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#### Advantage 1 is China:

#### Standards-Setting Organizations (SSO’s) are industry members who jointly establish standards for information tech defined by the adoption of standard-essential patents (SEP’s), which are licensed to companies who wish to implement the tech in their product, called implementers, on Fair, Reasonable, and Non-Discriminatory (FRAND) terms. Current standards promote price gouging, FRAND enforcement is critical.

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

I. Standard Setting and the Competitive Process

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Monopoly pricing and selective licensing undermines 5G innovation---FRAND enforcement is key.

Actonline 20, the App Association represents more than 5,000 app companies and information technology firms across the mobile economy; (August 26th, 2020, “Save Our Standards: The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals Reverses Decision in FTC v. Qualcomm”, <https://actonline.org/2020/08/26/save-our-standards-the-ninth-circuit-court-of-appeals-reverses-decision-in-ftc-v-qualcomm/>)
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Moreover, the FRAND agreement is a critical tool used by standard setting organizations to ensure the process enhances competition and does not run afoul of antitrust laws. Generally, a collaboration between competitors to choose market winners or set prices raises significant questions for competition regulators. Royalty free and FRAND licensing requirements were created by standards bodies to avoid potential antitrust scrutiny by limiting the market power and the potential for abuse by those involved in developing a standard. This is why the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) will not accredit any standards developing organization (SDO) that does not require standard-essential patent holders to provide licensing terms at least as favorable as FRAND.

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

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

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

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

Duan 19, \*Charles Duan is a senior fellow and associate director of tech & innovation policy at the R Street Institute, where he focuses his research on intellectual property issues; (February 5th, 2019, “Why China Is Winning the 5G War”, https://nationalinterest.org/feature/why-china-winning-5g-war-43347)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Obscurity Through Complexity

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

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

Internal Competition vs Strategic Direction

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

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

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

#### Causes global backsliding.

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

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

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

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

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

#### China 5G leadership compromise US military superiority

Borghard et al. 19, \*Erica D. Borghard is an Assistant Professor at the Army Cyber Institute at West Point. Shawn W. \*Lonergan is a U.S. Army Reserve officer assigned to 75th Innovation Command and a Research Scholar at the Army Cyber Institute. (April 25th, 2019, “The Overlooked Military Implications of the 5G Debate”, https://www.cfr.org/blog/overlooked-military-implications-5g-debate)

There are economic implications for which entities can secure the [greatest global market share](https://www.reuters.com/brandfeatures/venture-capital/article?id=61837) of 5G technology. Technological innovation drives economic growth, job creation, and global economic influence. Huawei may have a long-term market advantage over U.S and Western telecoms because the former has been able to offer 5G products at [far cheaper](https://www.nytimes.com/2019/01/26/us/politics/huawei-china-us-5g-technology.html) rates than the latter. Furthermore, there are also concerns that Chinese-built 5G technology is likely to [contain backdoors](https://www.wired.com/story/huawei-case-signals-new-us-china-cold-war-tech/) that could be used to enable [Chinese economic or national security espionage](https://www.cnbc.com/2019/03/05/huawei-would-have-to-give-data-to-china-government-if-asked-experts.html). It is unlikely that Beijing would actively monitor all of the content of the data that comes across Huawei owned or operated infrastructure (although it may collect and analyze metadata). However, it is conceivable that Huawei would get a proverbial “tap on the shoulder” from Beijing to share pertinent information in specific instances. This may include individually targeting senior corporate executives, which is enabled by the millimeter wave frequency that 5G networks employ.

The military applications of 5G technology have vital strategic and battlefield implications for the U.S. Historically, the U.S. military has reaped enormous advantages from employing cutting edge technology on the battlefield. 5G technology holds similar innovative potential. Perhaps most obviously, the next generation of telecommunications infrastructure will have a direct impact on improving military communications. However, it will also produce cascading effects on the development of other kinds of military technologies, such as robotics and artificial intelligence. For instance, artificial intelligence and machine learning capabilities, such as those used in the Department of Defense’s [Project Maven](https://dod.defense.gov/News/Article/Article/1254719/project-maven-to-deploy-computer-algorithms-to-war-zone-by-years-end/), could be greatly enhanced when leveraging the data processing speeds made possible through 5G infrastructure. As an [era of great power competition](https://dod.defense.gov/Portals/1/Documents/pubs/2018-National-Defense-Strategy-Summary.pdf) emerges between the United States and China, the United States has a compelling strategic interest in being at the forefront of these new technologies.

The United States and its allies must also consider the tactical and operational implications on the battlefield of conducting conventional or counterinsurgency operations in an area with Chinese owned or operated 5G infrastructure. This concern stems from the nature of the relationship between Huawei, an [ostensibly private company](https://www.itnews.com.au/news/analysis-who-really-owns-huawei-175946), and the Chinese Communist Party (CCP). While Huawei’s founder and CEO, Ren Zhengfei proclaimed in a February 2019 interview on [CBS This Morning](https://www.cbsnews.com/news/ren-zhengfei-huawei-ceo-says-we-will-never-provide-chinese-government-with-any-information/)that the company never has and never would provide information to the Chinese government, many experts are [skeptical](https://www.cnbc.com/2019/03/05/huawei-would-have-to-give-data-to-china-government-if-asked-experts.html). Under China’s [2017 National Intelligence Law](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-china-security-lawmaking-idUSKBN19I1FW), the CCP has the authority to monitor and investigate domestic and international companies as well as direct organizations to assist with government espionage efforts. As such, it is conceivable that Huawei will be required to hand over its data to the Chinese government for collection and analysis.

Due to this reality, the United States must consider and be prepared to conduct overseas contingency or counterterrorism operations in areas where Chinese telecommunications infrastructure is widely proliferated, thus restricting the United States’ ability to rely on indigenous telecoms. As [noted](https://www.africom.mil/media-room/transcript/31604/gen-joseph-votel-gen-thomas-waldhauser-and-acting-asd-for-international-security-affairs-kathryn) by US AFRICOM Commander General Thomas Waldhauser, this has already become an issue in Africa where Chinese telecommunications companies are poised to dominate. The integrity of U.S. military communications systems that rely on 5G networks could be undermined at key phases of an operation. For example, if the United States is conducting a military operation in an area of interest to China, it is plausible that the Chinese government could leverage Huawei to intercept or even deny military communications. Furthermore, Chinese telecom infrastructure dominance in a theater of operations may limit the U.S. military’s ability to conduct precision targeting that leverages signals intelligence collection on 5G telecommunications networks.

The strategic and battlefield implications of who owns and operates 5G infrastructure around the world underscores the national security importance of 5G. The U.S. government and its allies should more systematically assess both the opportunities and risks associated with conducting future military operations in environments that rely on Chinese technology.

To date, the U.S. government has devoted significant energy to persuading its allies and partners to follow the United States in prohibiting Chinese telecoms, particularly Huawei, from building and/or operating 5G infrastructure. However, its diplomatic approach has been met with varying degrees of success. While some countries such as [Australia](https://www.ft.com/content/e90c3800-aad3-11e8-94bd-cba20d67390c) and [Japan](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-china-huawei-japan/japans-top-three-telcos-to-exclude-huawei-zte-network-equipment-kyodo-idUSKBN1O90JW) have fallen in line with the U.S. stance on Huawei, many others have not. The European Commission’s recent 5G [recommendations](https://www.cyberscoop.com/5g-eu-huawei-cybersecurity-recommendations/) for member states dismissed a ban on Chinese telecoms. British intelligence has reportedly maintained that the security risks associated with Huawei can be [sufficiently managed](https://www.ft.com/content/619f9df4-32c2-11e9-bd3a-8b2a211d90d5), and New Zealand, after [initially bandwagoning](https://www.nytimes.com/2018/11/28/business/huawei-new-zealand-papua-new-guinea.html) with the United States in December 2018, abruptly [reversed course](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2019-02-18/new-zealand-says-china-s-huawei-hasn-t-been-ruled-out-of-5g-role) in February 2019. This is concerning for the United States because New Zealand and the UK are members of the Five Eyes intelligence-sharing alliance. Many allies have refused an outright ban of Huawei because of the company’s ability to offer 5G products at far cheaper rates than Western telecoms.

It is clear that U.S. diplomatic efforts are not working. The reality is that the bottom line is largely driving decision-making. Therefore, rather than take a purely negative approach, the United States should consider using positive inducements to make its 5G products more appealing. While the United States should not strive to mirror China’s top-down approach to innovation, it should work with allies to use market incentives to make U.S.- and Western-developed 5G infrastructure and products more competitive. Furthermore, the U.S. military needs to anticipate that its use of native telecommunications infrastructure in a future operating environment may be compromised, limited, or denied. The U.S. military will inevitably need greater bandwidth on the tactical edge and this should be an imperative that drives investment in research and development to address this challenge.

Technological innovation was at the crux of the United States’ comparative military and economic advantage in the twentieth century. In this contemporary great power competition, U.S. failure to innovate at the scientific and technological frontier will have direct (and deleterious) effects for the United States on the distribution of power in the international system over the long term.

#### Chinese tech superiority upends deterrence and emboldens them to risk conflict over Taiwan---extinction.

Kroenig 18, Deputy Director for Strategy, Scowcroft Center for Strategy and Security Associate Professor of Government and Foreign Service, Georgetown University (Matthew, Nov 12, 2018, “Will disruptive technology cause nuclear war?” *BAS*, <https://thebulletin.org/2018/11/will-disruptive-technology-cause-nuclear-war>)

Rather, we should think more broadly about how new technology might affect global politics, and, for this, it is helpful to turn to scholarly international relations theory. The dominant theory of the causes of war in the academy is the “bargaining model of war.” This theory identifies rapid shifts in the balance of power as a primary cause of conflict.

International politics often presents states with conflicts that they can settle through peaceful bargaining, but when bargaining breaks down, war results. Shifts in the balance of power are problematic because they undermine effective bargaining. After all, why agree to a deal today if your bargaining position will be stronger tomorrow? And, a clear understanding of the military balance of power can contribute to peace. (Why start a war you are likely to lose?) But shifts in the balance of power muddy understandings of which states have the advantage.

You may see where this is going. New technologies threaten to create potentially destabilizing shifts in the balance of power.

For decades, stability in Europe and Asia has been supported by US military power. In recent years, however, the balance of power in Asia has begun to shift, as China has increased its military capabilities. Already, Beijing has become more assertive in the region, claiming contested territory in the South China Sea. And the results of Russia’s military modernization have been on full display in its ongoing intervention in Ukraine.

Moreover, China may have the lead over the United States in emerging technologies that could be decisive for the future of military acquisitions and warfare, including 3D printing, hypersonic missiles, quantum computing, 5G wireless connectivity, and artificial intelligence (AI). And Russian President Vladimir Putin is building new unmanned vehicles while ominously declaring, “Whoever leads in AI will rule the world.”

If China or Russia are able to incorporate new technologies into their militaries before the United States, then this could lead to the kind of rapid shift in the balance of power that often causes war. If Beijing believes emerging technologies provide it with a newfound, local military advantage over the United States, for example, it may be more willing than previously to initiate conflict over Taiwan. And if Putin thinks new tech has strengthened his hand, he may be more tempted to launch a Ukraine-style invasion of a NATO member.

Either scenario could bring these nuclear powers into direct conflict with the United States, and once nuclear armed states are at war, there is an inherent risk of nuclear conflict through limited nuclear war strategies, nuclear brinkmanship, or simple accident or inadvertent escalation.

This framing of the problem leads to a different set of policy implications. The concern is not simply technologies that threaten to undermine nuclear second-strike capabilities directly, but, rather, any technologies that can result in a meaningful shift in the broader balance of power. And the solution is not to preserve second-strike capabilities, but to preserve prevailing power balances more broadly.

When it comes to new technology, this means that the United States should seek to maintain an innovation edge. Washington should also work with other states, including its nuclear-armed rivals, to develop a new set of arms control and nonproliferation agreements and export controls to deny these newer and potentially destabilizing technologies to potentially hostile states.

These are no easy tasks, but the consequences of Washington losing the race for technological superiority to its autocratic challengers just might mean nuclear Armageddon.

### 1AC---Cybersecurity ADV

#### Advantage 2 is Cybersecurity:

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

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

III. COMPETITION AND CYBERSECURITY

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

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

A. Cybersecurity as Competitive Value-Add

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

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

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

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

B. Vulnerabilities of “Monocultures”

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Those attacks cause accidental nuclear escalation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Nuclear-Cyber Connection

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Pathways to Escalation

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

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

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

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

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

### 1AC---Solvency

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

#### The plan requires SSO’s to administer reasonable action to prohibit ex post opportunism---that strengthens FRAND effectiveness while enabling SEP holders to capture appropriate royalties---which is the best competition-innovation balance.
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3. Application of the Basic Legal Principles

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Alleviating patent holdup begins by permitting consumer challenges to SSO misconduct, which necessitates antitrust. SSO’s cannot be counted on to self execute FRAND.
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2. Why Antitrust Enforcement Is Necessary

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

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

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

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

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

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

The problem is exacerbated by the fact that most SSOs put IPR rules in place long ago, when SEP-holder opportunism was much less of a problem. Proponents of new, stricter IPR rules to prevent SEP-holder opportunism thus face the daunting task of persuading an SSO that makes decisions by consensus to change an existing policy over the often-intense opposition of SEP holders. The dispute over the recent changes to the IPR rules at the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE) illustrates how difficult and contentious that process can be.81

Thus, effective prevention of ex post opportunism by SEP holders requires antitrust enforcement to overcome the SSO problems associated with (a) attenuated incentives (implementers that also own SEPs); (b) the public good aspect of stronger FRAND rules (the danger that implementers will free ride on others rather than expend resources to implement strong FRAND rules); and (c) externalities (the harm to consumers that results when implementers pass through higher royalties in the form of higher prices).

#### Indicting systemic holdup is a fruitless academic exercise. Be cautious of neg studies---they rely on deeply flawed methodologies, don’t address relevant hypotheses, and in all likelihood are funded by Qualcomm.

Shapiro & Lemley 20, \*Carl Shapiro is the Transamerica Professor of Business Strategy Emeritus at the Haas School of Business, University of California at Berkeley; \*Lemley is the William H. Neukom Professor at Stanford Law School and a partner at Durie Tangri LLP; (2020, “THE ROLE OF ANTITRUST IN PREVENTING PATENT HOLDUP”, https://faculty.haas.berkeley.edu/shapiro/patentholdup.pdf)

C. Actual Patent Holdups Are Very Difficult to Measure

As with holdup in general, quantifying the frequency and magnitude of actual patent holdups is very difficult as a practical matter and not a useful way of assessing the importance of the patent holdup problem. Rarely can researchers observe the ex post price, because patent licensing terms are normally confidential. Even when researchers can observe the license fees, they are often embedded in a complex agreement. And even in those rare cases where researchers can accurately observe the ex post price, they are unlikely to observe the ex ante price, making it difficult if not impossible to measure the magnitude of the holdup.

Litigated cases also are problematic as a source of data to quantify the magnitude of actual patent holdups. A litigated case resulting in an award of reasonable royalties may well involve attempted holdup, but by definition it cannot provide smoking-gun evidence of actual holdup, at least if one accepts that the royalties awarded by the court are reasonable.64 Rather, at least since the Supreme Court eliminated the automatic entitlement to an injunction, litigation to judgment (which is rare) often reflects a refusal to give in to holdup by a defendant willing to take its chances in court. And the vast majority of patent cases settle. The terms of a settlement are rarely observable, so it is impossible to know whether those settlements reflected the value of holdup.

Notwithstanding these points, a number of authors have pointed to a lack of empirical evidence to argue that patent holdup either does not exist or is not a significant problem.65 Even taken on their own terms, many of these papers are deeply flawed. One such paper, which has often been cited by those who downplay the importance of patent holdup, purports to offer empirical evidence inconsistent with the hypothesis that SEP holdup has slowed innovation or harmed consumers.66 The conclusion to this Qualcomm-funded paper states, “[w]e cannot reject the hypothesis of no SEP holdup.”67 How do these authors reach this conclusion? They compare rates of change of quality-adjusted prices in “SEP- reliant” industries with “similar” non-SEP-reliant industries, primarily over the 1997-2013 period.68 For example, they show that quality-adjusted prices of cellular phones have fallen faster than the quality-adjusted prices of automobiles.69 This exercise does not address the relevant hypothesis: whether SEP holdup increased the price of cellular phones from what it otherwise would have been.70 The quality- adjusted prices of pharmaceuticals have risen much faster than automobiles over the same period of time, but that similarly is not proof that pharmaceuticals are subject to a patent holdup problem.

Beyond the obvious and fatal flaws in this empirical work,71 the whole line of inquiry is of limited relevance for the purpose of measuring the social costs of holdup or designing institutions to limit patent holdup, because it only looks for instances of actual patent holdup. As explained above, these instances are very difficult to detect and are only the tip of the iceberg in terms of the social costs of patent holdup.72 So far as we can tell, the vast majority of these papers have been funded by Qualcomm and other patent holders seeking to weaken the institutions designed to control patent holdup, increase their leverage in licensing negotiations, and thus increase their ability to monetize their patents.73

Despite the difficulties of observing the incidence and magnitude of actual patent holdups, we are able to observe the telltale signs of actual patent holdup. Transaction cost economics, and simple bargaining theory for that matter, tell us that actual patent holdup can be expected to occur when three conditions are present: (1) a firm has developed a new product independently; (2) that firm has made significant investments that are specific to one or more patents asserted against that product; and (3) the firm is not protected from patent holdup.74 As discussed above, conditions (1) and (2) are common in the high-tech sector, placing considerable weight on the institutions that protect firms from patent holdup.

The presence of those institutions is itself evidence that the patent holdup problem is real and significant. As we noted in Part I, companies try to structure their transactions to avoid holdup, developing institutions for that purpose. As we have seen, the traditional market solutions do not work well for patents. In most industries, the central mechanisms limiting patent holdup come from patent law, namely the rules governing injunctions and patent damages. In the high-tech sector, companies have overwhelmingly turned to SSOs in an effort to obtain global commitments to an ex ante royalty, which appear in the form of FRAND commitments. The near-universal recognition in the industry of the need for such a mechanism is strong evidence that companies view holdup as a problem they must build institutions to avoid.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 2AC

### China Advantage

#### Extinction outweighs---our framing shifts security policy from a national to existential frame---solves their threat K’s.

Sears 20, \*Nathan Sears, PhD Candidate in Political Science at The University of Toronto and Trudeau Fellow in Peace, Conflict and Justice at the Munk School of Global Affairs (April 17th, 2020, “Existential Security: Towards a Security Framework for the Survival of Humanity,” https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1758-5899.12800)

‘Existential security’ responds to a similar set of questions as alternative security frames (see Table 2). Security for whom? The ‘referent object’ of existential security is humanity. Security is therefore about humanity’s survival . Security for which values? The ‘values’ to be secured are, at the minimum, the survival of humanity (i.e. the biological entity of the human species and cultural entity of human civilization), and, at the maximum, the long‐term prosperity of human civilization and the planet. The security of humankind ranges from the survival of existing human beings and societies to past and future generations of humanity – the past whose memory is recorded in history and preserved by the present, and the future whose possibilities of existence depend on actions taken in the present. Existential security therefore adopts an intergenerational perspective of security, not only for utilitarian reasons (e.g. quantifying the potential gains/losses in ‘future lives’) (Baum, 2015; Bostrom, 2002, 2013; Torres, 2017), but also because the significance of humankind – that is, all its past sufferings, present achievements, and future potential – is at stake, since existential risks simultaneously threaten humanity’s past, present, and future (Morgenthau, 1961).

How much security? Nick Bostrom (2013, p. 19) proposes the principle of ‘maxipok’, in which security policy would seek to ‘maximise the probability of an “OK outcome”, where an OK outcome is any outcome that avoids existential catastrophe’. While reducing the probability of existential risk to ‘zero’ may be impossible, the amount of security should be determined by a level of risk‐aversion equivalent to existential threats. Since thinking in terms of ‘worst‐case scenarios’ is a common practice in the security domain, and since some ‘worst‐case scenarios’ could include civilizational collapse or human extinction, this should imply a strong aversion to risk. Although there are logical limits to the ‘precautionary principle’ with respect to existential risks,10 it has practical implications for security policy, such as taking preventive, cost‐effective, and long‐term oriented action (Clarke, 2005). More generally, making (existential) security a priority does not imply the sacrifice of all other values (e.g. political liberty, economic wealth), but it does mean that potential gains in other values be weighed against potential losses in security. Security is always a question of degree (Wolfers, 1952).

From what threats? Existential security is concerned with those threats that have their origins in human agency and could bring about civilizational collapse or human extinction. This requires broadening the security agenda beyond its conventional focus on ‘security from violence’, while excluding ‘natural’ existential risks (e.g. asteroids and supervolcanos). There are two main reasons for emphasizing anthropogenic threats. The first is the low probability of natural risks on timescales relevant to humanity (Bostrom, 2013; Bostrom and Cirkovic, 2008;), whereas anthropogenic threats are, by definition, relevant to human timescales, including the twenty‐first century (Rees, 2003). The second is that many prevention/mitigation strategies for anthropogenic existential threats act on their drivers in human agency, which makes little sense for natural risks. The spectrum of anthropogenic existential threats includes threats to international peace and security (e.g. nuclear war), dangers from human intervention in the natural environment (e.g. climate change), and risks from emerging technologies (e.g. AI). Existential security must take into account the complex relationships between human, environmental, and technological systems, as well as inherent uncertainties about existential threat scenarios (e.g. ‘nuclear winter’, ‘hothouse Earth’, or ‘superintelligence’).

By what means and modes of protection? The existential security frame requires innovation in the means and modes of security policy. This is because the conventional emphasis on military capabilities and balancing is either inadequate (e.g. nuclear war), irrelevant (e.g. climate change), or counterproductive (e.g. AI). Moreover, the pursuit of relative gains/losses in security is fundamentally misguided for anthropogenic existential threats, since – as a general principle – either all human societies are safe, or none of them are. Existential security requires a paradigm shift from thinking about security policy as a matter of (national) ‘defense’ to being a matter of (global) ‘governance’. Governance is not an end in itself (e.g. the creation of a ‘world state’), but rather a means to security (i.e. the survival of humankind). The pursuit of existential security requires means of protection that involve a comprehensive set of political, economic, and technological resources – not merely military capabilities. The modes of protection are primarily ‘restraint’ and ‘resilience’. Restraint is a prevention strategy, while resilience is a mitigation strategy, which take on different forms for different threats. For the nuclear threat, restraint manifests itself in the policies of disarmament, arms control, and nonproliferation, while resilience comes mostly in the form of nuclear bunkers and shelters (Bull, 1961; Deudney, 2007). For climate change, restraint is primarily about limiting greenhouse gas emissions and the degradation of carbon sinks, while resilience is about making societies less vulnerable to heat stress, rising seas, food and water scarcities, new diseases, and human migration (Wallace‐Wells, 2019; World Bank, 2012). For AI, restraint entails the slow and careful development of AI (Bostrom, 2014) – or perhaps forgoing the ‘AI dream’ altogether (Joy, 2000) – while resilience is about reducing societal vulnerability to technological disruption (e.g. cybersecurity). Importantly, the growing survival interdependence of human societies implies that restraint and resilience must be mutual to be effective. If only some states choose disarmament or nonproliferation, if some societies reduce carbon emissions while others increase them, or if one technology firm decides to rapidly pursue ‘superintelligence’, then the (in)action of some actors may affect the security of all humankind. This emphasis on mutual restraint and resilience contrasts with the national security frame's emphasis on ‘self‐help’.

#### Western IR explains China’s behavior---suggesting otherwise ignores decades of Chinese history.

Chong 20, PhD, associate professor of political science at the National University of Singapore and a Harvard-Yenching Institute Visiting Scholar for 2019-2020. (Ja Ian, 11/9/20, "Roundtable 12-2 on *Thucydides’s Trap? Historical Interpretation, Logic of Inquiry, and the Future of Sino-American Relations*", *H-Diplo | ISSF*, https://issforum.org/roundtables/12-2-thucydides)

Chan’s finding that misplaced worries about the PRC and its intentions stem in part from misunderstandings of perspectives on international politics that are informed by theories from “the West” rather than China deserves elaboration and debate. So-called “Western” international relations theories often have parallels in the Chinese tradition, broadly construed. Work analyzing Spring and Autumn, Warring States, Song, and Ming documents indicate that the strategic thought that is prominent in these periods closely resembles statecraft familiar to those in the contemporary “West.”[16] Texts as varied as the Han-era annals Records of the Grand Historian and the Ming-era fiction Romance of the Three Kingdoms will suggest the same.[17] Parallels between “Western” and “Chinese” approaches to politics are unsurprising. Several millennia of collective human experience, thought, and debate over statecraft, conflict, as well as governance are almost certainly bound to produce similarities in responses.

Dividing the world into “Western” and “Chinese” views of the world ignores the fact the PRC has disagreements with ostensibly “non-Western” polities such as India, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, and Vietnam, each with their own distinct philosophical traditions.[18] Also, despite sharing cultural origins, people in the PRC and on Taiwan disagree fundamentally issues of political valAues and rights, not the relatively simple issues of who should rule China or what a Chinese state should entail geographically.[19] Moreover, the PRC’s ruling Chinese Communist Party draws at least some of its inspiration from European thinkers in the form of Karl Marx and Vladimir Lenin. Successive dynasties from historical China also proved themselves very adept at conquest—that is how regimes and empires get built.[20] Attributing tensions between the United States and PRC to culture suggests an overly monolithic view of the rich and varied philosophical and political traditions both major powers draw from, giving them less credit than is due.[21]

To claim that contemporary international scholarship and U.S. policy are unable to adequately understand China because they are “Western” may oversimplify the nature and seriousness of problems dogging U.S.-China relations and their consequences for the world. Relegating difference to culture is not only Orientalizing, it can encourage a misplaced expectation that understanding can bring some sort of happy, mutually acceptable outcome. Perhaps Beijing and Washington understand each other well. They simply disagree fundamentally over values and interests in ways that make finding mutually acceptable accommodation increasingly difficult. This does not have to imply that either side is morally superior or normatively “better” than the other, just that understanding provides little promise for improving relations and avoiding confrontation. Better accounting for such possibilities invites fuller consideration of the roles that agency and contingency play in major power relations, two features that Chan clearly identifies as critical in the volume.

#### Don’t over-analyze China’s behavior---they mean what they say, and their intentions to upend the international system are opaque.

Brands 20, \*Hal Brands is an American scholar of U.S. foreign policy. He is the Henry A. Kissinger Distinguished Professor of Global Affairs at the Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies and a Resident Scholar at the American Enterprise Institute; (May 20th, 2020, “What Does China Really Want? To Dominate the World”, https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2020-05-20/xi-jinping-makes-clear-that-china-s-goal-is-to-dominate-the-world)

Can we pay the Chinese Communist Party the compliment of acknowledging that it means what it says and knows what it wants? That may be the key to understanding Beijing’s strategic ambitions in the coming decades.

A long-standing trope in the U.S. [debate](https://warontherocks.com/2018/12/wotr-podcast-full-steam-ahead-naval-competition-with-china/) on [that](https://warontherocks.com/2019/01/the-party-congress-test-a-minimum-standard-for-analyzing-beijings-intentions/) [subject](https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/fp_20181018_us_china_transcript.pdf) is that China itself doesn’t know what it seeks to achieve, that its leaders haven’t yet worked out how far Beijing’s influence should reach. Yet there is a growing body of evidence, assembled and interpreted by talented China experts, that the Chinese government is indeed aiming for global power and perhaps global primacy over the next generation — that it seeks to upend the American-led international system and create at least a competing, quasi-world order of its own.

It doesn’t take unparalleled powers of deduction to reach this conclusion. Top Chinese officials and members of the country’s foreign policy community are becoming increasingly explicit in saying so themselves.

President Xi Jinping more than hinted at this goal in his landmark address to the 19th Party Congress in October 2017. That speech represents one of the most authoritative statements of the party’s policy and aims; it reflects Xi’s [understanding](https://twitter.com/PLMattis/status/1259592233726205953) of what China has accomplished under Communist rule and how it must advance in the future.

Xi [declared](http://www.xinhuanet.com/english/download/Xi_Jinping's_report_at_19th_CPC_National_Congress.pdf) that China “has stood up, grown rich, and is becoming strong,” and that it was now “blazing a new trail for other developing countries” and offering “Chinese wisdom and a Chinese approach to solving the problems facing mankind.” By 2049, Xi promised, China would “become a global leader in terms of composite national strength and international influence” and would build a “stable international order” in which China’s “national rejuvenation” could be fully achieved.

This was the statement of a leader who sees his country not just participating in global affairs but setting the terms, and it testifies to two core themes in China’s foreign policy discourse.

The first is a deeply skeptical view of the existing international system. Chinese leaders recognize that the global trade regime has been indispensable to the country’s economic and military rise. Yet when they look at the key features of the world Washington and its allies have made, they see mostly [threats](https://tnsr.org/2018/11/xis-vision-for-transforming-global-governance-a-strategic-challenge-for-washington-and-its-allies/).

In their view, American alliances do not preserve peace and stability; they stunt China’s potential and prevent Asian nations from giving Beijing its due. Seen through that lens, promoting democracy and human rights is neither moral nor benign, but propaganda supporting a dangerous doctrine that threatens to delegitimize the Communist government and energize its domestic enemies. U.S.-led international institutions appear as tools for imposing America’s will on weaker states. The Communist Party recognizes that the liberal international order has brought benefits, [writes](https://www.nbr.org/wp-content/uploads/pdfs/publications/sr83_chinasvision_jan2020.pdf) Nadege Rolland, a senior fellow at the National Bureau of Asian Research, but “the party abhors and dreads” the principles on which it is based.

The second theme is that the international order must change — not a little, but a lot — for China to become fully prosperous and secure. Chinese leaders have, understandably, been somewhat opaque in describing the world they want, but the outlines are becoming easier to discern.

If one studies the statements of Xi and other top officials, China expert Liza Tobin [concludes](https://tnsr.org/2018/11/xis-vision-for-transforming-global-governance-a-strategic-challenge-for-washington-and-its-allies/), what emerges is a vision in which “a global network of partnerships centered on China would replace the U.S. system of treaty alliances” and the world would view Chinese authoritarianism as preferable to Western democracy.

Based on a similar analysis, Rolland [agrees](https://www.nbr.org/wp-content/uploads/pdfs/publications/sr83_chinasvision_jan2020.pdf) that China has “a yearning for partial hegemony,” a loose dominance over large swaths of the global south. When it comes to global governance, still other [examinations](https://www.tabletmag.com/sections/news/articles/china-plans-global-order) [show](https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/security/reports/2019/02/28/466768/mapping-chinas-global-governance-ambitions/), Beijing wants a system in which international institutions buttress rather than batter repressive regimes. Meanwhile, Chinese strategists and academics are talking openly about building a “new China-centric global economic order.”

There is little indication, in any of this, that Beijing’s strategic horizon is limited to the Western Pacific or even Asia. Xi’s [invocation](http://www.xinhuanet.com/english/2019-10/03/c_138445509.htm) of a “community with a shared future for humanity” [indicates](https://warontherocks.com/2019/01/the-party-congress-test-a-minimum-standard-for-analyzing-beijings-intentions/) a [global](https://tnsr.org/2018/11/xis-vision-for-transforming-global-governance-a-strategic-challenge-for-washington-and-its-allies/) tableau for Chinese influence. One hardly has to read between the lines to understand that this agenda will require fundamentally resetting the current geopolitical balance. As Xi remarked several years ago, China must work resolutely toward “a future where we will win the initiative and have the dominant position.”

Of course, there’s not need to take literally everything national leaders say, or even everything that makes it into official speeches. In Beijing’s case, however, Chinese leaders are actually saying less than what the country is doing.

Whether it is the naval shipbuilding program that is churning out vessels at astonishing rate; the drive to [control](https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2020-03-31/china-s-influence-operation-goes-beyond-who-taiwan-and-covid-19) existing international organizations and build new ones; the projection of military power in the [Arctic](https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/china-as-a-polar-great-power/22493FFC041E6739DAED329CCB71F688#fndtn-information), the Indian Ocean and points beyond; the quest to [dominate](https://www.pbs.org/wgbh/frontline/article/made-in-china-2025-the-industrial-plan-that-china-doesnt-want-anyone-talking-about/) the world’s high-tech industries; the ever-more [systematic](https://halbrands.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/60-5-07-Brands.pdf) efforts to support authoritarian regimes and weaken democratic institutions; or the Belt and Road Initiative that [encompasses](https://tnsr.org/2019/07/unlocking-the-gates-of-eurasia-chinas-belt-and-road-initiative-and-its-implications-for-u-s-grand-strategy/) multiple continents, China is hardly acting like a country that lacks a grand geopolitical design.

As with so many aspects of the U.S.-China competition, there is a Cold War parallel. During the 1970s, some leading American Sovietologists insisted that Moscow was becoming a satisfied, status quo power. Yet that claim required ignoring what Soviet leaders [said](https://www.google.com/books/edition/What_Good_Is_Grand_Strategy/nGqoAgAAQBAJ?hl=en&gbpv=1&bsq=%22we%20make%20no%20secret%22) about detente and peaceful coexistence — that it was a way of ensuring the triumph of socialism without war — as well as their efforts to build military superiority and positions of strength in the Third World. The warning signs were evident then, as they are today.

China probably doesn’t have a step-by-step checklist for achieving global primacy, any more than the Soviet Union did in the 1970s. Chinese leaders aren’t insensitive to costs and obstacles: Xi may ritualistically restate the importance of unifying the Chinese nation, but that [doesn’t mean](https://twitter.com/resplinodell/status/1259883799254634498) he’s hell-bent on war over Taiwan.

Beijing may not even have decided which of its two paths to global influence is preferable: Establishing dominance in the Western Pacific and then expanding outward from there, or outflanking the U.S. position in the region by building up economic and political power around the world. Finally, China may ultimately fail to accomplish any of this. Perhaps the coronavirus will so weaken the U.S. and the liberal order that China’s ascent will be accelerated. Or perhaps China will run into so many internal problems, and so much external resistance, that its drive will stall.

Yet we ought to recognize that the debate about what China wants is growing stale, because China’s leaders and behavior have increasingly answered that question. When a proud and powerful challenger starts to advertise its global ambitions, Americans should probably err on the side of taking those ambitious seriously.

#### Authoritarian governments are magnitudes more conflict-prone.

Kendall-Taylor 19 (Andrea; is a Senior Fellow and Director of the Transatlantic Security Program at the Center for a New American Security (CNAS); February 26th; “Autocracy’s Advance and Democracy’s Decline: National Security Implications of the Rise of Authoritarianism Around the World”; <https://www.cnas.org/publications/congressional-testimony/testimony-before-the-house-permanent-select-committee-on-intelligence-1>; accessed 7/21/19)

The growing prevalence of personalized autocracies is cause for concern because they tend to produce the worst outcomes of any type of political regime: they tend to produce the most risky and aggressive foreign policies; the most likely to invest in nuclear weapons;7 the most likely to fight wars against democracies;8 and the most likely to initiate interstate conflicts.9 As the adventurism of Iraq’s Saddam Hussein, Uganda’s Idi Amin, and North Korea’s Kim Jong-un suggests, a lack of accountability often translates into an ability to take risks that other dictatorial systems simply cannot afford.

Russia underscores the link between rising personalism and aggression. Although Putin’s actions in Crimea and Syria were designed to advance a number of key Russian goals, it is also likely that Putin’s lack of domestic constraints increased the level of risk he was willing to accept in pursuit of those goals. Putin’s tight control over the media ensures that the public receives only the official narrative of foreign events. Limited access to outside information makes it difficult for Russians to access unbiased accounts of the goings-on in the rest of the world and gauge Putin’s success in the foreign policy arena. Putin’s elimination of competing voices within his regime further ensures that he faces minimal accountability for his foreign policy actions.

Politics in China show many of these same trends. Xi’s increasingly aggressive posture in the South China Sea has occurred alongside the rising personalization of the political system. Xi has amassed substantial personal power since coming to office in 2012 and continues to roll back the norms of the post-Mao collective leadership system. If Xi further consolidates control and limits accountability—particularly over military and foreign policy bodies—research suggests that he, too, could feel free to further escalate his aggressive rhetoric and actions in the South China Sea.

Not only do personalist dictatorships pursue aggressive foreign policies—they are also often difficult and unpredictable partners. Research underscores that, thanks to limited constraints on decisionmaking, personalist leaders generally have the latitude to change their minds on a whim, producing volatile and erratic policies.10 Moreover, personalist leaders—think Putin, Bolivian President Evo Morales, and Venezuelan President Nicolás Maduro—are among those autocrats who are most suspicious of U.S. intentions and who see the creation of an external enemy as an effective means of boosting public support. Anti-U.S. rhetoric, therefore, is most pronounced in personalist settings.

Finally, personalist regimes are the most corrupt and the least likely to democratize. Strongman autocracies, more so than any other type of government, depend on the distribution of financial incentives to maintain power.11 As such, these leaders are the most likely to squander foreign aid and sideline competent individuals, hollowing out those institutions that could plausibly constrain their power. Their departure from power often entails instability and violence. And they leave conditions that are highly inhospitable for a transition to democracy. Put differently, when leaders like Turkish President Erdoğan roll back democracy and consolidate personal power, the effects of their actions persist long after they exit office.

#### DPT’s true---there’s a clear dyadic peace and a lower risk of war across the board.

Hegre et al. 18 (Havard; Professor Department of Peace and Conflict Research Uppsala University; Michael Bernhard; Miriam Ehrlich Chair in Political Science Department of Political Science University of Florida; Jan Teorell; Professor of Political Science Department of Political Science Lund University; *Reassessing the Democratic Peace: A Novel Test Based on the Varieties of Democracy Data*; <https://gupea.ub.gu.se/bitstream/2077/56045/1/gupea_2077_56045_1.pdf>)

4. Results

We estimated two sets of models for all pairs of states for every year over the 1900–2010 period with the democratic peace hypothesis represented as the democracy score(s) of the stronger country, that of the weaker country, the interaction of these two, and several control variables. In the first set of models, we entered the five indicators of constraint one by one along with our control variables. Figure 3 summarizes the results from these models. Complete estimation results in table form with all control variables are found in Appendix Table A-1.

The first model (called ‘Electoral accountability’) enters the three terms based on the electoral accountability index along with control variables. The estimates from this model are printed in green color at the top of the figure. The points represent the estimates and the whiskers their estimated 95% confidence interval. The two main terms are both positive, although that for the weaker country is not statistically significant. The interaction between the index values for the two countries in the dyad, on the other hand, is negative and highly significant – when both countries score highly in terms of electoral accountability, the risk of fatal dispute is much lower than if either have low scores. In line with expectations, we show in Appendix Table A-3 that the effect of electoral democracy is driven by the “Schumpeterian” core dimensions tapping into contestation – whereas suffrage does not play an independent role in promoting peace.

The second model enters the ‘Legislative constraints’ index terms. Again, the interaction term is negative and significant, whereas the main terms are positive and significant. Similar patterns are observed for the other three individual indicators.

Figure 4 shows that the net effect for each of these indicators is consistent with the democratic peace. In the left panels, the dashed line plots the estimated log odds of a MID when the weaker country j is at the mean of the index, as a function of the score for the stronger country (along the x-axis). The metric for the y-axis is log odds relative to the case where both countries have scores of 0 for the index. The dotted and solid lines show the same when the index is one standard deviation below or above the mean.19

The graph on the right plots the marginal effect of this relationship – it shows the change in the estimated probability of a fatal dispute when comparing a pair of countries where the weaker country has a value for the index one standard deviation below the mean and one standard 22 deviation above, respectively, as a function of the index for the stronger country. Both these graphs show a clear dyadic democratic peace in terms of all our indices of constraint – a more democratic weaker country means a clearly lower risk of fatal MID if the stronger country is relatively democratic.20

All of our individual indicators of constraint reflect the democratic peace when entered on their own. Given the high correlation between them, however, each of them may serve as a proxy for one of the other. We investigate which of them are relatively most important along two routes.

### States CP

#### Preemption deficit---The Ninth Circuit imposed court-order limitations on antitrust law to preserve its balance with patent law.

Martino et al. 20, \*[Matthew M. Martino](https://www.skadden.com/professionals/m/martino-matthew-m) [Tara L. Reinhart](https://www.skadden.com/professionals/r/reinhart-tara-l) [Steven C. Sunshine](https://www.skadden.com/professionals/s/sunshine-steven-c) [Julia K. York](https://www.skadden.com/professionals/y/york-julia-k), works with clients at Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP; (August 14th, 2020, “Ninth Circuit Strikes Down Sweeping Injunction Against Qualcomm and Reins In Expansive Interpretation of Sherman Act”, https://www.skadden.com/insights/publications/2020/08/ninth-circuit-strikes-down-sweeping-injunction)

In its highly anticipated decision, the Ninth Circuit panel unanimously rejected the lower court’s reasoning, vacating the judgment and reversing the worldwide injunction against Qualcomm. The panel concluded that the district court had erroneously imposed the antitrust duty to deal on Qualcomm, had impermissibly looked outside the relevant antitrust market in order to infer an anticompetitive act and had relied on outdated evidence of agreements that were terminated before the suit was filed to justify a broad, forward-looking global injunction. The Ninth Circuit further rejected the argument that a SEP holder’s violation of FRAND commitments could independently create antitrust liability, instead pointing to patent and contract law as sources for potential remedies. The decision reflects a considered effort to rei

n in the district court’s expansive interpretation of general antitrust principles and their specific application to SEP holders, as well as recognition that the antitrust laws aim to preserve companies’ incentives to innovate and compete. Recognizing that while “[a]nticompetitive behavior is illegal under federal antitrust law[,]” the panel was adamant that “[h]ypercompetitive behavior is not.”[7](https://www.skadden.com/insights/publications/2020/08/ninth-circuit-strikes-down-sweeping-injunction" \l "ftn7)

Rejection of District Court’s Expansive Interpretation of Antitrust Laws

The Ninth Circuit decision contains several notable conclusions regarding the scope of Section 2 of the Sherman Act and what constitutes cognizable antitrust harm.

#### State efforts to impose greater antitrust liability than established by federal courts will be preempted to protect that balance.

Samp 14, \*Richard A. Samp is the chief counsel for Washington Legal Foundation (WLF), a non-profit, public interest law firm in Washington, D.C. WLF filed an amicus brief in support of Love Terminal Partners. (2014, “The Role of State Antitrust Law in the Aftermath of Actavis”, https://scholarship.law.umn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1062&context=mjlst)

V. ACTAVIS’S PREEMPTIVE EFFECT

Application of state antitrust law to reverse payment settlements is not merely a hypothetical possibility. There are a fair number of pending lawsuits that challenge reverse payment settlements on state-law grounds. The California Supreme Court has agreed to review one such suit.74 In seeking affirmance of the appeals court’s dismissal of the suit, the defendants argue inter alia that the suit is preempted by federal law.75

As noted above, there is precedent for a finding that state antitrust law is preempted to the extent that it conflicts with the policy underlying a federal statute.76 Moreover, in the context of patent law, federal courts have not hesitated to preempt state laws that the courts deem to stand as an obstacle to accomplishing Congress’s objectives (i.e., encouraging efforts to develop new and useful products).77 To the extent that any portions of Actavis’s holding can be deemed to reflect the Court’s perception of Congress’s new-product-development objectives, a state law is preempted if it is inconsistent with that holding and seeks to impose a greater degree of antitrust liability on the parties to a reverse payment settlement.

Actavis’s treatment of settlements involving a compromise entry date appears to meet that description. Actavis held that federal antitrust liability could not arise from a settlement in which the generic manufacturer agrees not compete for a number of years and in return is rewarded with an exclusive license to market its product several years in advance of the patent’s expiration date.78 Accordingly, states are not permitted to impose antitrust liability under similar circumstances because doing so would upset the balance that, according to Actavis, Congress sought to achieve between antitrust and patent law.

Other issues left open by Actavis are likely to be answered in the years ahead. For example, the Supreme Court did not specify whether noncash benefits received by a generic manufacturer in connection with a patent settlement can ever serve as the basis for federal antitrust liability. If the Supreme Court eventually answers that question by stating: “No, federal antitrust law will not examine settlement benefits other than cash that flow to the infringing party,” then it is likely that state antitrust law would be required to conform to that rule. The potential grounds for such a ruling (a desire both to promote settlement of patent disputes and to uphold reliance interests in existing patents) are based largely on values embedded in federal patent law.

There is little reason to believe, however, that the Court would prevent application of state antitrust law to patent settlement agreements where state law is fully consistent with federal antitrust law. Even in areas subject to extensive federal regulation, the Supreme Court has upheld the authority of states to engage in parallel regulation that is not inconsistent with the federal regulation.79 Unless the Court were to determine, as in Connell,80 that states could not be trusted to properly accommodate the objectives of the federal statute at issue (here, federal patent law), there is no reason to conclude that Congress would not have wanted states to be permitted to police the same sorts of anticompetitive conduct that is policed by federal antitrust law. Moreover, states are likely free to impose greater penalties on the proscribed conduct than is available under federal law. As the Court explained in California v. ARC America Corp., state antitrust law is not required to adhere to the same set of sanctions imposed by federal antitrust law.81

It seems reasonably clear, however, that Actavis prohibits states from adopting the procedural devices rejected by the U.S. Supreme Court—either a per se condemnation of reverse payment settlements or a presumption of illegality accompanied by “quick look” review. The Supreme Court rejected those approaches because it determined that in many cases there might well be pro-competitive economic justifications for reverse payment settlements and that presuming their illegality could result in the suppression of economically useful conduct.82 State antitrust laws that adopted the FTC’s proposed presumption of illegality would be subject to similar criticism, and thus would likely be impliedly preempted as inconsistent with the careful balance between antitrust and patent law established by Actavis.

CONCLUSION

Because Actavis left so many questions unanswered regarding the application of federal antitrust law to patent settlement agreements, the extent to which federal law preempts the application of state antitrust law to such agreements remains similarly unsettled. One can be reasonably confident that if private plaintiffs become dissatisfied with the results of pending litigation under federal antitrust law, they will turn with increasing frequency to state antitrust law as an alternative remedy. Even if state law ends up doing no more than “parallel” federal antitrust law, defendants are likely to incur substantial litigation costs fending off such state claims in the years to come.

#### Extraterritoriality deficit---SSO’s are multinational private ventures with representatives from a litany of different countries---specifically, the 3GPP connects global standards bodies in the development of 5G.

Coopersmith 21, \*Jonathan Coopersmith is a Professor at Texas A&M University, where he teaches the history of technology; (March 31st, 2021, “[Let’s Thwart This Terrible Idea for Standards Setting”, https://spectrum.ieee.org/lets-thwart-this-terrible-idea-for-standards-setting)](Let’s%20Thwart%20This%20Terrible%20Idea%20for%20Standards%20Setting)

Technical standards hold the global economy together. They specify the characteristics or performance requirements of countless aspects of your world, and you’re completely oblivious to most of them. The code that converts your finger’s pressure on a keyboard key into a symbol on your computer screen? That’s the [ISO/IEC 646](https://www.iso.org/standard/4777.html) family of standards.  And that television in your media room? It was transported across the sea in a shipping container, whose [corners interlocked](https://backspace00.wordpress.com/tag/iso-14961/) with those of adjacent containers in accordance with ISO standard 1496. You get the idea. Non-governmental technical committees, thousands of which are active at any time, create most of these standards. Their members are typically engineers and other experts representing the companies, universities, and other entities worldwide that are the main producers or purchasers of the object or the process being standardized. Most of the technical committees also have experts who explicitly represent the larger public interest. These are often engineers who volunteer their time and pay their own expenses.

Standard-setting organizations (SSOs) and networks of SSOs organize these technical committees. The largest such network is the [International Organization for Standardization](https://www.iso.org/home.html) (ISO, founded in 1946) and its partner, the [International Electrotechnical Commission](https://www.iec.ch/homepage) (IEC, founded in London in 1906). Their members are national-level standard-setting bodies that exist in almost every country. Those bodies, in turn, have members from engineering societies (including the [IEEE](https://www.ieee.org/)), from trade associations in different industries, and from such other organizations as testing laboratories, companies, non-profits, and government agencies.  In parallel with all of this conventional standards activity, at any given moment there are hundreds of corporate consortia creating anticipatory standards in new fields in which technologies are not yet stabilized.

The 1906 London meeting establishing the IEC adopted a brilliant precept. It mandated that national delegations to the new international body should represent not governments but private or non-profit standards bodies. These delegations would consist of people representing manufacturers, purchasers, and independent engineers charged with representing the larger public interest. An exception was made for countries where the electrotechnical industry was so new that no private organization existed. During the Soviet era, the IEC and ISO allowed a second exception for countries with centrally planned economies.

Over the past century, an ecology of technical committees, institutions, and their international community of engineers has grown and evolved stupendously but has nevertheless remained a largely private, non-governmental endeavor. The participating organizations typically cooperate with governments and include representatives of government organizations (often in their role as major purchasers), but they are in no way appendages of a national government.  Of course, the evolution of the standards ecosystem reflects the spread and development of technologies. Outside the ISO/IEC network, global organizations produce standards for the internet (IETF, the [Internet Engineering Task Force](https://www.ietf.org/) -1986), the web (W3C, the [World Wide Web Consortium](https://www.w3.org/) – 1994), and mobile broadband standards ([3rd Generation Partnership Project](https://www.3gpp.org/), 3GPP – 1998).  The 3GPP is an association of the Chinese, European, Indian, Japanese, Korean, and U.S. telecommunications-industry associations.

#### Mitigating holdup among 3GPP players is key---it threatens worldwide application of 5G to other technologies.

Pepe et al. 19, \*Steve Pepe is an accomplished trial lawyer who focuses on patent litigation in nearly every significant patent jurisdiction, including the International Trade Commission, the Eastern District of Texas, the District of Delaware, the Eastern District of Virginia, the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, and the PTAB; \*Kevin Post works extensively with high-technology and life science companies handling their complex patent disputes; \*Allen S. Cross is an associate in the intellectual property litigation group focused on patent matters and has represented clients in various technical fields, including mesh networks, semiconductor manufacturing, LEDs, displays, encryption technologies, video encoding/decoding, medical devices, and consumer electronics; (October 2019, “Opportunities and IP Risks Surrounding 5G: The Next Dominant Cellular Technology”, file:///C:/Users/mjmcm/AppData/Local/Temp/5G%20IP%20Opportunities%20Risks%20Bloomberg%20Law%20Article%2010-30-19.pdf)

The 3rd Generation Partnership Project is the SSO that has developed numerous communications standards including Global System for Mobile (GSM), Universal Mobile Telecommunications System (UMTS), 4G-LTE, and now 5G. 3GPP technical specifications are defined with input from its members, which, for 5G, includes hundreds of leading technology companies representing various industries. Among other things, 3GPP's 5G specifications define the system's overall architecture, security, and capabilities.

With the integration of mobile communications in atypical industries, such as automotive and aviation, a surge of new members have joined 3GPP. Of course, 5G will not operate in a vacuum and other standards, such as other communications protocols, signal protocols, encoding and decoding methods, will play an important role in the exemplary use cases discussed above. And each SSO's rules, policies, and procedures will impact the potential implementation of these technologies, as well as frame future issues regarding licensing and enforcement.

Lessons Learned from 4G Licensing and Litigation

The wide applicability of 5G is expected to produce a complicated licensing and litigation landscape. There are, however, several lessons that can be learned from a review of past licensing and litigation activities of earlier cellular standards—4G in particular.

Historically, 1G/2G/3G licenses were typically negotiated between telecommunications companies that developed wireless technology and produced cellular products, such that both had SEP portfolios and product lines that practiced those SEPs. As direct competitors (or as customers/suppliers), these telecommunications companies were often able to simplify negotiations by cross-licensing their patent portfolios, sometimes on a royalty-free basis, or by including a smaller balancing payment to one party.

With the transition to mobile broadband communication of 4G LTE, however, non-telecommunications companies began integrating cellular technology into a wide range of IoT products, causing them to become licensing targets for SEP holders. The cellular industry's traditional licensing model did not work well in this situation. First, these companies were mis-aligned, in that they did not have similar SEP portfolios and corresponding product lines.

Consider, for example, a historical telecommunications company with a large, established cellular SEP portfolio that is attempting to license an appliance manufacturer selling a very successful IoT-enabled refrigerator that does not have its own cellular SEP portfolio. Here, the traditional approach of cross-licensing with a balancing payment will not work, as the payment from the appliance manufacturer to the cellular SEP holder may be viewed as being too significant. And the conventional method of valuing the cellular SEPs in the context of, for example, an end-product like a smartphone, may be inapplicable (or at least a less-ideal match) to the value provided to a product like a refrigerator whose primary function of cooling food is unrelated to cellular technology.

Many cellular SEP portfolios, moreover, had been licensed as a percentage of the end-product price. This made sense, as most cellular devices were devices dedicated to cellular communication, so the value to that device was easier to isolate and quantify. But when considering the value cellular technology might provide for a refrigerator, the historical calculus is less applicable, and could produce an inaccurate measure of those SEP's value to that new type of end product. This was an issue faced in 4G licensing and, with an even greater variety of 5G-enabled devices, that problem will likely grow in 5G licensing as well.

Further complicating modern cellular licensing is the fact that cellular components have become commoditized and are often nested into other increasingly complicated, multifunctional devices. One ongoing case, Continental Automotive v. Avanci (Case No. 5:19-cv-02520), pending in the Northern District of California, exemplifies how parties have struggled with the challenges inherent in valuing SEPs in modern, complex devices. This case involves licensing discussions surrounding communications SEPs between a patent pool administrator (Avanci) and car manufacturers. The automobiles at issue included telematics control units (TCUs) that act as the car's “black box” and report collision and other data to remote servers using an onboard network access device (NAD) that itself includes an integrated baseband chip.

Rather than license the portfolio to the manufacturers of the integrated baseband chip (which provides the communication functionality arguably covered by the patents), or the NADs (which include the baseband chip), or the TCUs (which include the NAD), Avanci allegedly has chosen to license only end-product manufacturers (i.e., the automobile manufacturer, whose device is the one that benefits from all these embedded systems). When Avanci's demanded royalty is applied to the total cost of the automobile, it appears small. But when compared to the price of the baseband chip, it is roughly two- thirds the cost of the chip. As 5G expands further into new markets, this type of valuation challenge is likely to persist and will underscore the need for comprehensive and effective indemnification provisions.

So, how does an implementer considering incorporating 5G technology into a new device learn from these past challenges? Perhaps most importantly, an implementer needs to consider the value proposition of 5G for this new device. Specifically, how does adding 5G functionality add value to the product? And is this a product that will require 5G in all modes of operation, or will this be more of an add-on benefit that only some customers would be interested in using? The answer to questions like these will help an implementer determine how best to design their product (and how best to prepare for incoming licensing demands).

Depending on the specific end-product, certain strategies may be employed to minimize the costs of implementing certain standards. For example, while avoiding cellular communications standards would be impossible in developing a mobile phone, there are design options an implementer should consider when developing a 5G-enabled IoT product. For example, consider a consumer product company producing a hobbyist drone that is designed to use 5G. If certain aspects of 5G, like machine-to-machine communication capabilities for collision avoidance, will not be required for certain users, the manufacturer may have the option of setting certain hardware or software switches to enable/disable the offending feature.

Or, they may be able to design their product such that the 5G functionality can be added by installing a 5G module, or by requiring the user to download certain software necessary for use. Switches, add-ons, and downloads of this nature may be able to reduce the number of potentially infringing devices sold, such that any royalty paid can be more closely tied to the select customers who choose to pay for the feature (and would actually benefit from its inclusion in the device at issue).

This type of “activation” system, or one in which functionality is added in a modular manner, provides protection against a potential injunction, as an adjudicated infringer would have the option of simply disabling or removing the feature, rather than pulling the products from the market. Traditionally, at least within the U.S., the risk of an injunction by an SEP owner was viewed to be quite low, as injunctions were not believed to be in the public interest, at least by the U.S. Department of Justice and Federal Trade Commission.

But some observers noted this policy upset the delicate balance between implementers and innovators in terms of SEP enforcement. Specifically, without the ability to seek an injunction, those implementing the standards could potentially “hold-out” during negotiations, because courts could, at most, impose the very same FRAND rates that the implementer could obtain through negotiation. Addressing these tactics, the DOJ recently withdrew from its prior approach, signaling greater freedom for courts to impose injunctions against SEP infringers in appropriate circumstances. It will remain to be seen how the DOJ ultimately expresses its new policy, and if others follow the DOJ in making injunctions more available (as they have been in other countries).

As 5G expansion continues, SEP holders should be mindful of potentially negative consequences, including the emergence of “hold up,” in which the threat of excluding a product from market is used to extract an above-FRAND royalty. Time will tell whether equipping SEP holders with injunctive remedies will bring potential 5G licensees to the table, or whether it will deter them from using 5G entirely.

### BBB Disad

#### Political capital low now

Baker 1-17-2022 (Gerard, “Biden Goes for Broke. He’s Broke. Now What?,” Wall Street Journal, <https://www.wsj.com/articles/biden-goes-for-broke-filibuster-kyrsten-sinema-joe-manchin-stacey-abrams-bbb-voting-rights-bills-11642432437>)

lèse-majesté = the insulting of a ruler

‘Just colossally disrespectful” was how someone described as a “longtime Biden advisor” characterized for a Daily Beast reporter the behavior of Sen. Kyrsten Sinema last week. The Arizona Democrat had told the Senate she wouldn’t support a proposal to suspend the filibuster, thereby dealing the long-expected fatal blow to President Biden’s legislative ambitions.

The adviser was presumably articulating a widespread frustration in the president’s ranks after Ms. Sinema declined even to hear any more pleas from Mr. Biden before jilting him. But think about that outburst for a moment and consider what it says about the standing and authority of the 46th president as we mark the end of his first year in office.

Has there ever been a figure a year into his term reduced to such impotence that his aides are impelled to whine to friendly media about the “disrespect” shown him by a first-term senator? Can you imagine Lyndon Johnson’s acolytes doing that for him? Ronald Reagan’s ?

But such lèse-majesté is routine now in Democratic ranks. In the past month the president has been spurned by Ms. Sinema, rebuffed by Sen. Joe Manchin, and, perhaps most humiliating, snubbed by Stacey Abrams, whose principal political achievement is to have come in second in the 2018 election for Georgia governor. Ms. Abrams decided she had a “scheduling” conflict when the president was in her patch last week.

As we survey the flattened landscape of Mr. Biden’s ambitions at the one-year mark, it’s for all of us, not just frazzled White House staff to ask: What now?

The answer is obvious: He should do what he should have done a year ago. A little wisdom, some prudence and a grasp of elementary congressional arithmetic might have guided him to make genuine progress for an exhausted and fractured nation. Instead of trying to build ever more improbable progressive utopias in the clouds on the vaporous platform of a 50-50 Senate, he could have started—and could even now—start doing some of the things the American people would actually like to see him do. He could take boring, practical measures to address real challenges—getting us past the pandemic, cooling inflation, addressing crime in the cities and the crisis at the border—not the imaginary ones that fester in the revolutionary’s mind.

But it’s going to be much harder now. A year ago he had the political capital of a newly elected president with an approval rating that approached 60%. Having largely squandered that capital, what does he do to persuade vulnerable politicians in his own party—let alone anyone else—that they should support the goals of a president with 40% approval?

#### BBB is dead---the Manchin well is poisoned

Weissmanm 1-13-2022 (Jordan, “My Incredibly Dumb but Potentially Effective Plan to Save Joe Biden’s Agenda (or at Least Some of It),” Slate, https://slate.com/news-and-politics/2022/01/there-still-might-be-one-way-to-save-joe-bidens-agenda-or-at-least-some-of-it.html)

So, I have an idea to resurrect the Build Back Better Act, Joe Biden’s social spending and climate bill that, as of now, appears to be dead in the water. On the policy merits, it is objectively dumb—just completely pointless and maybe even self-defeating. But as a political compromise that might entice a certain senator from West Virginia, I think it’s just ridiculous enough to work.

It is time, perhaps, to transform BBB into a deficit reduction bill, by making sure it raises significantly more new revenue than it spends.

I’m cringing just typing those words. (Sincerely.) During the 2020 Democratic primary, I wrote at length about how the worst-case scenario in a Joe Biden presidency was that he might rediscover his old deficit hawkishness and make a premature turn toward fiscal austerity. But please consider the circumstances Democrats now find themselves in: Negotiations over BBB crashed to a halt in December, when Joe Manchin shocked his party by announcing that he was a hard no on the legislation during a Fox News interview. It was later reported that the senator had made a private, $1.8 trillion counteroffer to the administration, including hundreds of billions in spending for climate, but became enraged when the White House released a press release blaming him for the bill’s delay, despite his asking them not to.

A thin-skinned overreaction? Perhaps. But the prospects for a bill only appear to have dimmed since that pre-holiday blowup. On Saturday, the Washington Post reported that Manchin’s $1.8 trillion offer appeared to be off the table. “Privately, he has also made clear that he is not interested in approving legislation resembling Biden’s Build Back Better package and that Democrats should fundamentally rethink their approach,” the paper reported. “Senior Democrats say they do not believe Manchin would support his offer even if the White House tried adopting it in full—at least not at the moment—following the fallout in mid-December.”

#### Plan is bipartisan.

Contreras 18, \*Jorge L. Contreras teaches in the areas of intellectual property law, property law and genetics and the law at the University of Utah. He has recently been named one of the University of Utah's Presidential Scholars, and won the 2018-19 Faculty Scholarship Award from the S.J. Quinney College of Law. Professor Contreras has previously served on the law faculties of American University Washington College of Law and Washington University in St. Louis, and was a partner at the international law firm Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP, where he practiced transactional and intellectual property law in Boston, London and Washington DC; (August 2018, “Taking it to the Limit: Shifting U.S. Antitrust Policy Toward Standards Development”, https://dc.law.utah.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1114&context=scholarship)

This being said, antitrust policy regarding standard-setting, and hold-up in particular, did not previously appear to run along party lines. In fact, many key DOJ position statements regarding hold-up, including those expressed in its 2006 and 2007 business review letters to VITA and IEEE, respectively, and the 2007 report on antitrust and IP that it produced jointly with the FTC, were developed during the Republican George W. Bush Administration. Each of these documents acknowledged the existence and potential anticompetitive effects of hold-up. At least in this area, the Obama DOJ did not appear to deviate significantly from the policies of prior administrations. As observed by FTC Commissioner Terrell McSweeny, the FTC and prior DOJ approach to combatting hold-up were based on “15 years of scholarship and bipartisan study” and should not lightly be discarded.37

#### Winner’s win---spending PC rebuilds it [their ev is premised on outdated political theory]

Kane 7-24-2021, The Washington Post's senior congressional correspondent and columnist (Paul, “Day-to-day, Biden’s agenda looks rocky. But congressional Democrats say things are far rosier if you take the long view.,” *Washington Post*, https://www.washingtonpost.com/powerpost/biden-agenda-democrats-congress/2021/07/24/83b776be-ebc0-11eb-ba5d-55d3b5ffcaf1\_story.html)

There is, so far at least, little fear that Democrats are spreading themselves too thin by eschewing the traditional practice of focusing on a handful of domestic policy issues in the first two years of an administration. “Political momentum and political capital is like a muscle. The more you exercise it, the more of it you have. It is not like a finite resource that you can run out of if you spend too much of it. What happens is that if we do a lot of positive things, then we’ve got more political clout to do even more positive things,” Sen. Brian Schatz (D-Hawaii) said. But there is an undercurrent of fear that Democrats lost focus on battling the pandemic and that those gains might be forgotten if current trend lines prompt new shutdowns. “We’ve done a good job over the last several months. But we’re going to have to continue to do it with aggressiveness and precision because the other side has no interest in governing and is going to spend all their time trying to mischaracterize public policy wins,” Rep. Hakeem Jeffries (D-N.Y.), who is in charge of messaging in Pelosi’s leadership team, said. Some worry that the Biden administration needs to stay focused on promoting the $1.9 trillion American Rescue Plan, fearful of mistakes similar to 12 years ago, when the Obama administration neglected to promote its roughly $800 billion economic recovery bill after it passed a month into office. “I don’t think they’ve gotten enough credit for the extraordinary logistical and managerial effort to manage the rollout of the vaccine. That was a big task. And I think it was managed effectively. And I think that’s maybe the most important thing and the least discussed,” Sen. Angus King (I-Maine) said. In late 2010, while he was still a college professor, King wrote an essay, “The Democrats Beat Themselves,” citing how poorly the Obama administration sold the economic recovery. “Basically, the President was subjected to a two-year, nonstop ‘Swift Boating’ and never really fought back,” King wrote after the 2010 political bloodbath for Democrats. So, yes, on Tuesday, federal health officials reported more than 62,000 new cases of the deadly virus as 314 Americans died of the virus. A day earlier, the stock market tumbled more than 700 points amid fears of the health crisis causing another economic shock. But exactly six months earlier — Jan. 20, the day Biden was sworn in under strict social distancing and masking guidelines outside the Capitol — there were more than 185,000 new virus cases and a rolling weekly average of almost 200,000, with 4,440 deaths caused by covid-19 that day. On Jan. 20, the Dow Jones industrial average stood at 31,188, far below the closing of 34,512 six months later. Labor Department reports this month showed strong wage growth amid steady job growth that suggests sometime next year, the economy will recover all the lost jobs from the pandemic. In June and most of July, Biden tried to move past the pandemic and focused his attention on the bipartisan infrastructure plan and the proposed $3.5 trillion budget plan that is favored by liberals. Those two packages are filled with campaign pledges to remake government support for the middle class, the most ambitious budgets since the Great Society proposals of the 1960s. Democrats will need to make Congress spend a lot more time in Washington if they want to get Biden’s agenda passed Democrats defend these proposals as worthy of the big moment the nation faces. “We are confronting a multitude of crises, including a once-in-a-century covid-19 pandemic, a democracy crisis, a racial justice crisis and a climate crisis all at the same time,” Jeffries said. Schatz views the old presidential model of focusing on a couple big things as outdated. “The model from the ’80s was if you do too many things, people are going to get freaked out. And I think the danger here is not doing enough rather than doing too much,” he said.

### FTC Disad

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Deterrence turn---the prospect of antitrust intervention deters violations.

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

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