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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.

#### Gaps in enforcement and the presumption against extraterritoriality leave much of the Global South vulnerable to anticompetitive predation.
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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 more developed antitrust regimes, which creates impunity for transboundary and multinational cartels.
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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.

#### Democratic failure cascades and causes nuclear war.

Diamond 19, is a professor of Sociology and Political Science at Stanford University, PhD in Sociology. (Larry, 2019, Ill Winds: Saving Democracy from Russian Rage, Chinese Ambition, and American Complacency, p. 199-202)

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

### 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, "[the 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---Quarters

## T---Per Se

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

#### We meet---Cartels are ‘per se’ illegal.

GLI 21, \*Global Legal Insights, provides essential insights into the current legal issues, providing readers with expert analysis of legal, economic and policy developments through the eyes of the world's leading lawyers; (2021, “Cartel Laws and Regulations”, https://www.globallegalinsights.com/practice-areas/cartels-laws-and-regulations/usa)

In the United States, there are two major federal antitrust laws relating to cartels:

• Section 1 of the Sherman Antitrust Act (1 5 U.S.C. S 1), which prohibits "[e] very contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations"; and

• Section 5(a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act ("FTC Act") (1 5 U.S.C. SS 41-58), which prohibits "unfair methods of competition" and "unfair or deceptive acts or practices".

The Sherman Act can be enforced criminally or civilly by the Antitrust Division ("Division") of the U.S. Department of Justice ("DOJ"). Criminal antitrust enforcement is reserved for "hard core" violations of Section 1: price-fixing; bid-rigging; and market allocation schemes among horizontal competitors. The DOJ can also pursue less egregious cases civilly. Section 4 of the Clayton Act provides for a private right of action to enforce Section 1 of the Sherman Act. Private plaintiffs may recover treble damages and litigation costs and may also seek injunctive relief.

While Section 1 of the Sherman Act on its face prohibits all restraints of trade, the Supreme Court has interpreted it to prohibit only "unreasonable" restraints. See Standard Oil Co. v. United States, 221 U.S. 1, 60—68 (1 911). Naked horizontal agreements with competitors to fix prices (or any component of pricing), restrict output, rig bids, or allocate customers or geographic markets, i.e., the hard-core violations discussed above, are considered "per sé illegal regardless of the economic rationale or the consequences because these practices always or almost always restrict competition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## T---Expand Scope

### 2AC---AT: T---Expand Scope

#### The plan expands the territorial scope of the Sherman Act.

Popofsky 08, \*Mark S. Popofsky, Kaye Scholer LLP; (2008, “Extraterritoriality in U.S. Jurisprudence”, in 3 ISSUES IN COMPETITION LAW AND POLICY 2417 (ABA Section of Antitrust Law 2008)

For a century, courts, Congress, and enforcement agencies have struggled to define the Sherman Act’s applicability to conduct outside the United States. The Sherman Act’s evolving territorial scope reflects an uneasy tension between two opposing impulses: protecting American consumers from international cartels requires giving the Sherman Act some “extraterritorial” scope. However, condemning overseas conduct under American laws often draws the charge that American antitrust policy reflects “legal imperialism” and risks retaliation from other jurisdictions upon whose antitrust enforcement efforts American consumers too depend.

#### Expanding the scope of the Sherman Act includes expanding the categories of cases it is intended to apply to.

Popofsky 08, \*Mark S. Popofsky, Kaye Scholer LLP; (2008, “Extraterritoriality in U.S. Jurisprudence”, in 3 ISSUES IN COMPETITION LAW AND POLICY 2417 (ABA Section of Antitrust Law 2008)

3.1. Which jurisdictional principles apply?

A threshold issue in any matter involving foreign commerce is which of the many tests that govern the Sherman Act’s reach applies. With the FTAIA’s passage, there are three possible “jurisdictional”91 standards:

* the test that applies to domestic commerce,
* the Alcoa substantial intended effects standard, and
* the FTAIA.

[FOOTNOTE 91]

As the Supreme Court has observed, “jurisdiction is a word of many, too many, meanings.” Steel Co. v. Citizens for a Better Env’t, 523 U.S. 83, 90 (1998) (citation omitted). The territorial reach of the Sherman Act, as explained, presents at least a question of “prescriptive” jurisdiction; that is, whether Congress has extended the Sherman Act to particular conduct. Some courts have held that the scope of the Sherman Act also delimits the subject matter jurisdiction of the federal courts in cases arising under the Sherman Act. See United Phosphorous, Ltd. v. Angus Chem. Co., 322 F.3d 942, 951-52 (7th Cir. 2002) (en banc).

[END FOOTNOTE 91]

#### *Empagran* limited the territorial scope of the Sherman Act through narrow interpretations of the FTAIA.

Popofsky 08, \*Mark S. Popofsky, Kaye Scholer LLP; (2008, “Extraterritoriality in U.S. Jurisprudence”, in 3 ISSUES IN COMPETITION LAW AND POLICY 2417 (ABA Section of Antitrust Law 2008)

In F. Hoffman-La Roche, Ltd. v. Empagran,135 the Supreme Court adopted the narrower reading of Subsection 2 but largely left open what type of nexus between in- U.S. detrimental effects and plaintiffs’ injury is required. Empagran involved class actions seeking recovery for a worldwide conspiracy to fix the price of vitamins. One class involved foreign purchasers: those who bought price-fixed vitamins for delivery in Ecuador, Ukraine, Australia, and Panama. The defendants argued that FTAIA Subsection 2 barred these claims, because, having purchased abroad, the in-U.S. anticompetitive effects of the scheme did not “give rise” to plaintiffs’ injuries.136 The plaintiffs, by contrast, advanced the broader reading of Subsection 2 and argued, inter alia, that the FTAIA imposed no such nexus requirement.137

The Supreme Court agreed with defendants that the FTAIA imposes a nexus requirement. The Court decided the case on the assumption that “the adverse foreign effect [the plaintiffs alleged] is independent of any adverse domestic effect.”138 In other words, the only link alleged between the in-U.S. effects that meet FTAIA Subsection 1 and the plaintiffs’ injury was that both flowed from the same conduct. The FTAIA, the Court held, could not be construed to extend the Sherman Act to redress such foreign injuries for two reasons.

First, permitting such treble damages actions defied international norms on the reasonable scope of the objective territorial principle.139 Finding Subsection 2 of the FTAIA ambiguous, the Court invoked the principle that the Sherman Act not be construed to violate customary principles of international law.140 The Court explained that, although applying the Sherman Act to condemn foreign conduct is “consistent with principles of prescriptive comity,” permitting treble damages actions to proceed where the only link between the foreign harm asserted and the requisite in-U.S. harm is that both flow from the same conduct is not.141 Such private enforcement in U.S. courts would “interfer[e] with a foreign nation’s ability independently to regulate its own commercial affairs.”142 The Court agreed with commentators observing that reading the FTAIA to impose no nexus requirement would effectively “provide worldwide subject matter jurisdiction to any foreign suitor wishing to sue its own local supplier, but unhappy with its own sovereign’s provision for private antitrust enforcement.”143 “Congress,” the Court explained, cannot lightly be assumed to have engaged “in an act of legal imperialism.”144

The Court rejected the plaintiffs’ arguments that international comity concerns were better addressed on a case-by-case basis and that a contrary rule would threaten to undermine the Sherman Act’s goals of compensation and deterrence. The Court accepted the arguments of amici—the United States, the business community, and foreign enforcers—that permitting private damages actions for foreign injuries could “undermine foreign nations’ own antitrust enforcement policies by diminishing foreign firms’ incentive to cooperate with antitrust authorities in return for prosecutorial amnesty.”145

Second, the Court concluded that applying “the Sherman Act to redress foreign injuries” that are independent of in-U.S. effects would be unprecedented.146 This doomed the plaintiffs’ reading of the FTAIA because, according to the court, the FTAIA was designed to limit, not expand, the Sherman Act’s scope.147

## CP---ADV

### 2AC---Planks

#### Fails

Sokol 8—(Assistant Professor of Law, University of Florida, Fredric G. Levin College of Law). D. Daniel Sokol 2008. “WHAT DO WE REALLY KNOW ABOUT EXPORT CARTELS AND WHAT IS THE APPROPRIATE SOLUTION?” Journal of Competition Law & Economics, 4(4), 967–982.

Could soft law assist in export cartel efforts across agencies? To use soft law to identify and implement domestic business clearance for export joint ventures would require a significant change for the 51 jurisdictions that have either explicit or implicit export cartel immunities. At present, there may not be the political will necessary to undertake such a change. This particularly affects the ability of soft-law institutions to implement an export cartel solution. Presently, the most influential soft-law international institutions (ICN and OECD) do not have export cartels on their agenda.60 To the extent that export cartels cause consumer welfare loss because of their exemptions from domestic competition laws, these spillover effects go unpunished. Export cartels being off the agenda of the soft-law international antitrust institutions is in part a function of the power dynamics of the countries that maintain them. Not surprisingly, the jurisdictions with the most to lose with limits on export cartels (U.S. and EU) set the agenda (or at least have veto power over the agenda) of both of these organizations. Because the United States and nearly all EU member states maintain such cartels explicitly or implicitly, this limits the likelihood that these countries, the leaders in international antitrust, will focus on removing such exemptions any time soon.61

#### Throwing money at the problem does nothing.

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

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

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

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

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

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

## CP---CIL

### 2AC — CIL CP

#### The United States federal government should substantially increase its prohibitions on anticompetitive private cartel practices in cases where foreign plaintiffs cannot secure adequate relief in alternative for a by expanding the scope of its interpretive obligations under customary international law and expanding the scope of its core antitrust laws.

Bradley 15, William Van Alstyne Professor of Law at Duke Law School, where he is a co-director of the Law School's Center for International and Comparative Law (Curtis A. Bradley, 5-18-2015, "Customary international law’s uncertain status in the US Legal System," Oxford University Press Blog, https://blog.oup.com/2015/05/customary-international-laws-uncertain-status-in-the-us-legal-system/)

Even if customary international law does not have the status of self-executing federal law, it does not mean that its role in the US legal system is unimportant. Congress can incorporate customary international law into US law, and it has done so in a number of ways, such as by codifying the standards for foreign sovereign immunity, providing a civil cause of action for acts of torture committed under color of foreign law, and allowing for criminal prosecution of acts of piracy “as defined by the law of nations.” Courts also have long applied a canon of construction – known as the “Charming Betsy canon” – whereby they will construe federal statutes, where reasonably possible, to avoid violations of customary international law. In addition, it is possible that in developing some rules of federal common law relating to foreign affairs, courts will take account of a mixture of international law and domestic law considerations, even if they do not apply customary international law directly. This may be happening, for example, with respect to the law governing the immunity of foreign government officials, something that the US Supreme Court in its 2010 Samantar decision indicated should be developed as a matter of federal common law.

#### Can’t enforce it

Walt 13, American professor of international affairs at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government (Steven Walt, February 2013, “Why Jurisprudence Doesn’t Matter for Customary International Law, William & Mary Law Review, Vol. 54 (2012-2013), Issue 3 (Law Without a Lawmaker Symposium), Article 10)

For the same reason, custom has no necessary priority over other norms. While customary law, unlike simple custom, creates legal obligations, those obligations may not be superior to other legal obligations. Whether customary law operates only at the state level or also domestically can depend on the content of the particular custom. Although customary international law does not require recognition by a domestic legal system to create legal obligations, these obligations need not have priority over domestic law or automatic effect domestically. There is nothing in the bare notion of customary international law that gives it priority over inconsistent domestic law or makes customary international law applicable in domestic law without domestic implementation. The mere fact that international and domestic law are part of the same or different legal orders does not by itself give international law priority over domestic law or make it self-executing. Put another way, even if customary international law and domestic law are parts of a single legal order, international law might give priority to domestic law over customary international law, or domestic law might give priority to customary international law over domestic law. The priority or effect of customary international law depends on particular facts: facts about the priority or effect international law gives it. This is a contingent matter. Finally, if customary international law is not self-executing, so that its domestic application requires incorporation into domestic law, domestic law controls the recognition of customary international law. Erie’s limit on federal judicial law making extends to customary international law, requiring a source of authority in federal or state law for its application. Customary international law might be federal law for purposes of the Supremacy Clause in Article VI of the Constitution. Alternatively, its recognition might be authorized by legislation.127 In both cases, the limits on the judicial recognition of customary international law are constitutional or statutory, not jurisprudential.

## CP---RICO

### 2AC---Top Level

#### You really think this is gonna solve cartels?



### 2AC---AT: CP---Civil RICO

#### The counterplan fails---civil RICO doesn’t permit a private right of action that extends to foreign injuries (and links to comity DA’s).

Winston & Strawn LLP 16, (June 24th, 2016, “Supreme Court Clarifies the Extraterritorial Application of RICO and the Availability of Private Civil Claims for Foreign Injuries”, https://www.winston.com/en/thought-leadership/supreme-court-clarifies-the-extraterritorial-application-of-rico.html)

Earlier this week, the Supreme Court issued an important decision clarifying the scope of the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO). In RJR Nabisco, Inc., v. European Community, No. 15-138, the Court held that while certain substantive provisions of RICO do apply to foreign conduct, the provision providing for a private right of action under RICO does not allow civil plaintiffs to sue for injuries outside the United States.

RICO’s § 1962 makes it a crime to engage in a “pattern of racketeering activity” to infiltrate, control, or operate an enterprise. RICO defines “racketeering activity” to include a number “predicate acts.” A defendant must have engaged in at least two predicate acts within a ten-year period in order for there to be a violation. RICO violations are subject to criminal penalties and also may be addressed by the government through civil actions. In addition, § 1964(c) provides for a private right of action, allowing “any person injured in his business or property” resulting from a violation of RICO to sue in federal court to recover treble damages, costs, and fees.

In November 2000, the European Community and 26 member states filed a private civil action alleging that RJR and related entities participated in a global smuggling and money laundering scheme, in violation of RICO. Under the alleged scheme, traffickers smuggled drugs into Europe that were sold for euros, which were used to pay for large shipments of cigarettes into Europe. In its complaint, the European Community alleged a variety of injuries suffered by member states as a result of the scheme, including competitive harm to their state-owned cigarette businesses, lost tax revenue, instability of currency, and increased costs for law enforcement.

RJR moved to dismiss the European Community’s claims on the ground that RICO does not apply to racketeering activity occurring outside the United States or to foreign enterprises. The district court granted the motion, but the Second Circuit reversed and held that RICO applied to the claims. The Supreme Court granted certiorari to address the question of extraterritorial application.

In an opinion by Justice Alito, the Court confirmed that RICO’s substantive provisions in § 1962 may apply to certain conduct in foreign countries. This portion of Court’s opinion was unanimous, save for Justice Sotomayor, who recused herself from this case. Justice Alito explained that under the principle known as the “presumption against extraterritoriality,” federal laws generally do not apply beyond our Nation’s borders absent an expressed intent by Congress to the contrary. In RICO, however, Congress included a number of predicate acts that plainly encompass foreign conduct. For example, the prohibition on killing a U.S. national outside of the United States is a predicate act that necessarily applies to foreign conduct. Thus, the Court held that a violation of § 1962 may be based on a pattern of racketeering outside the United States, as long as the predicate acts that form the basis of the RICO violation either took place within the United States or took place elsewhere but still constituted a violation of a U.S. law that itself applies extraterritorially.

Although the Court ruled for the European Community on that critical issue, it ultimately rejected the claims on other grounds. Justice Alito, now writing only for a four-justice majority, explained that even though RICO’s substantive provisions may apply to foreign conduct, there is nothing in § 1964(c) that expresses Congress’s intent that the private right of action extend to foreign injuries. In addition, the Court reasoned that allowing private lawsuits in federal courts for foreign conduct would create the very real possibility of international conflict. To the extent that a foreign violation arises, it would need to be addressed in a criminal or civil action by the Department of Justice, which presumably can be charged with managing such conflicts. Accordingly, the Court held that RICO’s private right of action in § 1964(c) requires private RICO plaintiffs to allege and prove a domestic injury and does not extend to foreign injuries.

## DA---Litigation

### 2AC---AT: DA---Court Clog

#### Courts are clogged now.

Land et al. 21, \*Greg Land covers topics including verdicts and settlements and insurance-related litigation for the Daily Report in Atlanta; \*Amanda Bronstad is the ALM staff reporter covering class actions and mass torts nationwide. She writes the email dispatch Law.com Class Actions: Critical Mass; (July 30th, 2021, “Can We Talk? Eyeing COVID-Clogged Dockets, Judges Push Civil Cases to Settle”, https://www.law.com/2021/07/30/can-we-talk-eyeing-covid-clogged-dockets-judges-push-civil-cases-to-settle/?slreturn=20211014154916)

As judges around the country gingerly reopen their courtrooms and invite lawyers, litigants and jurors back for business—sometimes as usual, but often still far from the normal routines of years past—they’re being confronted by an array of pitfalls, real and potential. Will a surge of COVID-19 cases among the unvaccinated and forceful advance of the delta variant force renewed shutdowns? Will jurors and staffers be willing to risk a return? Are mask mandates and vaccine passports in the offing? But one very real dilemma is already on their minds: Backlogs of criminal, civil and domestic cases that have piled up, exacerbating already crowded dockets where litigants and lawyers jostle to get motions filed, rulings issued and, toughest of all, cases tried. Richard Clifton, a senior judge on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, who serves as president of the Federal Judges Association, said that court backlogs are a big topic for judges, although not all are as impacted as others. “At least one judge in a very busy district didn’t think the backlog had turned out as high as it turned out to be,” he said. “Other judges have commented, unspecifically, they’re just piling up.” He said the most frequent comment is that the civil calendar “is just sitting there” because judges are spending all their time dealing with criminal caseloads. He hasn’t heard about judges suggesting settlement as an option to those with civil cases but, he said, “I would be shocked if it weren’t happening.” “The reality is that most cases get settled, we all know that—it’s not a good or a bad thing, it’s just a fact,” he said. And, while judges don’t actively get involved in settlements, their goal is to resolve cases. “And if it’s realistic to say to parties, ‘look, you won’t get a trial date anytime soon,’ I’m sure that’s something judges are saying to parties in those cases.” That’s exactly what happened to Ryan Baker, of [Waymaker](https://www.waymakerlaw.com/) in Los Angeles. “It absolutely is the case that, especially in the federal courts, civil trials are at the end of the line,” he said. Baker represents the defendant in a trademark case filed in 2017. “I know there’s been a lot of debate among the judges on how to handle this situation,” he said. “There are very different views, as there are with any group of people, on what is appropriate and what measures need to be taken.” In Baker’s case, U.S. District Judge Cormac Carney of the Central District of California minced no words in telling the parties in April that he could not guarantee a trial date in 2021, or even the first half of 2022. “The court strongly believes that this case should settle,” he wrote in a minute order. “To hold a trial in this civil case would mean asking citizens to report for jury duty or to testify as witnesses when many of them have been out of work for months and fear they will not be able to pay their rent, mortgage, or other bills, or put food on the table for their families. “And it would also ask the court to find time in its congested calendar for such an endeavor after more than a year of closure due to the coronavirus,” Carney wrote. Baker said the case went through two mediations and three court-ordered settlement conferences before settling July 23. “And these conferences, the last couple have been ordered because the court is concerned that this case is not going to be set for trial, not this year, not even next year, because of the backlog of criminal matters that will necessarily precede all the civil trials,” he said. California’s Central District, which includes Los Angeles, has six judicial vacancies. But Baker said a lot depends on how much is at stake in the case and the specific judge’s calendar. He has another case in the district in which Judge Consuelo Marshall has set a trial date for February 2022. But there has been a strong push for settlement. “The backlog factor weighs heavily in favor of courts really advocating for private resolution because the reality is litigants are having to bear the cost of extended and protracted litigation,” Baker said. In a 2015 patent infringement lawsuit in the Southern District of New York, Judge Gregory Woods canceled a Nov. 29 trial, citing a criminal trial now scheduled for that date. After his June 15 order, U.S. Magistrate Judge Sarah Netburn asked the parties for settlement dates. Another judge in New Mexico cited the court’s backlog as a reason to grant final approval of a nearly $4.2 million settlement involving a class of truck drivers seeking unpaid overtime wages. Settling the 2019 class action would avoid “significant delay,” U.S. Magistrate Judge Gregory Fouratt said in an April 9 order. “The court further observes that litigation of this case would have moved exceptionally slowly in the current pandemic environment in which jury trials are logistically difficult and almost entirely devoted for the next 12-18 months to resolving an unprecedented backlog in criminal cases,” he wrote.

#### Thumpers:

#### ---antitrust.

Rivero 21, \*Nicolas Rivero, Nico covers tech for Quartz. He graduated from Northwestern University and has written for The Miami New Times, Mental Floss, and El Cronista; (September 29th, 2021, “A cheat sheet to all of the antitrust cases against Big Tech in 2021”, https://qz.com/2066217/a-cheat-sheet-to-all-the-antitrust-cases-against-big-tech-in-2021/)

Anti-monopoly enforcement is in vogue once again around the world. After two decades of virtually unchecked growth from the world’s biggest tech companies—particularly, Google, Amazon, Facebook, and Apple—regulators and politicians are rediscovering their zeal for reining in corporate power. In the last four years, the EU has issued [a series of multi-billion-dollar rulings](https://www.cnbc.com/2019/06/07/how-google-facebook-amazon-and-apple-faced-eu-tech-antitrust-rules.html) against big tech companies, and the bloc’s crusading competition commissioner Margrethe Vestager has announced [new investigations at a steady clip](https://www.csis.org/analysis/rise-europes-competition-policy-challenges-technology-companies). Antitrust regulators in [South Korea](https://www.cnbc.com/2021/09/14/south-korea-antitrust-regulator-fines-google-177-million.html), [India](https://www.reuters.com/technology/india-antitrust-probe-finds-google-abused-android-dominance-report-shows-2021-09-18/), [Australia](https://www.reuters.com/business/media-telecom/google-dominance-australia-online-advertising-harms-businesses-regulator-2021-09-28/), and the [post-Brexit UK](https://qz.com/1989645/uk-regulators-accuse-facebook-of-monopolizing-the-worlds-gifs/) have started to launch investigations and levy fines in an effort to shift tech companies’ business practices. Now the US is joining the fray. The US steps up antitrust enforcement Spurred by a rapid shift in US public opinion, politicians on the left and right—from progressive Democratic senators like Elizabeth Warren to Trump-allied Republican representatives like Jim Jordan—have made taking on Big Tech a core piece of their political identities. Congress has begun the process of [updating the nation’s antitrust laws](https://qz.com/2020152/congresss-antitrust-bills-empower-regulators-to-take-on-big-tech/) for the first time in seven decades. President Joe Biden named Lina Khan, [a firebrand antitrust scholar once at the fringe of US legal thought](https://qz.com/2021305/lina-khan-will-bring-the-lefts-anti-monopoly-stance-to-the-ftc/), as the head of the country’s top competition regulator; she has vowed to ramp up lawsuits against tech firms and dust off her agency’s long-neglected power to set competition rules. Federal prosecutors have joined forces with coalitions of state attorneys general to bring sweeping suits against the likes of [Facebook](https://techcrunch.com/2020/12/09/facebook-antitrust-state-attorneys-general/) and [Google](https://abcnews.go.com/Technology/google-hit-antitrust-lawsuit-38-state-attorneys-general/story?id=74780182). Some of these cases explicitly [call for tech giants to be broken up](https://www.cbsnews.com/news/facebook-antitrust-case-wall-street/)—a legal feat that would [only be possible in US courts](https://qz.com/1946058/europes-digital-markets-act-wont-topple-big-tech/), which have jurisdiction over the biggest [tech](https://qz.com/re/tech/) companies. All these efforts could, with time, reconfigure the landscape of corporate giants that control how the world shops, finds information, and accesses the internet. But, historically, the pace of antitrust proceedings has been glacially slow. US prosecutors’ landmark lawsuit against Microsoft, for instance, [didn’t fully wind down](https://www.seattletimes.com/business/microsoft/long-antitrust-saga-ends-for-microsoft/) until a decade after it began in 2001. Today, any investigation, lawsuit, or enforcement action could take years to reach a resolution, as legions of high-paid economists and lawyers well-versed in stalling tactics debate the minutia of arcane market models and legal precedents. We’ve taken a snapshot of the wide world of antitrust in an attempt to put into perspective the slow-moving, global project of reining in big tech. This chart lists every major antitrust case against Google, Amazon, Facebook, and Apple that is still pending today.

## DA---Biz Con

### 2AC---Ukraine

#### Ukraine reverses recovery – uncertainty has spiked

Bhattarai 2/25

Abha Bhattarai, Tony Romm and Rachel Siegel, Washington Post, “U.S. economy appeared ready to surge, but Russia’s invasion of Ukraine could send shockwaves, “https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/2022/02/25/economy-us-russia-ukraine-gas/

A few weeks ago, the coronavirus’s fading omicron variant, falling gas prices, and a newly buoyant stock market set the table for what many felt could be a surging U.S. economy in 2022. But those rosy scenarios are suddenly in doubt, as rampant geopolitical uncertainty has helped drive up energy prices and send global markets on a roller-coaster ride. These changes could give many consumers and businesses pause and put more pressure on Washington leaders to respond, even though it is unclear how exactly they will intervene.

### 2AC---Inflation

#### Confidence is at a historic low – Inflation and Worker Shortages

Reuters 2/8

“U.S. small business sentiment drops to 11-month low -NFIB” February 8, 2022 https://www.reuters.com/business/us-small-business-sentiment-drops-11-month-low-nfib-2022-02-08/

WASHINGTON, Feb 8 (Reuters) - U.S. small business confidence fell to an 11-month low in January amid persistent worker shortages and higher prices for materials, a survey showed on Tuesday. The National Federation of Independent Business said its Small Business Optimism Index dropped 1.8 points to 97.1 last month, the lowest reading since February 2021. Scarce workers and rising labor costs remain the main areas of worry for businesses. Snarled supply chains as the global economy rebounds from the COVID-19 pandemic, fueled by massive stimulus from governments, have unleashed inflation. The pandemic, now in its third year, has also disrupted labor supply, making it difficult for goods to move from factories to consumers. There were a near record 10.9 million job openings at the end of December. The NFIB survey showed half of the 1,504 small businesses who participated in the poll reporting raising compensation. That was the highest reading in 48 years and was up 2 points from December. That corroborates to a surge in measures of wage growth tracked by the government. About 27% of small businesses said they planned to increase compensation in the next three months, down 5 points from December, but still historically high. Eleven percent said labor costs were their top business problem, down 2 points from December's 48-year record high reading. About 23% complained about labor quality. Faced with rising labor costs, the share of small businesses raising average selling prices jumped 4 points to 61%, the highest reading since the fourth quarter of 1974. Price hikes were most frequent in wholesale, manufacturing, retail and construction industries.

## DA---Comity

### 2AC---Thumpers

#### A litany of extraterritorial laws aside from antitrust offend other countries.

Briggs et al. 15, John DeQ Briggs is Co-chair of the Antitrust & Competition practice at Axinn Veltrop & Harkrider LLP, Managing Partner of the firm’s Washington, DC, office, and a former Chair of the Section of Antitrust Law of the American Bar Association; Daniel S. Bitton is a partner in the Antitrust & Competition practice at Axinn Veltrop & Harkrider LLP. His practice is focused on counseling and representing clients in high-stakes international antitrust matters, including global merger clearance, government non-merger investigations, and litigation; (2015, “Heisenberg’s Uncertainty Principle, Extraterritoriality and Comity”, https://thesedonaconference.org/sites/default/files/publications/Heisenberg%27s%20Uncertainty%20Principle\_Extraterritorialty%20and%20Comity.16TSCJ327.pdf)

It is not just foreign governments who react angrily to what some call American Judicial Imperialism. Consider the reaction outside of the United States to a statute that took effect on July 1 of last year—the Foreign Account Tax Compliance Act (FATCA). It is not well known that the United States is virtually alone in the world in exercising jurisdiction over its citizens no matter where they might be. FATCA is intended to detect and deter tax evasion by U.S. citizens through the use of accounts held abroad. But the extraterritorial feature is that FATCA places the reporting burden primarily on financial institutions, wealth managers, and national tax authorities, rather than individuals. These are foreign entities. For example in the UK, information on U.S. citizens’ accounts holding more than $50,000 must be reported to HM Revenue & Customs, who will then pass details to the U.S. Internal Revenue Service (this latter step is the subject of a bilateral agreement between the U.S. and the UK).

Placing responsibility for compliance with the U.S. statute on foreign banks or other such institutions amounts to extraterritoriality writ large. The U.S. was and is able to engage in this kind of regulatory hegemony because it controls the world’s finance system, at least for now. Americans, who are mostly unconnected with the international community, probably neither know nor care much about this. But outside the U.S., and in the business and financial community especially, FATCA (and other American regulatory provisos) are controversial. As Felix Salmon put it in the Financial Times last year:

America is using its banking laws not to make its financial system safer, nor to protect its own citizens from predatory financial behaviour, but rather to advance foreign policy and national security objectives. Only in America, for instance, would citizens have to apply to the finance ministry in order to get a visa to visit Cuba.

Leadership is important, and most countries would be fine with following America’s lead for some things—cross-border rules governing stability, liquidity, and leverage, for instance. But even then the US has a tendency to ignore everybody else once the rules have been written, and decide to implement a set of entirely separate rules instead. The hegemon does whatever it wants, for its own, often inscrutable reasons, and it does not enjoy being questioned about its decisions.

No other country can get away with this: what we are seeing is unapologetic American exceptionalism, manifesting as extraterritorial powermongering. Using financial regulation as a vehicle for international power politics is extremely effective. It is also very cheap, compared with, say, declaring war.

US officials never apologise for the fact that their own domestic law always trumps everybody else’s; rather, they positively revel in it. The consequence is entirely predictable: a very high degree of resentment at the way in which the U.S. throws its weight around.35

The U.S. indictments, plea agreements and extradition requests in the Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) fraud scandal are triggering similar signs of international skepticism. The first criticism actually came from Russia,36 which does not have much credibility in complaining about extraterritorial assertion of power, much less in complaining about the FIFA investigations (since it allegedly benefitted from the bribes that are being investigated). But that does not necessarily detract from the merits of the Russian criticism. Indeed, The Economist noted that Russia was onto something, observing that “American prosecutors . . . do indeed reach much farther than their peers elsewhere—sometimes too far” and that while the crack down on FIFA is welcome “when it comes to bribery, America has sometimes been too audacious.”37 DOJ’s reliance on the RICO Act and Travel Act (rather than anti-bribery statutes) to establish jurisdiction to prosecute what essentially are bribery allegations does not help its cause.38

The extraterritorial adventures of U.S. courts in antitrust proceedings have not yet produced quite this much heat, but they are producing in their own way a great deal of heat, and one senses that the temperature is rising.

### 2AC---LD---Offends Sovereigns (Short)

#### Empirics---countries embrace and coordinate enforcement, even if it targets *their own companies*.

First and Bush 19, \*Harry First, Charles L. Denison Professor of Law, New York University School of Law, and \*Darren Bush, Leonard B. Rosenberg Professor of Law, University of Houston Law Center; (2019, “Antitrust Analysis of NOPEC Legislation”, https://lawecommons.luc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2044&context=lclr)

In the past, foreign countries have not always been happy about the United States applying its antitrust laws to cartels formed or operated in their countries. Early efforts to resist that enforcement, however, have largely given way to foreign countries embracing competition, engaging in law enforcement against international cartels, and even accepting the imprisonment of their nationals in U.S. jails. While asymmetric retaliation from foreign countries outside the competition law system is certainly possible, there is no history of such retaliation against U.S. antitrust enforcement, even in the context of the private litigation brought directly against OPEC and state-owned oil companies. Consequently, concerns with retaliation as a result of antitrust action by the United States are misplaced.

### 2AC---U---Protectionism

#### Free trade is dead.

Alden 21, \*Edward Alden is an American journalist, author, and the Bernard L. Schwartz senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations; (July 20th, 2021, “Free Trade Is Dead. Risky Managed Trade Is Here”, https://foreignpolicy.com/2021/07/20/free-trade-dead-managed-carbon-border-tax-climate-tariffs-trade-war-protectionism-esg-biden-trump-eu-china/)

But the nondiscrimination principle is now under the most sustained assault it has ever faced. On issues from national security to labor rights to the environment, the world’s largest economies are deciding that nondiscrimination—the bedrock principle of free trade and globalization—must take a back seat to more pressing concerns. The most dramatic abandonment is about to hit: Last week, the European Union unveiled its “[Fit for 55](https://www.forbes.com/sites/siladityaray/2021/07/14/fit-for-55-heres-what-to-expect-as-the-eu-unveils-its-ambitious-new-climate-legislation/?sh=453215bb5ad6)” plan to reduce carbon emissions by 55 percent from 1990 levels by the end of this decade and to reach carbon neutrality by 2050—which will require the most sustained economic upheaval since the Industrial Revolution. Central to the EU’s plan is a carbon border tax, under which Europe plans to charge higher tariffs on imports of products made in ways that generate higher emissions than European producers will be permitted to generate for the same goods. The scheme will start by targeting carbon-intensive sectors such as concrete, steel, aluminum, and fertilizer. The U.S. Congress is developing a similar plan to [tax carbon-intensive imports](https://www.nytimes.com/2021/07/14/climate/border-carbon-tax-united-states.html) as part of the coming budget reconciliation package—although the details are still murky. Other new trade restrictions being imposed or considered on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean are based on compliance with labor protections, human rights, and other criteria. For many traded goods, nondiscrimination will become a quaint relic.

Most of these measures are eminently defensible, perhaps even critically necessary, but together, they are leading to an increasingly balkanized global economy—one divided by ideology, social values, and environmental commitments. It will be a less efficient world, one in which companies will need to tailor both investments and production decisions to the values of the countries they wish to sell to. And it will cause more economic conflict. The more these exceptions to the principle of nondiscrimination become entrenched, the easier it becomes to expand those exceptions in the future. As the world moves down this road to closely managed trade, it will need to step cautiously to avoid going too far—and slide back into damaging protectionism.

The dilemma is the line between legitimate humanitarianism or environmentalism and selfish protectionism can be vanishingly thin.

Nondiscrimination has been the foundation of global trade since the 1947 creation of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), the forerunner of the World Trade Organization (WTO). [Article 1.1 of the GATT agreement](https://www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/gatt47_01_e.htm)—the founding constitution for modern trade—directs that “any advantage, favour, privilege or immunity” given to the products of any GATT member “shall be accorded immediately and unconditionally” to the same products from any other member. In those years, of course, much of the world remained outside the system, in particular the Soviet bloc of communist countries; China withdrew in 1950. But for GATT members, which, by the mid-1990s, included most of the world, there were very few exceptions to nondiscrimination. Having learned from the wreckage of the 1930s, when high tariff walls killed off much of the world’s trade and deepened the global depression, the founders of the GATT wanted nondiscrimination to be a largely inviolate principle, a bulwark against the descent back into senseless trade wars.

Unfortunately, the exceptions were still large enough to erode that bedrock commitment. Decades of preferential trade agreements and regional trade zones, from the original European Community to the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and beyond, offered favorable treatment for countries inside those arrangements at the expense of nonmembers. Some of these arrangements gave preferences to certain outside countries but not others—for decades, the European Community gave special privileges to France’s former colonies. Mexico’s proximity to the large U.S. consumer market and its special access under NAFTA turned it into a manufacturing powerhouse. The GATT system also permits countries to slap tariffs on goods deemed “unfairly traded” due to government subsidies or predatory pricing. Many global steelmakers especially have faced such duties for decades. Critics argue “unfair” and “predatory” can be squishy criteria, subjectively applied to ward off competition.

Recently, these exceptions have mushroomed. Former U.S. President Donald Trump cited national security—[a narrow but permitted GATT exception](https://www.cato.org/policy-analysis/closing-pandoras-box-growing-abuse-national-security-rationale-restricting-trade)—to raise taxes on imports of steel and aluminum from some countries. U.S. President Joe Biden is making similar arguments when he insists goods like semiconductors, advanced electric batteries, pharmaceuticals, and critical minerals [be produced primarily in the United States](https://foreignpolicy.com/2021/06/18/biden-bidenomics-economy-america-first-trump-trade-supply-chains-industrial-policy-china-reshoring-protectionism/). Washington has threatened to block goods deemed environmentally damaging and is currently pursuing a case against Vietnam over its exports of furniture and other wood products made from timber alleged to have been [illegally harvested](https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/IF/IF11683). The European Union, the United States, Britain, and Canada recently imposed trade sanctions targeted at imports from China’s Xinjiang region to protest Beijing’s treatment of the region’s Uyghur Muslims.

Each exception to the nondiscrimination principle has many defenders. No country, quite reasonably, would let its desire for open global trade threaten its national security. Defenders of U.S. trade restrictions on China argue China’s admission to the WTO and the explosion in trade and investment that followed allowed Beijing to grow richer and advance technologically to the point that it poses a significant security threat. A correction was long overdue. Countries, quite understandably, want their economic policies to reflect their values—who would now argue that trade policies should be blind to deforestation in the Amazon or the exploitation of workers? And climate change is now an existential threat to the planet.

The dilemma with each of these measures is the line between legitimate humanitarianism or environmentalism and selfish protectionism can be vanishingly thin. The goals of the EU carbon tax are twofold. First, to encourage other countries to make similarly ambitious climate commitments by threatening the loss of European market access while also equalizing competitive conditions for the EU producers who will pay higher costs for switching to clean energy. The latter goal is dauntingly complex. The EU fears what it calls “carbon leakage,” in which companies would increasingly abandon the EU and shift production abroad to take advantage of looser rules in other countries. The new border tax is intended to “[equalise the price of carbon](https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/qanda_21_3661) between domestic products and imports.”

The EU has worked hard to try to ensure the new mechanism does not violate WTO rules, but implementation will be messy at best. The means for assessing the carbon content of imports remain unclear, and EU firms are certain to lobby for the highest possible tariffs to protect their competitive edge. In the United States, which has not set a domestic price for carbon, the danger of protectionist discrimination through import tariffs may be even higher. It’s easy to imagine the next step: Targeted countries and companies will complain they’re being treated unfairly, retaliatory tariffs will ensue, and a trade conflict will start that will be difficult to control given the intensity of the societal and political convictions involved.

The same dynamics are in play on other measures, such as labor rights. For decades, U.S. administrations have pushed for tougher labor standards in trade agreements, partly motivated by the desire to see working conditions improve abroad but mostly in response to domestic labor unions that fear being undercut by cheaper foreign workers. The debate over whether lower wages are an integral part of the competitive advantage of developing economies or a pernicious feature of a global race to the bottom remains unresolved. But the advanced economies have become more aggressive in blocking imports over labor rights. The new United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement, for example, allows for [import tariffs to be targeted](https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/IF/IF11308) at a single company’s products if that company is deemed to be wrongly impeding union organizing.

There is much to support in all of this. For too long, trade has been blind to most values other than maximizing wealth and corporate profits. However important the pursuit of profit has been in lifting hundreds of millions of people out of misery and destitution in the developing world, there are other values that matter as much, not least the survival of the planet in the face of climate change.

As the world enters a new era of closely managed trade, countries must ensure enlightened discrimination does not become a cover for ruinous protectionism.

But as they abandon the old trade order in pursuit of these laudable goals, the EU and the United States, in particular, would be wise to remind themselves repeatedly of another standard enshrined in the WTO: the “less trade-restrictive” principle. Trade negotiators have grappled for decades with the trade implications of national regulations designed to protect human health and safety, from car crash testing standards to drug and food quality regulations. Such regulations are the proper sovereign authority of nations—but they’re also easily abused to keep out foreign competition or applied for political reasons alone, such as Europe’s fears of certain U.S. food exports.

The compromise has been that while countries must be free to take regulatory measures to protect their people, those measures “[shall not be more trade-restrictive](https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/tbt_e/tbt_info_e.htm) than necessary to fulfill the legitimate objective.” A series of WTO dispute cases in the 1990s on issues like U.S. air quality standards for gasoline and the U.S. requirement that the fishing industry protect sea turtles provided sensible standards. The panels in those cases found that although such environmental measures were legitimate under trade rules, they must be implemented in an even-handed way that does not disproportionately harm foreign countries, and those countries must be given time to adapt to the new rules. The panels called for negotiated compromises to resolve disagreements wherever possible.

Although weaker, to be sure, a commitment to less trade-restrictive responses and compromises would provide some needed guardrails against sliding down the proverbial slippery slope. As the world enters a new era of closely managed trade, countries must ensure enlightened discrimination does not become a cover for ruinous protectionism.

### 2AC---!D---Trade

#### Trade doesn’t solve war.

White 13, Emeritus Professor of Strategic Studies at the Strategic and Defence Studies Centre of the Australian National University. (Hugh, “China: Power and Ambition,” *The China Choice: Why We Should Share Power*, pg. 51-53, Oxford University Press)

Certainly, the more countries trade and invest with one another, the greater the economic cost of conflict and the stronger the incentive to keep the peace. America and China today are more interdependent economically than any two comparably powerful states have ever been before, and this will certainly restrain ambition and rivalry on both sides. The question is whether the restraints will prove stronger than the pressures going the other way. If interdependence does trump strategic and political ambition, we should be seeing it happening between the United States and China now – but we have not seen much evidence of that yet. So far the two countries seem to be acting very much as strong states in the past have acted as relative power shifts from one to the other. Pessimists like John Mearsheimer and Niall Ferguson remind us that before war broke out in 1914, the great powers of Europe had grown more economically interdependent than they had ever been before, and than they would be again for almost a century.12

The lesson to draw is that interdependence increases the incentive for leaders to subordinate political ambitions and ignore nationalist sentiments, but it does not remove the need for them to take these bold and [politically] politicaly risky steps. The hard choices still have to be made. It is easy for leaders to see that economic interests require them to compromise their countries’ aspirations for international status and power, but it is harder for them to acknowledge that to their people, and harder still to put their economic interests ahead of strategic and political ones when a choice has to be made. In fact, most often people see it as shameful to put economic concerns first when issues of power and status are engaged. What president would tell the American people that their country will compromise its position on an issue like Taiwan in order to protect America’s economic interests? What Chinese leader could make the same argument to the Chinese people? When a choice has to be made, especially when it has to be made in the glare of an international crisis, it is very hard to put economics first.

In some ways the obvious importance of economic interdependence increases rather than limits the risk that rivalry will escalate, because of the way it can affect one country’s view of the other’s priorities. There seems to be a pattern here: each side believes that the imperatives of interdependence will press more heavily on the other. That inclines both governments to assume that the other will compromise to protect the economic relationship, so they do not have to do so. In Washington they expect China to back down from its challenge to America once Beijing understands the economic risks of rivalry. In Beijing they think America will blink. That makes both of them less inclined to compromise their own position – which makes escalation more likely.

Ultimately, faith in the power of interdependence boils down to faith in the power of money to trump other emotions and motivations. That is a risky proposition. We cannot assume that Chinese leaders will always choose rationally to maximise China’s objective benefits. They are no less liable than the leaders of any other country to allow what may be, or may seem to us to be, irrational desires for status and influence to trump the rational calculations of national interest.

Economics is important, but money isn’t everything. Countries, like people, want to be rich, but they also want to be safe and to feel good about themselves. For countries, as for individuals, aspirations for security and identity often compete with material interests, and often win. America’s and China’s divergent visions touch on very deep issues of national identity in both countries, which can easily seem to outweigh economic imperatives when the crunch comes. And there is always something a little strange about the assumption, implicit in the interdependence argument, that our economic desires will suppress the urge to strategic and political competition when our desire to avoid the horrors of war will not.

### 2AC---Trade Bad---Environment

#### Trade causes warming and kills bio-d.

Sakashita 15 (Miyoko, Oceans Program Director, Center for Biological Diversity, “Free Trade: The Hidden Costs to Our Oceans and Climate,” 6 December 2017, <https://www.huffpost.com/entry/free-trade-the-hidden-cos_b_8560336>, DOA: 3-2-2022)

The free trade paradigm has driven the export of U.S. manufacturing jobs to other countries, predominantly China, which is the world's leading emitter of greenhouse gases. In outsourcing production jobs, the U.S. also outsources its carbon emissions. The Global Carbon Project last year found that almost all the U.S. emissions reductions since 1990 have resulted from outsourcing production to countries like China, where production-related emissions are rising faster than consumption-related emissions, even though it's the world's most populous country. And those emissions transfers are increasing at 11 percent per year, largely because of free trade policies, a source of global warming that is barely being addressed in the negotiations leading up the Paris climate talks next month.

It isn't just carbon emissions that are being fueled by consumption in the U.S. and other wealthy countries. We create the demand that causes other countries to produce all those throwaway plastic products and packaging now swirling in the North Pacific Gyre, the biggest garbage dump in the world, collecting toxins along the way and sending them up the aquatic food chain. And international trade has spread invasive species (such as zebra mussels, cholera, and toxic algae blooms) around the world, traveling in the ballast water of ships and colonizing foreign lands, where they compromise biodiversity and clog up intake pipes and other vital infrastructure.

In an era when we're having trouble breaking our fossil fuel addiction despite its damage to our planet, when our ocean is becoming more polluted and corrosive, and we're rapidly losing the biodiversity on which healthy ecosystems rely, it's worth reexamining our assumptions about the value of free trade.

#### Those cause extinction AND elevate other existential threats.

**Torres 16** – affiliate scholar @ Institute for Ethics and Emerging Technologies (Phil, PhD candidate @ Rice University in tropical conservation biology, Op-ed: Climate Change Is the Most Urgent Existential Risk, <http://ieet.org/index.php/IEET/more/Torres20160807>)

Humanity faces a number of formidable challenges this century. Threats to our collective survival stem from asteroids and comets, supervolcanoes, global pandemics, climate change, biodiversity loss, nuclear weapons, biotechnology, synthetic biology, nanotechnology, and artificial superintelligence. With such threats in mind, an informal survey conducted by the Future of Humanity Institute placed the probability of human extinction this century at 19%. To put this in perspective, it means that the average American is more than a thousand times more likely to die in a human extinction event than a plane crash.\* So, given limited resources, which risks should we prioritize? Many intellectual leaders, including Elon Musk, Stephen Hawking, and Bill Gates, have suggested that artificial superintelligence constitutes one of the most significant risks to humanity. And this may be correct in the long-term. But I would argue that two other risks, namely **climate change and biodiveristy loss**, should **take priority** right now over **every other known threat**. Why? Because these ongoing catastrophes **in slow-motion** will frame our **existential predicament** on Earth not just for the rest of this century, but for literally **thousands of years** to come. As such, they have the capacity to **raise or lower** the **probability of other risks scenarios** unfolding. Multiplying Threats Ask yourself the following: are wars more or less likely in a world marked by **extreme weather events**, **megadroughts**, **food supply disruptions**, and **sea-level rise**? Are terrorist attacks more or less likely in a world beset by **the collapse of global ecosystems**, **agricultural failures**, **economic uncertainty**, and political instability? Both government officials and scientists agree that the answer is **“more likely.”** For example, the current Director of the CIA, John Brennan, recently identified “the impact of climate change” as one of the “deeper causes of this rising instability” in countries like **Syria**, **Iraq**, **Yemen**, **Libya**, and **Ukraine**. Similarly, the former Secretary of Defense, Chuck Hagel, has described climate change as a **“threat multiplier”** with “the potential to exacerbate many of the challenges we are dealing with today — from **infectious disease** to terrorism.” The Department of Defense has also affirmed a connection. In a 2015 report, it states, “Global climate change will aggravate problems such as **poverty**, **social tensions**, environmental degradation, **ineffectual leadership** and **weak political institutions** that threaten stability in a number of countries.” Scientific studies have further shown a connection between the environmental crisis and violent conflicts. For example, a 2015 paper in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences argues that climate change was a causal factor behind the record-breaking 2007-2010 drought in Syria. This drought led to a mass migration of farmers into urban centers, which fueled the 2011 Syrian civil war. Some observers, including myself, have suggested that this struggle could be the beginning of World War III, given the complex tangle of international involvement and overlapping interests. The study’s conclusion is also significant because the Syrian civil war was the Petri dish in which the Islamic State consolidated its forces, later emerging as the largest and most powerful terrorist organization in human history. A Perfect Storm The point is that climate change and biodiversity loss could very easily push societies **to the brink of collapse**. This will exacerbate **existing geopolitical tensions** and introduce entirely **new power struggles** between state and nonstate actors. At the same time, advanced technologies will very likely become increasingly powerful and accessible. As I’ve written elsewhere, the malicious agents of the future will have bulldozers rather than shovels to dig mass graves for their enemies. The result is a perfect storm of more conflicts in the world along with unprecedentedly dangerous weapons. If the conversation were to end here, we’d have ample reason for placing climate change and biodiversity loss at the top of our priority lists. But there are other reasons they ought to be considered urgent threats. I would argue that they could make humanity more vulnerable to a catastrophe involving superintelligence and even asteroids. The basic reasoning is the same for both cases. Consider superintelligence first. Programming a superintelligence whose values align with ours is a formidable task even in stable circumstances. As Nick Bostrom argues in his 2014 book, we should recognize the “default outcome” of superintelligence to be “doom.” Now imagine trying to solve these problems amidst a rising tide of interstate wars, civil unrest, terrorist attacks, and other tragedies? The societal stress caused by climate change and biodiversity loss will almost certainly compromise important conditions for creating friendly AI, such as sufficient funding, academic programs to train new scientists, conferences on AI, peer-reviewed journal publications, and communication/collaboration between experts of different fields, such as computer science and ethics. It could even make an “AI arms race” more likely, thereby raising the probability of a malevolent superintelligence being created either on purpose or by mistake. Similarly, imagine that astronomers discover a behemoth asteroid barreling toward Earth. Will designing, building, and launching a spacecraft to divert the assassin past our planet be easier or more difficult in a world preoccupied with other survival issues? In a relatively peaceful world, one could imagine an asteroid actually bringing humanity together by directing our attention **toward a common threat**. **But** if the “conflict multipliers” of climate change and biodiversity loss have already **catapulted civilization** into chaos and turmoil, I strongly suspect that humanity will become more, rather than less, susceptible to dangers of this sort. Context Risks We can describe the dual threats of climate change and biodiversity loss as “context risks.” Neither is likely to directly cause the extinction of our species. But **both will define the context in which civilization confronts all the other threats** before us. In this way, they could **indirectly** contribute to the **overall danger of annihilation** — and this worrisome effect could be significant. For example, according to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the effects of climate change will be “severe,” “pervasive,” and “irreversible.” Or, as a 2016 study published in Nature and authored by over twenty scientists puts it, the consequences of climate change “will extend longer than the entire history of human civilization thus far.” Furthermore, a recent article in Science Advances confirms that humanity has already escorted the biosphere into the sixth mass extinction event in life’s 3.8 billion year history on Earth. Yet another study suggests that we could be approaching a **sudden**, **irreversible**, catastrophic **collapse of the global ecosystem**. If this were to occur, it could result in “widespread social unrest, economic instability and loss of human life.” Given the potential for environmental degradation to **elevate the likelihood of nuclear wars**, **nuclear terrorism**, **engineered pandemics**, a **superintelligence takeover**, and perhaps even **an impact winter**, it ought to take precedence **over all other risk concerns** — at least in the near-term. Let’s make sure we get our priorities straight.

### 2AC---Disease

#### Interdependence makes catastrophic outbreaks inevitable.

Morand & Walther ‘4/20 (\*Serge Morand; PhD, disease ecologist @ Kasetsart University; \*\*Bruno A. Walther; DPhil, Taipei Medical University; 4/20/20; “The accelerated infectious disease risk in the Anthropocene: more outbreaks and wider global spread”; pg. 3-4; Accessible at: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.20.049866>) \*”to” added to preserve grammatical integrity, brackets denote a change

We here want to draw attention to another important and noteworthy feature of the Anthropocene which greatly affects public health, human well-being, and economic performance. These findings are especially pertinent as the world reels from the health, social and economic impact of the current SARS-CoV-2 pandemic (El Zowalaty and Järhult, 2020; Ghebreyesus and Swaminathan, 2020; Lorusso et al., 2020). The increasing connectivity of human populations due to international trade and travel (Guimerà et al., 2005; Colizza et al., 2006; Brockmann and Helbing, 2013; Gabrielli et al., 2019), the rapid growth of the transport of wild and domesticated animals worldwide (Rosen and Smith, 2010; Schneider, 2012; Rohr et al., 2019; Levitt, 2020), and other factors such as the increasing encroachment of human populations on hitherto isolated wild animal populations through loss and fragmentation of wild habitats (Patz et al., 2004; Despommier et al., 2006; Pongsiri et al., 2009; Myers et al., 2013) have led to a great acceleration of infectious disease risks, e.g., the increase in emerging infectious diseases and drug-resistant microbes since 1940 (Jones et al., 2008) and the increase in the number of disease outbreaks since 1980 (Smith et al., 2014). To expand the previous analysis (Smith et al., 2014) to the beginning of the Anthropocene, we investigated whether the number of disease outbreaks has increased since the Second World War. In addition, we examined whether the global pattern of infectious disease outbreaks changed possibly due [to] the increasing connectivity of human populations. In other words, have the disease outbreaks become more globalized in the sense that these outbreaks are increasingly shared by countries worldwide? To investigate these questions, we used a the most complete, reliable, and up-to-date global dataset (GIDEON Informatics, 2020) which had already been used in the previous analysis (Smith et al., 2014). This dataset can be used to enumerated the recorded annual number of disease outbreaks. To investigate the changing global patterns of disease outbreaks, we used this dataset to calculate two measures which have been recently introduced into ecological and parasitological studies. These two measures, namely modularity and centrality, quantify the connectivity of bipartite networks. Modularity is defined as the extent to which nodes (specifically, sites and species for presenceabsence matrices) in a compartment are more likely to be connected to each other than to other nodes of the network (Thébault, 2013). The calculation of a modularity measure is useful for global phenomena because it allows the overall level of compartmentalization (or fragmentation) into compartments (or clusters, modules, subgroups, or subsets) of an entire dataset to be quantified. High modularity in a global network means that subgroups of countries and disease outbreaks interact more strongly among themselves (that is, within a compartment) than with the other subgroups (that is, among compartments) (Bordes et al., 2015). Centrality is defined as the degree of the connectedness of a node (e.g., a keystone species in ecological studies; Jordán, 2009; González et al., 2010). In the context of our study, centrality is the degree of the connectedness of a country and those countries connected to it. We estimated the countries which are the potential centres of disease outbreaks by investigating the eigenvector centrality of a given country in a network of countries which share disease outbreaks among each other. Eigenvector centrality is a generalization of degree centrality, which is the number of connections a country has to other countries in terms of sharing disease outbreaks. Eigenvector centrality considers countries to be highly central if the connected countries to them through shared outbreaks are connected to many other well-connected countries (Bonacich and Lloyd, 2001; Wells et al., 2020). Modularity and centrality analyses have been used to investigate various ecological, parasitological and epidemiological questions (e.g., Tylianakis et al., 2007; Jordán, 2009; González et al., 2010; Anderson and Sukhdeo, 2011; Bascompte and Jordano, 2014; Poisot et al., 2014; Bordes et al., 2015; Genrich et al., 2017). Using a widely used world dataset on infectious disease outbreaks, we here present results which demonstrate that the accelerated number of disease outbreaks and their increased global spread are two further threatening aspects of the accelerated infectious disease risk associated with the globalization process which characterizes the Anthropocene.

### 2AC---AT: China Mod

#### **No US-China war.**

Lei 20, PhD and MA in International Politics, associate research fellow with the China Institute of International Studies. (Cui, 7-24-2020, "Despite heated talk, risk of a US-China hot war is small", *South China Morning Post*, https://www.scmp.com/comment/opinion/article/3094121/why-risk-us-china-hot-war-small-despite-heated-talk)

Many observers are pessimistic about deteriorating US-China relations and believe the two countries are heading towards a cold war. Even worse, some argue that the situation might be more dangerous than the US-Soviet Union Cold War, and that a hot war might break out between the two. This argument is unconvincing. First of all, deterrents to a flare-up are much stronger in US-China relations than in US-Soviet relations. Although economic and people-to-people ties between China and the US are declining, they are still close compared to US-Soviet ties. It is hard to decouple two closely intertwined economies and societies. Take two examples. China is expected to become the world's largest consumer market, a temptation hard to resist for exporters, including those from the US. And in education, more than 300,000 Chinese students study in the US, bringing in huge revenues for the US education industry. Many universities go to great lengths to woo international students. Recently Harvard and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology even sued the government over its new visa restrictions, now aborted, on international students. Second, even if there is decoupling, the pain would not be too great and can be kept out of the national security sphere if properly handled. In fact, for national security reasons, a modest degree of isolation will make both sides more secure and comfortable. For instance, if China’s information technology equipment cannot capture Western markets, the US will be more relaxed. If China cannot get advanced technologies from the US and its technological progress slows down, the US will be less anxious. In the same vein, China feels assured knowing that if the Trump administration does impose a travel ban on Communist Party members, it would be abandoning one of the tools available to the US to promote “peaceful evolution” in China. Economic decoupling is undeniably more painful for China than for the US. But unlike Japan during WWII, which was hit hard by the US oil embargo because of its lack of natural resources, China has no such problems. Given its large domestic market, losing the US as a major customer is not a disaster for China, and can be compensated through more dynamic economic activities at home. China can also make up for being freezed out of technological exchanges by turning to indigenous innovation. As for the US, it can import goods from other developing countries, albeit less cheaply. The relative loss is acceptable when weighed against the heightened perception of economic independence and security. Third, the ideological confrontation between China and the US is less intense than that during the Cold War. Unlike the obsession with ideology in those days, the line between capitalism and socialism is blurred today. The market economy has become universally recognised as the best way to promote economic growth and, politically, many countries have embraced democracy. Even North Korea calls itself the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea. Although ideological hawks in the US still long for the day when the beacon of freedom will light up the world, after many years of fighting bloody wars overseas, most American people are not interested in promoting democracy abroad. Meanwhile, China just wants to preserve its political system and has no interest in exporting it to other countries, as the Soviet Union did. Thus, ideological antagonism in China-US relations can easily be eased by calculations of realistic interests, which create conditions for compromise and cooperation. Fourth, both China and the US have many options other than war to achieve their policy goals. While they have no allies to serve as a buffer, given the nature of the potential conflict in the South China Sea or Taiwan Strait, both countries are adept at operating in grey zones and fighting psychological, public opinion or diplomatic warfare below the threshold of war. The forced closure of the Chinese consulate in Houston by the US government is just the latest act of brinkmanship. In addition, given China’s huge economic and financial interests in the US, the latter can wield the stick of sanctions when use of force is highly risky or not worth it. When both sides have many tools and options, why would they rush to war to achieve their goals? Last but not least, the imbalance of power will act as a deterrent. Some say the US and Soviet Union did not fight a hot war because they were evenly matched. It was not the case, actually. At the beginning of the Cold War, the Soviet Union was at a relative military disadvantage. Moreover, a country needs the will to fight before going to war, even if it is stronger militarily than its adversary. Having fought years of meaningless wars, the US is weary of war. China, too, abhors war. Having a clear understanding of US strength, especially when its own economy is slowing down and it is facing various domestic challenges, China would not wish to recklessly start a war with the US. In summary, the possibility of a hot war between China and the US is very small. The greatest danger for China is not a cold or hot confrontation with the US, but policymakers’ interpretation of the momentary hostility towards Beijing of a portion of the American population and the larger world. An erroneous interpretation could end China’s march to further opening up, and see it turn instead towards self-isolation.

# 1AR vs Michigan PS

### 1AR---Treble

#### Treble damages are key---otherwise, investigation and filing are cost-prohibitive.

Leslie 20, \*Christopher R. Leslie, Chancellor’s Professor of Law, University of California Irvine School of Law; (2020, “The DOJ’s Defense of Deception: Antitrust Law’s Role in Protecting the Standard-Setting Process”, https://scholarsbank.uoregon.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/1794/25382/1\_Leslie\_FNL.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y)

In litigation involving FRAND violations, the core of the plaintiff’s case is the same under either a contract law approach or an antitrust law approach. The same conduct—charging a supra-FRAND royalty—is the foundation of both a breach of contract and an antitrust violation. Besides the fact that Section 2 liability requires proof of a defendant’s monopoly power, the two most important differences are the remedies and the universe of potential plaintiffs. With respect to remedies, under contract law, if the patentee charges a royalty that is not FRAND, the contract plaintiff can recover the difference between the FRAND amount and the royalty actually paid. In contrast, successful antitrust plaintiffs are entitled to treble damages on the overcharge as well as reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs.200 These differences in available remedies have important implications for both compensation and deterrence. Although called compensatory damages, the single damages associated with contract law do not actually fully compensate victims of breach for their injuries. Although contract damages are supposed to make the nonbreaching party whole, they do not for several reasons. First, contract law does not generally provide attorneys’ fees for successful plaintiffs.201 Second, contract remedies do not compensate the nonbreaching party for the time and effort of investigating their contract claims.202 As a result, even when a plaintiff wins her contract law case, she is not fully compensated for her injuries. She remains worse off than if the contract had been properly performed.

Congress provided for the automatic trebling of antitrust damages in order to deter firms from engaging in anticompetitive conduct in the first place.203 Antitrust law’s treble damages are also intended to compensate victims of antitrust violations for the time it takes to investigate and pursue potential antitrust violations.204 Congress recognized that consumers would be less likely to spend the necessary resources to detect and challenge antitrust violations if they were not compensated for their investment in time. Although contract law alone does not deter patentholder deception and holdup,205 Delrahim praises contract remedies specifically because contract law does not provide for treble damages.206 He raises the threat of overdeterrence if antitrust law were in play. But there should be no meaningful risk of overdeterrence because the owner of a SEP can eliminate the prospect of antitrust litigation by adjudicating FRAND royalty rates ahead of time.

#### 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

### TL---2AC

#### 2---speed. Decline triggers global war quickly

Diamond 19, PhD in Sociology, professor of Sociology and Political Science at Stanford University (Larry, “Ill Winds: Saving Democracy from Russian Rage, Chinese Ambition and American Complacency,” Kindle Edition)

In such a near future, my fellow experts would no longer talk of “democratic erosion.” We would be spiraling downward into a time of democratic despair, recalling Daniel Patrick Moynihan’s grim observation from the 1970s that liberal democracy “is where the world was, not where it is going.” 5 The world pulled out of that downward spiral—but it took new, more purposeful American leadership. The planet was not so lucky in the 1930s, when the global implosion of democracy led to a catastrophic world war, between a rising axis of emboldened dictatorships and a shaken and economically depressed collection of self-doubting democracies. These are the stakes. Expanding democracy—with its liberal norms and constitutional commitments—is a crucial foundation for world peace and security. Knock that away, and our most basic hopes and assumptions will be imperiled. The problem is not just that the ground is slipping. It is that we are perched on a global precipice. That ledge has been gradually giving way for a decade. If the erosion continues, we may well reach a tipping point where democracy goes bankrupt suddenly—plunging the world into depths of oppression and aggression that we have not seen since the end of World War II. As a political scientist, I know that our theories and tools are not nearly good enough to tell us just how close we are getting to that point—until it happens.

### DPT True---2AC

#### The absolute best and newest studies verify the link between democracies and peace.

Kosuke Imai 20, PhD in Political Science @ Harvard, Professor in the Department of Government and the Department of Statistics at Harvard University, “Robustness of Empirical Evidence for the Democratic Peace: A Nonparametric Sensitivity Analysis”, https://imai.fas.harvard.edu/research/files/dempeace.pdf

The democratic peace — the idea that democracies rarely fight one another — has been called “the closest thing we have to an empirical law in the study of international relations.” Yet, some contend that this relationship is spurious and suggest alternative explanations. Unfortunately, in the absence of randomized experiments, we can never rule out the possible existence of such confounding biases. Rather than commonly used regression-based approaches, we apply a nonparametric sensitivity analysis. We show that overturning the positive association between democracy and peace would require a confounder that is 47 times more prevalent in democratic dyads than in other dyads. To put this number in context, the relationship between democracy and peace is at least five times as robust as that between smoking and lung cancer. To explain away the democratic peace, therefore, scholars must find far more powerful confounders than already those identified in the literature.

### Laundry List---2AC

#### Authoritarian norms cause extinction---multiple scenarios

Orts 18, Guardsmark Professor at The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania. (Eric, 6-27-2018, “Foreign Affairs: Six Future Scenarios (and a Seventh)”, *LinkedIn*, <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/foreign-affairs-six-future-scenarios-seventh-eric-orts>)

7. Fascist Nationalism. There is another possible future that the Foreign Affairs scenarios do not contemplate, and it’s a dark world in which Trump, Putin, Xi, Erdogan, and others construct regimes that are authoritarian and nationalist. Fascism is possible in the United States and elsewhere if big business can be seduced by promises of riches in return for the institutional keys to democracy. Perhaps Foreign Affairs editors are right to leave this dark world out, for it would be very dark: nationalist wars with risks of escalation into global nuclear conflict, further digital militarization (even Terminator-style scenarios of smart military robots), and unchecked climate disasters.

The global challenges are quite large – and the six pieces do an outstanding job of presenting them. One must remain optimistic and engaged, hopeful that we can overcome the serious dangers of tribalism, nationalism, and new fascism. These “isms” of our time stand in the way of solving some of our biggest global problems, such as the risks of thermonuclear war and global climate catastrophe.

## China Impact

### 1AR v Overly

#### Overly is so aff it’s embarrassing

1NR Overly ’22 [Seven; 1/3/22; covers the intersection of trade and technology policy and politics for POLITICO with a special focus on the industry's effort to influence decisions in Washington; "Five big trade predictions for the new year," https://www.politico.com/newsletters/weekly-trade/2022/01/03/five-big-trade-predictions-for-the-new-year-799628]

Trade becomes a political weapon: Chinese trade bullying of Lithuania is a harbinger of things to come. Unless countered, trade and other forms of economic coercion will multiply and intensify as more countries turn away from the international rule of law. One of the necessary responses to trade coercion must be legal action in the WTO. — James Bacchus, director of the Center for Global Economic and Environmental Opportunity at the University of Central Florida

#### Auto, EVS, lumber, solar

1NR Overly ’22 [Seven; 1/3/22; covers the intersection of trade and technology policy and politics for POLITICO with a special focus on the industry's effort to influence decisions in Washington; "Five big trade predictions for the new year," https://www.politico.com/newsletters/weekly-trade/2022/01/03/five-big-trade-predictions-for-the-new-year-799628]

Fights ahead with Mexico and Canada: Tensions will remain over automotive rules of origin, U.S. incentives for the purchase of union-made, U.S. e-vehicles, softwood lumber, solar panels and possibly some agricultural exports. While USMCA labor disputes that arise will be promptly resolved, some of the issues mentioned above will not be resolved via good offices, conciliation or mediation, and will reach a panel stage. USMCA has a number of mechanisms to resolve disputes: the mechanisms will work well and governments will abide by panel reports. The agreement will hold. — Antonio Ortiz-Mena, senior vice president at Albright Stonebridge Group

### IP Thumpers

#### IP is wrecked globally

Radu 19 (Sintia, “Countries the U.S. Sees as Threat to Patents and IP,” US News, https://www.usnews.com/news/best-countries/slideshows/these-countries-pose-the-biggest-ip-protection-threats-according-to-the-us?slide=7)

China

China went through a government reorganization that included intellectual property responsibilities of various agencies. The country proposed revisions of laws and regulations but despite the effort, "China failed to make fundamental structural changes to strengthen IP protection and enforcement, open China's market to foreign investment, allow the market a decisive role in allocating resources, and refrain from government interference in private sector technology transfer decisions," says the Office of the United States Trade Representative.

Indonesia

U.S. trade officials say American rights holders struggle with inadequate and non-effective intellectual property protection and enforcement in Indonesia, as well as having fair market access. Washington sees Indonesia as an IP protection threat primarily because of widespread piracy and counterfeiting in the Southeast Asian country, and for not having effective enforcement against counterfeiting.

India

The fastest-growing large economy in the world, India is also one of the most challenging when it comes to intellectual rights protection, according to Washington. "In particular, India has yet to take steps to address long-standing patent issues that affect innovative industries," say the authors of the Trade Representative report.

U.S. companies spanning across various industries are concerned about narrow patent standards in India, as well as threats of compulsory licensing and patent revocations and very broad criteria for issuing licenses and revocations in the country. In addition, "patent applicants face costly and time-consuming patent opposition hurdles, long timelines for receiving patents, and excessive reporting requirements," according to the report.

Algeria

The U.S. government considers Algeria to still struggle with granting "fair and equitable market access for U.S. intellectual property (IP) right holders in Algeria, notably for pharmaceutical and medical device manufacturers," the Trade Representative report says. In addition, Algeria has banned imports on a large number of pharmaceutical products and medical devices to favor local products. This, the U.S. government adds, "remains a trade matter of serious concern."

Kuwait

Since 2016, Kuwait has made progress in establishing effective copyright and related rights laws. Yet the U.S. government warns that "necessary steps still remain for Kuwait's copyright regime in light of international commitments, including with respect to the term of protection; limitations on the amount of work reproduced; enforcement, remedies and damages; and definitions."

Intellectual property rights holders in Kuwait struggle with the difficulty in having Kuwaiti government officials remove illicit physical goods from the country's market. A lack of transparency in administrative and criminal proceedings is also an issue.

Saudi Arabia

Saudi Arabia took a spot on the U.S. 2019 priority watch list because, the report says, of a deterioration in intellectual property protection for innovative pharmaceutical products. In addition, the nation raises "long outstanding concerns regarding enforcement against counterfeit and pirated goods within the country."

### No China War

#### China won’t invade Taiwan because of Ukraine.

Mastro 3-2-2022, Center Fellow at the Freeman Spogli Institute for International Studies at Stanford University and a Senior Nonresident Fellow at the American Enterprise Institute. (Oriana Skylar, “Invasions Are Not Contagious: Russia’s War in Ukraine Doesn’t Presage a Chinese Assault on Taiwan,” *Foreign Affairs*)

As Russian President Vladimir Putin intensifies his assault on Ukraine, a growing number of U.S. military and foreign policy analysts are voicing concern that China may be emboldened by Russia’s example and try to take Taiwan by force. “If Russia can grab chunks of Ukraine or install a puppet regime and withstand economic sanctions, that could embolden nationalists in China to look to Taiwan and think they could do the same,” Ian Johnson, a China expert at the Council on Foreign Relations, has argued. Representative Michael McCaul, Republican of Texas, made a similar argument in an interview last month, as did retired Army General Jack Keane, who said that Chinese President Xi Jinping sees “weakness in the West and how that can advantage him in terms of his national objectives as well.” Xi is certainly watching events in Ukraine, but his calculus for whether to use force against Taiwan is shaped primarily by domestic factors, not foreign ones. As I have argued in Foreign Affairs, Chinese leaders are considering “armed reunification” with Taiwan more seriously than at any time in the last 50 years. But Xi will assert Chinese control over the island only if he is confident his military can conduct a successful amphibious invasion and if he believes the timing is right for his own career. Shifts in the international environment would be important for Taiwan if they changed Xi’s thinking on either count. But the war in Ukraine has not. Xi’s views about U.S. power and resolve and about the likely international response to an invasion of Taiwan probably remain unchanged. If anything, China’s desire not to invite comparisons with Russia at a time when the world is united against Moscow will lengthen its timeline for taking control of Taiwan, not shorten it. The economic sanctions that the United States, Canada, and many European countries have imposed on Russia give China little reason for pause. To the contrary, these punitive measures simply confirm Beijing’s previous assessments of the possible economic repercussions of using force against Taiwan. Chinese leaders expect the economic costs of an invasion to be heavy but acceptable—partly because of how the international community has responded to Chinese provocations in the past and partly because Beijing’s foreign policy is designed to convince countries to stay out of China’s “internal” affairs, such as the status of Taiwan. That is not to say the economic measures Washington and its allies have imposed on Russia in recent days are insignificant. The United States and European countries have blocked Russia’s access to most of its foreign currency reserves, making it impossible for Moscow to intervene to prop up its collapsing currency. They have frozen the assets of senior Russian officials, including Putin himself. And they have moved to exclude big Russian banks from SWIFT, the global financial messaging system. China’s ability to retaliate against the West with economic sanctions of its own is much greater than Russia’s. But the United States and its allies could do more to punish Russia. They could bar all transactions with Russia, whether trade or financial. They could seize all Russian assets within their jurisdictions. Washington could announce secondary sanctions on anyone using U.S. dollars for any transaction with Russia. Most important, the United States could use these and other measures to prevent Russia from exporting oil and gas. Letting Russia continue to export oil and gas would be like letting China sell consumer electronics even after it had taken Taiwan by force. If the United States and its allies have been cautious in their response to Russia, they are likely to be even more restrained when responding to China—and Beijing knows it. China’s ability to retaliate against the West with economic sanctions of its own is much greater than Russia’s. Singapore, which announced trade and banking restrictions against Moscow, trades about $2.5 billion worth of goods with Russia each year—but $57 billion worth of goods with China. China’s leaders likely do not fear U.S.-led economic sanctions in the event of a Taiwan takeover because they probably think that China’s own productive capacity, resources, and friendly partners will allow them to survive on their own, especially since China will soon be the world’s largest economy. They are probably right. China could absorb the types of sanctions being imposed on Russia. And given China’s ability to inflict pain on Western countries, any measures levied against Beijing would likely be softer than those imposed on Moscow. TAIWAN IS NOT UKRAINE The Western military response to Russia’s invasion of Ukraine will have an even smaller impact than sanctions on China’s thinking about Taiwan. True, neither the United States nor NATO has deployed troops to fight on Ukraine’s behalf. And U.S. military assistance to Ukraine has been modest: late last month, President Joe Biden instructed the State Department to release up to an additional $350 million worth of weapons from U.S. stocks to Ukraine. But Russia would have to invade a NATO ally without provoking a U.S. military response for Chinese leaders to seriously question Washington’s commitment to defending Taiwan. Biden has made clear from the beginning of the crisis that his administration will never send troops to Ukraine—a stark contrast with his rhetoric on Taiwan. Just last week, Biden stated unequivocally that the United States would defend Taiwan in the event of a Chinese attack. As a show of support, he also sent to the island a delegation of former U.S. officials led by Mike Mullen, a former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Chinese planners largely assume the United States would intervene militarily on behalf of Taiwan. In any case, Chinese planners largely assume the United States would intervene militarily on behalf of Taiwan. What some of them question is whether the United States could amass enough forces fast enough to blunt a Chinese assault on the island. Ironically, if the United States had launched a military operation in response to Russia’s invasion of Ukraine, Chinese leaders would have had further reason to question Washington’s ability to thwart a Chinese assault on Taiwan. The United States does not have the resources to fight the Russians in Europe and prepare adequately for a great-power war in Asia. Of course, these facts have not prevented China from trying to manipulate the narrative to undermine Taiwan’s resolve. Chinese state media has been flush with stories about how the United States did not come to Ukraine’s aid and therefore won’t come to Taiwan’s either. Like much of what appears on Chinese state media, however, these stories reflect what Chinese leaders want the world to believe—not what they believe themselves. NOT THE RIGHT TIME Chinese leaders are without a doubt considering an attack on Taiwan, but now is not the right time. China’s military is still honing the capabilities it would need to take and hold the island. And Xi is unlikely to take a dangerous gamble on Taiwan before the next Party Congress in late 2022, when he is widely expected to secure a third term as general secretary of the Chinese Communist Party. Xi is also working hard to lessen China’s technological dependence on the West, thus minimizing the impact on any further decoupling after a possible war. For all these reasons, an assault on Taiwan before 2025 is unlikely. If anything, the crisis in Ukraine creates an additional incentive for China to wait. Beijing does not want the world to equate the two scenarios. From China’s perspective, Ukraine is an independent country engaged in a border dispute with Russia. Taiwan, by contrast, “has always been an inalienable part of China’s territory,” as China’s ambassador to the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, Deng Xijun, put it late last month. In other words, linking the two issues would undermine China’s claim to the island. China also understands that moving against Taiwan now would solidify fears in the West of an axis of autocrats. The United States may not have the resolve to fight a protracted war to defend Taiwan. But suddenly faced with a need to defend freedom and democracy against an authoritarian alliance, Washington could muster a greater military response and convince its allies to do the same. Partly for this reason, China has desperately tried to maintain some semblance of neutrality during the Ukrainian crisis. Russia’s invasion of Ukraine has certainly changed aspects of the international order. It has rallied European countries against Russia, prompted Germany to increase defense spending, and even convinced historically neutral countries such as Finland, Sweden, and Switzerland to take a stance against Moscow. From China’s perspective, however, nothing Russia or its adversaries have done meaningfully alters the calculus on Taiwan.