social cohesion so that all felt they had a stake in society.

He also emphasized that women’s participation was crucial to success, from conflict prevention to peacemaking and sustaining peace.  Where women were in power, societies flourished, he pointed out.  Sexual violence against women, therefore, must be addressed and justice pursued for perpetrators.

Prevention also included preventive diplomacy, he said, noting that the newly established High-level Advisory Board on Mediation had met for the first time.  The concept of human security was a useful frame of reference for that work, as it was people‑centred and holistic and emphasized the need to act early and prioritize the most vulnerable.

“Let us work together to enhance the Council’s focus on emerging situations, expand the toolbox, increase resources for prevention, and be more systematic in avoiding conflict and sustaining peace,” he said, emphasizing the need for Council unity.  Without it, he said, the parties to conflict might take more inflexible and intransigent positions, and the drivers of conflict might push situations to the point of no return.

Japan’s representative, Council President for December, spoke in his national capacity, noting that in the 25 years since the end of the Cold War, there had been a rise in complex contemporary challenges to international peace and security.  That included the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, the expansion of terrorism, and non‑traditional challenges such as non‑State actors and inter‑State criminal organizations.

While the Council had been tackling those challenges, in most cases through a country or region‑specific context, he stressed that a human security approach was highly relevant when addressing complex contemporary challenges to international peace and security.  Such an approach placed the individual at the centre, based on a cross‑sectoral understanding of insecurities.  It also entailed a broadened understanding of threats and challenges.

In the ensuing debate, speakers emphasized the need to adjust to the changing challenges to international peace and security and welcomed the Secretary General’s reform of the Organization’s security pillar and other initiatives.  Many stressed the need to address root causes of instability and conflict, including climate change, non‑State armed groups, extremism and terrorism, as well as poverty and underdevelopment.

#### Independently, development deflates wars globally.

Cortright 16, \*David Cortright, Director of the Global Policy Initiative; Special Advisor for Policy Studies; Professor Emeritus of the Practice, Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies; (May 18th, 2016, “Linking Development and Peace: The Empirical Evidence”, https://peacepolicy.nd.edu/2016/05/18/linking-development-and-peace-the-empirical-evidence/)

The connections between development and peace are firmly supported by social science research. All the standard indicators of economic development, including per capita income, economic growth rates, levels of trade and investment, and degree of market openness, are significantly correlated with peace. Virtually every study on the causes of war finds a strong connection between low income and the likelihood of armed conflict. Economist Edward Miguel describes this link as “one of the most robust empirical relationships in the economic literature.” Irrespective of all other variables and indicators, poverty as measured by low income bears a strong and statistically significant relationship to increased risk of civil conflict.

No one has made this point more convincingly over the years than Paul Collier. He and his colleagues have shown that civil conflict is heavily concentrated in the poorest countries. The risk of civil war is strongly associated with joblessness, poverty and a general lack of development. They famously [conclude](https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/13938), “The key root cause of conflict is the failure of economic development.” They also make the reverse point. Raising economic growth rates and levels of per capita income may be “the single most important step that can be taken” to reduce the likelihood of armed conflict.

War is reverse development. It undermines economic well-being and reduces income levels. War may bring profit for the few, those ‘masters of war’ as Bob Dylan called them, but it creates economic misery for many. Once started, war becomes a self-sustaining system, an “economy of war” Mary Kaldor calls it in New and Old Wars, a feeding trough for profiteers, warlords and mobsters that becomes exceedingly difficult to stop.

War reduces life expectancy and destroys education and public health systems. It tears apart the social fabric. The [World Development Report 2011](http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTWDRS/Resources/WDR2011_Full_Text.pdf) calculates the cost of a major civil war as equivalent to more than 30 years of typical growth for a medium-size developing country. Trade levels take 20 years to recover. The negative economic impact of conflict helps to explain why countries at war are often caught in a deadly conflict trap, why the chief legacy of a civil war is another war.

#### Specifically, the Middle East---sluggish growth perpetuates proxy conflicts.

Eaton et al. 19, \*Tim Eaton, Senior Research Fellow, Middle East and North Africa Programme; \*Dr Renad Mansour, Senior Research Fellow, Middle East and North Africa Programme; Project Director, Iraq Initiative; \*[Dr Lina Khatib,](https://www.chathamhouse.org/about-us/our-people/lina-khatib) Director, Middle East and North Africa Programme; \*Dr Christine Cheng, Lecturer in War Studies, King's College London; \*Jihad Yazigi, Journalist and Analyst; (February 2019, “Conflict Economies in the Middle East and North Africa”, <https://www.chathamhouse.org/2019/06/conflict-economies-middle-east-and-north-africa-0/1-introduction>)

1. Introduction

The conflicts in Iraq, Libya, Syria and Yemen have killed hundreds of thousands of people and displaced millions. In Iraq, the defeat of Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) is unlikely to lead to lasting stability because it does not address fundamental conditions on the ground which allow violent extremist groups to resurge every few years. In Libya’s fragmented political and security environment, a wide range of largely local actors continue to compete violently for influence, as evidenced by the latest major outbreak of fighting around Tripoli. In Syria, ISIS fighters have been forced out of their last enclave in Baghouz, while President Bashar al-Assad consolidates his control over territory in the rest of the country. In Yemen, a precarious ceasefire on the Red Sea coast has led to an intensification of battles between the Houthis and their rivals on other front lines.

Other states within the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region, along with Western states, have often been active proxy participants in these conflicts, supporting certain groups over others in pursuit of national interests. The impacts have also been felt far beyond MENA borders, as refugees fleeing conflict areas have travelled to Europe and other Western countries, sparking outcry over a supposed ‘migration crisis’ which has in fact been instrumentalized by political actors.

Identity-based discourses

To explain the violence that has struck the region, many scholars, policymakers, journalists and pundits have focused their analysis on ideological and identity-based factors. Developments in Iraq, Syria and Yemen have been viewed predominantly through the lens of ethno-sectarian politics.[10](https://www.chathamhouse.org/2019/06/conflict-economies-middle-east-and-north-africa-0/CHHJ6854-War-Economies-190620-1.xhtml#footnote-037) In Libya, significant attention has been paid to the development of Islamist and Salafi-jihadi movements since 2011, particularly in policy circles.[11](https://www.chathamhouse.org/2019/06/conflict-economies-middle-east-and-north-africa-0/CHHJ6854-War-Economies-190620-1.xhtml#footnote-036) In Iraq, the conflict since 2003 has been explained as a sectarian battle between Shia and Sunni Arabs, with the assumption that these identities are easily carved out along ethno-sectarian lines.

Exclusively identity-centric explanations of conflict at times miss important realities on the ground

Such exclusively identity-centric explanations of conflict at times miss important realities on the ground. As the knowledge base around MENA political dynamics has expanded, so too has our common understanding of how ethnic and religious divisions in the region have intersected with other critical factors. This has enabled more accurate and layered analyses.[12](https://www.chathamhouse.org/2019/06/conflict-economies-middle-east-and-north-africa-0/CHHJ6854-War-Economies-190620-1.xhtml#footnote-035) Chatham House research has sought to broaden policy analysis through its focus on the political economy of the conflicts in question.[13](https://www.chathamhouse.org/2019/06/conflict-economies-middle-east-and-north-africa-0/CHHJ6854-War-Economies-190620-1.xhtml#footnote-034)

Exploring the political economy of war

Against this backdrop, this report seeks to expand the discourse by analysing economic drivers of conflict in Iraq, Libya, Syria and Yemen. Factors such as rent-seeking, economic coping strategies and local political expediency are key to understanding the civil wars in these countries, yet they tend to be under-emphasized. As the conflicts have progressed, the national and local economies in which they are embedded have likewise evolved.

Over the past several decades, research on the political economy of war has sought to explain the initiation,[14](https://www.chathamhouse.org/2019/06/conflict-economies-middle-east-and-north-africa-0/CHHJ6854-War-Economies-190620-1.xhtml#footnote-033) duration [15](https://www.chathamhouse.org/2019/06/conflict-economies-middle-east-and-north-africa-0/CHHJ6854-War-Economies-190620-1.xhtml#footnote-032) and character of war.[16](https://www.chathamhouse.org/2019/06/conflict-economies-middle-east-and-north-africa-0/CHHJ6854-War-Economies-190620-1.xhtml#footnote-031) Initially, as with the MENA wars of today, the dominant discourse in studies of the 1990s civil wars was identity-centred.[17](https://www.chathamhouse.org/2019/06/conflict-economies-middle-east-and-north-africa-0/CHHJ6854-War-Economies-190620-1.xhtml#footnote-030) Following ethnic cleansing in the former Yugoslavia, the Rwandan genocide, the end of apartheid in South Africa, and the violence of clan conflicts in Somalia, civil war was viewed largely as a product of group identity.[18](https://www.chathamhouse.org/2019/06/conflict-economies-middle-east-and-north-africa-0/CHHJ6854-War-Economies-190620-1.xhtml#footnote-029) In contrast, the quantitative study of war economies that subsequently developed in the late 1990s and early 2000s contended that economic motivations – especially in resource-rich areas – rather than group identities provided greater explanatory power for the onset of armed conflict. On the qualitative side, case study research focusing largely on sub-Saharan Africa (and, to a lesser extent, on Latin America and Asia) showed that profit-based incentives are co-mingled with narratives of grievance and embedded in a larger global political economy.[19](https://www.chathamhouse.org/2019/06/conflict-economies-middle-east-and-north-africa-0/CHHJ6854-War-Economies-190620-1.xhtml#footnote-028) The heart of that debate was about identifying economic self-interest as the main motivation for rebels joining and fighting civil wars.[20](https://www.chathamhouse.org/2019/06/conflict-economies-middle-east-and-north-africa-0/CHHJ6854-War-Economies-190620-1.xhtml#footnote-027)

More recent work on horizontal inequality has added nuance to these discussions. It has moved beyond a binary ‘greed versus grievance’ distinction to illustrating how group grievances are constructed. Such research seeks to demonstrate empirically how an unequal distribution of power and resources between groups generates conditions for violent mobilization.[21](https://www.chathamhouse.org/2019/06/conflict-economies-middle-east-and-north-africa-0/CHHJ6854-War-Economies-190620-1.xhtml#footnote-026) More generally, the incorporation of economic motives into analysis of civil war has revealed that members of rebel organizations, militias and paramilitaries have joined[22](https://www.chathamhouse.org/2019/06/conflict-economies-middle-east-and-north-africa-0/CHHJ6854-War-Economies-190620-1.xhtml#footnote-025) and stayed in such groups[23](https://www.chathamhouse.org/2019/06/conflict-economies-middle-east-and-north-africa-0/CHHJ6854-War-Economies-190620-1.xhtml#footnote-024) for a variety of reasons, and that the relative weighting of these imperatives can change over time. Individuals may join (or be forced to join) an armed group for one set of reasons, and stay for an entirely different set of reasons.

To date, the ‘political economy of war’ approach has had limited application in analysis of the MENA region.[24](https://www.chathamhouse.org/2019/06/conflict-economies-middle-east-and-north-africa-0/CHHJ6854-War-Economies-190620-1.xhtml#footnote-023) Yet we find that the insights of the literature associated with this approach resonate in each of our four case studies. We show how economic motivations at the individual and group level can offer an alternative or complementary explanation for armed group membership and armed group violence. While some people will fight to promote or defend a particular identity, others fight for economic survival or enrichment. For many more, these motivations are tied together, and separating out ‘greed’ and ‘grievance’ is a difficult, if not impossible, task. By focusing on conflict economies in a localized way, we aim to rebalance how the wars in Iraq, Libya, Syria and Yemen are portrayed and analysed. Even if economic motivations did not spark these wars initially, it is now clear that such motivations play a critical role in the persistence of open fighting, localized violence and coercion.

#### Middle East conflicts escalate to World War III.

Tonhnor 18, \*Author at Proutist Universal; (March 27th, 2018, “A Ticking Time Bomb: Proxy Wars and the Tragedy of the Kurds”, https://prout.info/blog/2018/03/27/a-ticking-time-bomb-proxy-wars-and-the-tragedy-of-the-kurds/)

Since the Arab Spring, the armed conflicts in the Middle East have escalated to a point where they pose the greatest risk to world peace in our times.

While the media is focusing on the threat posed by North Korea due to its nuclear weapons, the chances for an all-out escalation are small, for the reasons I outlined in a previous article. If we accept the premise that Kim Jong-un is a shrewd, calculating politician (and all signs indicates that he is) it does not matter if he is ruthless, cruel, and self-serving. Whatever nuclear arsenal he has, it is just a fraction of one percent of the size of the arsenal of the United States. Hence, he knows that he cannot possibly win a nuclear war with the United States.

By developing proven nuclear capabilities his negotiating power has vastly increased, and insures that nobody can take North Korea lightly. The timing of his recent diplomatic overtures towards South Korea has buttressed this point. He waited until he had proven that he had intercontinental missiles capable of striking the United States. He then turned down his aggressive rhetoric and instead turned up his charm. This is not the act of a madman. It is a clever political game.

Middle East Tinder Box

The situation in the Middle East is not so simple. We are not dealing with one regime in complete control over its armed forces, but rather a host of unstable states and armed groups of a number of persuasions and interests. In addition to this, the two most powerful countries in the world are actively involved in the war on one side or the other. While Russia has combat troops on the ground in Syria, the United States is actively supporting groups that are directly fighting Russian and Syrian government troops.

If we add the powerful regional powers, such as Iran, Israel, Turkey and Saudi Arabia, who all have their own strategic reasons to fight, we have a truly explosive mix. At present there is seemingly no way all parties can be satisfied. The region has become a battle ground for political influence and power.

Even though the conflict started out as a proxy fight, today the main protagonists are directly involved in the war. The United States has since decades had troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, and Russia now has a strong military presence in Syria. Depending on how the situation develops, the United States may increase its number of troops in Iraq, and may even decide to put troops on the ground in Syria to protect its strategic interests.

Most recently Turkey has launched a full scale offensive into Syria, attacking the Kurdish guerrilla fighters which are supported by the United States. This creates an unprecedented situation where two NATO allies are coming in direct military conflict with each other. The long term consequences of this is hard to foresee, but it could potentially destabilize an institution that has been the main military force in Europe since the Second World War.

Why is Turkey so keen on attacking the Kurds? To understand this, we need to take a look back in history.

A Brief History of the Kurds

Like the Rohingya, the Kurds are a people without a country. They emerged as a group in Iran during the Medieval Period, and are presently constituting a sizeable minority in Turkey, Iran, Iraq, and Syria. They have a distinct language that has strong similarities with Persian and Baluchi, suggesting a common ancestry. The first recorded military clash involved Arab Commander Utba ibn Farqad, who in 641 AD conquered a number of Kurdish forts. Since then the Kurds have throughout the centuries participated in many revolts, but although they managed to establish a number of Kurdish Principalities, mainly in the mountains, they never managed to get a state of their own.

Apart from wars, they have also been subjected to massacres, including the Massacre of Ganja in 1606, when all men, women and children of the Sunni Kurdish tribe of Jekirlu were killed.

Kurdish nationalism emerged at the end of the 19thcentury, and since then they have been striving for nationhood. The problem is that the Kurds are not in majority in any country, and to form a nation they would have to carve out a territory from Syria, Iraq, Turkey, Iran, and other nations, and none of these nations would allow something like that to happen. Hence, the Kurds have few friends in the region. Yet the Kurds are a sizeable minority, and so they cannot be ignored either. A minority group of 1% can be marginalized and even exterminated, but with a minority population close to 20% in Iraq, Syria and Turkey, this is not possible to achieve with the Kurds. For example, 19% of the population in Turkey is Kurdish, some 5 million people.

In the past 50 years, the Kurds have been fighting for autonomy and independence. While they managed to create an autonomous region in Northern Iraq, and recently had substantial military success in Syria and managed to carve out a sizeable territory there, they have had little success in Turkey. The Kurdish Workers’ Party, PKK, has for a long time been fighting for autonomy in Turkey, and from 1984 to 1999, and again from 2004 to 2012, the Turkish military engaged in open war with the PKK.

Fearing that the Kurds will use their newly gained territories in Northern Syria as a spring board to launch fresh guerrilla attacks across the border, Turkey has now decided to invade the Kurdish controlled areas of Iraq to create a buffer zone to prevent the PKK to operate from Iraq. This is a serious escalation in the conflict, as it is the first time in recent history a country in the Middle East is directly invading a neighbor state. This is naturally seen as a threat by the Syrian regime, so while fighting the Kurdish forces in other places, they have tacitly allowed the Kurdish YPG (“People’s Protection Unit”) to pass through government controlled areas to resupply the areas attacked by Turkey. It seems everyone is fighting everyone and nobody really knows who is an enemy and who is a friend.

Western Support for the Kurds

While the vast majority of Kurds are Sunni Muslims, there are also Shiites, Christians and even Jews among them. They are one of the few cultural groups in the Middle East which practice religious tolerance. For example, the Kurdish Regional Government in Northern Iraq rejected Islamic teachers from Bagdad, and declared that their schools should be religiously neutral. The bonds that keep the Kurdish nation together is cultural, and not religious. The Kurds have all the hallmarks of a distinct Samaj.

Kurdish women have generally a better standing in society than that of other women in the Middle East. They have actively taken part in both political and military struggles. ISIS fear the female Peshmerga and the YPJ (“Women’s Protection Force”) forces more than any other enemy, since being killed by a woman would send their souls to hell!

These characteristics have made them the ‘ideal’ partner for the Unites States. The civil war in Syria, has enabled the Kurds to capture much territory, and their clear intention is to hold on to it and create a Kurdish nation.

Unfortunately for the Kurds, the support from the West is purely tactical, and probably none of the Western powers would be happy to see the emergence of a Kurdish nation. A Kurdish nation would be fiercely opposed by all countries in the Middle East that have Kurdish minorities, and the West could politically not afford to back such a scenario.

The Endgame

While we can hope that the conflict is localized to the Middle East, there is no guarantee that it will not escalate to a worldwide conflict. But even in a best case scenario, the suffering in the region is far from over and millions more will die or be made refugees before it will get any better.

#### The plan solves---reinvigorating antitrust enforcement in the Middle East unlocks sweeping economic improvements.

World Bank 19, \*World Bank is an international financial institution that provides loans and grants to the governments of low- and middle-income countries for the purpose of pursuing capital projects; (October 2019, “Reaching New Heights: Promoting Fair Competition in the Middle East and North Africa”, https://thedocs.worldbank.org/en/doc/660811570642119982-0280022019/original/ENMEMReachingNewHeightsOCT19.pdf)

1A. Making MENA Markets Competitive10

Economies in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) have two faces. One is the concentrated and sclerotic formal sector, often dominated by state-owned enterprises (SOEs) and politically connected private companies. That economy keeps out competitors, misallocates resources, and generates excessive profits for participants. The official economy coexists with an informal economy in which most of the population toils in relatively small operations at low wages and with few social protections.11

A powerful way to invigorate MENA economies would be to inject more competition. That would create a more efficient official economy and reduce informality.

Economists suggest that competition is a powerful tool for ensuring that resources are used in the best way that is technologically feasible—minimizing costs (and therefore prices) and helping ensure that goods and services are provided in the amount and variety consumers desire. As firms compete against each other to make a profit, they have an incentive to invest in research and development to improve the production of existing goods and services and to introduce new ones12. More competition also leads to higher growth in output per worker (productivity) and therefore is a key ingredient in long-run sustainable development13.

Market entry by new firms and the exit of inefficient companies are potent sources of competition. But in the MENA region there are often sizeable barriers that prevent new firms from entering existing markets and protections for inefficient ones. Ease of entry and exit is what determines contestability, and it is the result of the interplay between the available production technology and the regulatory framework in place.

Moreover, when state-owned enterprises (SOEs) are present, it is fundamental that they do not benefit from any type of advantage over their private competitors—whether by obtaining specific inputs (physical or financial) or by receiving easier market access. In brief, the institutional framework must be geared towards the principle of competitive neutrality—that all enterprises face the same set of rules whether they are public or private and that government involvement or ownership of a firm confers no special advantage.

Competition and contestability are essential to creating economic opportunity, which allows workers to help shape their destiny through personal initiative. Competition also increases the purchasing power of incomes, because firms find it harder to set prices above cost. Moreover, these effects are reinforced through cost-reducing technological progress and firm turnover, which allows the most productive firms to survive14. The overall effect is that competition can be an antidote to inequality15. As Eleanor Fox put it: “Markets empower people to help themselves. Markets and access to markets stand side by side with food, health, shelter, education, environment, infrastructure, and institutions as critical tools to combat the world’s greatest economic deprivations”16. But, as the father of modern economics, Adam Smith, recognized in The Wealth of Nations, a well-functioning competitive process cannot be taken for granted17.

That means countries must undertake policies that foster competition. Those policies include an effective antitrust law that keeps in check restrictive practices of the private sector and of government interventions to preserve a level playing field—which means that any regulation that distorts markets in pursuit of the general interest18 should not create any unnecessary barriers. But it also means that when state owned enterprises (SOEs) are present or subsidy programs are involved, competitive neutrality should be ensured for all market participants (see Figure II.1).

In 1890, the United States recognized that legislation was needed to preserve and nurture competitive forces by passing the Sherman Act. The law was a reaction to the dangerous concentration of economic and political power in large companies and trusts that characterized the so-called Gilded Age19. Since then, almost every country has adopted some form of competition law, with a substantial acceleration during the past few decades20.

In the MENA region, four countries lack antitrust legislation—Iran, Lebanon, Libya and West Bank and Gaza–while Bahrain and Iraq have no competition authority to enforce their law (see Table II.1).

Extensive information exists about the competition frameworks of seven MENA countries—Algeria, Egypt, Jordan, Kuwait, Morocco, Oman, and Tunisia21. The evidence shows that they lack key elements of effective regimes, placing substantial costs on their economies. In addition, weak enforcement is a major problem. Its importance is demonstrated by the increase in the value of the divested assets that followed successes in breaking up market concentration.

The breakup of Standard Oil in the United States is a vivid example. When the U.S. government sued Standard Oil in 1906, the company controlled more than 90 percent of U.S. oil refining. After the courts broke Standard Oil into 34 entities in 1911, their combined stock value increased so rapidly that a few years later it was five times higher22. Such an experience is relevant for the MENA countries, where many economic sectors are dominated by few companies even though there are no technological reasons for such a level of market concentration. A striking example is exclusive import licensing for goods for which countries are not self-sufficient (see Box II.1).

Moreover, strong antitrust action can unleash substantial technological advancement, as suggested by two landmark U.S. cases—against IBM and Microsoft 23. The IBM case effectively opened the software industry by forcing IBM to stop selling computers and software as a package.24 The Microsoft case in 2001 likely kept the Seattle-based giant from trying to monopolize the nascent new economy by preemptively crushing companies such as Amazon, Facebook and Google (as it did to the competing web-browser Netscape, which sparked the antitrust action).

Lack of contestability in MENA is arguably a main culprit in the slow pace of technology adoption that has historically characterized the region, which significantly hurt its growth performance. Without substantial reforms to encourage competition, MENA countries risk missing the opportunities offered by digitization and the so-called Fourth Industrial Revolution (See Box II.2).

#### Lax cartel enforcement devastates Latin American development---supplanting competition law solves.

World Bank 21, \*World Bank is an international financial institution that provides loans and grants to the governments of low- and middle-income countries for the purpose of pursuing capital projects; (2021, “FIXING MARKETS, NOT PRICES”, <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/35985/Fixing-Markets-Not-Prices-Policy-Options-to-Tackle-Economic-Cartels-in-Latin-America-and-the-Caribbean.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>) //rhetoric modified

Cartels in LAC have affected hundreds of markets and the large majority went undetected22

Over the last 4 decades, more than 300 economic cartels have been revealed - mostly in markets that provide key inputs to firms or essential goods to families. Between 1980 and 2020, in over 300 incidences, firms supplying markets as critical as milk, sugar, poultry, transport, energy and medicines chose to jointly fix higher prices, restrict total production, divide or share markets, rig bids, or obstruct the entry of new competitors – that is, to create economic cartels. Instead of vying for consumers with better deals and higher quality, more than 2,500 firms and 153 trade associations engaged in these agreements in 19 different sectors.

Cartels affect important markets with large market players. Previous evidence of international cartels from 1990 to 2007 suggests that between USD 150 and 200 billion worth of sales in LAC were affected by discovered cartels, and consumers in this region paid overcharges of at least USD 35 billion from 1990 to 2007 (Ivaldi, Julien, Rey, Seabright, & Tirole, 2003).23 Based on newly available information, 89 of the firms that formed cartels in LAC had total revenues of USD 81 billion in 2019, equivalent to what would constitute the 8th largest GDP in LAC.24

The cartel activity revealed so far affects a significant share of the economy. Evidence based on a selected number of cartels in developing economies between 1995 and 2013 shows that affected sales of cartel members related to GDP at a given point in time reaches up to 6.4 percent. As much as 3.4-8.4 percent of imports in ~~developing~~ [Global South] countries may be affected by cartel agreements (Levenstein, Suslow, & Oswald, 2003). New evidence for LAC now reveals that the Competition Watchdog in El Salvador, even with limited cartel enforcement trajectory, has detected 7 cartels that affected sales in the amount to 0.4 to 0.8 percent of GDP between 2006 and 2011. This does not even take into account that some of the cartel agreements occurred at the upstream level and may have also affected the downstream industries (such as in the case of wheat and bread).

The true pervasiveness of economic cartel activity is at least tenfold. While over 300 cartels have been detected and dismantled by respective authorities in LAC, studies from advanced economies show that even mature competition authorities only detect between 10 and 20 percent of cartel activity (See Box 1). Given the incipient status or even entire lack of cartel enforcement in most parts of LAC, the extent to which consumers and businesses are affected is likely manifold. For example, of at least 84 large global cartels that were shown to fix prices in LAC at some point between 1990 and 2007, only four were investigated by authorities in this region (Connor, 2008).

Detection rates of cartel activity in LAC may be particularly low in some sectors, such as the financial sector. In the European Union (EU), 28 percent of cases against anti-competitive practices between 2013 and 2017 targeted the financial sector and revealed several high-profile price-fixing agreements in markets such as financial derivative products linked to the Euro Interbank Offered Rate (EURIBOR), Japanese Yen LIBOR, Swiss Franc IRDs and future Swiss Franc LIBOR. However, only one of seven mature competition authorities in LAC have opened antitrust investigations in the banking sector, and only one of them related to cartel activity: Mexico detected and fined agreements to manipulate sovereign bond prices (WBG, 2020). In Colombia, 2 banking associations, 14 banks and 2 payment systems network providers entered into commitments with the competition authority to end an investigation regarding an agreement among banks to fix interchange fees.2

Cartels hurt the poor, stifle growth and limit policy effectiveness

Cartels are particularly harmful for economic development objectives: By eliminating competition among firms, they lose incentives to innovate, and charge higher prices. These consequences disproportionately and directly affect the poorest households. Cartels limit growth by affecting productivity and competitiveness. Finally, cartels undermine effectiveness of public policies. Benefits of trade liberalization do not materialize when firms collude across borders or agree to block imports. Governments can procure fewer public goods and services (medicine, public works, school supplies, etc.) when procurement processes are rigged. The following section will briefly discuss the existing evidence and new insights from the novel data on LAC.

Economic cartels affect the poor. Cartels disproportionally affect poor households because they are common in markets affecting products in the basic consumption basket. At least 21 percent of the cartels detected involved basic consumption products such as sugar, toilet paper, wheat, poultry, milk, and medicines.26 Global estimates suggest consumers pay on average 49 percent more when buying from cartels, and 80 percent more when cartels are stronger.27 In LAC, in 65 percent of cartels detected over the last decades with information available on prices charged, consumers experienced overcharges ranging between 5-25 percent and in at least 4 percent of the cases, consumers had to pay as much as twice for the products and services. A simple comparison of public expenditure efficiency from South Africa suggests that public resources spent on cartel enforcement would be 38 times more effective in tackling poverty than cash transfers, when considering that part of the cash transferred to eligible household is spent on overcharges for basic food items (Purfield, et al., 2016).

Collusive agreements lower economic growth prospects by depressing productivity growth and reducing competitiveness. First, agreements among competitors to limit competition affect productivity. The introduction of anti-cartel policy is related to higher labor productivity growth in industries affected by collusive behavior, which otherwise record a 20 to 30 p.p. lower labor productivity growth (than industries without cartels) (OECD, 2014). Evidence from a 40-year long cartel in the United States suggests that quantity-productivity declined by 22 percent (Bridgman, Qi, & Schmitz Jr, 2009). Systematically allowing for cartel activity can further curb total productivity growth across the economy (Petit, Kemp, & Van Sinderen, 2015). Second, cartels distort important markets in LAC’s value chains. 34 percent of collusive agreements detected occurred in the manufacturing sector (Figure 1). Another 15 percent of cartels affected wholesale and retail trade activities transportation activities, respectively.28 Within the manufacturing sector, cartels across LAC region are particularly frequent in the meat processing activity in Brazil, Chile, and Panama, and in the manufacturing of basic chemicals in Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Panama, and Peru.29 Within the wholesale and retail trade sector, trade of pharmaceutical goods are also found in Brazil, Chile, Honduras and El Salvador. In the transport sector, Chile fined six shipping lines with USD 95 million for colluding in multiple tender processes for providing maritime transport services to manufacturers and consignees of various car brands imported to Chile beginning in 2000. Mexico sanctioned seven shipping lines for engaging in nine collusive agreements and segmenting the car transport market into different routes between 2009 and 2012. Some of the sanctioned firms were also investigated in Chile and Peru (WBG-USAID, 2018) .

Cartel agreements undermine the benefits of trade opening and liberalization. In the Pacific Alliance30 – the group of countries with the lowest trade barriers in the region – at least 67 cartels were detected in sectors generally considered tradable, and a third of those operated in the market for more than 5 years. Even though Colombia is an open market economy, sugar traders from the region were able to sell in Colombian markets only after a decade-long cartel agreement by domestic sugar mills was broken up in 2015: 12 mills had been explicitly coordinating to obstruct sugar imports.31 Import competition does not preclude the formation of cartels in tradable goods. Such agreements can operate at the regional or even global level: In Chile, Peru, and Colombia, three international firms jointly raised prices for toilet paper by up to 30 percent for over 10 years (Dinamo, 2015). In smaller LAC economies, where connectivity issues are central to economic growth, such as those of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM), cartels have also been uncovered, for example in shipping services.32

When cartels raise prices, the state can provide fewer public goods and services and cartels can even distort the market of government bonds. At least one in four cartels formed among firms participating in government procurement process. In such cases, taxpayers bear the burden of the overcharges. In Peru, between 2010 and 2012, 31 providers of hemodialysis services rigged the bids by abstaining from participating in public tenders called by one of the Peruvian public healthcare administrators with the objective of increasing reference prices in subsequent tenders. This led to overcharges in each tender of approximately over USD 10 million.33 Similarly in 2014, Peru sanctioned an engineer’s cartel that affected public-construction contracts worth USD50 million which had been designated for the expansion of the public highway network34 (Martinez Licetti & Goodwin, 2015). In Mexico, seven banks entered into at least 142 agreements to manipulate the price of the Mexican sovereign bond market between 2010 and 2013 by limiting sales and acquisitions of bonds with losses to the market of over USD 1.443 million.35 In Colombia, the government and ultimately the taxpayers incurred in losses of at least USD 11 million for the overcharges paid in the construction of a major highway (Ruta del Sol II), due to an anticompetitive agreement that favored a particular group of firms in the concession process.36

Recent developments in LAC also suggest that economic cartels undermine public trust in market economies. In 2016, 73 percent of the population in Chile considered collusion to be a reproachable conduct, even more reproachable than violations of labor laws.37 This sentiment was preceded by several years of successful breakups of cartels, and a historic confirmation by the Supreme Court of the decision to fine a group of poultry producers for having agreed to limit output. The protests in 2019 were partly motivated by discontent with the private sector (Freire, 2020) . As part of the government’s response in form of an “anti-abuse agenda”, the executive submitted four bills to Congress in March 2020 aiming at increased enforcement of the laws against white collar crimes, including cartels.

On the upside, consumers and businesses benefit from effective anti-cartel enforcement. For example, so-called leniency programs – which offer firms the possibility to come clean about their involvement in cartel conduct in exchange for immunity or reduction of financial penalties - (and as we will see later) render any agreement less stable, because any member of the cartel has incentives to break out and report the cartel. Thus, these programs shorten the duration of harmful cartels and can even reduce the level of anti-competitive overcharges by cartels.38 Miller (2009) finds empirical support for these effects: the leniency program in the United States increased the rate of cartel detection by 62 percent and reduced the rate of cartel formation by 59 percent. Yusupova (2013) also finds that the 2009 revision of the Russian leniency program was effective in reducing the size and duration of cartels. Choi & Hahn (2014) show that the leniency program in Korea shortened cartel duration. Leniency programs can also speed up the process of breaking up cartels. Brener (2009) demonstrates how leniency reduces the average sanctioning process by 1.5 years on average. In Europe, nearly 60 percent of detected cartels are discovered through leniency (Jaspers, 2020). Overall, leniency programs can have significant effects on competition intensity. Klein (2011) revises data from 23 OECD countries and finds that leniency policies were associated with a decrease in the industry-level price-cost margin of 3 to 5 percent.

However, many LAC countries do not have any tools to deter and prevent economic cartels. 28 percent of countries in the region do not have an operational competition legal framework. In only 5 out of 15 countries where the legal framework is in place, there are effective anti-cartel enforcement tools.

#### LAC economic volatility causes democratic erosion and backsliding.

Merke et al. 21, \*Federico Merke is an associate professor of international relations at the Universidad de San Andrés, Argentina. He is also a researcher for the National Council for Scientific Research; \*Oliver Stuenkel is an associate professor at the School of International Relations at Fundação Getulio Vargas (FGV) in São Paulo, Brazil. He is also a nonresident scholar affiliated with the Democracy, Conflict, and Governance Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. \*Andreas E. Feldmann is an associate professor in the departments of Latin American and Latino Studies and Political Science at the University of Illinois at Chicago; (June 24th, 2021, “Reimagining Regional Governance in Latin America”, https://carnegieendowment.org/2021/06/24/reimagining-regional-governance-in-latin-america-pub-84813)

Introduction

Latin America is experiencing one of the most difficult moments in its recent history as it confronts three overlapping crises: the coronavirus pandemic, a steep economic contraction, and high levels of political polarization and democratic erosion. No region has been more impacted by COVID-19, the disease caused by the coronavirus, than Latin America, both in human and economic terms.1 As of April 30, 2021, Latin America had a total of 28 million confirmed cases (out of a world total of 150 million) and just over 900,000 deaths (out of a world total of just over 3 million). With around 8 percent of the world’s population, the region has almost 19 percent of confirmed cases and 28 percent of total deaths. Also, as of April 30, Latin America had administered only 8 percent of the total vaccines.2

The economic impact has been equally devastating. The World Bank estimates that in 2020, 53 million Latin Americans saw their income fall below the region’s poverty line of $5.50 per day, pushing up the percentage of those living in poverty to an estimated 37.7 percent—a level not seen since 2006.3 According to the United Nations (UN) Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, Latin America is suffering its worst economic crisis in 120 years, with gross domestic product (GDP) having declined by a staggering 9.1 percent in 2020, eliminating most of the progress made during the commodity boom years (2003–2013). As might be expected, governments across the region are grappling with serious fiscal limitations and seem hard pressed to offer even basic responses to their population’s significant needs.4 All the while, a toxic mix of insecurity and pervasive social turmoil is undermining ~~[crippling]~~ most countries. As if this were not enough, the region faces what is arguably the most acute migration crisis of its history, with the exodus in recent years of more than 5 million Venezuelans.5

Several reasons explain why the region was hit so hard by the pandemic. First, even before the pandemic began, Latin America was economically vulnerable. Between 2014 and 2019, the region’s GDP per capita shrank 4 percent, largely as a result of significant declines in commodity prices.6 As part of these economic difficulties, chronic underinvestment in public health limited most countries’ capacity to treat COVID-19 patients, especially during the most acute periods of the disease. In addition, fiscal constraints limited governments’ ability to provide emergency cash-transfer payments to the poorest in their societies. Labor productivity and the job market were also hit hard by lockdown orders and workplace closures: only about 20 percent of existing jobs in Latin America could be performed remotely, compared to 40 percent in advanced economies and 26 percent in the rest of the emerging world.7

Second, the region entered the pandemic in a politically vulnerable condition. Throughout 2019, large-scale protests rocked Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Haiti, and Venezuela, creating one of the most politically volatile years in memory.8 In most cases, social turmoil stemmed from popular frustration with low-quality public services, socioeconomic inequality, and detached political elites. Many people who joined Latin America’s new middle class during the commodity boom of the 2000s slid back into poverty during the 2010s, and faced the realization that both they and their children are unlikely to escape poverty for many years to come. Popular demands for economic justice and support became more intense and difficult for governments to satisfy, creating openings for radical antiestablishment figures to come to power, like President Jair Bolsonaro in Brazil or President Nayib Bukele in El Salvador.

Finally, the region is beset by severe political polarization and democratic backsliding.9 In Mexico, President Andrés Manuel López Obrador is undermining democracy by seeking to concentrate power in an already strong executive.10 In Nicaragua, the increasingly authoritarian administration of President Daniel Ortega has pushed through new laws to name “traitors” and to pressure media and human rights groups opposing his grip on power. At the time of writing, there have been twelve opponents detained since June 2.11 In El Salvador, Bukele has enacted a series of controversial policies that many observers believe represent a serious threat to democracy. Neighboring Honduras is not faring much better, as an inflammable mix of corruption, violence, and authoritarianism under President Orlando Hernández is generating massive outmigration. Ecuador recently has seen widespread discontent, while Peru witnessed massive protests and instability following the legislature’s ousting of caretaker President Martín Vizcarra in 2020.

Another regional trend, present in both Ecuador and Peru as well as in other countries, has been the acute fragmentation of political parties, which has made governance exceedingly difficult.12 Colombia is in the midst of a serious crisis with widespread protests and a resurgence of politically driven violence, with one social leader killed every forty-one hours.13 Argentina’s economy has hit rock bottom as its government aims to reach a deal with the International Monetary Fund while tackling high inflation rates. Following former U.S. president Donald Trump’s playbook, Brazil’s right-wing Bolsonaro continuously glorifies dictatorship and tests the resilience of Brazil’s democratic institutions. In May 2020, for instance, Bolsonaro, while facing allegations that he tried to meddle with law enforcement for personal reasons, had to be convinced by generals to not ask soldiers to close the Supreme Court.14 Chile, once regarded as one of the region’s few bright spots due to its economic growth and political stability, also has witnessed massive demonstrations and violent riots against the establishment. It now has the daunting task of attempting to design a new constitution even as it struggles to respond to the pandemic and undertake a rapid vaccination program to protect its citizens.

Given this complex set of interlinked social, economic, and political crises, Latin American governments and nongovernmental actors urgently need to work together to address collective challenges. The events of recent decades have shown that unless better regional mechanisms can be found, transnational and even domestic problems—from organized crime and environmental degradation to migration and lackluster economic growth—will become even more difficult to address, with potentially devastating long-term consequences. Yet traditional regional governance mechanisms seem paralyzed, lacking even the capacity to discuss the current untenable situation, let alone address it. The popular narrative is that regional cooperation across Latin America is practically nonexistent because its heads of states have insurmountable ideological differences and because the region’s dominant diplomatic institutions have failed to fulfill their purpose. In addition, domestic turmoil is fueling rising isolationism and “antiglobalism,” most prominently in Brazil. Such a pessimistic view, however, stifles any capacity to reimagine regional cooperation. The dramatic crisis in Latin America requires more creative thinking, not less, about ways to promote renewed channels for regional cooperation.15

#### Regional democratic backsliding enable Russia and China to spread authoritarianism globally.

Brands 19, \*Hal Brands, Henry Kissinger Distinguished Professor at Johns Hopkins University’s School of Advanced International Studies, and a scholar at the American Enterprise Institute; (February 10th, 2019, “South America Is a Battlefield in the New Cold War”, https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2019-02-10/venezuela-crisis-south-america-is-a-battlefield-in-the-new-cold)

By the early 2000s, however, the climate was shifting. First came a new generation of leaders who viewed neoliberal economics as the source of the region’s persistent poverty and inequality. Governments led by the likes of Chávez in Venezuela, Evo Morales in Bolivia and Rafael Correa in Ecuador coupled populist political appeals and economic programs with a penchant for illiberalism and, in some cases, outright authoritarianism. They challenged the U.S. diplomatically and rhetorically, while establishing close ties with Cuba. This created a bloc of regional actors that opposed American power — just as outside actors were beginning to assert, or reassert, their own influence in the region.

China's Big Business in America's Backyard

As China’s economy has boomed over the last two decades, its presence in Latin America has grown as well. Chinese trade and investment has surged nearly everywhere, not just countries run by radical populists. Chinese commerce and loans have provided a lifeline to illiberal rulers such as Chávez and now Maduro by reducing their vulnerability to U.S. and Western pressure. Chinese military engagement followed, creating fears that Beijing may be trying to establish a strategic foothold in the Western Hemisphere. Although aspects of China’s relationship with Latin American countries remain controversial — some Chinese infrastructure projects have been criticized because they often employ Chinese rather than Latin American workers, for instance — Beijing has undoubtedly become a player in the Western Hemisphere.

Russia has provided economic and diplomatic support to Chavez, Maduro and other autocratic rulers such as Nicaragua’s Daniel Ortega. It has sold jets, tanks and other weapons to populist governments, and resumed providing military technology and oil to Cuba. Much to the concern of the U.S. government, the Kremlin has also been working to establish a significant intelligence presence in Nicaragua. As the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace observes, “Moscow’s approach to Latin America today echoes Soviet outreach in the 1960s through 1980s.”

Russian and Chinese relations with Latin American countries are often described as simply transactional, and it is true that both Moscow and Beijing can drive hard bargains for their support. One price of Russia’s continued backing of the Maduro regime has been a significant ownership stake in the Venezuelan oil industry. China, too, has seen Venezuela as an energy source, and its economic growth would have driven enhanced involvement in Latin America even in the absence of any geopolitical design.

But for both countries, that involvement also has a deeply competitive logic. Reaching into Latin America is a way of keeping the U.S. off-balance by exerting influence in Washington’s “near abroad.” It helps augment Beijing’s and Moscow’s global influence and stature at a time of intensifying rivalry with Washington. Finally, supporting autocratic regimes such as those in Caracas and Managua — whether quietly, as in China’s case, or more vocally, as in Russia’s — is a way of making sure that the world remains ideologically safe for authoritarianism in Beijing and Moscow, as well.

All this constitutes the backdrop to the Venezuelan crisis. The growth of Russian and Chinese influence in Latin America broadly, and Venezuela specifically, is a key reason the Trump administration has so uncharacteristically taken up the banner of human rights and democracy. By imposing harsh economic sanctions, calling for the military to desert Maduro, and backing the political opposition led by the Juan Guiadó, the Trump administration is seeking to deprive Moscow, Beijing and Havana of a critical partner in Latin America. And while Russia and China have responded very differently to this crisis, both are working, in their own ways, to protect that partner.

#### Extinction from nuclear war and rogue tech development.

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

Though the global liberal order has many faults and problems, it has proved superior to all alternatives. The liberal world of the early 21st century is more prosperous, healthy and peaceful than ever before. For the first time in human history, starvation kills fewer people than obesity; plagues kill fewer people than old age; and violence kills fewer people than accidents. When I was six months old I didn’t die in an epidemic, thanks to medicines discovered by foreign scientists in distant lands. When I was three I didn’t starve to death, thanks to wheat grown by foreign farmers thousands of kilometers away. And when I was eleven I wasn’t obliterated in a nuclear war, thanks to agreements signed by foreign leaders on the other side of the planet. If you think we should go back to some pre-liberal golden age, please name the year in which humankind was in better shape than in the early 21st century. Was it 1918? 1718? 1218?

Nevertheless, people all over the world are now losing faith in the liberal order. Nationalist and religious views that privilege one human group over all others are back in vogue. Governments are increasingly restricting the flow of ideas, goods, money and people. Walls are popping up everywhere, both on the ground and in cyberspace. Immigration is out, tariffs are in.

If the liberal order is collapsing, what new kind of global order might replace it? So far, those who challenge the liberal order do so mainly on a national level. They have many ideas about how to advance the interests of their particular country, but they don’t have a viable vision for how the world as a whole should function. For example, Russian nationalism can be a reasonable guide for running the affairs of Russia, but Russian nationalism has no plan for the rest of humanity. Unless, of course, nationalism morphs into imperialism, and calls for one nation to conquer and rule the entire world. A century ago, several nationalist movements indeed harboured such imperialist fantasies. Today’s nationalists, whether in Russia, Turkey, Italy or China, so far refrain from advocating global conquest.

In place of violently establishing a global empire, some nationalists such as Steve Bannon, Viktor Orban, the Northern League in Italy and the British Brexiteers dream about a peaceful “Nationalist International”. They argue that all nations today face the same enemies. The bogeymen of globalism, multiculturalism and immigration are threatening to destroy the traditions and identities of all nations. Therefore nationalists across the world should make common cause in opposing these global forces. Hungarians, Italians, Turks and Israelis should build walls, erect fences and slow down the movement of people, goods, money and ideas.

The world will then be divided into distinct nation-states, each with its own sacred identity and traditions. Based on mutual respect for these differing identities, all nation-states could cooperate and trade peacefully with one another. Hungary will be Hungarian, Turkey will be Turkish, Israel will be Israeli, and everyone will know who they are and what is their proper place in the world. It will be a world without immigration, without universal values, without multiculturalism, and without a global elite—but with peaceful international relations and some trade. In a word, the “Nationalist International” envisions the world as a network of walled-but-friendly fortresses.

Many people would think this is quite a reasonable vision. Why isn’t it a viable alternative to the liberal order? Two things should be noted about it. First, it is still a comparatively liberal vision. It assumes that no human group is superior to all others, that no nation should dominate its peers, and that international cooperation is better than conflict. In fact, liberalism and nationalism were originally closely aligned with one another. The 19th century liberal nationalists, such as Giuseppe Garibaldi and Giuseppe Mazzini in Italy, and Adam Mickiewicz in Poland, dreamt about precisely such an international liberal order of peacefully-coexisting nations.

The second thing to note about this vision of friendly fortresses is that it has been tried—and it failed spectacularly. All attempts to divide the world into clear-cut nations have so far resulted in war and genocide. When the heirs of Garibaldi, Mazzini and Mickiewicz managed to overthrow the multi-ethnic Habsburg Empire, it proved impossible to find a clear line dividing Italians from Slovenes or Poles from Ukrainians.

This had set the stage for the second world war. The key problem with the network of fortresses is that each national fortress wants a bit more land, security and prosperity for itself at the expense of the neighbors, and without the help of universal values and global organisations, rival fortresses cannot agree on any common rules. Walled fortresses are seldom friendly.

But if you happen to live inside a particularly strong fortress, such as America or Russia, why should you care? Some nationalists indeed adopt a more extreme isolationist position. They don’t believe in either a global empire or in a global network of fortresses. Instead, they deny the necessity of any global order whatsoever. “Our fortress should just raise the drawbridges,” they say, “and the rest of the world can go to hell. We should refuse entry to foreign people, foreign ideas and foreign goods, and as long as our walls are stout and the guards are loyal, who cares what happens to the foreigners?”

Such extreme isolationism, however, is completely divorced from economic realities. Without a global trade network, all existing national economies will collapse—including that of North Korea. Many countries will not be able even to feed themselves without imports, and prices of almost all products will skyrocket. The made-in-China shirt I am wearing cost me about $5. If it had been produced by Israeli workers from Israeli-grown cotton using Israeli-made machines powered by non-existing Israeli oil, it may well have cost ten times as much. Nationalist leaders from Donald Trump to Vladimir Putin may therefore heap abuse on the global trade network, but none thinks seriously of taking their country completely out of that network. And we cannot have a global trade network without some global order that sets the rules of the game.

Even more importantly, whether people like it or not, humankind today faces three common problems that make a mockery of all national borders, and that can only be solved through global cooperation. These are nuclear war, climate change and technological disruption. You cannot build a wall against nuclear winter or against global warming, and no nation can regulate artificial intelligence (AI) or bioengineering single-handedly. It won’t be enough if only the European Union forbids producing killer robots or only America bans genetically-engineering human babies. Due to the immense potential of such disruptive technologies, if even one country decides to pursue these high-risk high-gain paths, other countries will be forced to follow its dangerous lead for fear of being left behind.

An AI arms race or a biotechnological arms race almost guarantees the worst outcome. Whoever wins the arms race, the loser will likely be humanity itself. For in an arms race, all regulations will collapse. Consider, for example, conducting genetic-engineering experiments on human babies. Every country will say: “We don’t want to conduct such experiments—we are the good guys. But how do we know our rivals are not doing it? We cannot afford to remain behind. So we must do it before them.”

Similarly, consider developing autonomous-weapon systems, that can decide for themselves whether to shoot and kill people. Again, every country will say: “This is a very dangerous technology, and it should be regulated carefully. But we don’t trust our rivals to regulate it, so we must develop it first”.

The only thing that can prevent such destructive arms races is greater trust between countries. This is not an impossible mission. If today the Germans promise the French: “Trust us, we aren’t developing killer robots in a secret laboratory under the Bavarian Alps,” the French are likely to believe the Germans, despite the terrible history of these two countries. We need to build such trust globally. We need to reach a point when Americans and Chinese can trust one another like the French and Germans.

Similarly, we need to create a global safety-net to protect humans against the economic shocks that AI is likely to cause. Automation will create immense new wealth in high-tech hubs such as Silicon Valley, while the worst effects will be felt in developing countries whose economies depend on cheap manual labor. There will be more jobs to software engineers in California, but fewer jobs to Mexican factory workers and truck drivers. We now have a global economy, but politics is still very national. Unless we find solutions on a global level to the disruptions caused by AI, entire countries might collapse, and the resulting chaos, violence and waves of immigration will destabilise the entire world.

This is the proper perspective to look at recent developments such as Brexit. In itself, Brexit isn’t necessarily a bad idea. But is this what Britain and the EU should be dealing with right now? How does Brexit help prevent nuclear war? How does Brexit help prevent climate change? How does Brexit help regulate artificial intelligence and bioengineering? Instead of helping, Brexit makes it harder to solve all of these problems. Every minute that Britain and the EU spend on Brexit is one less minute they spend on preventing climate change and on regulating AI.

In order to survive and flourish in the 21st century, humankind needs effective global cooperation, and so far the only viable blueprint for such cooperation is offered by liberalism. Nevertheless, governments all over the world are undermining the foundations of the liberal order, and the world is turning into a network of fortresses. The first to feel the impact are the weakest members of humanity, who find themselves without any fortress willing to protect them: refugees, illegal migrants, persecuted minorities. But if the walls keep rising, eventually the whole of humankind will feel the squeeze.

### 1AC---Resource Cartels

#### Advantage 2 is Resource Cartels:

#### International cartels devastate competition in metals and minerals markets.

Kooroshy et al. 14, \*Jaakko Kooroshy was a Research Fellow in the Energy, Environment and Resources Department; \*Felix Preston is a Senior Research Fellow in the Energy, Environment and Resources Department; \*Siân Bradley is a Research Associate in the Energy, Environment and Resources Department; (December 2014, “Cartels and Competition in Minerals Markets: Challenges for Global Governance”, https://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/default/files/field/field\_document/20141219CartelsCompetitionMineralsMarketsKooroshyPrestonBradleyFinal.pdf)

Private companies’ attempts to manipulate prices and supply nevertheless remain a significant threat to metals markets, even if they tend to take more subtle forms than in the past. There were at least 15 cases where anti-trust authorities uncovered and punished attempts to form clandestine international private cartels in mining and primary metals between 2000 and 2010.33 Given that such ‘private international hardcore cartels’ present the most extreme form of anti-competitive practices – and that cartel members will make considerable efforts to conceal them – they could be the tip of the iceberg of manipulative practices in the sector.

#### That undermines efficiency innovations necessary to relieve stress on the environment and global resource production.

Kooroshy et al. 14, \*Jaakko Kooroshy was a Research Fellow in the Energy, Environment and Resources Department; \*Felix Preston is a Senior Research Fellow in the Energy, Environment and Resources Department; \*Siân Bradley is a Research Associate in the Energy, Environment and Resources Department; (December 2014, “Cartels and Competition in Minerals Markets: Challenges for Global Governance”, https://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/default/files/field/field\_document/20141219CartelsCompetitionMineralsMarketsKooroshyPrestonBradleyFinal.pdf)

Introduction

Global prosperity and security depend upon more efficient, sustainable and equitable consumption of key resources. The current outlook is one of volatility and continued pressure on global resource production systems, mounting environmental stress and potential political clashes over resource access. Looking to make the most of their natural endowments, many producer countries have also intervened more actively into markets, spurring debates about rising resource nationalism and a ‘new mercantilism’.7

International commerce is becoming a front line for such tensions over resources – at a time when the global economy is more dependent than ever on global markets and integrated supply chains. New actors, such as sovereign wealth funds and state-owned enterprises, and tightening links between physical and complex financial markets, further complicate the picture.

Policy debates on natural resources have often focused on energy, food and water, but metals and minerals are also vital for economic competitiveness and development. Large volumes are needed by emerging economies such as China and India for infrastructure, construction and industrial development. Equally, manufacturing sectors in advanced economies such as Germany and Japan depend on access to metals and mineral markets. Detailed data for Germany show that raw materials and components account for 30–60% of manufacturers’ production costs, while energy costs are typically below 10%.8

Metals and minerals have perhaps received less attention than other types of resources because price swings or supply disruptions have little immediate or obvious impact on individual consumers. But attempts to manipulate prices, restrict supplies or carve up international markets for metals and minerals can cause direct and indirect welfare losses for consuming industries. In many cases, these are ultimately passed down the supply chain to consumers around the world.

Such distortions can be considerable, as recent examples demonstrate. Companies that consume aluminium have calculated that artificial constraints on warehousing deliveries on the LME cost them at least $3bn a year.9 The moratoria on iron ore exports imposed by two Indian states to combat illegal mining in 2010 may have added as much as $40 per tonne, or more than 25%, to the price of iron ore in global markets.10 For European and Japanese steelmakers respectively, this could equate to a $5bn difference in the costs of raw material imports per year. For China, the impact could have been as large as $30bn per year.11

It is not only heavy industries or construction that depend on secure supplies; many of the technologies needed to unlock a resource efficiency revolution, advance low-carbon energy and boost food security also depend on the availability and affordability of minerals.12 Potash-based fertilizers could make an important contribution to closing yield gaps in many developing countries, but are often not affordable for low-income farmers. In the second half of 2013, potash prices dropped by over 20% when one of the two export cartels that control global supplies broke down. Speciality metals and minerals such as lithium, flake graphite and rare earths play a growing role for resource-efficient and low-carbon technologies.13 Price spikes and supply security concerns for these raw materials, some of which relate to export restrictions or other anti-competitive practices, can slow the diffusion of best-available technology, e.g. for electric vehicles or wind turbines.14

Allegations over anti-competitive activities in metals markets also have the potential to spill over into broader trade and diplomatic tensions between consumer and producer countries. International coordination mechanisms that exist for other types of resources (e.g. the International Energy Agency (IEA) for energy and Agricultural Market Information System (AMIS) for food) and that could help to defuse such tensions are largely absent for metals and minerals. For example, forming export cartels is still not illegal in most parts of the world, including the US, the EU, China and Japan, and the WTO framework lacks effective mechanisms to deal with cartel-like structures.15

Meanwhile, national authorities face the challenge of regulating supply chains that stretch across continents, where unclear jurisdiction, lack of coordination among regulators and poor data availability often give potential offenders the advantage.

The purpose of this research paper is to identify and analyse the key policy challenges associated with anti-competitive practices in international metals and minerals markets. Such anti-competitive practices include producer-country cartels in the traditional sense, like the Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) but also other major sources of market distortions, including clandestine private cartels, unilateral export restrictions and more sophisticated forms of manipulation of physical and associated financial markets, e.g. through warehousing practices. In particular, the paper will address the following questions:

#### Climate-driven resource shocks cause extinction.

Klare 13, \*Michael T. Klare, The Nation’s defense correspondent, is professor emeritus of peace and world-security studies at Hampshire College and senior visiting fellow at the Arms Control Association in Washington, D.C.; (April 22nd, 2013, “How Resource Scarcity and Climate Change Could Produce a Global Explosion”, https://www.thenation.com/article/archive/how-resource-scarcity-and-climate-change-could-produce-global-explosion/)

It is safe to assume that climate change, especially when combined with growing supply shortages, will result in a significant reduction in the planet’s vital resources, augmenting the kinds of pressures that have historically led to conflict, even under better circumstances. In this way, according to the Chatham House report, climate change is best understood as a “threat multiplier…a key factor exacerbating existing resource vulnerability” in states already prone to such disorders.

Like [other experts](http://www.guardian.co.uk/global-development/2013/apr/13/climate-change-millions-starvation-scientists) on the subject, Chatham House’s analysts claim, for example, that climate change will reduce crop output in many areas, sending global food prices soaring and triggering unrest among those already pushed to the limit under existing conditions. “Increased frequency and severity of extreme weather events, such as droughts, heat waves and floods, will also result in much larger and frequent local harvest shocks around the world….These shocks will affect global food prices whenever key centers of agricultural production area are hit—further amplifying global food price volatility.” This, in turn, will increase the likelihood of civil unrest.

When, for instance, a [brutal heat wave](http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/business-10977955) decimated Russia’s wheat crop during the summer of 2010, the global price of wheat (and so of that staple of life, [bread](http://www.tomdispatch.com/archive/175419)) began an inexorable upward climb, reaching particularly high levels in North Africa and the Middle East. With local governments unwilling or unable to help desperate populations, anger over impossible-to-afford food merged with resentment toward autocratic regimes to trigger the massive popular outburst we know as the Arab Spring.

Many such explosions are likely in the future, Chatham House suggests, if current trends continue as climate change and resource scarcity meld into a single reality in our world. A single provocative question from that group should haunt us all: “Are we on the cusp of a new world order dominated by struggles over access to affordable resources?”

For the US intelligence community, which appears to have been influenced by the report, the response was blunt. In March, for the first time, Director of National Intelligence James R. Clapper [listed](http://www.upi.com/Top_News/US/2013/03/13/Official-US-faces-diverse-threats/UPI-15151363156505/) “competition and scarcity involving natural resources” as a national security threat on a par with global terrorism, cyberwar and nuclear proliferation.

“Many countries important to the United States are vulnerable to natural resource shocks that degrade economic development, frustrate attempts to democratize, raise the risk of regime-threatening instability, and aggravate regional tensions,” he wrote in his [prepared statement](http://www.dni.gov/index.php/newsroom/testimonies) for the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. “Extreme weather events (floods, droughts, heat waves) will increasingly disrupt food and energy markets, exacerbating state weakness, forcing human migrations, and triggering riots, civil disobedience, and vandalism.”

There was a new phrase embedded in his comments: “resource shocks.” It catches something of the world we’re barreling toward, and the language is striking for an intelligence community that, like the government it serves, has largely played down or ignored the dangers of climate change. For the first time, senior government analysts may be coming to appreciate what energy experts, resource analysts and scientists have long been warning about: the unbridled consumption of the world’s natural resources, combined with the advent of extreme climate change, could produce a global explosion of human chaos and conflict. We are now heading directly into a resource-shock world.

#### And, international ag cartels dominate the industrial food chain, hammering global food security.

ETC 13, \*ETC, Action Group on Erosion, Technology and Concentration, staff and board members come from a variety of backgrounds, including community and regional planning, ecology and evolutionary biology, and political science; (September 2013, “Putting the Cartel before the Horse ...and Farm, Seeds, Soil, Peasants, etc.”, https://www.etcgroup.org/sites/www.etcgroup.org/files/CartelBeforeHorse11Sep2013.pdf)

Introduction: 3 Messages

ETC Group has been monitoring the power and global reach of agro-industrial corporations for several decades – including the increasingly consolidated control of agricultural inputs for the industrial food chain: proprietary seeds and livestock genetics, chemical pesticides and fertilizers and animal pharmaceuticals. Collectively, these inputs are the chemical and biological engines that drive industrial agriculture.

This update documents the continuing concentration (surprise, surprise), but it also brings us to three conclusions important to both peasant producers and policymakers…

1. Cartels are commonplace. Regulators have lost sight of the well-accepted economic principle that the market is neither free nor healthy whenever 4 companies control more than 50% of sales in any commercial sector. In this report, we show that the 4 firms / 50% line in the sand has been substantially surpassed by all but the complex fertilizer sector. Four firms control 58.2% of seeds; 61.9% of agrochemicals; 24.3% of fertilizers; 53.4% of animal pharmaceuticals; and, in livestock genetics, 97% of poultry and two-thirds of swine and cattle research. More disturbingly, the oligopoly paradigm has moved beyond individual sectors to the entire food system: the same six multinationals control 75% of all private sector plant breeding research; 60% of the commercial seed market and 76% of global agrochemical sales.1 Some also have links to animal pharmaceuticals. This creates a vulnerability in the world food system that we have not seen since the founding of the UN Food and Agriculture Organization. It’s time to dust off national competition / anti-combines policies and to consider international measures to defend global food security.

2. The “invisible hold” of the market is growing. For all the talk of the invisible hand of the free market, the market is evermore opaque and far from “free.” As the concentration grows, companies are more guarded with their information. Further, the investment companies that analyze markets have also become more concentrated and more proprietary (and their information is more expensive). As the “invisible hold” tightens, it is harder and harder for governments – and more so, peasants – to understand the level of food system control exercised by a handful of multinational enterprises. As a result, ETC’s data – in order to be accurate – is dependent upon 2011 figures. Be assured that corporate concentration in these sectors is not receding. Agribusiness must be legally obliged to provide full and timely data on sales and market share.

3. Climate research shows that we don’t know (that) we don’t know our food system: One positive outcome since our last update is that society in general – and governments in particular – are more aware of the threat posed by climate change to global food security. There is now a popular mantra (but not much movement) emphasizing the central importance of smallholder producers in meeting global food requirements in the decades ahead. We couldn’t agree more. To help policymakers move from mantra to marching orders, this Communiqué is accompanied by a poster contrasting the capacity of the Industrial Food Chain and the Peasant Food Web to address climate chaos. The poster raises 20 genuine questions. It is a work-in-progress. There may be more than one answer to the questions, but the data provides a basis for a fundamental change of mind and shift in policy direction. For some of the reasons cited already, the data policymakers need to make decisions are not always available (or accurate). As the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change prepares to receive the fifth assessment report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change over the coming months, we hope this report and accompanying poster will encourage a much needed constructive debate and complementary research on all of the issues we are raising.

Over the past half-century, the corporations that dominate the industrial food system have wrested control of the agricultural R&D agenda while concentrating power and influencing trade, aid and agricultural policies to fuel their own growth. There was cautious hope in the United States that a new era was dawning when, in 2009 – the first year of President Obama’s first term – the US Department of Agriculture and the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice (DOJ) announced a joint investigation into anticompetitive practices in agriculture. The news that Monsanto specifically had been required to turn over internal documents related to seed prices raised the level of optimism. But when the DOJ dropped the Monsanto investigation almost 3 years later without explanation, it was clear that antitrust fervour had fizzled, despite the breathless claims2 (which happen to be true) that anticompetitive practices in agriculture pose a threat to public health and security.

#### Food wars go nuclear.

Cribb 19, \*Julian Cribb, Principal of Julian Cribb & Associates, Fellow of the Australian Academy of Technological Sciences and Engineering, former Director of National Awareness at the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation; (August 23rd, 2019, “FOOD AS AN EXISTENTIAL RISK”, <https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/abs/food-or-war/food-as-an-existential-risk/8C45279588CD572FE805B7E240DE7368>) //rhetoric modified

Although actual numbers of warheads have continued to fall from its peak of 70,000 weapons in the mid 1980s, scientists argue the danger of nuclear conflict in fact increased in the first two decades of the twentyfirst century. This was due to the modernisation of existing stockpiles, the adoption of dangerous new technologies such as robot delivery systems, hypersonic missiles, artificial intelligence and electronic warfare, and the continuing leakage of nuclear materials and knowhow to non- nuclear nations and potential terrorist organisations.

In early 2018 the hands of the ‘Doomsday Clock’, maintained by the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, were re-set at two minutes to midnight, the highest risk to humanity that it has ever shown since the clock was introduced in 1953. This was due not only to the state of the world’s nuclear arsenal, but also to irresponsible language by world leaders, the growing use of social media to destabilise rival regimes, and to the rising threat of uncontrolled climate change (see below).12

In an historic moment on 17 July 2017, 122 nations voted in the UN for the first time ever in favour of a treaty banning all nuclear weapons. This called for comprehensive prohibition of “a full range of nuclear-weapon-related activities, such as under- taking to develop, test, produce, manufacture, acquire, possess or stockpile nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices, as well as the use or threat of use of these weapons.”13 However, 71 other countries – including all the nuclear states – either opposed the ban, abstained or declined to vote. The Treaty vote was nonetheless interpreted by some as a promising first step towards abolishing the nuclear nightmare that hangs over the entire human species.

In contrast, 192 countries had signed up to the Chemical Weapons Convention to ban the use of chemical weapons, and 180 to the Biological Weapons Convention. As of 2018, 96 per cent of previous world stocks of chemical weapons had been destroyed – but their continued use in the Syrian conflict and in alleged assassination attempts by Russia indicated the world remains at risk.14

As things stand, the only entities that can afford to own nuclear weapons are nations – and if humanity is to be wiped out, it will most likely be as a result of an atomic conflict between nations. It follows from this that, if the world is to be made safe from such a fate it will need to get rid of nations as a structure of human self-organisation and replace them with wiser, less aggressive forms of self-governance. After all, the nation state really only began in the early nineteenth century and is by no means a permanent feature of self-governance, any more than monarchies, feudal systems or priest states. Although many people still tend to assume it is. Between them, nations have butchered more than 200 million people in the past 150 years and it is increasingly clear the world would be a far safer, more peaceable place without either nations or national- ism. The question is what to replace them with.

Although there may at first glance appear to be no close linkage between weapons of mass destruction and food, in the twentyfirst century with world resources of food, land and water under growing stress, nothing can be ruled out. Indeed, chemical weapons have frequently been deployed in the Syrian civil war, which had drought, agricultural failure and hunger among its early drivers. And nuclear conflict remains a distinct possibility in South Asia and the Middle East, especially, as these regions are already stressed in terms of food, land and water, and their nuclear firepower or access to nuclear materials is multiplying.

It remains an open question whether panicking regimes in Russia, the USA or even France would be ruthless enough to deploy atomic weapons in an attempt to quell ~~invasion~~ [entry] by tens of millions of desperate refugees, fleeing famine and climate chaos in their own homelands – but the possibility ought not to be ignored.

That nuclear war is at least a possible outcome of food and climate crises was first flagged in the report The Age of Consequences by Kurt Campbell and the US-based Centre for Strategic and International Studies, which stated ‘it is clear that even nuclear war cannot be excluded as a political consequence of global warming’.15 Food insecurity is therefore a driver in the preconditions for the use of nuclear weapons, whether limited or unlimited.

### 1AC---Solvency

#### Finally, solvency:

#### Plan: The United States federal government should substantially increase prohibitions on anticompetitive private cartel practices in cases where foreign plaintiffs cannot secure adequate relief in alternative fora.

#### The plan permits jurisdiction over *Empagran*-type cases only in instances where foreign plaintiffs don’t have an alternative forum for recovering damages---that maximizes cartel deterrence through harmonization of antitrust laws and preserves judicial economy.

Schmidt 6, \*Jonathan T. Schmidt. Antitrust lawyer. Master’s in Public Affairs from the Princeton School of Public and International Affairs. JD from Yale Law School. Former Fulbright Fellow in Peru, where he studied micro-enterprise lending; (2006, “Keeping U.S. Courts Open to Foreign Antitrust Plaintiffs: A Hybrid Approach to the Effective Deterrence of International Cartels.” <https://digitalcommons.law.yale.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=&httpsredir=1&article=1266&context=yjil>)

5. A New Approach to the Empagran Problem: Legislative Authorization to the Executive Branch To Limit Jurisdiction Based on the Principles of Foreign Non Conveniens

A better approach would systematize the executive branch's review of other countries' antitrust regimes, apply that executive determination categorically over a class of cases, and remove judicial discretion with respect to complying with that executive determination. Accordingly, I recommend that the DOJ 2 7 6 should annually review other countries' antitrust regimes to determine whether they provide private parties an adequate forum to recover damages from cartel activities. Congress should amend 277 section 12 of the Clayton Act to bar jurisdiction in cases involving international cartels in which (1) neither the plaintiff nor the defendant is a national of the United States, and (2) the plaintiff or defendant is a national of a country that the DOJ currently lists as one that provides plaintiffs with an adequate private remedy in the antitrust claim, except (3) when that country permits United States jurisdiction for reasons of judicial economy. Such a law would promote international judicial economy in a transparent and predictable manner that prevents forum shopping without greatly reducing the deterrent effect of United States law.

The principles underlying this proposed law are those of the doctrine of forum non conveniens as articulated in Piper. Thus, if plaintiffs can secure relief in their domestic courts for antitrust violations that involve foreign harms, they should not be able to sue a foreign defendant in U.S. courts simply because the damages available there may be more favorable. However, when a foreign plaintiff cannot secure relief in her domestic courts--either because the courts do not permit jurisdiction over the claims or because the statutory relief is not actually available-she should first turn to the court system in which the foreign defendant is located. Again, this result would accord with a concern for convenience and judicial economy. Only if the plaintiff cannot receive adequate relief in her home forum or the defendant's home forum should U.S. courts exercise jurisdiction, assuming the requisite showing of a link to domestic effect is made. Such an exercise of jurisdiction would not be an act of charity toward the plaintiff; it would recognize that affording such plaintiffs an opportunity for relief somewhere is necessary to deter the international cartels that harm American consumers and businesses.

Such a restriction of jurisdiction would not affect the ability of American plaintiffs to bring antitrust claims against anyone in the world, nor would it prevent U.S. courts from exercising jurisdiction over cases involving American defendants. Instead, this restriction on jurisdiction would apply only when neither the plaintiff nor the defendant was an American. In such situations, the United States retains an interest in ensuring that plaintiffs can receive adequate compensation because of its deterrent effect on international cartels that affect the United States. However, if such claims could be better heard before a foreign court, the United States should decline jurisdiction because of convenience and judicial economy.279

The DOJ's annual review of other countries' private antitrust remedies should be more than a broad "thumbs-up, thumbs-down" review; it should distinguish the types of claims for which a country's relief is adequate from those for which it is inadequate. For example, although Canada has a strong anti-cartel regime, it also protects its domestic export cartels.280 Such protectionist policies-of which the FTAIA is one-do not enhance worldwide deterrence,28' and when implemented by foreign governments, they specifically do not deter conduct harming American consumers. Therefore, the DOJ would list Canada as a country that provides an adequate forum except in cases involving Canadian export cartels. Similarly, other countries may not permit foreign plaintiffs to sue their domestic firms for participating in an international cartel, though domestic plaintiffs can bring such actions. In these situations, the DOJ would list those countries as providing an adequate forum for domestic plaintiffs, but U.S. jurisdiction would be permitted if the plaintiffs were foreigners who also lacked an adequate forum in their home country.

The definition of "adequate" relief is an important component of this proposal. Consistent with the principles of forum non conveniens articulated in Piper, the United States should not require that countries provide treble damages. The United States should decline jurisdiction in anti-cartel actions so long as plaintiffs can recover at least compensatory damages. America's mandatory treble damages regime is based on a policy choice in the United States regarding the proper mix of public and private enforcement. The fact that other governments do not provide treble damages may reflect other aspects of their systems, such as greater public fines, the availability of punitive damages, or the cost to plaintiffs of bringing actions for damages. The United States should not require treble damages as the sole mechanism of deterrence.

Refusing jurisdiction in international antitrust suits may sacrifice some global judicial economy. The nature of international cartel activities increases the possibility that the same defendants will simultaneously face multiple lawsuits in many countries. By splitting the plaintiffs' actions, these multiple lawsuits could complicate the suits, delay them, and make them more 282 expensive. For this reason, the U.S. courts could exercise jurisdiction if the nations implicated in the case ask it to do so. Admittedly, this is only a partial solution to the issue of global judicial economy. A more comprehensive solution will require additional political solutions, such as an international agreement permitting some form of transnational transfer or consolidation of cases. Such agreement is foreseeable, as informal collaboration already occurs with respect to public lawsuits against international cartel members.

This proposal would help achieve America's three goals with respect to international antitrust. First, the U.S. government would have a national policy with respect to jurisdiction in international cartel cases that distinguishes between those foreign antitrust regimes that are effective and those that are not. Second, such a policy would be consistent and predictable, facilitating international trade. Plaintiffs and defendants would know whether jurisdiction could be exercised before bringing a case. Plaintiffs from countries that the United States deems to have an effective antitrust regime would have no reason to bring a case in U.S. courts, and they would therefore need to turn to their home jurisdiction. In this manner, the policy would encourage other jurisdictions to enact policies that would be in harmony with those of the United States. For example, with respect to Canada, the exercise of U.S. jurisdiction with respect to a Canadian export cartel may cause Canadian lawmakers to tear down their measures protecting such cartels, especially if they wish to protect Canadian defendants from America's treble damages regime.283

[FOOTNOTE 283]

283. Indeed, America's treble damages regime would provide an incentive for foreign companies to lobby their countries to enact antitrust policies sufficiently strong to remove them from U.S. jurisdiction in Empagran-type suits.

[END FOOTNOTE 283]

Upon such action, the DOJ would determine that U.S. jurisdiction should no longer be granted in such cases. Thus, this proposal, like my suggested reforms of national amnesty programs, seeks to harmonize international antitrust policies and to do so in a manner that most effectively deters international cartels.

#### Only international, private antitrust enforcement maximizes deterrence---it enhances the cartel’s likelihood of being detected and makes operation in multiple countries cost-prohibitive.

Schmidt 6, \*Jonathan T. Schmidt. Antitrust lawyer. Master’s in Public Affairs from the Princeton School of Public and International Affairs. JD from Yale Law School. Former Fulbright Fellow in Peru, where he studied micro-enterprise lending; (2006, “Keeping U.S. Courts Open to Foreign Antitrust Plaintiffs: A Hybrid Approach to the Effective Deterrence of International Cartels.” <https://digitalcommons.law.yale.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=&httpsredir=1&article=1266&context=yjil>)

II. BACKGROUND

A core aspect of America's antitrust regime is its encouragement of private litigation as an enforcement device. Private litigation is thought to be particularly effective against cartels, as the consumers in a cartel market may often be among the first entities to detect the cartel's damaging collusive behavior, and awarding damages-particularly a multiple of the cartel's profits-may make the illegal conduct cost-prohibitive. Thus, private litigation is viewed as an important mechanism for achieving one of the fundamental goals of the antitrust acts: the maximum deterrence of cartels.26

Initially, the application of America's antitrust regime was contained within its borders. But as commerce became increasingly international after World War II, U.S. courts applied the antitrust laws extraterritorially. America's extraterritorial application of its antitrust laws created tension with its trading partners, who disagreed with the American approach of relying on private litigation and treble damages as an enforcement device. They viewed the extraterritorial application of U.S. law as an anticompetitive maneuver aimed at furthering U.S. trade objectives. In the late 1970s and early 1980s, many of these countries passed legislation to frustrate the extraterritorial application of America's antitrust laws. The U.S. Congress responded by passing the FTAIA. This law barred foreigners from using America's laws against American companies when American consumers were not harmed. The Empagran decision-and the governments' amici briefs-must be understood within this context of antitrust policy as trade policy.

A. The Sherman and Clayton Acts

The Sherman and Clayton Acts are the statutory foundation for private antitrust litigation in the United States. The Sherman Antitrust Act outlaws "[e]very contract, combination . . . or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations., 27 Violations are felonies, with corporations and individuals facing civil and criminal penalties, including imprisonment.29

To expand the enforcement of the antitrust laws and to facilitate the compensation of the victims of antitrust harms, Congress adopted the Clayton Act. Section 4 of the Clayton Act creates a private cause of action for individuals and companies harmed by antitrust violations, 30 and section 12 grants jurisdiction over these lawsuits to any district in which the defendant does business.3' Plaintiffs in such lawsuits act as "private attorneys general, 32 who help alert authorities to violations of the antitrust laws while also punishing those violations. The Clayton Act allows private litigants to sue for treble damages. Treble damages enhance deterrence in two ways-they encourage private suits, which raise the probability the cartel will be detected,33 and they increase the penalty imposed on defendants found guilty of violating the acts.34 The Clayton Act has succeeded in encouraging such suits. 35

B. Cartels-An Introduction

Cartels are "unambiguously bad' 36 and "the most egregious violations of competition law."3 7 The collusion they engage in the "supreme evil of antitrust. ' '3s A cartel is a group of firms in an industry that should be competitors but have instead agreed to coordinate their activities so that they can raise prices and earn profits above competitive market levels. Cartels utilize a number of mechanisms to coordinate their activities, including horizontal price fixing,39 bid rigging, territorial division,40 non-territorial customer division, and market-share agreements. In addition to harming the consumers of their products by charging supra-competitive prices, cartels also reduce economic efficiency by causing consumers to purchase less of a product than they otherwise would buy and by reducing the competitive pressures that member firms face to control costs and to innovate.41

A cartel must overcome four challenges to operate successfully. First, the cartel's members must reach agreement to restrict the supply of a product and increase its price. A cartel restricts supply so that the loss from the lower quantity of sales is more than offset by the increase in the price of each remaining sale. The optimal cartel quantity and price is that of a monopoly producer, but cartels rarely achieve that optimal level because cheating by members and market entry by new producers increases market supply. Thus, a second challenge for a cartel is to ensure that its members follow the agreed course of action. Each cartel member has an incentive-to sell more than the agreed quantity of the product-at the cartel price or one slightly below it-to gain even more profit.42 Because cheating threatens the cartel's viability, cartels must monitor their members and punish cheating.4 3 But monitoring is difficult because of the third challenge inherent to cartels: their illegal actions force them to operate in secrecy to avoid detection.44 Yet even if, while operating in secret, cartels are able to monitor and punish cheaters, they still must prevent entry by other firms into the market. Entrants will be enticed by the opportunity to earn profits due to the extra-competitive cartel prices, and their entry will drive down the cartel's profits. To maintain its hold on the market, the cartel must prevent new entry, again without making the cartel visible. The complexity of addressing these four challenges leads many economists to conclude that cartels are "inherently unstable."43

Certain market characteristics are conducive to collusive activity. Cartels often operate in concentrated markets with few firms, permitting easier coordination and more reliable confidentiality.46 Markets with high initial investment costs are also conducive to cartel activity. These costs deter other firms from quickly entering the market to take advantage of the cartel's artificially high prices.47 Products that are homogenous and fungible also facilitate cartel activity. a Such products are usually uniformly priced, making it easier for cartels to monitor member prices. Finally, market structures, such as public disclosure laws regarding prices and quantities, can help cartels monitor their members' activities.

Market characteristics alone cannot sustain a cartel; cartel members must adopt a variety of practices to avoid detection and to enforce compliance. Cartels avoid detection by holding secret meetings, using code names, and creating legitimate-appearing trade associations to share information.49 Generally, cartel members meet periodically to review public and private sales and price figures from prior periods. They also force members who exceed their quotas to compensate the other members.50 Thus, cartels overcome their inherent instability by successfully providing supra-competitive profits to their members while maintaining the secrecy of their collusion and punishing any deviations. Indeed, based on the fact that twenty-four of the forty international cartels prosecuted in the 1990s had operated for at least four years, one study concluded, "market forces alone may be unable to quickly undermine attempts to fix prices, rig bids, allocate quotas, and market shares; perhaps implying a potential role for national anti-cartel enforcement." 51

C. International Cartels

Certain characteristics of the global marketplace increase the ability of international cartels to monitor their members and maintain secrecy. The publication of official import and export data facilitates the cartel's monitoring of its members. National differences in accounting, reporting requirements, and other legal mandates help cartels to hide their activities and profits. 53 National borders mask agreements to divide a product market among competitors,54 and they can facilitate the punishment of cheaters.55 Cartel members also frustrate the efforts of effective policing authorities by meeting and retaining records outside their jurisdictions.56

Almost invariably, any international cartel harms consumers in all of the countries in which its product is sold. If an international cartel does not raise prices everywhere, a product sold at a cheaper price in one country can be resold in another country where the price is higher. This arbitrage threat exists as long as transaction costs, including transportation costs, are low and the product is undifferentiated across the various countries. If the cartel's product is sold in the United States, the cartel must raise its price in the United States sufficiently so that it is not profitable to buy the product in the United States, ship it to another market, and sell it at or below the cartel price. Thus, because cartels must address the arbitrage threat by raising prices in all of the markets in which they operate, the harms caused by the cartels in those markets are interconnected.

To effectively deter cartels, the total expected penalty must at least equal the supra-competitive profits from participating in the cartel.57 Because an international cartel enjoys supra-competitive profits from its sales in other countries, "[tihe relevant expected penalty depends on the sum of the expected penalties in each nation., 58 According to the OECD, sanctions against cartels "are, on the whole, still inadequate" 59 in most countries. Therefore, cartels will raise their prices in the United States even though doing so increases the likelihood of the cartel's detection due to the United States's more rigorous antitrust regime. The international cartel will still harm American consumers because it can offset its expected American losses with its supra-competitive profits from countries where it has little fear of penalty. As a result, "the deterrent required to prevent a global cartel from including the United States is generally larger than the deterrent required to prevent a purely domestic cartel from forming." 60

#### Only the AFF’s bottom-up harmonization fills enforcement gaps---that must precede any effort to develop an international antitrust regime.

Schmidt 6, \*Jonathan T. Schmidt. Antitrust lawyer. Master’s in Public Affairs from the Princeton School of Public and International Affairs. JD from Yale Law School. Former Fulbright Fellow in Peru, where he studied micro-enterprise lending; (2006, “Keeping U.S. Courts Open to Foreign Antitrust Plaintiffs: A Hybrid Approach to the Effective Deterrence of International Cartels.” <https://digitalcommons.law.yale.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=&httpsredir=1&article=1266&context=yjil>)

My proposal is also consistent with the desire by many economists and legal scholars to see some form of global antitrust authority established. Eleanor Fox notes, "international antitrust has been a gleam in the eye of the world at least since the proposal of the Havana Charter in the 1940s.,,29' Yet while there are "seeds"2 for some sort of international antitrust charter, there is disagreement as to whether the international community should adopt a common international antitrust code,294 establish an oversight body along the lines of the World Trade Organization to ensure compliance with such a code, or create a world antitrust court to adjudicate important private international disputes.295 Indeed, the United States and the European Union-arguably the two jurisdictions that present the most agreement on the substantive aspects of international antitrust-occupy diametrically opposed positions with respect to the form international antitrust enforcement should take. The European Union favors binding dispute resolution in the WTO; the United States favors a more voluntary approach that focuses on technical assistance and the issuance of voluntary standards. Although there has been convergence in substantive antitrust policies, there, too, disagreement exists. The substantive disagreements led Judge Diane Wood, after proposing a baseline general international antitrust code, to note that in actually negotiating such a code, "the details would indeed be devilish" and to "wonder whether the effort it would take to achieve international consensus on all [of the areas of antitrust] would be worth it." 296 As an international antitrust regime is still such a distant possibility, I prefer to propose an improvement to the status quo rather than waiting for the intellectually best solution.

Absent an international agreement establishing some form of global antitrust regime, the international community needs to work to further harmonize their practices to fill the enforcement gaps that allow corporate criminals like cartels to thrive.297 I believe my proposal is the best mechanism-absent an international agreement-to encourage harmonization of antitrust policies with respect to international cartels. By exercising jurisdiction over claims by plaintiffs located in countries where the laws do not provide adequate relief, the United States implicitly encourages those countries to implement and enforce laws that provide such relief. Although other nations might respond negatively to America's judgment of their antitrust regimes, their objections should be mollified by the fact that such judgments are undertaken to limit, rather than extend, American power 298 through an exercise of jurisdictional restraint.

Still, international antitrust disagreements will persist, but such disagreements are not created by the United States. Instead, they reflect real policy differences between the United States and its trading allies regarding the degree to which all cartels, especially domestic export cartels, should be deterred, the viability of private antitrust suits as a means of policing cartel activities, and the ability of the United States to protect its consumers, even at the expense of foreign corporations. Empagran has not generated conflict; it has only revealed it. Accordingly, I reject the view that the absence of conflict, such as would result by closing our courts to Empagran-type suits, is equivalent to harmony. Instead, the closing of our courts to all Empagran-type suits would represent a surrender of America's interest in protecting its consumers from the harms of international cartels. At the least, such a capitulation of America's vital economic interests should not be achieved by judicial fiat.

# 2AC

## DA---FTC

### 2AC---AT: DA---FTC Tradeoff

#### The FTC doesn’t have the statutory authority to prosecute cartels.

McCulloch 21, \*Bruce McCulloch, Partner, Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer LLP; \*Meredith Mommers, Senior Associate, Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer LLP; (February 2nd, 2021, “US: Settling Antitrust Cartel Conduct Matters with the US DOJ”, https://globalcompetitionreview.com/guide/the-settlements-guide/first-edition/article/us-settling-antitrust-cartel-conduct-matters-the-us-doj)

The DOJ has sole federal authority to investigate and prosecute antitrust cartels as criminal violations in the United States and, therefore, has sole authority to negotiate settlements. To the extent that the Federal Trade Commission identifies cartel conduct, it may refer the investigation to the DOJ for prosecution as a cartel offence. Although the speed at which antitrust cartel investigations proceed varies widely, the stages of a criminal investigation are generally the same across cases, and how quickly the investigation proceeds through those steps will dictate when a settlement with the DOJ is possible.

### 2AC---S---Deterrence

#### Extraterritorial liability in the U.S. is key to deterrence.

Leonardo 16, \*Lizl Leonardo, general corporate attorney, Associate at Armstrong Teasdale; (2016, “A Proposal to the Seventh and Ninth Circuit Split: Expand the Reach of the U.S. Antitrust Laws to Extraterritorial Conduct that Reach of the U.S. Antitrust Laws to Extraterritorial Conduct that Impacts U.S. Commerce Impacts U.S. Commerce”, https://via.library.depaul.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=4008&context=law-review)

A U.S. Supreme Court ruling in favor of the Seventh Circuit will also prevent companies from potentially leaving the United States to avoid compliance with antitrust laws.417 Domestic companies with foreign subsidiaries that seek to increase their market share by colluding to fix the prices of products will be deterred from engaging in illegal conduct, but they will also be incentivized to keep their businesses in the country.418 Mere knowledge that companies can be liable in the United States for engaging in illegal, extraterritorial conduct that indirectly affects U.S. consumers could in itself discourage the companies from pursuing such conduct.419 Likewise, without the benefit of being exculpated from any extraterritorial conduct, companies will rather stay in the United States than incur expensive costs of moving overseas. This is a win-win situation; prices of products remain controlled by the natural forces of supply and demand, and small and local companies are able to compete with the bigger and international companies. On the contrary, a ruling that limits the extraterritorial reach of the FTAIA to non-import commerce, similar to what the Seventh Circuit held, will encourage companies to move their operations overseas and strategically only deal with the United States in instances they are certain will not subject them to either the Sherman Act or FTAIA.420

## DA---Litigation

### 2AC---Follow-on Innovation

#### Patents wreck growth by prohibiting follow-on innovation.

WCEG 15 (Washington Center for Equitable Growth, “How patents might hold back innovation,” 8 January 2015, <https://equitablegrowth.org/patents-might-hold-back-innovation/>, DOA: 2-18-2022) //Snowball

Innovation, most people can agree, is a good thing. Continued advances in technology are critical for the long-run growth of the economy and rising living standards. The tricky thing is figuring out how to best promote innovation. One well-trodden policy tool is giving the creator of a new technology or process an incentive by providing her with a monopoly over the invention, also known as a patent. But can there be too much of good thing. Patents may help spur one innovation, but hurt overall innovation further down the line.

No innovation is an island. One advance helps spur several others, either directly or indirectly, with the resulting accumulation of knowledge and technology further boosting economic growth. But patents, if they hinder innovations based on the new innovation, may slow down the pace of follow-on innovation.

A paper presented at the recently completed annual Allied Social Sciences Associations meeting found a significant effect of patents on cumulative innovation. Alberto Galasso of the University of Toronto and Mark Schankerman of the London School of Economics look specifically at the effect of patent invalidations on citations of those innovations in future patents.

Patents in the United States can be invalidated by a federal court as well as a special appeals court, the U.S. Court of Appeal for the Federal Circuit, which has exclusive jurisdiction over appeals cases involving patents. The authors look at what happens to citations after the patent was struck down.

Galasso and Schankerman find a large effect from patent invalidations: Citations increase by about 50 percent on average in the five years afterward. But once they dig deeper into the data, they find that the effect isn’t the same for all patents. For many fields, such as pharmaceuticals, the effect was minimal to non-existent.

The fields that did see significant effects on cumulative innovation were computers and communications, electronics, and medical instruments. These fields are ones where the technology is complex and patent ownership is widely spread, making it more likely that patents can block follow-on innovations.

The authors also looked at the sizes of the firms affected by these decisions. They find that the effect is entirely about the patents of large firms being invalidated and the increased citations are by small firms. So these patents were seemingly restricting the innovative efforts of smaller businesses.

If patents are acting as a barrier, what is to be done? Remember that the effect is only for certain kinds of technology industries. So the authors point out that more efficient patent arrangements for certain industries should be considered. Other options for spurring innovation outside of the patent system, such as innovation prizes, exist as well. More federal spending on basic scientific research is fundamental, too. Regardless of the method, policymakers need to consider the best way to foster innovation now without hindering it in the future.

### 2AC – AT: I/L – Delay

#### Delays in patent issuance are good—prevent abuse of the system and bias in decision-making.

Lichtman ‘17 (Doug Lichtman; Professor of Law, UCLA; June 2017; “Patient Patents: Can certain types of patent litigation be beneficially delayed?”; Accessible at: <http://www.law.nyu.edu/sites/default/files/upload_documents/Doug%20Lichtman%20Paper.pdf>; pg. 4-5)

The benefits of delay thus begin to loom large. For example, what better way to decide (under section 103 of the Patent Act) whether a given invention was “obvious to those skilled in the art” than to wait a few years and see if a sufficiently large number of skilled practitioners independently come up with the same invention? Similarly, would not court decisions on validity be more reliable if they could be delayed long enough for the Patent Office to first run its own re-examination of any disputed patent, for example under the new Inter Partes Review procedure? Moreover, fast litigations are systematically biased in favor of patent holders because a patent holder can prepare its case long before the complaint is filed, whereas accused infringers will often not even know about the patents at issue until after the complaint is served. Fast clocks exacerbate this difference in time to prepare; slower clocks would mitigate it.

None of this is to imply that delay has no costs, or that tremendously long delays are now suddenly desirable. Delay means longer periods of uncertainty for both patent holders and accused infringers. Delay also makes it more difficult for poorly capitalized patent holders to pursue even valid claims. Moreover, delay will certainly require that courts take more seriously the need to award interest to patent holders to whom payments would now be even more overdue. That said, thanks to the change in the Supreme Court’s remedies jurisprudence, these costs and benefits newly trade off in ways that favor delay in certain cases. In this Essay, I set out to make that case.

### 2AC – AT: I/L – Patents

#### Strengthening patent protection discourages innovation – empirical data.

Day & Udick ’19 (Gregory Day; J.D., Ph.D., is an Assistant Professor at the University of Georgia Terry College of Business with a courtesy appointment in the School of Law. Steven Udick; J.D., is an Associate at Skiermont Derby, LLP; “Patent Law and the Emigration of Innovation”; *Washington Law Review*; Vol. 94:119; pg. 124-125)

This Article is one of the first dedicated to the hidden incentives of patent law shopping.19 Using data provided to us from the Global IP Project20 Darts-ip,21 our analysis explores whether firms optimize value by placing R&D and innovation in countries with “better” patent laws. To verify our models, we interviewed notable patent attorneys practicing in the United States, Europe, and Asia. Our hypothesis is that foreign patent environments offer inventors meaningful options influencing where they choose to innovate but not in the expected ways. We find that inventors are heterogeneous with contrasting preferences depending on their stage of innovation.22 Entrenched patent owners value stronger patent rights—reflected by sizeable royalty awards, treble damages, and equitable remedies—to deter and punish acts of infringement.23 Inventors during the innovation stage, on the other hand, have incentives to develop technology where patent rights are *weaker*. This is because the innovation process exposes the typical inventor to liability if the inventor’s R&D has unwittingly (or intentionally) incorporated another’s patented technology without permission.24 Increasing this issue’s saliency, there are both practicing and non-practicing entities that, in asserting meritless patent infringement claims, exploit the high costs of U.S. patent litigation; this strategy is typically meant to either extract rents from inventors or frustrate efforts to develop competing technology, which may lead early stage innovators to seek out foreign patent regimes.25 As a partner at an international law firm confirmed to us, patent litigation is a common strategy used against upstart companies who have “stepped on the toes” of dominant players.26 Another practitioner witnessed “egregious” examples of large companies “steamrolling” smaller inventors using patent litigation.27 Given the average cost to defend an infringement lawsuit in the United States is roughly $3.5 million28 and royalty awards have surpassed $2.5 billion29— which inventors can potentially mitigate by innovating almost anywhere but the United States—this may explain why the United States has reportedly lost innovation. Our results generate novel empirical and theoretical insights into the way patent rights incentivize innovation. According to our quantitative analysis, some firms avoid the litigation risks of U.S. patent law by developing technology in countries that have lessened the costs and risks of patent enforcement (i.e., all the costs borne from the patent assertion and litigation processes).30 We deduce, then, that a critical and generally ignored element of patent law’s ability to promote innovation concerns where the resulting innovation takes place. It seems industry advocates and patent scholars overestimate how much innovation strong patent protection generates, while underestimating the deterrent effect of the high costs associated with patent enforcement. So, contrary to popular logic, recent congressional efforts, and industry advocates,31 our findings indicate that the increasingly common proposal to strengthen patent rights would have the opposite effect of diminishing innovation in the United States

## PIC---OPEC

### 2AC---“Private Sector”

#### Private sector is non-governmental.

Black’s Law 14 Black's Law Dictionary (10th ed. 2014), private sector PRIVATE SECTOR Bryan A. Garner, Editor in Chief

Private sector (1930) The part of the economy or an industry that is free from direct governmental control. Cf. public sector.

#### OPEC is governmental.

Dictionary.com no date (https://www.dictionary.com/browse/opec)

noun

an organization founded in 1960 of nations that export large amounts of petroleum: formed to establish oil-exporting policies and set prices.

## CP---State AG

### 2AC---AT: CP---State Antitrust

#### The presumption against extraterritorial antitrust denies states the ability to remand foreign conduct.

Buxbaum 17, \*Hannah L. Buxbaum, vice president for international affairs at Indiana University. She is a professor at the Indiana University Maurer School of Law in Bloomington, Indiana, where she holds the John E. Schiller Chair in Legal Ethics. She was appointed vice president for international affairs in 2018. (2017, “Determining the Territorial Scope of State Law in Interstate and International Conflicts: Comments on the Draft Restatement International Conflicts: Comments on the Draft Restatement (Third) and on the Role of Party Autonomy (Third) and on the Role of Party Autonomy”, https://www.repository.law.indiana.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3548&context=facpub)

B. The Presumption Against Extraterritorial Application of State Law in International Conflicts

The application of state law in international cases creates the potential for conflict between that law and the law of a foreign nation. In two critical respects, such cases present the same problems as the application of federal law in international cases. First, they create the possibility of international discord. Second, due to foreign affairs concerns, they create a potential problem regarding the allocation of power within the U.S. political system (although, as we will see, of a slightly different nature than in the federal context). Many courts applying a presumption against the application of state law in international cases acknowledge the difference between interpretation of federal and state legislation, but recognize these similarities.30 In addressing the need to avoid friction with foreign sovereigns, for instance, courts invoke international comity as a reason for the presumption. In an age discrimination claim brought under Pennsylvania human rights law, for example, a federal district court stated:

[F]ederal courts will only attribute to Congress an intent to apply federal law outside the United States when Congress has very explicitly expressed such an intention. The rationale for this reluctance—respect for the sovereignty of other nations within their territories—should make courts even more reluctant to apply state law outside the boundaries of the United States.31

With respect to the allocation of authority to address matters of foreign relations, where the federal cases focus on separation of powers between the political branches and the judiciary, the state cases focus on the division of power between state and federal lawmakers. The Supreme Court has held that, as a general matter, the sovereign authority of U.S. states to regulate extraterritorially is analogous to that of the federal government.32 However, several constitutional doctrines limit the role of the states in matters of foreign affairs. Courts often invoke these limitations in justifying a presumption against the extraterritorial application of state law in international cases. In one representative case, the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals considered the application of state tort law in an international case.33 It noted that the classic presumption against extraterritoriality applies only to federal legislation, and reasoned that “given that the Constitution entrusts foreign affairs to the federal political branches, limits state power over foreign affairs, and establishes the supremacy of federal enactments over state law, the presumption against extraterritorial application is even stronger in the context of state tort law.”34 Other cases have similarly invoked the limited role of states in matters of foreign affairs.35

For similar reasons, courts addressing the applicability of state regulatory law in international cases often decide that the geographic scope of those laws is coterminous with the geographic scope of their federal counterparts. In one case, a court considered the geographic scope of the Donnelly Act, New York’s antitrust statute.36 The court concluded:

It is not necessary to know precisely the extent of the Donnelly Act’s extraterritorial reach to understand that it cannot reach foreign conduct deliberately placed by Congress beyond the Sherman Act’s jurisdiction. The federal limitation upon the reach of the Sherman Act, predicated upon and an expression of the essentially federal power to regulate foreign commerce, would be undone if states remained free to authorize “little Sherman Act” claims that went beyond it. The established presumption is, of course, against the extraterritorial operation of New York law, and we do not see how it could be overcome in a situation where the analogue federal claim would be barred by congressional enactment.37

#### The FTAIA limits overreach---state action will be preempted.

O’Rourke 10, \*Ken O’Rourke Senior Partner, O'Melveny & Myers LLP, an international law firm specializing in antitrust; (March 3rd, 2010, “United States: The FTAIA In State Court: A Defense Perspective,” https://www.mondaq.com/unitedstates/trade-regulation-practices/95030/the-ftaia-in-state-court-a-defense-perspective?utm\_source=pocket\_mylist)

As federal courts tighten the reins on private antitrust actions, some antitrust plaintiffs are focusing their attention on litigating in state court. And they are being creative about how to avoid removal to federal court.1 Yet, as antitrust plaintiffs turn to state court and state law, they are likely to face some of the same federal doctrines they would prefer to avoid.

One federal doctrine sure to arise in state court antitrust actions when there are allegations or damages based on cross-border conduct is the Foreign Trade Antitrust Improvements Act ("FTAIA").2 The FTAIA defines the limits on the reach of the Sherman Act in cases involving foreign trade and commerce.

The FTAIA's parameters continue to evolve as litigants and the courts wrestle with new variations of the basic allegation that international price-fixing or overseas monopolistic conduct "caused" domestic injury on which a Sherman Act claim is based.

Congress enacted the FTAIA in 1982, some 92 years after the enactment of the Sherman Act. The FTAIA operates by "removing" anticompetitive conduct in foreign trade or commerce (other than import trade or import commerce) "from the Sherman Act's reach," unless that same conduct also causes direct, foreseeable and substantial injury to domestic trade or commerce within the United States, U.S. import commerce, or exporting activities of American exporters.3

A threshold question is whether these limitations similarly restrict the extraterritorial application of state antitrust laws. Defendants will argue that the state antitrust laws cannot permissibly extend to reach conduct or give rise to damages that Congress has placed beyond the reach of federal antitrust law under the FTAIA.

The defendants' argument goes like this. First, under the Supremacy Clause of the U.S. Constitution,4 federal law preempts state law even in the absence of an express preemption provision when, "under the circumstances of [a] particular case, [the challenged state law] stands as an obstacle to the accomplishment and execution of the full purposes and objectives of Congress."5

Second, the FTAIA's legislative history establishes that Congress had multiple objectives when enacting the statute. One objective was to ensure that the risk of Sherman Act liability did not prevent American exporters and other firms doing business abroad from entering into advantageous "business arrangements (such as joint selling arrangements), however anticompetitive, as long as those arrangements adversely affect only foreign markets."6

Another objective was to eliminate "ambiguity in the precise legal standard to be employed in determining whether American antitrust law is to be applied to a particular transaction."7

Congress sought to adopt a "clear benchmark ... for businessmen, attorneys and judges as well as [U.S.] trading partners"8 with the "ultimate purpose" of "promot[ing] certainty in assessing the applicability of American antitrust law to international business transactions and proposed transactions."9

A third objective was to promote international comity by acknowledging and respecting the prerogatives of other nations to establish and apply their own standards for regulating and remediating alleged restraints of trade in their own markets.10

Congress believed that respecting such foreign sovereign regulatory prerogatives would ultimately best serve U.S. interests by "encourage[ing] our trading partners to take more effective steps to protect competition in their markets."11

Applying state antitrust laws to regulate foreign trade or commerce excluded from federal antitrust jurisdiction by the FTAIA arguably would frustrate every one of these objectives.

American exporters and other businesses engaged in foreign trade or commerce could have no confidence that restraints exempted from federal antitrust attack would not be subject to alternative antitrust attack under the laws of one or more U.S. states. Businesses, therefore, would be deterred from entering into arrangements that Congress intended to enable.

Likewise, ambiguity in the "standard to be employed" for assessing the extraterritorial application of "American antitrust law" would not only persist, but would be multiplied fifty times.

And the imposition of as many as 50 states' antitrust laws on foreign trade or commerce clearly would negate the federal objectives of international comity and respect for foreign regulation of foreign markets.

#### Foreign defendants can remove cases to the federal level.

Crowell and Moring 08, \*Crowell and Moring LLP provide legal services across the world and specialize in antitrust, (2008, “THE ABCs OF CROSS-BORDER LITIGATION IN THE UNITED STATES”, https://www.crowell.com/files/ABC-Guide-to-Cross-Border-Litigation\_Crowell-Moring.pdf)

FEDERAL COURT JURISDICTION

Jurisdiction in the U.S. federal courts is somewhat more restrictive. The federal courts are called courts of “limited jurisdiction” because they are available only for certain limited types of disputes, including cases involving the U.S. or foreign governments, questions relating to international treaties or agreements, cases arising under federal laws or regulations, and cases between residents of different states.

Still, the jurisdiction of federal courts remains broad, especially for disputes between U.S. and non-U.S. parties. The procedural rules governing the federal courts expressly grant subject matter jurisdiction over claims between U.S. and non-U.S. citizens. While the text appears simple, this rule in practice can present many complexities. For example, what is the citizenship of an entity that is incorporated in Hungary but has its primary place of business in the U.S.? What about a corporation that is separately incorporated in the U.S. and in the E.U.? There are a range of legal strategies that may be available to a non-U.S. company in this regard. It is important to discuss these options with U.S. counsel to be able to make an informed judgment regarding how to proceed in the U.S. litigation.

It is important to bear in mind that some federal statutes may apply to conduct abroad of both foreign and U.S. corporations. For example, certain federal antitrust laws may apply where the conduct was meant to produce and in fact did produce a substantial effect in the United States. Other examples of laws that may be applied extraterritorially include certain federal securities and international banking laws, the Alien Tort Claims Act, suits against foreign states, various federal civil rights acts, and claims related to international arbitration agreements.

REMOVAL FROM STATE COURT TO FEDERAL COURT

“Removal” permits defendants sued in state court to “remove” the case from state court, in certain circumstances, so that it may be adjudicated by a federal court. A party sued in state court may favor proceeding in federal court for many reasons: federal courts may be more predictable, consistent, and experienced in certain matters than state courts; however, federal court litigation also may be more expensive and time-consuming than litigation in the state courts. As usual, with each rule there are exceptions. For example, federal courts in the Eastern District of Virginia are known for moving extremely quickly while some judges in other jurisdictions can take months or even years to resolve threshold questions in a case.

## K---Capitalism

### 2AC---Capitalism Good

#### Cap is good:

#### 1---Development---market competition is a critical predictor of growth---cartels diminish fair pricing, production and R&D, which creates breeding grounds for violent conflict---that’s Cortright---independently, competition alleviates poverty, inequality, and improves quality of life---that’s Khameni.

#### Alt can’t solve it---decline hammers global development, causes poverty to skyrocket.

Piper 21, \*Kelsey Piper, a Staff Writer for Vox's new vertical; (August 3rd, 2021,“Can we save the planet by shrinking the economy?”, https://www.vox.com/future-perfect/22408556/save-planet-shrink-economy-degrowth)

The tension at the heart of degrowth: Can we fix global poverty without economic growth?

One big problem with degrowth is this simple fact: In the coming decades, most carbon emissions won’t be coming from rich countries like the US — they’ll be happening in newly middle-income countries, like India, China, or Indonesia. Already, developing nations account for 63 percent of emissions, and they’re expected to account for even more as they develop further and as the rich world decarbonizes.

Even if emissions in rich countries go to zero very soon, climate change is set to worsen as poorer countries increase their own emissions.

That will, of course, have deeply negative climate impacts. But the alternative is a nonstarter — should the world really prioritize curbing emissions and economic growth if it meant suppressing the growth of those countries?

Degrowthers see no dilemma here. What Hickel envisions is global movement in two directions: Poor countries could develop up to a certain level of prosperity and then stop; rich countries could develop down to that level and then stop. Thus, climate catastrophe could be averted, all while making the world’s poor more prosperous.

“Rich countries urgently need to reduce their excess energy and resource use to sustainable levels so our sisters and brothers in the global South can live well too,” Hickel put it. “We live on an abundant planet and we can all flourish on it together, but to do so we have to share it more fairly, and build economies that are designed around meeting human needs rather than around perpetual growth.”

From a climate change perspective, though, there’s a problem. First, it means that degrowth would do nothing about the bulk of emissions, [which are occurring in developing countries](https://www.cgdev.org/media/developing-countries-are-responsible-63-percent-current-carbon-emissions).

Second, the global economy is more interconnected than Hickel implies. When Covid-19 hit, poor countries were devastated not just by the virus but by the [aftershocks of virus-induced slowdowns in consumption in rich countries](https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/799701589552654684/pdf/Costs-and-Trade-Offs-in-the-Fight-Against-the-COVID-19-Pandemic-A-Developing-Country-Perspective.pdf).

There’s some genuine appeal to the idea of an end to “consumerism,” but the pandemic offered a taste of how a sudden drop in rich-world consumption would actually affect the developing world. Covid-19 [dramatically curtailed Western imports and tourism for a time](https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/799701589552654684/pdf/Costs-and-Trade-Offs-in-the-Fight-Against-the-COVID-19-Pandemic-A-Developing-Country-Perspective.pdf). The consequences in poor countries were devastating. Hunger rose, and child mortality followed.

Covid-19, of course, wreaked direct economic havoc at the same time, with lockdowns having an [especially negative impact on some poor countries](https://www.vox.com/future-perfect/2020/4/18/21212688/coronavirus-lockdowns-developing-world); the effects of the pandemic and international demand shock were combined, and in some cases they’re hard to separate. But the United Nations, the [World Bank](https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/799701589552654684/pdf/Costs-and-Trade-Offs-in-the-Fight-Against-the-COVID-19-Pandemic-A-Developing-Country-Perspective.pdf), and expert analyses point to the decline in global consumption as a significant part of the picture.

Degrowthers reject this concern on two fronts: First, they argue that a sustained, deliberate reduction in consumption wouldn’t be anything like a recession. Recessions, they agree, are really bad, but that’s because consumption falls in affected sectors, instead of being targeted at things that don’t improve well-being. Degrowth, they say, would be different.

Second, they contend that there is some path to economic growth in poor countries that doesn’t rely on trade with rich ones — certainly some countries managed economic growth when the whole world was poor, after all.

Hickel’s perspective is that most trade between rich and poor countries is extractive, not mutually beneficial — and that maybe when that dynamic ceases, poor countries will have the chance for the catch-up growth they merit. That’s one take. But it means that degrowth’s case for not crushing the poor world is predicated on a speculative take on how those countries can grow — one that democratically elected leaders in those countries largely don’t share.

What GDP doesn’t capture — and what it can tell us

In a way, the debate over degrowth is a debate over the meaning of one economic indicator: gross domestic product (GDP).

GDP measures the transactions within an economy — all the occasions when money changes hands in exchange for goods and services. It’s not wealth, but it’s one of the primary ways we measure wealth.

It certainly doesn’t capture everything of value. When parents spend a quiet weekend at home teaching their children to read, for example, nothing GDP-generating has happened — but value has certainly been created.

Degrowth articles burst with such examples. GDP, they love to point out, includes the production of things like nerve gas, even though that has no social value. And it doesn’t include storytelling, singing, gardening, and other simple human pleasures.

“If our washing machines, fridges, and phones lasted twice as long, we would consume half as many (thus the output of those industries would decline), but with zero reduction in our access to those goods,” Hickel told me. If everyone worked half the hours they currently do, and made half the income, they might mostly be better off — at least, assuming that their basic needs were still met.

“We propose policies like a living wage, a maximum income ratio, wealth taxes, etc. to accomplish this,” Hickel told me. “Given all of this, the language of poverty really gets it wrong: longer-lasting products, living wages, shorter working weeks, better access to public services and affordable housing — we are calling for the opposite of poverty. Yes, industries like SUVs and fast fashion would decline, but that doesn’t mean poverty. We can replace them with public transportation and longer-lasting fashion, thus meeting everyone’s needs.”

There’s a lot of speculation here, and a lot of what degrowth’s critics would call hand-waving. Degrowth is fundamentally premised on the claim that we can cease to focus on growth while getting better than ever at addressing human needs. If that’s true, then that would certainly be great news.

But in many ways, it’s a vision more wildly optimistic — disconnected from actual policy results — than any of the more standard “sustainable development” models degrowthers criticize for being out of touch.

First, in the world today, there’s an extremely strong association between growth and welfare outcomes of every kind. GDP, while imperfect, is a better predictor of a country’s welfare state, outcomes for poor citizens in that country, and well-being measures like leisure time and life expectancy than any other measure.

“GDP does leave out non-commercialized activities that are welfare-enhancing,” economist Branko Milanovic writes in a [rebuttal of degrowth](https://brankomilanovic.substack.com/p/degrowth-solving-the-impasse-by-magical):

It is, like every other measure, imperfect and one-dimensional. But ... it is imperfect at the edges while fairly accurate overall. Richer countries are countries that are generally better-off in almost all metrics, from education, life expectancy, child mortality to women’s employment etc. Not only that: richer people are also on average healthier, better educated, and happier. Income indeed buys you health and happiness. (It does not guarantee that you are a better person; but that’s a different topic.) The metric of income or GDP is strongly associated with positive outcomes, whether we compare countries to each other, or people (within a country) to each other.

The things degrowthers care about — leisure time, health care, life expectancy — are strongly correlated with societal wealth. The generosity of a welfare state and the availability of transfers to a state’s poorest people are also strongly correlated with societal wealth. Innovation, discovery, invention, and medical technology improvements are also strongly correlated with societal wealth.

The strong correlation between child mortality and GDP per capita is apparent on the above graph. There are some outliers — some countries outperform or underperform their GDP somewhat, in terms of preventing child deaths — but in general, wealth strongly predicts child survival. No single, simple medical intervention causes the difference. Wealthier societies on average get better health outcomes across the board.

This graph looks at child mortality not just by comparing rich countries to poor ones but also by comparing countries over time, as they get richer: Getting richer improves outcomes for children.

Leisure time, too, has increased — and hours worked have declined — as the world has gotten wealthier.

It might be possible in principle to do better — to decouple, if you will, health and well-being from access to material resources, so that everyone is well-off with many fewer resources.

But the examples degrowthers point to remain speculative ones; if we ought to be skeptical, as degrowthers argue we should be, about the decoupling of wealth from ecological impact, we ought to be at least as skeptical about the prospects of decoupling wealth from living standards.

“In the end, economic growth is about the production of stuff that people need and then the consumption of those things by the people who need it,” Max Roser at Our World in Data, a research institute focused on finding, visualizing, and communicating historical economic and health data, told me. He added:

The money aspect, and the abstract concept of GDP, distract us and make it less obvious what it’s actually about. People want to have enough food, they need to go to the doctor, they need childcare, they want a good education. People need lots of stuff, and one thing that people care about are goods and services, and they need to be produced, and economic growth is about an increase in the quality and quantity of the goods and services that people need.

#### 2---War---Cap solves nuclear war through interdependence---the alt’s disruption causes a transition war.

Drezner ’16 [Daniel; May 2016; Professor of International Politics at Tufts University, Ph.D. in Political Science and M.A. in Economics in Stanford University, B.A. in Political Economy from Williams College; Brookings Institution, “Five Known Unknowns about the Next Generation Global Political Economy,” <https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/IOS-Drezner-web.pdf>]

Multiple scholars have observed a secular decline in interstate violence in recent decades.105 The Kantian triad of more democracies, stronger multilateral institutions, and greater levels of cross-border trade is well known. In recent years, international relations theorists have stressed that commercial interdependence is a bigger driver of this phenomenon than previously thought.106 The liberal logic is straightforward. The benefits of cross-border exchange and economic interdependence act as a powerful brake on the utility of violence in international politics. The global supply chain and “just in time” delivery systems have further imbricated national economies into the international system. This creates incentives for governments to preserve an open economy even during times of crisis. The more that a country’s economy was enmeshed in the global supply chain, for example, the less likely it was to raise tariffs after the 2008 financial crisis.107 Similarly, global financiers are strongly interested in minimizing political risk; historically, the financial sector has staunchly opposed initiating the use of force in world politics.108 Even militarily powerful actors must be wary of alienating global capital.

Globalization therefore creates powerful pressures on governments not to close off their economies through protectionism or military aggression. Interdependence can also tamp down conflicts that would otherwise be likely to break out during a great power transition. Of the 15 times a rising power has emerged to challenge a ruling power between 1500 and 2000, war broke out 11 times.109 Despite these odds, China’s recent rise to great power status has elevated tensions without leading to anything approaching war. It could be argued that the Sino-American economic relationship is so deep that it has tamped down the great power conflict that would otherwise have been in full bloom over the past two decades. Instead, both China and the United States have taken pains to talk about the need for a new kind of great power relationship. Interdependence can help to reduce the likelihood of an extreme event—such as a great power war—from taking place.

#### 3---Warming---clean energy is rapidly superseding fossil fuels which is sufficient to avoid tipping points.

Wallace-Wells 21, \*David Wallace-Wells is deputy editor of New York magazine, where he also writes frequently about climate change and the near future of science and technology; (January 18th, 2021, “After Alarmism”, https://nymag.com/intelligencer/article/climate-change-after-pandemic.html)

The change is much bigger than the turnover of American leadership. By the time the Biden presidency finds its footing in a vaccinated world, the bounds of climate possibility will have been remade. Just a half-decade ago, it was widely believed that a “business as usual” emissions path would bring the planet four or five degrees of warming — enough to make large parts of Earth effectively uninhabitable. Now, thanks to the rapid death of coal, the revolution in the price of renewable energy, and a global climate politics forged by a generational awakening, the [expectation](https://climateactiontracker.org/global/temperatures/) is for about three degrees. Recent pledges [could bring us closer to two](https://climateactiontracker.org/publications/global-update-paris-agreement-turning-point/). All of these projections sketch a hazardous and unequal future, and all are clouded with uncertainties — about the climate system, about technology, about the dexterity and intensity of human response, about how inequitably the most punishing impacts will be distributed. Yet if each half-degree of warming marks an entirely different level of suffering, we appear to have shaved a few of them off our likeliest end stage in not much time at all.

The next half-degrees will be harder to shave off, and the most crucial increment — getting from two degrees to 1.5 — perhaps impossible, dashing the dream of avoiding what was long described as “catastrophic” change. But for a climate alarmist like me, seeing clearly the state of the planet’s future now requires a conspicuous kind of double vision, in which a guarded optimism seems perhaps as reasonable as panic. Given how long we’ve waited to move, what counts now as a best-case outcome remains grim. It also appears, miraculously, within reach.

In December, a month after Biden was elected promising to return the U.S. to the Paris agreement, the U.N. celebrated five years since the signing of those accords. They were five of the six hottest on record. (The sixth was 2015, the year the agreement was signed.) They were also the years with the highest levels of carbon output in the history of humanity — with emissions equivalent to what was produced by all human and industrial activity from the speciation of Homo sapiens to the start of World War II.

They have also been the five years in which the nations of the world — and cities and regions, individuals and institutions, corporations and central banks — have made the most ambitious pledges of future climate action. Most of them were made in the past 12 months, in the face of the pandemic. Or, perhaps, to some degree, because of it — because the pandemic demanded a full-body jolt to the global political economy, provoking much more aggressive government spending, a much more accommodating perspective on debt, and a much greater openness to large-scale actions and investments of the kind that might plausibly reshape the world. And because decarbonization has come to seem, even to those economists and policy-makers blinded for decades to the moral and humanitarian cases for reform, a rational investment. “When I think about climate change,” Biden is fond of saying, “the word I think of is jobs.”

There are two ways of looking at these seemingly contradictory sets of facts. The first is that the distance between what is being done and what needs to be done is only growing. This is the finding of, among others, the U.N.’s comprehensive [“Emissions Gap” report](https://www.unenvironment.org/emissions-gap-report-2020), issued in December, which found that staying below two degrees of warming would require a tripling of stated ambitions. To bring the planet in reach of the 1.5-degree target — favored by activists, most scientists, and really anyone reading their work with open eyes — would require a quintupling. It is also the perspective of Greta Thunberg, who has spent the pandemic year castigating global leaders for paying mere lip service to far-off decarbonization targets and who called the E.U.’s new net-zero emissions law “surrender.”

The second is that all of the relevant curves are bending — too slowly but nevertheless in the right direction. The International Energy Agency, a notoriously conservative forecaster, recently [called](https://www.carbonbrief.org/solar-is-now-cheapest-electricity-in-history-confirms-iea#:~:text=Source%3A%20IEA%20World%20Energy%20Outlook%202020.&text=Together%2C%20low%2Dcarbon%20sources%20would,up%20from%2019%25%20in%202019.) solar power “the cheapest electricity in history” and projected that India will build 86 percent less new coal power capacity than it thought just one year ago. Today, business as usual no longer means a fivefold increase of coal use this century, as was once expected. It means pretty rapid decarbonization, at least by the standards of history, in which hardly any has ever taken place before.

Both of these perspectives are true. The gap is real, and the world risks tumbling into it, subjecting much of the global South to unconscionable punishments all the way down. But in the months since the pandemic wiped climate strikers off the streets, their concerns have seeped into not just public-opinion surveys but parliaments and presidencies, trade deals and the advertising business, finance and insurance — in short, all the citadels presiding over the ancien régime of fossil capital.

This is not exactly a climate revolution; the strikers and their allies didn’t win in the way they wanted to, at least not yet. But they did win something. Environmental anxieties haven’t toppled neoliberalism. Instead, to an unprecedented degree, they infiltrated it. (Or perhaps they were appropriated by it. It’s an open question.) Climate change isn’t an issue just for die-hards anymore — it’s for normies, sellouts, and anyone with their finger in the wind. It will take time, of course, for voters to see empty rhetoric for what it is, and for consumers to learn to distinguish, say, between the claims of guiltless airline tickets, or between carbon-free foods in the supermarket aisle. Harder still will be sorting through the differences between real corporate commitments like Microsoft’s and more evasive ones, like BP’s. Already, there is considerable consternation among climate activists that the public doesn’t understand the tricky math of “net-zero” on which so many of these commitments have been made—it is not a promise of ending emissions, but of offsetting some amount of them, in the future, with “negative emissions,” sometimes called “carbon dioxide removal,” though no approach of that kind is ready to go at anything like the necessary scale. And while some amount of skepticism about those commitments is surely warranted, it is also the case that, according to [a recent Bloomberg review](https://www.bloomberg.com/graphics/2020-company-emissions-pledges/), of 187 corporate climate pledges made for 2020 in 2015, 138 will be met. (Many of those promises were quite modest, but it is a much better performance than has been managed by the 189 parties to the Paris agreement, of which only two — Morocco and Gambia — are today [judged](https://climateactiontracker.org/countries/) fully “compatible” with the 1.5-degree goal, and only six more with the 2-degree target).

In the political sphere, the uneasy alliance between activists and those in power will be tested, producing new conflicts, or new equilibria, or both. Consider, though, that Varshini Prakash, whose [Sunrise Movement](https://www.sunrisemovement.org/) gave Biden’s primary candidacy an F, later helped write his climate plan along with Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez. Climate expertise has been distributed throughout the incoming administration, as was promised during a campaign that closed, remarkably, with a climate-focused advertising blitz. During the transition, Biden’s pick for director of the National Economic Council, Brian Deese, was targeted by the environmental left for his time with BlackRock, but even this purported stooge had been married by Bill McKibben, one of the godfathers of modern climate activism.

Elsewhere in the world, where 85 percent of global emissions are produced, the great infiltration of climate concerns represents what the British environmental [writer](https://www.businessgreen.com/blog-post/4025199/2020-crisis-crossroads-alternative-histories) James Murray has called “an alternative history to 2020” and what the scientist turned journalist Akshat Rathi [has declared](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2021-01-05/climate-action-is-embedding-into-how-the-world-works) “a strong sign that climate action is starting to be ‘institutionalized’ — that is, getting deeply embedded into how the world works.” This is not about coronavirus lockdowns producing emissions drops or “nature healing.” It is instead about long-standing trajectories passing obvious tipping points in coal use and political salience; promises and posturing by powerful if compromised institutions; and policy progress almost smuggled into place, all over the world, under cover of pandemic night. In the U.S., in the second coronavirus stimulus, [$35 billion in clean-energy spending](https://nymag.com/intelligencer/2020/12/what-is-in-covid-stimulus-omnibus-climate-pell-grants-medical-billing.html) passed in the Senate 92-6 — an effective down payment, energy researcher Varun Sivaram has estimated, on the innovation spending needed for a full electrification of the country. Did you even notice?

Biden’s climate plan now faces the challenge of a filibuster, a skeptical Supreme Court, and the mood of Senator Joe Manchin of West Virginia, which means American climate action over the next four years is probably more likely to be delivered piecemeal — through appropriations and stimulus, executive action, and regulation — than through a landmark Green New Deal–style piece of legislation. That does limit what can be achieved, but it also means avoiding a protracted battle over climate as a referendum on the identity of the nation. And at least nominally, having been pressured by activists to do so, Biden is promising to multiply the green spending in that recent stimulus by a factor of 60.

The numbers are numbingly large — reminders that in the midst of pandemic turmoil, the rules of state spending have been dramatically revised and perhaps even suspended. Is this global free-spending binge the beginning of a new era or merely a crisis interregnum to be followed by a new new austerity? “We don’t know what the recovery packages of COVID are going to be,” Christiana Figueres, one of the central architects of the Paris accords, told me this summer. “And honestly, the depth of decarbonization is going to largely depend on the characteristics of those recovery packages more than on anything else, because of their scale. We’re already at $12 trillion; we could go up to $20 trillion over the next 18 months. We have never seen — the world has never seen — $20 trillion go into the economy over such a short period of time. That is going to determine the logic, the structures, and certainly the carbon intensity of the global economy at least for a decade, if not more.”

For those dreaming of a climate recovery, the first round of spending was not so encouraging. The E.U. was the gold standard, promising that 30 percent of its stimulus would be earmarked for climate. The U.S. and China each pledged only a fraction of that (and in each case, there was fossil stimulus, too). But in October, a team of researchers including Joeri Rogelj of the Imperial College of London [calculated](https://www.reuters.com/article/climate-change-stimulus/tenth-of-pandemic-stimulus-spend-could-help-world-reach-climate-goals-study-idUSKBN271098) that just one-tenth of the COVID-19 stimulus spending already committed around the world, directed toward decarbonization during each of the next five years, would be sufficient to deliver the goals of the Paris agreement and stop global warming well below two degrees. That analysis may be a touch optimistic, but the level of spending seems, now, doable.

When Donald Trump was elected, trashing Paris, climate hawks were left hoping that the world would hang on for the length of his administration — insisting that, in the long term, the crisis couldn’t be solved without America at the helm. But the past four years of missing leadership have produced astonishing gains.

The price of solar energy has fallen ninefold over the past decade, as has the price of lithium batteries, critical to the growth of electric cars. The costs of utility-scale batteries, which could solve the “intermittency” (i.e., cloudy day) problem of renewables and help power whole cities in relatively short order, have fallen 70 percent since just 2015. Wind power is 40 percent cheaper than it was a decade ago, with offshore wind experiencing an even steeper decline. Overall, renewable energy is less expensive than dirty energy almost everywhere on the planet, and in many places it is simply cheaper to build new renewable capacity than to continue running the old fossil-fuel infrastructure. Oil demand and carbon emissions may both have peaked this year. Eighty percent of coal plants planned in Asia’s developing countries have been shelved.

This summer, I heard the Australian scientist and entrepreneur Saul Griffith talk about what it would take to get the U.S. within range of a 1.5 degree world. He said it would mean that beginning in 2021, this year, every single person buying a new car would have to be buying an electric one. That seems unrealistic, I thought, making a note of it as a useful benchmark illustrating just how far we have to go.

Then, in the fall, the U.K. pledged to ban nonelectrics by 2030—a once-unthinkable law coming both too slow and much more quickly than seemed possible not very long ago. Similar plans are now in place in 16 other countries, plus Massachusetts and California. Canada recently raised its tax on carbon sixfold. Italy cut its power-sector emissions 65 percent between 2012 and 2019, and Denmark is now aiming to reduce its overall emissions 70 percent by 2030. “We set ourselves challenges that on paper looked almost impossible,” the country’s minister for the environment, Dan Jørgensen, told me recently. “And I think experts in many countries said, when looking at Denmark, ‘This is going to be too expensive, this is going to lower their living standards, this is going to hurt their ability to compete.’ But actually I’m proud to say that the opposite has happened. Now, of course, we have set even higher standards.”

In the midst of the pandemic, new net-zero pledges, far more ambitious than those offered at Paris, were independently made by Japan, South Korea, the E.U., and, most significant, China, the world’s biggest emitter, which promised to reach an emissions peak by 2030 and get all the way to zero by 2060. China’s promise is so ambitious it has inspired one wave of debate among experts about whether it is even feasible — given that it would require, for instance, roughly twice as much renewable power to be installed every year for the next decade as Germany has operating nationwide today — and another debate about whether it has revived the possibility of that 1.5-degree target, with economic historian Adam Tooze writing, just after Xi Jinping’s surprise announcement in September, that it single-handedly “redefined the future prospects for humanity.” Together, the new net-zero pledges may have subtracted a full half-degree from ultimate warming. Add Biden’s campaign pledge of net zero by 2050, and you’ve got about two-thirds of global emissions at least nominally committed to firm, aggressive timelines to zero.

These are all just paper promises, of course, and the history of climate action is littered with the receipts of similar ones uncashed. Plot the growth of carbon concentration in the atmosphere against the sequence of climate-action conferences and a distressing pattern emerges: the World Meteorological Conference of 1979, the U.N. framework of 1992, the Kyoto protocol of 1997, the Copenhagen accord of 2009, and the 2015 Paris accords, all tracking an uninterrupted trajectory upward for carbon from a “safe” level under 350 parts per million, past 400, to 414 today, and pointing upward from there. Before the industrial revolution, humans had never known an atmosphere with even 300 parts per million. Inevitably now, within a few years, the concentration will reach levels not seen since 3.3 million years ago, when sea levels were 60 feet higher. For all their momentum, renewables still only make up 10 percent of global electricity production.

But alarmists have to take the good news where they find it. And while mood affiliation is not always the best guide to the state of the world, in 2020, for me, there were three main sources of hope.

The first is the fact that the age of climate denial is over thanks to extreme weather and the march of science and the historic labor of activists — climate strikers, Sunrise, Extinction Rebellion — whose success in raising alarm may have been so sudden that they brought an end to the age of climate Jeremiahs as well. Their voices now echo in some unlikely places. Exxon was booted from the S&P 500 within months of Tesla making Elon Musk the world’s richest man. The cultural cachet of oil companies is quickly approaching that of tobacco companies. Jair Bolsonaro of Brazil aside, practically every leader of every country and every major figure in every corporate and industrial sector now feels obligated — because of protest and social pressure, economic realities, and cultural expectation — to at least make a show of support for climate action. It would be nice not to have to count that as progress, but it is. The questions are: How much does it matter? And what will follow? Disinformation and human disregard are not the only instruments of delay, and the age of climate denial is likely to yield first not to an age of straightforward climate deliverance but to one characterized by climate hypocrisy, greenwashing, and gaslighting. But those things, ugly and maddening and even criminal as they are, have always been with us. It is the other thing that is new.

The second source of good news is the arrival on the global stage of climate self-interest. By this I don’t mean the profiteering logic of BlackRock, which opportunistically announced some half-hearted climate commitments last year, but rather the growing consensus in almost every part of the globe, and at almost every level of society and governance, that the world will be made better through decarbonization. A decade ago, many of the more ruthless capitalists to analyze that project deemed it too expensive to undertake. Today, it suddenly appears almost too good a deal to pass up. (A recent McKinsey [report](https://www.mckinsey.com/business-functions/sustainability/our-insights/how-the-european-union-could-achieve-net-zero-emissions-at-net-zero-cost): “Net-Zero Emissions at Net-Zero Cost.”)

The logic may be clearest in considering the effects of air pollution, which kills an estimated 9 million people per year. In India, where more than 8 percent of GDP is lost to pollution, poor air quality is also responsible for 350,000 miscarriages and stillbirths every year. Globally, coal kills one person for every thousand people it provides power to, and even in the U.S., with its enviably clean air, total decarbonization would be entirely paid for, Duke’s Drew Shindell [recently testified](https://www.vox.com/energy-and-environment/2020/8/12/21361498/climate-change-air-pollution-us-india-china-deaths) before Congress, just through the public-health benefits of cutting out fossil fuels. You don’t even have to calculate any of the other returns — more jobs, cheaper energy, new infrastructure. Of course, countries all around the world are incorporating those considerations too, turning the page on a generation of economic analysis that said decarbonization was too costly and its benefits too small to sell to the public as upside.

A decade ago, capitalists deemed decarbonization too expensive. Suddenly, it appears too good a deal to pass up.

What is perhaps most striking about all the new climate pledges is not just that they were made in the absence of American leadership but that they were made outside the boundaries of the Paris framework. They are not the result of geopolitical strong-arming or “Kumbaya” consensus. They are, instead, plans arrived at internally, in some cases secretly. This has been eye-opening for the many skeptics who worried for decades about climate’s collective-action problem — who warned that because the benefits of decarbonization were distributed globally while the costs were concentrated locally, nations would move only if all of their peers did too. But a [recent paper](https://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/full/10.1162/glep_a_00578) by Matto Mildenberger and Michaël Alkin suggests this shouldn’t be a surprise. In their retrospective analysis, they found that, despite much consternation about designing climate policy to prevent countries from “cheating,” there was basically no evidence of any country ever pulling back from mitigation efforts to take a free ride on the good-faith efforts of others. There was, in other words, no collective-action problem on climate after all. For a generation, the argument for climate action was made on a moral basis. That case has only grown stronger. And now there are other powerful, more mercenary arguments to offer.

The third cause for optimism is that, while the timelines to tolerably disruptive climate outcomes have already evaporated, the timelines to the next set of benchmarks is much more forgiving. This is why Glen Peters, the research director at the Cicero Center for International Climate Research, often jokes that while keeping warming below two degrees is very hard, perhaps even impossible, keeping it below 2.5 degrees now looks like a walk in the park.

This isn’t to say we’re on a glide path to safety. At current emissions levels, the planet will entirely exhaust the carbon budget for 1.5 degrees in just seven years — stay merely level, in other words, and we’ll burn through the possibility of a relatively comfortable endgame within the decade. We could buy ourselves a little more time by starting to move quickly, but not that much more. To decarbonize fast enough to give the planet a decent chance of hitting that 1.5-degree target without any negative emissions would require getting all the way to net-zero emissions by around 2035. Simply running the cars and furnaces and fossil-fuel infrastructure that already exists to its expected retirement date would push the world past 1.5 degrees—without a single new gasoline SUV hitting the road, or a single new oil-heated home being built, or a single new coal plant opened.

A two-degree target, by contrast, yields a much longer timeline, requiring the world to achieve net-zero by 2070 or 2080 — without even the help of negative emissions. We’d have to cut carbon production in half in about three decades, rather than one. That pathway will almost certainly prove harder than it looks. The good news is that we seem to be beginning, at least, to try.

### 2AC---Food DA

#### The alt would immediately starve 80% of humanity.

Harvey 19 (David, British-born Marxist economic geographer, podcaster and Distinguished Professor of anthropology and geography at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York. He received his PhD in geography from the University of Cambridge, “Anti-Capitalist Chronicles: Global Unrest,” 19 December 2019, <https://www.democracyatwork.info/acc_global_unrest>, DOA: 11-20-2021)

So that is, if you like, one half of the problem. But the other part of the problem is this: that in Marx's time if there was a sudden collapse of capitalism, most people in the world would be able to feed themselves and reproduce. Because most people were self-sufficient in their local area with the kinds of, you know, things they needed to live on – in other words, people could put breakfast on their table irrespective of what was going on in the global economy. Right now that's no longer the case. Most people in the United States, but increasingly, of course, in Europe, and in Japan, and now increasingly in China, and India, and Indonesia, and everywhere are dependent entirely upon the delivery of food to them, so that they get the food from the circulation of capital. Now, in Marx's time, like I say, that would have not been true but now this is a situation where probably around 70 or maybe 80 percent of the world's people are dependent upon the circulation of capital in order to assure their food supply, in order to deliver them the kinds of fuels which are going to allow them mobility, going to actually deliver them all the necessities to be able to reproduce their daily life.

So this is a, I think, a situation which I can really summarize in the following kind of way: that capital right now is too big to fail. We cannot imagine a situation where we would shut down the flow of capital, because if we shut down the flow of capital, 80 percent of the world's population would immediately starve, would be rendered immobile, would not be able to reproduce themselves in very effective ways. So we cannot afford any kind of sustained attack upon capital accumulation. So the kind of fantasy that you might have had – socialists, or communists, and so on, might have had back in 1850, which is that well, okay, we can destroy this capitalist system and we can build something entirely different – that is an impossibility right now. We have to keep the circulation of capital in motion, we have to keep things moving, because if we don't do that, we are actually stuck with a situation in which, as I've said, almost all of us would starve.

# 1AR

## K---Capitalism

### 1AR---Cap Good 2---War

#### 2---transition wars---turns environment quicky.

Smith 19, assistant professor of finance @ Stony Brook University (Noah, April 5th, “Dumping Capitalism Won’t Save the Planet,” *Bloomberg*, <https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2019-04-05/capitalism-is-more-likely-to-limit-climate-change-than-socialism>, Accessed: 07-15-19)

The climate threat is certainly dire, and carbon taxes are unlikely to be enough to solve the problem. But eco-socialism is probably not going to be an effective method of addressing that threat. Dismantling an entire economic system is never easy, and probably would touch off armed conflict and major political upheaval. In the scramble to win those battles, even the socialists would almost certainly abandon their limitation on fossil-fuel use — either to support military efforts, or to keep the population from turning against them. The precedent here is the Soviet Union, whose multidecade effort to reshape its economy by force amid confrontation with the West led to profound environmental degradation. The world's climate does not have several decades to spare.

### 1AR---Cap Good 3---Environment

#### Growth is sustainable---climate change is shifting economic incentives towards reducing emissions.

Henderson 20, John and Natty McArthur University Professor @ Harvard (Rebecca, May/June Issue, “The Unlikely Environmentalists: How the Private Sector Can Combat Climate Change,” Foreign Affairs, https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/world/2020-04-13/unlikely-environmentalists)

There’s a reason climate change is often described as a “wicked problem.” Fully decarbonizing the economy will require not only completely transforming the global energy infrastructure, at a cost of many trillions of dollars, but also retrofitting all of the world’s buildings, remaking the planet’s agricultural practices, and revolutionizing transportation systems. It is difficult to see how this can be accomplished without some kind of global carbon tax or regulatory regime. But putting such a system in place is proving to be enormously difficult. The 2015 Paris agreement on climate change was a good first step, but many countries show little sign of meeting the commitments they made as part of that agreement, and the United States’ withdrawal from the process has presented a significant barrier to further progress. Given the slowing global economy and the slide toward populism and nationalism in much of the world, the prospects for any kind of comprehensive global accord seem increasingly remote. So far, at least, the public sector is failing to confront the problem. But the private sector has begun to step in to fill the vacuum. In January, Larry Fink, the CEO of BlackRock, the largest asset manager in the world, declared that “climate risk is investment risk” and announced that going forward BlackRock would ask every firm in its portfolio to disclose its carbon emissions. BlackRock has roughly $7 trillion under management and is one of the largest shareholders in nearly every publicly traded firm in the world. So companies around the world paid attention when Fink went on to say that BlackRock would consider voting against boards whose firms “do not make sufficient progress” in addressing climate-related risks and would cease to invest altogether in some fossil fuel projects. Fink is not alone. Many of the world’s largest asset owners are coming to the conclusion that climate change is the most important risk to the long-term health of their portfolios. More than a third of global invested capital—about $19 trillion—is controlled by the world’s 100 largest asset owners. Nearly two-thirds of this money is in pension funds; the remaining third is in sovereign wealth funds. These funds are now so large that they are sometimes referred to as “universal owners” or “universal investors” since, in effect, they hold the entire market. For that reason, they cannot diversify away from the risk of climate change—a risk that Mark Carney, who until earlier this year was the governor of the Bank of England, suggested could result in an abrupt financial collapse, potentially wiping out as much as $20 trillion of assets. To avert that kind of calamity, major asset owners are starting to push the companies in their portfolios to address climate change. This trend is not driven by altruism or a deep commitment to the environment: it’s a function of economic interests. For the world’s largest asset owners, climate change is not an externality—it is a profound threat to their long-term returns. It will, after all, be significantly harder to make money in a world where most of the major ports are underwater, harvests are failing on a routine basis, and hundreds of millions of people are on the move. As more and more major asset owners come to this realization, it is creating increasingly strong incentives for them to cooperate with one another in support of large-scale decarbonization. Together, they are pressing the firms in their portfolios to set concrete targets for emission reductions and to make progress toward meeting those targets, potentially solving the problem posed by firms’ unwillingness to cut their emissions unless they can be assured that their competitors will follow suit. Someone, however, will need to monitor that progress and sanction firms that lag behind—a role that would be best filled by government regulators. The need for such public-sector involvement will likely increase private-sector support for the policy changes required to drastically reduce carbon emissions. In this way, private-sector pressure may serve as the force that finally breaks the political logjam that has long blocked the public action needed to solve the climate crisis. MONEY TALKS One of the most promising examples of what this might look like in practice is Climate Action 100+, a nonprofit affiliation of more than 300 investors who collectively control nearly half of the world’s invested capital. The group was founded in 2017 with the goal of persuading the world’s 100 largest private-sector carbon emitters to “cut the financial risk associated with catastrophe” by putting in place board-level processes to assess their climate-related risks and oversee plans for dealing with them, pledging to clearly disclose those risks, and taking action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions across their value chains rapidly enough to help meet the Paris agreement’s goal of limiting the increase in the global average temperature to well below two degrees Celsius. In December 2018, a group of investors belonging to Climate Action 100+ published a letter in the Financial Times listing some specific steps they were demanding of companies in which they invest, including “the rapid elimination of coal use by utilities in EU and OECD [Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development] countries by no later than 2030.” Six months later, investors from the consortium pushed the oil giant Shell to announce short-term targets for limiting its greenhouse gas emissions and persuaded BP to support a shareholder resolution that binds the oil company to disclose the carbon intensity of its products, the methodology it uses to consider the climate impact of new investments, and its plans for setting and measuring emission targets. More than half of the 40 oil and gas companies with which the group has engaged have set long-term quantitative targets for reducing their emissions. And the group has helped persuade the shipping giant Maersk and two of the world’s largest mining companies, ArcelorMittal and Thyssenkrupp, to commit to becoming carbon neutral by 2050. These kinds of commitments are sometimes dismissed as mere greenwashing: public relations stunts designed to buy time. And sometimes they are. But they might also help catalyze an economic transformation that could play a major role in arresting climate change. Of course, large asset holders are not the only players who shape a company’s incentives: employees and consumers do, as well, and they are increasingly insisting that firms go green—and rewarding them when they do. For example, after the consumer goods giant Unilever announced that it planned to cut its carbon footprint in half and double its revenue at the same time—and then followed through by transforming its operations, brand by brand—the firm joined Facebook, Google, and Microsoft on LinkedIn’s list of the ten most desirable employers in the world. Sales of Unilever’s “sustainable living” brands—which include Ben & Jerry’s, Dove, and Vaseline and which Unilever claims “contribute to achieving the company’s ambition of halving its environmental footprint”—are growing 69 percent faster than the rest of the business and providing 75 percent of the company’s growth. Shifting public attitudes about climate change and public policies intended to combat it have also created clear business opportunities. Solar and wind energy are both multibillion-dollar businesses. The market for plant-based alternatives to meat is exploding. And global recycling could generate close to $400 billion in the next five years. RISKY BUSINESS But embracing the innovation that is required to exploit new opportunities is often risky and expensive. The venture capital industry lost at least $10 billion between 2005 and 2011 investing in clean energy technology. An electric utility that commits to phasing out coal plants might reap the benefits of declining solar and wind energy costs, but it could also misjudge the market and significantly increase its costs. An automobile company that invests in developing electric vehicles might leap ahead of its competitors, but it could also risk losing out to more cautious rivals. Universal investors can help mitigate those risks by funneling capital to firms that are willing to make the first move. This can be transformational in itself, since companies that decide to embrace new opportunities can often persuade an entire industry to follow them. Walmart’s massive investments in energy saving and waste reduction, for example, have helped persuade many other companies to take similar steps. Since 2010, the price of battery storage has fallen by at least 73 percent, a change driven largely by the electric vehicle company Tesla’s significant investments in the technology, which spurred the company’s competitors to invest more than $90 billion in the development of electric vehicles. Major asset holders can also push companies to commit to aggressive targets for decarbonizing their business models and insist that they report on their progress. In this way, universal investors may be able to force every firm in an industry to act, solving the collective action problem inherent in tackling climate change. Firms don’t naturally act collectively—for all kinds of reasons, including antitrust law. But when there exists a clear business case for doing so and cooperation can be credibly enforced, voluntary cooperation can be an effective means of creating or preserving public goods. Nearly half of the world’s inshore fisheries are managed through some form of cooperative agreement. Most of the rules governing international trade are designed and enforced by the International Chamber of Commerce, a voluntary association founded in 1919. Some of the world’s largest firms are increasingly exploring whether these kinds of voluntary agreements might be an effective way to reduce emissions. For example, after Unilever came under pressure from activists to stop using palm oil, the cultivation of which contributes to deforestation, Paul Polman, who was then the company’s CEO, was able to persuade many of his fellow consumer goods CEOs that continuing to purchase conventionally produced palm oil presented a significant threat to their own brands. Partly as a result, more than 60 percent of the world’s traded palm oil is now covered by sustainability commitments. Similar agreements with respect to soy and beef have greatly slowed rates of deforestation in the Amazon River basin. And companies in industries as diverse as airlines, food, retail, apparel, travel, hospitality, construction, health care, and high technology have begun to coordinate to reduce carbon emissions across supply chains, so that no single firm is placed at a disadvantage by going green. Such arrangements produce a wealth of knowledge about what effective decarbonization might look like on the ground. As one might expect, however, they are often unstable and difficult to enforce, since no mechanism exists through which to punish firms that drag their feet or refuse to conform. Here, universal investors might be able to make a significant difference by acting as enforcers. If BlackRock, for example, follows through on its threat to vote against the boards of companies that do not adequately disclose their climate emissions, every major firm in every industry will be forced to report—in an auditable, replicable way—the degree to which it is meeting its commitments. And if the world’s major investors then vote against the boards of those companies that are falling behind, investors could catalyze the transformation of entire industries. THE EARTH LOBBY Arresting climate change will still require government action, of course, and the changes afoot in finance and the corporate world could ease the path. As firms commit to reducing their carbon emissions, they are increasingly recognizing that the most effective way to ensure that they are not undercut by lagging companies is to press for regulation. Together, they are creating a constituency for effective climate policy. In 2017, for example, when U.S. President Donald Trump declared that he was going to withdraw the United States from the Paris agreement, the CEOs of more than 50 U.S. companies, including Apple, Gap, Google, HP, and Levi Strauss, published an open letter urging him to rethink the decision. When Trump stuck to his plan, Elon Musk, the CEO of Tesla, and Bob Iger, then the CEO of Disney, resigned from some of the president’s advisory councils in protest. More than 2,000 companies have joined a collaborative effort called “We Are Still In,” a group working to ensure that the United States meets its commitments under the agreement despite the administration’s withdrawal. The group includes not only businesses but also states, cities, religious organizations, and universities. Together, they represent 68 percent of U.S. GDP, 65 percent of the U.S. population, and the source of more than half of all U.S. carbon emissions. Such action independent of the federal government could make a big difference. According to America’s Pledge, a nongovernmental organization that tracks local progress toward emission reductions, the “full achievement of already on-the-books policies from state and local actors—paired with rapidly shifting economics in the power sector—would reduce emissions 19 percent below 2005 levels by 2025 and 25 percent below 2005 levels by 2030.” This would be a significant step toward the approximately 50 percent reduction in emissions that the UN’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change estimates is necessary to avoid the most dangerous potential outcomes of climate change. These efforts and others like them also have the potential to change the nature of the political conversation around climate change. In an increasingly partisan world, firms occupy a unique position. According to the 2019 Edelman Trust Barometer, an annual survey measuring credibility and trust, business is now the world’s most trusted institution, and 71 percent of employees around the world agree that “it is critically important” for the CEOs of their companies “to respond to challenging times.” A broad-based movement among the world’s biggest companies to tackle climate change could help legitimate the idea that climate change is a real danger, that acting to avert it could be a major driver of innovation and economic growth, and that appropriate public policy could be enormously helpful. Such a movement could also put increasing pressure on companies that resist decarbonizing. One of the reasons that climate regulation has stalled in the United States is that a small minority of firms have invested billions of dollars in actively lobbying against it. If their peers start to push for regulation and highlight the dangers inherent in continuing with business as usual, those laggards will be compelled to change their behavior. One day soon, flooding the political process with money to defend the burning of fossil fuels could be seen as an unacceptable reputational risk—or even as morally indefensible. For many years, experts have assumed that the fastest and most efficient route to global decarbonization is coordinated state action. But as the world’s political institutions have come under pressure, such action has become increasingly elusive. Against this background, the growing understanding that climate change presents a profound threat to the long-term returns of the world’s largest asset owners provides some reason for hope. As investors push for change and the realization dawns in more and more boardrooms that the benefits of climate action will outweigh the costs, it is possible that leading-edge firms could trigger a cascade of reinforcing reforms, transforming the economics of individual industries and creating a significant constituency for political action. For decades, when it came to addressing climate change, large asset holders and big companies acted more as obstacles than as catalysts. Those days may soon be over.
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#### Strong patent processing deters innovation by exposing investors to lawsuits from bad faith actors
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C. Results The results provide fresh insights into how patent laws influence where firms innovate, and it spells trouble for the U.S. Patent Act. According to the random effects and OLS analyses, firms strongly consider the nature of a country’s patent enforcement system when deciding where to innovate. For example, the random effects analysis in Model 1 indicates that firms are more likely to place their R&D operations in countries where the costs of losing an infringement lawsuit are minimized, as measured by the negative and statistically significant variable of Average Damages. 194 This result was expected by our research, as those innovating a patentable good are more likely to be sued by those owning pre-existing patented technology than to sue them. As such, we find that inventors prefer jurisdictions where the prospective damages a court may issue are lessened. **[table omitted]** A similar conclusion is that the actual cost of litigating the lawsuit— ignoring the size of the judgment and damages rendered—helps to determine where firms innovate. Model 2 illustrates the negative and statistically significant relationship that average cost of patent litigation has on R&D Spending. This finding indicates that the actual cost of defending a lawsuit deters innovation—or, more articulately, causes inventors to place their R&D in jurisdictions where patent litigation is less costly. The OLS regressions produced similar results as the Random effects models. In Models 3 and 4, average damages was statistically significant and negative, as was average cost to defend a lawsuit, meaning that firms are likely to resist spending on R&D in countries that impose high costs on innovation

in terms of both litigation and damages. These results have powerful implications for the U.S. patent system. Not only is the typical infringement lawsuit in the United States costly and drawn out, but bad faith litigants have devised ways to exploit these extraordinary costs, namely, by waging patent litigation as a means to extract settlements and impede competition.196 In comparison, the cost of litigating a patent infringement lawsuit in other countries can be less than $50,000, which is only 2% of the cost in the United States. This explains why, as we have found, inventors place their R&D programs in countries with less costly patent enforcement regimes than the United States. If the United States would like to better incentivize and retain innovation, then reforms must be made to the litigious and expensive nature of patent enforcement.