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#### Antitrust rules are rapidly proliferating globally, but are overlapping and disjointed---the lack of international harmonization increases their cost and complexity AND creates an opening for politicized use of rules as a mechanism to unfairly promote domestic industrial policy under the guise of competition
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I. Global developments suggest increased need for legal certainty in rulemaking and enforcement

Companies today operate in an increasingly globalised world, interconnected via digital platforms and ecosystems. The technological revolution is accelerating at an ever-increasing speed. It promises to fundamentally alter both the competitive landscape and the tools by which competition is regulated. Against this backdrop, the world is facing substantial environmental challenges with mounting pressure on businesses to change the way they operate, including an increasing need for firms to collaborate to achieve social goals and increased efficiency that no one firm could achieve independently.

While some progress has been made towards a unified view of competition law, companies are also facing rising geopolitical tensions that have led to protectionist measures and the pursuit of industrial policy objectives under the guise of competition law enforcement. Concepts including national security, full employment, and ‘fair’ or ‘level’ pricing frequently introduce domestic protection concerns into traditional economic tests. With the proliferation of competition regimes, now well over 100, the potential for regulatory drag on the global markets increases exponentially. Having spent the last two decades as competition counsel, I can say with certainty that the complexity of the legal landscape and uncertainty and unpredictability as to compliance with competition law regulations have increased dramatically in recent years both at a global and EU level. Companies are struggling to achieve legal competition law compliance despite consistent efforts including scaling up their compliance departments.

As our markets continue to evolve in the face of technology and sustainability and other social goals, it is now more important than ever for the European Commission (‘the Commission’) to ensure legal certainty, both in rulemaking and in enforcement. The costs associated with uncertainty should not be underestimated, particularly as the Commission considers new enforcement tools designed to address competition structures and practices that may fall outside of traditional economic analyses. Not only is transparency and predictability vital for the proper functioning of the European Economic Area, but it would also send a much-needed signal to the rest of the world. Conversely, if, in any new enforcement system transparency and predictability do not prevail, the Commission’s efforts would likely serve to indirectly legitimise non-transparent and unpredictable protectionis[m]t in other countries, not founded on the rule of law and due process.

Even if one of the key roles of the Commission is to enforce competition law, it is important to keep in mind that competition policy and enforcement are tools of economic policy. Implemented well, competition policy can stimulate economic growth and competitiveness but, if not, it can be a significant regulatory brake on investment, economic development, and sustainability advances.

II.Why should we worry about uncertainty costs?

When considering the potential costs of new regulation, decision-makers often emphasise the legal spend, i.e., the cost of in-house lawyers, external advisers, document preservation systems, etc. But what is often overlooked is the far more expensive costs related to uncertainty in the process of risk-weighting potential investments. A simple example:

Company A seeks to enter into a transaction with Company B to achieve carbon output reduction. Company A’s executive management team, in conjunction with financial advisors, calculates a value for the transaction, which is typically a range of acceptable prices to achieve the desired goal. Company A’s CEO then engages her legal department to assess the potential for regulatory risk flowing from the venture. Given the potential for fines, divestitures, restrictions, or outright prohibitions on the project from a myriad of governmental authorities, the application of competition regulation has the potential to result in billions of dollars in business losses. On receiving legal advice on the probability of such losses, Company A’s CEO applies risk weighting to the value of the transaction, adjusting the value downward to account for the regulatory risk.

In some ways, legal ‘weight’ on a transaction, collaboration, or other business initiative is (socially and economically) desirable—if for example, a company employee proposed to engage in a price-fixing cartel, the legal department’s assessment of extreme risk serves a valuable societal goal. But in far too many cases, it is the mere lack of transparency and certainty in global competition regimes that lead to a determinative ‘risk weighting’ outcome in a deal. Competition counsel must conservatively advise of the uncertainty surrounding deal execution, and responsible CEOs must protect shareholders against business losses flowing frompossible regulatory intervention including the reputational risk following compliance breaches. As in our example, regulatory uncertainty alone may prevent a pro-competitive, socially desirable transaction that has been devalued by the risk of regulatory intervention.

When designing business practices, engaging in collaboration with other companies, and in considering merger activities, legal certainty, transparency, and predictability routinely drive willingness to invest.

III. Legal uncertainty has increased significantly in recent years

The trend that we see is that the complexity of the legal landscape and uncertainty as to compliance with and enforcement of antitrust regulations have increased dramatically in recent years, both globally and in the EU. There are several reasons for this development.

Firstly, more and more jurisdictions have competition laws in place and an increasing number of countries are actively enforcing their rules. For global companies that can mean familiarisation with up to 100 different competition law regulations. This is not particular to competition law, but it highlights the need for clear and transparent rules as well as predictability.

Secondly, the substantive competition rules are becoming increasingly unclear due to the application of domestic protection concerns, non-economic factors, and novel competition theories, such as proposed new competition enforcement tool (‘New Competition Tool’) currently under review in Europe1. The conduct at issue in these kinds of cases is rarely ‘black or white’ or may simply be a consequence of the (changing) market dynamics (also where changes are unrelated to the conduct of the company) and will typically pursue legitimate purposes, making it extremely difficult for companies to draw the boundaries needed to avoid government intervention.

Thirdly, companies increasingly operate in a vast number of countries, and their business practices may implicate several jurisdiction’s rules at the same time. Companies are often faced with substantially different rules despite apparently similar concepts. Also, we see new confidence by emerging countries to apply the common antitrust concepts according to their own interpretation and possibly to serve their own political ends. Lack of international convergence on substantive rules including sector-specific regulations thus in practice differs immensely across jurisdictions despite ICN and OECD efforts to harmonise rules.

#### This will dry up cross-border commerce and investment---foreign companies won’t participate if there’s the prospect of discrimination
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After setting our theoretical priors, we empirically test our two hypotheses on sector-level data covering 53 U.S. industries over the 2002–2017 period. Our panel-data empirical results indicate that merger policy investigative activities disproportionately deter foreign acquirers in local M&A markets. Specifically, increases in merger policy risk and merger policy uncertainty lead to reduced foreign acquirer presence in the U.S. markets for corporate control. The empirical evidence then suggests that merger policy enforcement is protectionist in effect, as foreign investment activities are more adversely affected by the application of merger policy as compared to domestic investment activities. These results yield salient implications for the international business literature on hostcountry characteristics and foreign investment activities.

In order to comprehensively examine the relationship between merger policy enforcement and foreign acquirer presence in local M&A markets, we structure the remainder of this paper as follows. We present a theoretical framework that focuses on the salience of policy risk and policy uncertainty in generating two hypotheses regarding the relationship between the enforcement of merger policy and the participation of foreign acquirers in domestic M&A markets. After setting out our theoretical priors, we describe our sector-level data on U.S. merger control and acquisition activities, formulate our estimation strategy, present our empirical results, and discuss robustness testing. The last section concludes.

HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

A considerable amount of IB literature has examined the impact of country-level political risk and uncertainty on inward FDI activities – see the literature reviews by Kobrin (1979), Fitzpatrick (1983) and Liesch, Welch, and Buckley (2011). The basis behind this literature is that political risks and uncertainties can ‘‘arise from the actions of national governments which interfere with or prevent business transactions’’ (Weston & Sorge, 1972: 60). Firms generally react to such political hurdles by reducing their willingness to make investments as the option value of delaying investment becomes higher under such risks and uncertainties (Bloom, 2014; Brouthers, Brouthers, & Werner, 2008). While political hurdles and hazards can negatively influence the investment activities of all firms, foreign firms are generally considered to be more sensitive to such shocks. For one, foreign firms might be more frequently targeted when burdensome laws, regulations and policies are implemented by national governments; e.g., Eden (1994) observes that national policies practiced in a parochial manner represent fundamental threats to multinationals. Furthermore, foreign firms often lack the local information, legitimacy and contacts which might help them properly assess and mitigate political constraints. As Werner, Brouthers, and Brouthers (1996: 572) underscore, ‘‘firms commonly find international business opportunities to be inherently more risky than domestic ones’’ due to the stark differences in political environments and the inherent legal uncertainties characteristic of foreign investment endeavors. It is no surprise then that a great deal of empirical literature (e.g., Delios & Henisz, 2000, 2003b; Henisz & Delios, 2001) indicates that uncertainty in the political environment substantially deters foreign investment activities. Indeed, Kobrin (1979) highlights how the response to political risk and uncertainty is frequently avoidance, as multinationals simply do not get involved in countries perceived as risky.

While macro-level studies regarding the relationship between political risk and FDI tend to dominate the literature (Vadlamannati, 2012), there have been efforts to follow the prescriptions of Kobrin (1979) to consider the industry-, firm-, and project-specific factors relating to political risk and uncertainty. For one, Miller (1993) breaks down the salient host-country environmental uncertainties into six different dimensions – where uncertainties with respect to specific government policies represent the first dimension. Werner et al. (1996) follow in this line of research by considering the national laws which affect foreign firms; and Grosse (1985) and Bonaime, Gulen, and Ion (2018), respectively, consider the impact of regulatory policies and uncertainties on FDI and M&A activities. The conduct of national merger policy represents a particular regulatory policy that involves a direct threat to the participation of foreign firms in local M&A markets. Specifically, the presence of a national merger policy can negatively impact foreign acquirers by slowing down the consummation of their cross-border acquisitions via antitrust investigations, curtailing the profitability of these cross-border acquisitions by requiring structural remedies, and by even outright prohibiting them. Thus, merger control is a specific and salient government barrier that foreign acquirers must successfully navigate in order to gain access to local M&A markets (Brouthers et al., 2008; Clougherty, 2005).

While the IB literature lacks empirical scholarship concerning this topic, many IB scholars (e.g., Brewer, 1993; Buckley & Casson, 1996; Hymer, 1970; Spar, 2001) have posited that the national enforcement of merger policy potentially restrains the level of inward FDI. It is with these concerns in mind that many policy advisors recommend that countries do not prioritize competition policy, as it could discourage inward FDI via the creation of additional regulatory barriers and uncertainties for foreign investors (Oliveira et al., 2001). Moreover, the conduct of national merger policy lends itself well to analyzing the deterrence effects with respect to acquisition activities in a manner that is consistent with the pre-existing literature on political risk and uncertainty. First, merger policy is conducted at the industry level and exhibits cross-sector variation in antitrust scrutiny (Clougherty & Seldeslachts, 2013); thus, it represents an industryspecific policy context worth analyzing for policy risk factors in line with Kobrin’s (1979) prescriptions. Second, merger policy involves both policy risk and policy uncertainty – both of which may disproportionately deter foreign acquirers as compared to domestic acquirers. We turn now to a discussion of these concepts and to the formulation of our theoretical priors.

Merger Policy Risk

The concept of risk goes back to Knight’s (1921) fundamental insights, where he considered risk to be a known probability distribution over a set of events; for example, flipping a coin involves risk, but with known odds. In moving from the concept of risk to its application in IB political risk, Kobrin (1979) observes that risk is at play when managers have knowledge regarding the possibility and probability of different political outcomes via either calculations or past experience statistics. While the relevant information is available with political risk, and observers generally agree with respect to the probabilities of different outcomes, foreign investors are often considered to be at a disadvantage as compared to domestic investors due in part to inherent information asymmetries (Gehrig, 1993; Gordon & Bovenberg, 1996; Liesch et al., 2011). As Gehrig (1993: 98) makes clear, ‘‘information may have to be interpreted in the light of the legal conventions and business culture of a particular community, which may be difficult for foreigners to assess’’. Thus, domestic investors are better informed and better able to interpret the relevant probabilities as compared to foreign investors, and, as a result, foreign managers tend to overestimate the risks and underestimate the benefits involved with host-country investment activities (Liesch et al., 2011). Simply put, the lack of information, knowledge, and experience with respect to the intricacies of host-country activities accentuates the perceptions of risk when considering foreign investments. A great deal of the political risk literature accordingly focuses on the probabilistic estimates of different policy outcomes and how increased risk leads to decreased foreign investment activities. With the above as a backdrop, we consider how the policy risk involved with merger control might disproportionately affect foreign investors considering participating in the local markets for corporate control.

#### Specifically---export cartels are legalized protectionism designed to bypass WTO subsidy controls---that creates increasing disputes that put trade on the brink, especially after Trump and Brexit
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Section 1: Introduction

Today, there is a growing fear of rising protectionism, from the United States (US) under the Trump administration’s imposition of tariffs and a trade war with China, to the United Kingdom’s Brexit, to the less known trade-restricting measures adopted by other countries all over the world.1

The neoclassical economic model suggests the desirability of free trade over protectionism because free trade lowers prices, allows a flow of goods with little restrictions and improves the quality of products, resulting in overall welfare gain.2 On the other hand, protectionism results in welfare losses, increased prices and a decline in innovation, thus harming consumers and economic efficiency.3

The natural inclination of states to engage in protectionism is as old as time and, until today, has never been diminished.4 The General Agreement on Trade & Tariff (GATT),5 superseded by World Trade Organisation (WTO) since 1995, rendered the classical forms of protectionism such as tariffs obsolete. However, it did not defeat protectionism; instead, protectionism has evolved through its protean capacity to adapt into new and often undetectable forms,6 now labelled as ‘murky’ protectionism.7

Competition law enforcement is suspected as one of the forms of this murky protectionism. There are two ways (among others) considered in this article in which States can utilise competition law to impair free trade and restrict access of foreign firms to domestic market. First is the exemption under national competition law such as export cartel exemptions; second is the strategic application of domestic competition law, e.g. alleged discriminatory and selective enforcement of merger regulation.8

It appears that States use their competition law as invincible trade barriers to further their protectionist bids such as national security and environmental protection.9 In recent years, States have been accused of using their competition law to pursue protectionism. For instance, the US has criticised the EU’s merger regulation as protecting competitors and not competition, particularly in the technology industry in mergers involving non-EU firms – even when those same acquisitions are approved by other competition authorities. A good example is the Commission’s 2001 decision to block the $42 billion acquisition of Honeywell by General Electric.10 Similarly, the US is being encouraged to change their stance on leniency towards export cartels due to its beggar-thy-neighbour effect.11 Investigating the controversy around the use of competition law for protectionist ends is particularly relevant today to protect and uphold free trade and liberalisation. There is a gap between competition and trade policies which national competition law fails to address and the WTO rules fail to regulate. Merger regulation and export cartel exemptions appear to be used as tools for protectionist ends to exploit the gap. This article, therefore, examines whether States use their competition law to pursue protectionist policy in the EU and the US. In this context, the article specifically focuses on analysing how merger regulation and treatment of export cartel further protectionism.12

In terms of method and approach, the article uses the international political economy (IPE) perspective underpinned by (legal/political) realism and interdisciplinary, theoretical-analytical perspectives within the framework of international competition law. It employs (comparative) qualitative empirical evidence from the EU and US for comparative analysis. The international political economic perspective is used to analyse how the presence of political elements and influences on decision-making reflect the enforcing jurisdiction’s national environment, culture, priorities and goals by presenting an opportunity for the use of competition law for protectionist bids. Meanwhile, the interdisciplinary and theoretical-analytical perspective is used to employ literature in the legal, economics, international relations and international politics areas.13 This is empirically analysed within the framework of (international) competition law. The (comparative) qualitative empirical evidence is employed by gathering relevant material from the European Union and the United States of America for an in-depth analysis.

The article adopts legal/political realism theory in the analysis section to demonstrate that the regulation of competition law by regulators/competition authorities in the EU (mainly, the EU Commission)14 and in the USA (the US Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission)15 is highly influenced by the public policy of the nation. In simple parlance, legal realism is a theory that all law derives from prevailing social interests and public policy. According to legal realist theory, judges consider not only abstract rules, but also social interest and public policy, when deciding a case.16 Legal realism is a diverse school of thought and any attempt to homogenise it will distort more than simplify,17 since its influence goes beyond being a mere theory of adjudication.18 Judges more often than not promote social ends; just as Cardozo admitted, a judge may be tempted to substitute their view for that of the community.19 From this perspective, the legal realist is attached to social reform and they want law to serve as an instrument for social action. To achieve this, realist thought, policy objectives and interrelationship between legal rules had to become more intimate.20

Political realism is a theory that attempts to explain, model, and prescribe political relations. It proposes that power is (or ought to be) the primary end of political action, whether in the domestic realm or international arena. In the domestic realm, the theory contends that politicians do, or should, strive to maximise their power, whilst in the international arena, nation States are the primary agents that maximise, or ought to maximise, their power. In the context of nation States, the proposition is that a nation can only advance its interests against the interests of other nations; this implies that the international environment is inherently unstable.21 Realism emphasizes power and the national interest and directs more attention to political security than to economic issues.22 Realism is equated to, if not related to, mercantilism, also known as protectionism.23 To obtain political security, realists enrich their power and wealth at the expense of their neighbouring States, often through an increase in exports and decrease in imports.24 IPE is concerned with the interaction of economics and politics in the international sphere.25 Politics is represented by the State as a sovereign political unit and economics is represented by the market as a system of production and consumption at a price determined by supply and demand.26

Based on the political and economic dimensions involved in the interplay of competition law and trade policy, particularly protectionism, it is the position of this article that realist theory, along with an IPE perspective, is relevant in understanding why nation States use competition law as a protectionist bid in their trade policy.

The article is structured into five broad sections; this section, Section 1 is the general introduction and set out the method, including the theoretical approach used in the article. Section 2 provides a brief conceptual understanding of the relevant concepts in the article which have divergent conceptual interpretations within academic literature. Section 3 discusses the relationship between competition law and other issues areas such as trade policy, protectionism and others. Section 4 analyses competition law and protectionism in the two case studies, EU and US, by using specific competition law instruments: (i) merger regulation and (ii) treatment of export cartels to investigate and analyse how they are used for protectionism, including a brief comparative analysis. Finally, Section 5 summarises and concludes the article.

Section 2: A Conceptual understanding of relevant concepts

Looking at academic literature, scholars have provided divergent conceptual views or interpretations of relevant competition law concepts that appear in the article.

(i) Competition

Competition, in its broad economic sense, is the process whereby firms struggle to win against each other. Competition law, also known as antitrust in the United States, refers to the legal rules and standards which aim to protect the process of competition by dealing with market imperfections and restoring desirable competitive conditions in the market.27 Competition policy, on the other hand, is broader than competition law and covers the full range of government measures that could promote competitive market structures and behaviour, including trade liberalisation measures.28 Views on the necessity of the enactment of competition law to implement competition policy remain divided.29 The neo-classical economics case for competition argues competition provides various benefits such as lower prices, efficiency, and innovation.30 There is no consensus on the goals of competition law. Some scholars suggest that competition law is akin to a sponge or that it is a fluid concept influenced by varying objectives, policies, culture; hence, the goals vary based on each enacting jurisdiction.31 On the other hand, one of the prominent scholars of the Chicago school of competition analysis suggests that the ultimate goal of competition law is economic efficiency, which is equated to consumer welfare maximisation.32 Nonetheless, the most commonly declared goal of competition law is to protect and encourage competition to achieve the optimal resource allocation and maximise consumer welfare.33

As a result of these diverging goals and enforcement policies of competition law, several scholars proposed for the internalisation, or at least harmonisation, of competition law.34 Some scholars such as Fox and Manne and Weinberger, recognising the restrictive effect on trade by anticompetitive practices, called for the alignment of competition law within the WTO Framework. However, this failed to materialise as a result of the diverging views of the member States.35

(ii) Merger

Under a business or firm perspective, mergers36 are motivated by efficiency goals as explained by efficiency theory, strategy to increase market power as explained by market power hypothesis, or simply the managers’ greed or overconfidence as explained by the hubris hypothesis.37 Efficiency theory suggests that firms will merge if there is a potential to generate sufficient realisable synergies beneficial to all the merging parties.38 Synergies comprise of collusive, operational and financial synergy.39 Operational synergies are manifested in resulting economies of scale and economies of scope as they mainly relate to production and/or administrative efficiencies; financial synergy refers to cost savings, and collusive synergy refers to expansion of market power as supported by the market power hypothesis.40 Alternatively, hubris hypothesis argues that decisions to merge are the result of managements’ overestimation of the resulting benefits to the business due to the managers’ overconfidence in decision-making.41 Nonetheless, each merger transaction is unique; hence, there is no single theory that encapsulates the motivations for pursuing these transactions.42

Under the legal perspective, however, a merger simply refers to a combination of two or more corporations into a single entity, regardless of business reason or mode of acquisition.43 For competition authorities, mergers pose a concern because of the merging firms’ potential to accumulate or expand market power, which can distort competition through monopoly or abuse of dominance.44

However, empirical analyses negate the protectionism hypothesis, at least with the perspective of the EU competition law. Initial studies found a positive correlation between the likelihood of opposition to mergers involving foreigners and the foreseen negative impact of the merger on domestic competitors.45 Yet, after the 2004 reforms introduced EU merger regulation, a re-examination of the protectionist hypothesis showed a shift in the protectionist tendencies of the enforcement authority.46 Recent research affirmed the results of this re-examination and found that the EU Commission committed no discrimination in its enforcement of merger regulation, whether in frequency or intensity, in mergers involving foreign firms.47 These empirical analyses, at least in the EU context, show that competition authorities did not use their merger control power to intervene on mergers involving non-EU or US acquirers. Nevertheless, they fail to conclusively prove that protectionism with merger regulation does not exist. Conversely, qualitative analyses examining merger decisions and the text of the merger regulations claim that merger regulation is used, or at least could potentially be used, for protectionist purposes such as promotion of national champions.48

(iii) Export cartels

A cartel is an association of rivals agreeing to fix prices above the competitive level, limit output below the competitive level or allocate markets between or amongst themselves in order to maximise their profits.49 Cartels, generally, have been labelled as the ‘supreme evil of antitrust’50 and the ‘primary evil of global trade’.51 On the other hand, export cartels are cartels that only operate in foreign markets and do not directly affect the markets in the jurisdiction where the cartel members are located.52 While there is a consensus among the world’s competition authorities to prohibit hard-core cartels,53 there is lack of clarity and transparency surrounding the treatment of export cartels. It is argued that export cartels receive considerable political support,54 not only because of its benefits to the exporting country, but also because it is argued that export cartels are not necessarily pure evil like hard-core cartels.55 Export cartels may have the same goals as hard-core cartels – to fix prices or allocate markets – but they may also have strictly efficiency-enhancing goals such as sharing marketing and transportation costs.56

According to economic theory, export cartels raise domestic producer welfare without diminishing domestic consumer welfare.57 Additional export revenues and increases in national welfare incentivises exporting States to tolerate, if not promote, export cartels.58 Furthermore, since the adverse effects of export cartels are externalised or felt exclusively by importing States, exporting States possessing the territorial jurisdiction over the cartel have very little interest in disciplining the conduct.59 On the other hand, importing States which have the motivation to prevent the conduct due to its anticompetitive effect and corresponding reduction in their consumer welfare do not have the territorial jurisdiction and must rather apply their competition laws extra-territorially to sanction the cartel.60 However, since exporting States are not motivated to sanction the cartel, or even induced to promote or tolerate the cartel because of its positive domestic effect, they may block any extraterritorial enforcement by the importing States through exemptions or non-cooperation.61 This conflicting interest presents a competition law enforcement dilemma on export cartels.

Fox similarly observed the insufficiency of national competition enforcement to regulate export cartels because it lacks legitimacy or capacity to reach competitive restraints on foreign soil; nonetheless, it mainly affects the domestic home market.62 Export cartels are often not covered by national competition laws when they do not affect the domestic market, neither directly or indirectly. Scholars argue that export cartels, to the extent that they are tolerated – if not encouraged – by the exporting States, are an effort of exporting States to boost domestic welfare at the expense of global welfare. More specifically, it is at the cost of the consumers’ welfare in the target market – a clear manifestation of a beggar-thy-neighbour conduct.63 On the contrary, there is a belief that the scarcity of empirical data on export cartels handicaps the attempts to analyse the issue on export cartels.64 The lack of data creates difficulties to determine the gravity of the anticompetitive harm that export cartels create; thus, the very assumptions on which the theory of the nexus of export cartel and anticompetitive conduct rely may be misguided.65

(iv) Trade policies

Like competition law, trade policy also contains both political and economic dimensions. It refers to the system of incentives put in place by a State with regard to production and consumption, including importation, exportation and trade of goods and services as aligned with the imposing state’s growth and development objectives.66 Trade policy involves various actions and tools such as the imposition of tariffs, quotas or restrictions, granting of subsidies to domestic industries and other measures often classified into two broad types: tariffs and non-tariff measures.67

The tariff is the classic instrument of trade policy.68 Tariffs are imposed to generate revenue but also, more importantly, to protect the domestic industry of the imposing country.69 However, with increasing trade liberalisation, most states covertly seek to protect domestic sectors through other instruments of trade policy such as non-tariff measures.70 Non-tariff measures include quotas, licences, technical barriers to trade, sanitary and phytosanitary measures, export restrictions, custom surcharges, financial measures and anti-dumping measures.71 Whilst non-tariff measures may intrinsically be protectionist, they seem useful in addressing failures in the market such as externalities and the asymmetry of information between producers and consumers.72

Trade policy is historically determined on the basis of the macro and micro view.73 The micro view provides that the State adopts its trade policy in accordance with the preferences of its industrial constituents.74 Hence, under the micro view, trade policy refers to the ‘aggregate outcome of industry battles over protection.’75 The macro view, on the other hand, suggests that the trade policy of the State cannot simply be traced back to the preferences of its industrial constituents.76 Under the macro view, the trade policy of the State reflects the collective interest of the State and the State acts as an independent agent furthering the national State objectives. Trade policy in all countries consists of varying dimensions or levels. For example, the EU trade policy, in addition to its ‘unilateral’ liberalization, i.e. voluntarily providing preferential market access or zero tariffs for specific types of countries, also adopts bilateral, plurilateral and multilateral agreements as well as commercial instruments such as anti-dumping laws and other safeguards.77 The objectives pursued at each level of trade policy constantly changes.78 Different States negotiate in order to determine their international trade policies.79 Hence, bilateral, plurilateral or multilateral trade agreements are born, usually involving preferential tariff rates, agreements on investments, technology-sharing or single market objectives.80 In the context of protectionism, the ability of States to resolve trade disputes amongst themselves significantly influences protectionist positions.81 However, it is argued that protectionist trade policy is more than just a means of adjudicating trade disputes; rather, protectionism is pursued by certain States in order to further their national economic and political policies.82

Part II

Protectionism

Protectionism is a kind of trade policy aimed at impeding foreign trade access to the domestic market and preserving, if not improving, the position of domestic producers in contrast to foreign producers.83 With the decline of classic protectionism, i.e. the imposition of tariffs and other visible barriers to trade, comes the rise of ‘murky’ protectionism, also known as new protectionism, which is characterised by seemingly innocuous and subtle measures designed to distort free trade without constituting as violations of the WTO rules or trade agreements.84 More aptly, murky protectionism has been defined as ‘abuses of legitimate discretion which are used to discriminate against foreign goods, companies, workers and investors’.85 Examples of murky protectionism are the imposition of regulatory and licensing requirements, tightening of product standards, limitation of ports of entry, introduction of bailout packages and initiation of disguised ‘green’ protectionism.86

Academic literature provides conflicting arguments regarding protectionism. Economic theory under the classic utility model establishes that any benefit that may result from protectionism is outweighed by its costs in terms of losses to consumer welfare and decline of economic growth.87 Another argument against protectionism is the moral argument which provides that protectionism is akin to stealing, i.e. producers and rent-seeking individuals induce the government to pursue their interests and benefit at the expense of consumers, in effect taking away what is due.88 On the other hand, the most notable arguments in favour of protectionism are national defence, infant industry and strategic trade theory.89

The national defence argument authorises the protection of industries with a vital role in national security such as weapon manufacturing to ensure the States’ readiness in times of war or adversity.90 It is suggested that agricultural protectionism is subsumed under the national defence argument because food security and food availability are part of the States’ legitimate national interests.91 It has been noted that the EU’s agricultural protectionism resulted in growth of production, achievement of self-sufficiency in food security and stability in the common market for agricultural products.92

The infant industry argument provides that a State, in order to grow, must first strengthen its newly established industries which do not enjoy the cost and production efficiencies yet compared to its competitors; this is at least until it establishes its comparative advantage and the playing field has been levelled.93 Proponents for the protection of the infant industry assert that protection must only be temporary and the benefits provided by the protected industry must exceed the costs of protection, also known as the Mill-Bastable Test.94

The strategic trade theory, introduced by James Brander and Barbara Spencer, has also been used to support protectionism.95 According to the strategic trade theory, firms are inclined to take ‘strategic’ moves exhibiting aggressive behaviour; the State’s support of such national firms will further give more credence to such behaviour, in effect deterring potential rivals such as foreign firms.96 Hence, strategic trade theory suggests the States can raise their national income at the expense of other States by supporting or promoting national firms in international competition.97

Section 3: The relationship between competition law and other issue areas

(i) Competition and Trade Policies

Competition and trade policies are both national policies used as tools for economic development, albeit with different objectives, principles, and scope. No consensus on the overall relationship between the two has yet been reached. It is suggested that the two policies could be mutually reinforcing, complementary, contradictory, or substitutes depending on how they are applied.98 Based on their basic objectives, efficiency and consumer welfare, competition and trade policies are perceived as mutually reinforcing.99 On the other hand, by dealing with private, anticompetitive conduct to ensure effective market access, competition policy is viewed as complementary with trade policy which is concerned with the removal of governmental actions. This facilitates the anti-competitive behaviour by private entities. Restrictive trade measures limit competition by curtailing the entry of foreign suppliers in the market as well as aiding anti-competitive practices by domestic firms; meanwhile, exclusions and exemptions from competition law, as well as lack of enforcement thereof, negatively impact trade.100

A contradictory relationship between competition and trade policy is also suggested as a result of their divergent aims and effects. Competition policy is concerned with consumer welfare, while trade policy is focused on the welfare of producers and is more easily influenced by special interest groups.101 Trade policy also has objectives which conflict with competition policy aims such as raising revenue, promoting self-sufficiency and supporting exports.102 Finally, competition policy and trade policy are also viewed as substitutes in some respects. For instance, the WTO found that competition law provisions relating to price discrimination serve as a substitute for anti-dumping measures in some circumstances.103

The impact of anti-competitive business practices on international trade is the most important concern in trade policy.104 Experts105 recognise that anti-competitive practices of firms, in addition to trade barriers, hamper international trade. Hence, the necessity to integrate or at least align competition and trade policies has been formally recognised as early as the proposal for the establishment of the International Trade Organisation (Havana Charter). The Havana Charter contained provisions which encourage member States to prohibit business practices that affect international trade which restrain competition, limit access to markets, or foster monopolistic control whenever such practices are harmful to trade.106 Nonetheless, the Havana Charter was not ratified and was instead succeeded by the GATT of 1947, which salvaged some of the provisions from the Havana Charter. Thus, the negotiating parties that created the GATT of 1947 had shown a public awareness that arrangements designed to foster trade could be undermined when commercial enterprises engaged in cartels or other restrictive business practices, and these negotiating parties had proposed treaty provisions to ensure that competition policy would reinforce government measures for international trade.107 Subsequently, the World Trade Organisation was established in 1995 to succeed the GATT of 1947. Efforts to include competition policy within the trade policy framework in the WTO have proved particularly challenging due to lack of agreement among member States on competition policy.108 Support for international discipline regarding competition law was originally stimulated by US perceptions that international cartels and the absence or lack of enforcement of national competition law obstructed the ability of US firms to contest markets.109 The US supported the inclusion of a chapter dealing with restrictive business practices, reflecting its views against German cartels and Japanese zaibatsu who are the main opposition to including competition law in the WTO.110 In recent times, the EU has been in the lead, arguing that all WTO members must adopt and enforce competition laws. Developing countries have not been at the center of the debate on trade and competition in the WTO.111 However, competition policy has an important role in developing countries, both in promoting a competitive environment and in building and sustaining public support for a pro-competitive policy stance. However, the issue is that many do not have competition laws; those that do often have limited implementation ability.112 The bottom line of the debate is that any agreement on international competition policy that goes beyond general procedural cooperation and introduction of transparency mechanisms likely must be plurilateral, at least initially.

The lack of consensus on the nexus of competition and trade policy creates a gap which is exploited in order to pursue various motives such as promoting industrial policy, protectionism or nationalism.

(ii) Competition law and protectionism

In the United States, some scholars claim that antitrust law is rooted in protectionist institutions.113 Evidence reveals that the political impetus for antitrust law originated from lobbying farmers of several agricultural states;114 however, the majority views of scholars differs on this.115 Inefficient businesses misused antitrust laws by suing their efficient competitors for lower prices, increase in output and product or process innovation116 Today, the use of antitrust law for protectionism is no longer limited to the protection of an industry from another within the domestic sphere; it extends to the international level and transcends international trade. Similarly, in the European Union, remnants of industrial policy abound in the EC competition law.117 The European Commission has been attacked on the ground of ‘disguised protectionism’, protecting EU-based competitors and furthering the single market objective rather than seeking to uphold competition in strict terms.118 This is clearly demonstrated in the proposed Siemens-Alstom merger. In prohibiting the proposed consolidation of Siemens and Alstom, the European Commission unleashed a turmoil of political discontent; arguably, this is more the manifestation of longstanding frustration with certain underlying asymmetries within merger regulation which impede the ascendancy of the European industry on the world stage than an issue with the Commission’s decision itself.119

Competition law, as a political creation, is inherently susceptible to ‘instrumentalisation’ for protectionist ends. Competition law is at risk of being misused to advance industrial policies, political agendas and protectionist policies in the guise of competition enforcement, thus bypassing the scrutiny of international trade agreements.120 The existing legislative framework of competition law enhances this risk, as it provides for greater discretion in decision making and political involvement in the enforcement of competition law.121 While open-ended discretionary standards are laudable because economic analysis cannot be put into rigid standards as each competition case is unique, it also creates opportunities for abuse. Discretion may be abused to allow regulators to pursue their own private interests, shirk unpleasant duties, augment their regulatory authority in hopes of increasing monopoly rents which they can trade to interest groups in return for personal benefits, and act in other ways that are contrary to the public good.122 In the context of merger law, for instance, discretion may incentivise regulators to pursue protectionism – in particular, new protectionism. Trade agreements and institutions such as the WTO have made traditional protectionism through open trade discrimination challenging. Yet, the underlying political dynamic driving protectionism has not gone away. Hence, while jurisdictions do not forbid certain mergers, they can still discriminate against them. For instance, regulators can require more onerous ‘fixes’ for mergers that threaten local producers such as requiring the merging parties to divest assets in a way that benefits the domestic competitor.123

Indeed, the argument that competition law may be a tool to pursue a protectionist end is commonly premised upon the possibility that competition law – especially through selective, discriminatory enforcement – might actually be abused as a trade barrier.124 National protectionism is often demanded by certain industries or interest groups.125 However, a competition regime that favours domestic firms such as local producers hurt not only the producers and consumers of other countries, but also the domestic consumers.

(iii) Merger regulation and protectionism

One area of competition law that has always been suspected as an instrument of protectionism is merger regulation; the failed merger of Siemens-Alstom is a good case in point. Merger regulation is one of the pillars of competition policy aimed at preserving market competition in the event of business combinations and takeovers.126 However, preservation of competition is not the only rationale for the enforcement of merger regulations; national security, businesses perceived to be of national strategic importance, technological capabilities, jobs and export also influence merger control enforcement.127 Thus, the protectionism hypothesis posits that merger regulation is used as a tool to protect domestic firms from competition.128 In addition to protection of domestic firms, which is often associated with the infant industry argument, States are also suspected of using merger regulations to promote its national champions on the premise of strategic trade theory. In the context of merger control, the notion of a national champion generally means that the government encourages or does not prevent a merger between two domestic firms to create a more powerful entity, or it opposes the acquisition of one of the domestic firms by a foreign company.129

A study has found that, while merger regulation has deterred anticompetitive mergers, it has also protected rival producers from increased competition due to efficient mergers.130 In the context of EU merger policy, an empirical analysis to prove the protectionist hypothesis concluded a direct correlation between the likelihood of opposition to the merger by the competition authority when the bidder is a foreign national and the expected adverse effect of the reviewed merger on domestic competitors.131 After reforms on the EU Merger Regulation were introduced in 2004, the hypothesis was re-examined and change in protectionist tendencies were discovered.132 The result was more consistent with a recent empirical study that showed the Commission has not intervened more frequently or extensively in transactions involving a non-EU- or US-based firm’s acquisition of a European target.133 Nonetheless, there has been no conclusive findings on the absence of protectionism. At most, empirical analyses have shifted the burden of proof to those advancing the view.

Despite these empirical results disproving the use of merger regulation for protectionist purposes, persistent allegations abound. The political model of antitrust established that merger decisions are influenced by political contributions of lobby groups representing special interests, political pressures and social welfare considerations.134 For instance, Bu argues that the decision of Chinese competition authority to block the merger between Coca Cola and Huiyuan illustrates the influence of non-competition considerations such as protectionism on merger regulation enforcement.135 The lack of sufficient analysis as well as broad conclusions reached on the decision left no other conclusion but that China was trying to protect its home-grown, local company from potential brand dilution once absorbed by Coca Cola.136 Another example is the opposition of the US to the potential merger between Broadcom, a Singapore-based company, and Qualcomm, an American telecommunication chip manufacturer, on the grounds of national security.137 In the EU, its opposition to the Boeing/McDonnell Douglas merger was suspected to arise from protectionist sentiment because of the merger’s adverse impact on the rival EU firm Airbus.138

(iv) Export cartels exemption and protectionism

Export cartel exemptions are instruments of competition policy for trade policy ends.139 By tolerating, if not supporting, anticompetitive conduct just because it does not affect the domestic market, exporting states in effect assist or condone the harm caused to the importing states.140 Hence, export cartel exemptions are perceived as tools for protectionism in this context of the beggar-thy-neighbour approach.

In the context of trade policy, export cartel exemptions produce the same economic effect as export subsidies or aids.141 While both harm competition at the expense of foreign markets and foreign competitors, only export subsidies are regulated under the WTO rules.142 However, State-run export cartel are challengeable under WTO rules with different outcomes depending on the State.143 Hence, the difficulty in prosecuting export cartels that have anti-competitive effects is considered a trade dilemma. In Argentina, based on Measures Affecting the Export of Bovine Hides and the Import of Finished Leather,144 the WTO Panel noted that the WTO rules do not obligate its members ‘to assume a full “due diligence” burden to investigate and prevent cartels from functioning as private export restrictions’.145

The United States, through the Webb-Pomerene Act of 1918,146 explicitly exempted export cartels and export association from the Sherman Act147 and from Section 7 of the Clayton Act,148 which has been reinforced by the Export Trading Company Act of 1982149 and the Foreign Trade Antitrust Improvements Act150 which regulated export cartels by granting them certificates. The EU, on the other hand, while it does not explicitly exempt export cartels, Articles 101 and 102 of the TFEU151 provide for the limited application of the EU competition law to conduct that produces anticompetitive effects (objective or subjective) within the internal market and to the trade between Member States. Hence, the EU competition law implicitly allows export cartels if they do not influence the EU internal market.

#### The perception of protectionism-by-antitrust sends shockwaves that end the last semblance of global trade---subtle vehicles like competition law are a unique threat because open protectionism is controlled by international agreements

Allison Murray 19, JD from the Loyola Law School, Los Angeles Law School, BS in Business Administration from the University of Redlands, Judicial Law Clerk at the U.S. Bankruptcy Courts, Former Corporate Paralegal at Boeing, Degree in Economics and Management from the University of Oxford, “Given Today's New Wave of Protectionism, Is Antitrust Law the Last Hope for Preserving a Free Global Economy or Another Nail in Free Trade's Coffin?”, Loyola of Los Angeles International and Comparative Law Review, Volume 42, Number 1, 42 Loy. L.A. Int'l & Comp. L. Rev. 117, Winter 2019, p. 117-119

INTRODUCTION

Trump. Le Pen. Brexit. Protectionist rhetoric has consumed the international political stage. Western countries and their leaders were once the drivers of economic globalization, relying on free-market speeches and the prospect of removing trade barriers to appeal to their constituents. 1They pointed fingers at other countries engaging in or encouraging protectionist behavior and challenged them in the court of public opinion and elsewhere to stop their antics. The "our country first, world trade after" mentality was widely politicized and vilified. Now, it seems that Western national leaders are championing the very protectionism that they once criticized. 2

Although a system of truly free world trade has never been perfected, past world leaders have eliminated most of the protectionist trade mechanisms that once ran rampant in the international economy. They did so by implementing multilateral and bilateral trade agreements. These webs of agreements have bolstered decades of support for free trade, or at least some version of it. By and large, tariff policies and other forms of protectionism were either eliminated or dramatically reduced. [\*118] Now, as we have seen in the media, when a government imposes a tariff, it becomes a rather extreme political statement which sends a shockwave of significant global consequences.

Protectionism did not end when the age of overbearing tariff policies did, despite then-leaders' best efforts to vilify it. Rather, the end of the tariff era forced nations to achieve protectionist goals through more subtle trade vehicles, like antitrust law. 3So, the recent resurgence of protectionist rhetoric should mean that these subtle trade vehicles, including antitrust law, will be relied on more heavily. It is a fear of many that antitrust law may become overused and inequitably applied to achieve and combat protectionist aims.

Notwithstanding the recent uptick in tariff threats, it is unlikely that all Western leaders will revamp or terminate the trade agreements set forth by their predecessors and bring back the kinds of tariff policies that once existed in their place. Although in the United States ("U.S."), President Trump recently imposed tariffs on steel imports, it appears that his intent is to limit this behavior to a specific industry rather than institute a widespread policy favoring the use of tariffs generally. 4To remedy bad behavior in a specialized set of industries is not to instigate a global paradigm shift. This purpose is underscored by his use of the national security exemption, which is largely interpreted as being used for individual situations rather than general policy schemes. 5 Many still hope that his course of action will be retracted and is merely a strong negotiation tactic. However, there is no doubt that Trump is far more comfortable than past leaders with subverting the status quo on trade relations.

Trump is not the only high-profile leader flirting with staunch protectionism. Western leaders in the E.U. appear to be growing more comfortable than their predecessors with considering similar policies. However, Western lawmakers themselves do not seem as persuaded by the statements of their leadership. The general sentiment among international policymakers is that there has been too much political wherewithal spent on loosening international trade barriers to take actions [\*119] that could counteract that progress. 6Presidential actions taken because of dissatisfaction with current global trade relations aside, a complete overhaul of trade agreements may be too daunting and difficult a task, especially absent ample political support in legislative bodies.

Given the anticipated continuation of cooperative trade agreements and the proliferation of protectionist rhetoric as the new norm of public opinion, leaders will be forced to rely on existing avenues to meet protectionist aims. Again, we find ourselves relying squarely on antitrust law, the more subtle and widely accepted mechanism of restricting trade, to address perceived inequities. In the words of the World Trade Organization ("WTO"), "once formal trade barriers come down, other issues become more important." 7 Among the important issues lies antitrust law. Antitrust and competition laws can form a subtle trade barrier resulting in the imposition of tariff-like measures.

Antitrust law can be enforced to reach protectionist aims and to combat them. It is a tool that allows nations to achieve individual protectionist aims without undermining the future of trade between countries and the cooperative framework underpinning the relatively delicate global free trade enjoyed today. However, the perception of enforcement of antitrust laws as an abusive and solely protectionist mechanism may cause the death of even the smallest semblance of international free trade that remains in the international marketplace today.

#### The result will be full-on trade wars

Sean A. Pager 20, Professor at the Michigan State University College of Law, LLM from the European University Institute, JD from the University of California-Berkeley, AB from Harvard University, and Eric Priest, Associate Professor at the University of Oregon School of Law, LLM from Harvard Law School, JD from the Chicago-Kent Illinois Institute of Technology, BA from the University of Minnesota, “Redeeming Globalization Through Unfair Competition Law”, Cardozo Law Review, Volume 41, Number 3, 41 Cardozo L. Rev. 2435, July 2020, Lexis

Yet, even so, it would be unreasonable for every minor violation of a local ordinance overseas to give rise to an unfair competition action in America. Committing to such collateral enforcement of foreign law in such an unqualified manner would be problematic on several levels. Doing so would open the floodgates to transnational claims, clogging the dockets of U.S. courts and agencies. 142It could encourage harassment of foreign competitors, burdening them with the costs and distractions of defending unfair competition claims lodged in a distant U.S. court. And it could also encourage litigation tourism, inviting foreign plaintiffs to forum shop. Finally, use of unfair competition law could be abused for protectionist purposes. Such perceived unilateral aggression could trigger retaliation that risks sparking a larger trade war.

#### Trade wars cause shooting wars that trigger World War III and collapse containment of environmental, disease, and tech threats that cause extinction

Michael F. Oppenheimer 21, Clinical Professor at the Center for Global Affairs at New York University, Senior Consulting Fellow for Scenario Planning at the International Institute for Strategic Studies, Former Executive Vice President at The Futures Group, Member of the Council on Foreign Relations, The Foreign Policy Roundtable at the Carnegie Council on Ethics and International Affairs, and the American Council on Germany, “The Turbulent Future of International Relations”, in The Future of Global Affairs: Managing Discontinuity, Disruption and Destruction, Ed. Ankersen and Sidhu, p. 23-30

Four structural forces will shape the future of International Relations: globalization (but without liberal rules, institutions, and leadership)1; multipolarity (the end of American hegemony and wider distribution of power among states and non-states2); the strengthening of distinctive, national and subnational identities, as persistent cultural differences are accentuated by the disruptive effects of Western style globalization (what Samuel Huntington called the “non-westernization of IR”3); and secular economic stagnation, a product of longer term global decline in birth rates combined with aging populations.4 These structural forces do not determine everything. Environmental events, global health challenges, internal political developments, policy mistakes, technology breakthroughs or failures, will intersect with structure to define our future. But these four structural forces will impact the way states behave, in the capacity of great powers to manage their differences, and to act collectively to settle, rather than exploit, the inevitable shocks of the next decade.

Some of these structural forces could be managed to promote prosperity and avoid war. Multipolarity (inherently more prone to conflict than other configurations of power, given coordination problems)5 plus globalization can work in a world of prosperity, convergent values, and effective conflict management. The Congress of Vienna system achieved relative peace in Europe over a hundred-year period through informal cooperation among multiple states sharing a fear of populist revolution. It ended decisively in 1914. Contemporary neoliberal institutionalists, such as John Ikenberry, accept multipolarity as our likely future, but are confident that globalization with liberal characteristics can be sustained without American hegemony, arguing that liberal values and practices have been fully accepted by states, global institutions, and private actors as imperative for growth and political legitimacy.6 Divergent values plus multipolarity can work, though at significantly lower levels of economic growth-in an autarchic world of isolated units, a world envisioned by the advocates of decoupling, including the current American president. 7 Divergent values plus globalization can be managed by hegemonic power, exemplified by the decade of the 1990s, when the Washington Consensus, imposed by American leverage exerted through the IMF and other U.S. dominated institutions, overrode national differences, but with real costs to those states undergoing “structural adjustment programs,”8 and ultimately at the cost of global growth, as states—especially in Asia—increased their savings to self insure against future financial crises.9

But all four forces operating simultaneously will produce a future of increasing internal polarization and cross border conflict, diminished economic growth and poverty alleviation, weakened global institutions and norms of behavior, and reduced collective capacity to confront emerging challenges of global warming, accelerating technology change, nuclear weapons innovation and proliferation. As in any effective scenario, this future is clearly visible to any keen observer. We have only to abolish wishful thinking and believe our own eyes.10

Secular Stagnation

This unbrave new world has been emerging for some time, as US power has declined relative to other states, especially China, global liberalism has failed to deliver on its promises, and totalitarian capitalism has proven effective in leveraging globalization for economic growth and political legitimacy while exploiting technology and the state’s coercive powers to maintain internal political control. But this new era was jumpstarted by the world financial crisis of 2007, which revealed the bankruptcy of unregulated market capitalism, weakened faith in US leadership, exacerbated economic deprivation and inequality around the world, ignited growing populism, and undermined international liberal institutions. The skewed distribution of wealth experienced in most developed countries, politically tolerated in periods of growth, became intolerable as growth rates declined. A combination of aging populations, accelerating technology, and global populism/nationalism promises to make this growth decline very difficult to reverse. What Larry Summers and other international political economists have come to call “secular stagnation” increases the likelihood that illiberal globalization, multipolarity, and rising nationalism will define our future. Summers11 has argued that the world is entering a long period of diminishing economic growth. He suggests that secular stagnation “may be the defining macroeconomic challenge of our times.” Julius Probst, in his recent assessment of Summers’ ideas, explains:

…rich countries are ageing as birth rates decline and people live longer. This has pushed down real interest rates because investors think these trends will mean they will make lower returns from investing in future, making them more willing to accept a lower return on government debt as a result.

Other factors that make investors similarly pessimistic include rising global inequality and the slowdown in productivity growth…

This decline in real interest rates matters because economists believe that to overcome an economic downturn, a central bank must drive down the real interest rate to a certain level to encourage more spending and investment… Because real interest rates are so low, Summers and his supporters believe that the rate required to reach full employment is so far into negative territory that it is effectively impossible.

…in the long run, more immigration might be a vital part of curing secular stagnation. Summers also heavily prescribes increased government spending, arguing that it might actually be more prudent than cutting back – especially if the money is spent on infrastructure, education and research and development.

Of course, governments in Europe and the US are instead trying to shut their doors to migrants. And austerity policies have taken their toll on infrastructure and public research. This looks set to ensure that the next recession will be particularly nasty when it comes… Unless governments change course radically, we could be in for a sobering period ahead.12

The rise of nationalism/populism is both cause and effect of this economic outlook. Lower growth will make every aspect of the liberal order more difficult to resuscitate post-Trump. Domestic politics will become more polarized and dysfunctional, as competition for diminishing resources intensifies. International collaboration, ad hoc or through institutions, will become politically toxic. Protectionism, in its multiple forms, will make economic recovery from “secular stagnation” a heavy lift, and the liberal hegemonic leadership and strong institutions that limited the damage of previous downturns, will be unavailable. A clear demonstration of this negative feedback loop is the economic damage being inflicted on the world by Trump’s trade war with China, which— despite the so-called phase one agreement—has predictably escalated from negotiating tactic to imbedded reality, with no end in sight. In a world already suffering from inadequate investment, the uncertainties generated by this confrontation will further curb the investments essential for future growth. Another demonstration of the intersection of structural forces is how populist-motivated controls on immigration (always a weakness in the hyper-globalization narrative) deprives developed countries of Summers’ recommended policy response to secular stagnation, which in a more open world would be a win-win for rich and poor countries alike, increasing wage rates and remittance revenues for the developing countries, replenishing the labor supply for rich countries experiencing low birth rates.

Illiberal Globalization

Economic weakness and rising nationalism (along with multipolarity) will not end globalization, but will profoundly alter its character and greatly reduce its economic and political benefits. Liberal global institutions, under American hegemony, have served multiple purposes, enabling states to improve the quality of international relations and more fully satisfy the needs of their citizens, and provide companies with the legal and institutional stability necessary to manage the inherent risks of global investment. But under present and future conditions these institutions will become the battlegrounds—and the victims—of geopolitical competition. The Trump Administration’s frontal attack on multilateralism is but the final nail in the coffin of the Bretton Woods system in trade and finance, which has been in slow but accelerating decline since the end of the Cold War. Future American leadership may embrace renewed collaboration in global trade and finance, macroeconomic management, environmental sustainability and the like, but repairing the damage requires the heroic assumption that America’s own identity has not been fundamentally altered by the Trump era (four years or eight matters here), and by the internal and global forces that enabled his rise. The fact will remain that a sizeable portion of the American electorate, and a monolithically pro- Trump Republican Party, is committed to an illiberal future. And even if the effects are transitory, the causes of weakening global collaboration are structural, not subject to the efforts of some hypothetical future US liberal leadership. It is clear that the US has lost respect among its rivals, and trust among its allies. While its economic and military capacity is still greatly superior to all others, its political dysfunction has diminished its ability to convert this wealth into effective power.13 It will furthermore operate in a future system of diffusing material power, diverging economic and political governance approaches, and rising nationalism. Trump has promoted these forces, but did not invent them, and future US Administrations will struggle to cope with them.

What will illiberal globalization look like? Consider recent events. The instruments of globalization have been weaponized by strong states in pursuit of their geopolitical objectives. This has turned the liberal argument on behalf of globalization on its head. Instead of interdependence as an unstoppable force pushing states toward collaboration and convergence around market-friendly domestic policies, states are exploiting interdependence to inflict harm on their adversaries, and even on their allies. The increasing interaction across national boundaries that globalization entails, now produces not harmonization and cooperation, but friction and escalating trade and investment disputes.14 The Trump Administration is in the lead here, but it is not alone. Trade and investment friction with China is the most obvious and damaging example, precipitated by China’s long failure to conform to the World Trade Organization (WTO) principles, now escalated by President Trump into a trade and currency war disturbingly reminiscent of the 1930s that Bretton Woods was designed to prevent. Financial sanctions against Iran, in violation of US obligations in the Joint Comprehensive Plan Of Action (JCPOA), is another example of the rule of law succumbing to geopolitical competition. Though more mercantilist in intent than geopolitical, US tariffs on steel and aluminum, and their threatened use in automotives, aimed at the EU, Canada, and Japan,15 are equally destructive of the liberal system and of future economic growth, imposed as they are by the author of that system, and will spread to others. And indeed, Japan has used export controls in its escalating conflict with South Korea16 (as did China in imposing controls on rare earth,17 and as the US has done as part of its trade war with China). Inward foreign direct investment restrictions are spreading. The vitality of the WTO is being sapped by its inability to complete the Doha Round, by the proliferation of bilateral and regional agreements, and now by the Trump Administration’s hold on appointments to WTO judicial panels. It should not surprise anyone if, during a second term, Trump formally withdrew the US from the WTO. At a minimum it will become a “dead letter regime.”18

As such measures gain traction, it will become clear to states—and to companies—that a global trading system more responsive to raw power than to law entails escalating risk and diminishing benefits. This will be the end of economic globalization, and its many benefits, as we know it. It represents nothing less than the subordination of economic globalization, a system which many thought obeyed its own logic, to an international politics of zero-sum power competition among multiple actors with divergent interests and values. The costs will be significant: Bloomberg Economics estimates that the cost in lost US GDP in 2019- dollar terms from the trade war with China has reached $134 billion to date and will rise to a total of $316 billion by the end of 2020.19 Economically, the just-in-time, maximally efficient world of global supply chains, driving down costs, incentivizing innovation, spreading investment, integrating new countries and populations into the global system, is being Balkanized. Bilateral and regional deals are proliferating, while global, nondiscriminatory trade agreements are at an end.

Economies of scale will shrink, incentivizing less investment, increasing costs and prices, compromising growth, marginalizing countries whose growth and poverty reduction depended on participation in global supply chains. A world already suffering from excess savings (in the corporate sector, among mostly Asian countries) will respond to heightened risk and uncertainty with further retrenchment. The problem is perfectly captured by Tim Boyle, CEO of Columbia Sportswear, whose supply chain runs through China, reacting to yet another ratcheting up of US tariffs on Chinese imports, most recently on consumer goods:

We move stuff around to take advantage of inexpensive labor. That’s why we’re in Bangladesh. That’s why we’re looking at Africa. We’re putting investment capital to work, to get a return for our shareholders. So, when we make a wager on investment, this is not Vegas. We have to have a reasonable expectation we can get a return. That’s predicated on the rule of law: where can we expect the laws to be enforced, and for the foreseeable future, the rules will be in place? That’s what America used to be.20

The international political effects will be equally damaging. The four structural forces act on each other to produce the more dangerous, less prosperous world projected here. Illiberal globalization represents geopolitical conflict by (at first) physically non-kinetic means. It arises from intensifying competition among powerful states with divergent interests and identities, but in its effects drives down growth and fuels increased nationalism/populism, which further contributes to conflict. Twenty-first-century protectionism represents bottom-up forces arising from economic disruption. But it is also a top-down phenomenon, representing a strategic effort by political leadership to reduce the constraints of interdependence on freedom of geopolitical action, in effect a precursor and enabler of war. This is the disturbing hypothesis of Daniel Drezner, argued in an important May 2019 piece in Reason, titled “Will Today’s Global Trade Wars Lead to World War Three,”21 which examines the pre- World War I period of heightened trade conflict, its contribution to the disaster that followed, and its parallels to the present:

Before the First World War started, powers great and small took a variety of steps to thwart the globalization of the 19th century. Each of these steps made it easier for the key combatants to conceive of a general war. We are beginning to see a similar approach to the globalization of the 21st century. One by one, the economic constraints on military aggression are eroding. And too many have forgotten—or never knew—how this played out a century ago.

…In many ways, 19th century globalization was a victim of its own success. Reduced tariffs and transport costs flooded Europe with inexpensive grains from Russia and the United States. The incomes of landowners in these countries suffered a serious hit, and the Long Depression that ran from 1873 until 1896 generated pressure on European governments to protect against cheap imports.

…The primary lesson to draw from the years before 1914 is not that economic interdependence was a weak constraint on military conflict. It is that, even in a globalized economy, governments can take protectionist actions to reduce their interdependence in anticipation of future wars. In retrospect, the 30 years of tariff hikes, trade wars, and currency conflicts that preceded 1914 were harbingers of the devastation to come. European governments did not necessarily want to ignite a war among the great powers. By reducing their interdependence, however, they made that option conceivable.

…the backlash to globalization that preceded the Great War seems to be reprised in the current moment. Indeed, there are ways in which the current moment is scarier than the pre-1914 era. Back then, the world’s hegemon, the United Kingdom, acted as a brake on economic closure. In 2019, the United States is the protectionist with its foot on the accelerator. The constraints of Sino-American interdependence—what economist Larry Summers once called “the financial balance of terror”—no longer look so binding. And there are far too many hot spots—the Korean peninsula, the South China Sea, Taiwan—where the kindling seems awfully dry.

#### Proxy conflicts will escalate globally---nuclear war

David Kampf 20, Senior PhD Fellow at the Center for Strategic Studies at The Fletcher School, MA in International Affairs from Columbia University, BA in Political Science from Bates College, “How COVID-19 Could Increase the Risk of War”, World Politics Review, 6/16/2020, https://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/28843/how-covid-19-could-increase-the-risk-of-war

But that overlooked the ways in which the risk of interstate war was already rising before COVID-19 began to spread. Civil wars were becoming more numerous, lasting longer and attracting more outside involvement, with dangerous consequences for stability in many regions of the world. And the global dynamics most commonly cited to explain the falling incidence of interstate war—democracy, economic prosperity, international cooperation and others—were being upended.

If the spread of democracy kept the peace, then its global decline is unnerving. If globalization and economic interdependence kept the peace, then a looming global depression and the rise of nationalism and protectionism are disconcerting. If regional and global institutions kept the peace, then their degradation is unsettling. If the balance of nuclear weapons kept the peace, then growing risks of proliferation are disquieting. And if America’s preeminent power kept the peace, then its relative decline is troubling.

Now, the pandemic, or more specifically the world’s reaction to it, is revealing the extent to which the factors holding major wars in check are withering. The idea that war between nations is a relic of the past no longer seems so convincing.

The Pessimists Strike Back

More than any other individual, it was cognitive scientist Steven Pinker who popularized the idea that we are living in the most peaceful moment in human history. Starting with his 2011 bestseller, “The Better Angels of Our Nature: Why Violence Has Declined,” Pinker argued that the frequency, duration and lethality of wars between great powers have all decreased. In his 2019 book, “Enlightenment Now: The Case for Reason, Science, Humanism, and Progress,” he wrote that war “between the uniformed armies of two nation-states appears to be obsolescent. There have been no more than three in any year since 1945, none in most years since 1989, and none since the American-led invasion of Iraq in 2003.”

Optimists like Pinker held that, rather than the world falling apart, as a quick glance at headline news might suggest, the opposite was true: Humanity was flourishing. More regions are characterized by peace; fewer mass killings are occurring; governance and the rule of law are improving; and people are richer, healthier, better educated and happier than ever before.

In their book, “Clear and Present Safety: The World Has Never Been Better and Why That Matters to Americans,” Michael A. Cohen and Micah Zenko argued that the evidence is so overwhelming that it is difficult to argue against the idea that wars between great powers, and all other interstate wars, are becoming vanishingly rare. Even when wars do break out, they tend to be shorter and less deadly than they were in the past. John Mueller, a senior fellow at the Cato Institute, also reasoned that the idea of war, like slavery and dueling before it, was in terminal decline, while Joshua Goldstein, an international relations researcher at American University, credited the United Nations and the rise of peacekeeping operations for helping win the “war on war.”

But in recent years, a range of critics have begun to poke holes in these arguments. Tanisha M. Fazal, an international relations professor at the University of Minnesota, contends that the decline in war is overstated. Major advances in medicine, speedier evacuations of wounded soldiers from the field of battle and better armor have made war less fatal—but not necessarily less frequent. Fazal and Paul Poast, who is at the University of Chicago, further assert that the notion of war between great powers as a thing of the past is based on the assumption that all such conflicts resemble World War I and II—both are historical anomalies—and overlooks the actual wars fought between great powers since 1945, from the Korean War and the Vietnam War to proxy wars from Afghanistan to Ukraine. Meanwhile, Bear F. Braumoeller, an Ohio State political science professor, analyzed the same historical data on conflicts used by Pinker, Mueller and Goldstein, and found no general downward trend in either the initiation or deadliness of warfare over the past two centuries. What’s more, Braumoeller contends that the so-called “long peace”—the 75 years that have passed without systemic war since World War II—is far from invulnerable, and that wars are just as likely to escalate now as they used to be. Just because a major interstate war hasn’t happened for a long time, doesn’t mean it never will again. In all probability, it will.

And by focusing solely on interstate wars, the optimists miss half the story, at least. Wars between states have declined, but civil wars never disappeared—and these internal conflicts could easily escalate into regional or global wars.

The number of conflicts in the world reached its highest point since World War II in 2016, with 53 state-based armed conflicts in 37 countries. All but two of these conflicts were considered civil wars. To make matters worse, new studies have shown that civil wars are becoming longer, deadlier and harder to conclusively end, and that these internal conflicts are not really internal. Civil wars harm the economies and stability of neighboring countries, since armed groups, refugees, illicit goods and diseases all spill over borders. Some 10 million refugees have fled to other countries since 2012. The countries that now host them are more likely to experience war, which means states with huge refugee populations like Lebanon, Jordan and Turkey face legitimate security challenges. Even after the threat of violence has diminished in refugees’ countries of origin, return migration can reignite conflicts, repeating the brutal cycle.

A Yugoslav Federal Army tank.

Perhaps most importantly, recent research indicates that civil wars increase the risk of interstate war, in large part because they are attracting more and more outside involvement. In a 2008 paper, researchers Kristian Skrede Gleditsch, Idean Salehyan and Kenneth Schultz explained that, in addition to the spillover effects, two other factors in civil wars increase international tensions and could possibly provoke wider interstate wars: external interventions in support of rebel groups and regime attacks on insurgents across international borders.

Immediately after the Cold War, none of the ongoing civil wars around the world were internationalized. According to the Uppsala Conflict Data Program, there were 12 full-fledged civil wars in 1991—in Afghanistan, Iraq, Peru, Sri Lanka, Sudan, and elsewhere—and foreign militaries were not active on the ground in any of them. Last year, by contrast, every single full-fledged civil war involved external military participants. This is due, in part, to the huge growth in U.S. military interventions abroad into civil conflicts, but it’s not only the Americans. All of today’s major wars are in essence proxy wars, pitting external rivals against one another. Conflicts in Syria, Yemen and Libya are best understood not as civil wars, but as international warzones, attracting meddlers including the United States, Russia, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, Iran, France and many others, which often intervene not to build peace, but to resolve conflicts in a way that is favorable to their own interests. These internationalized wars are more lethal, harder to resolve and possibly more likely to recur than civil wars that remain localized. It is not that difficult to imagine how these conflicts could spark wider international conflagrations. Wars, after all, can quickly spiral out of control.

As Risks Increase, Deterrents Decline

To make matters worse, most of the global trends that explained why interstate war had decreased in recent decades are now reversing. The theories that democracy, prosperity, cooperation and other factors kept the peace have been much debated—but if there was any truth to them, their reversals are likely to increase the chance of war, irrespective of how long the coronavirus pandemic lasts.

Democracy is often considered a prophylactic for war. Fully democratic countries are less likely to experience civil war and rarely, if ever, go to war with other democracies—though, of course, they do still go to war against non-democracies. While this would be great news if democracy and pluralism were spreading, there have now been 14 consecutive years of global democratic decline, and there have been signs of additional authoritarian power grabs in countries like Hungary and Serbia during the pandemic. If democracy backslides far enough, internal conflicts and foreign aggression will become more likely.

Other theories posit that economic bonds between countries have limited wars in recent decades. Dale Copeland, a professor of international relations at the University of Virginia, has argued that countries work to preserve ties when there are high expectations for future trade, but war becomes increasingly possible when trade is predicted to fall. If globalization brought peace, the recent wave of far-right nationalism and populism around the world may increase the chances of war, as tariffs and other trade barriers go up—mostly from the United States under President Donald Trump, who has launched trade wars with allies and adversaries alike.

The coronavirus pandemic immediately elicited further calls to reduce dependence on other countries, with Trump using the opportunity to pressure U.S. companies to reconfigure their supply chains away from China. For its part, China made sure that it had the homemade supplies it needed to fight the virus before exporting extras, while countries like France and Germany barred the export of face masks, even to friendly nations. And widening economic inequalities, a consequence of the pandemic, are not likely to enhance support for free trade.

This assault on open trade and globalization is just one aspect of a decaying liberal international order, which, its proponents argue, has largely helped to preserve peace between nations since World War II. But that old order is almost gone, and in all likelihood isn’t coming back. The U.N. Security Council appears increasingly fragmented and dysfunctional. Even before Trump, the world’s most powerful country ratified fewer treaties per year under the Obama administration than at any time since 1945.

Trump’s presidency only harms multilateral cooperation further. He has backed out of the Paris Agreement on climate change, reneged on the Iran nuclear deal, picked fights with allies, questioned the value of NATO and defunded the World Health Organization in the middle of a global health crisis. Hyper-nationalism, rather than international collaboration, was the default response to the coronavirus outbreak in the U.S. and many other countries around the world.

It’s hard to see the U.S. reluctance to lead as anything other than a sign of its inevitable, if slow, decline. The country’s institutionalized inequalities and systemic racism have been laid bare in recent months, and it no longer looks like a beacon for others to follow. The global balance of power is changing. China is both keen to assert a greater leadership role within traditionally Western-led institutions and to challenge the existing regional order in Asia. Between a rising China, revanchist Russia and new global actors, including non-state groups, we may be heading toward an increasingly multipolar or nonpolar world, which could prove destabilizing in its own right.

Finally, the pacifying effect of nuclear weapons could be waning. While vast nuclear arsenals once compelled the United States and the Soviet Union to reach arms control agreements, old treaties are expiring and new talks are breaking down. Mistrust is growing, and the chance of an unwanted U.S.-Russia nuclear confrontation is arguably as high as it has been since the Cuban missile crisis.

The theory of nuclear peace may no longer hold if more countries are tempted to obtain their own nuclear deterrent. Trump’s decision to abandon the Iran nuclear deal, for one thing, has only increased the chance that Tehran will acquire nuclear weapons. It’s almost easy to forget that, just a few short months ago, the United States and Iran were one miscalculation or dumb mistake away from waging all-out war. And despite Trump’s efforts to negotiate nuclear disarmament with Kim Jong Un’s regime in Pyongyang, it is wishful thinking to believe North Korea will give up its nuclear weapons. At this point, negotiators can only realistically try to ensure that North Korea’s nuclear menace doesn’t get even more potent.

In other words, by turning inward, the United States is choosing to leave other countries to fend for themselves. The end result may be a less stable world with more nuclear actors.

If leaders are smart, they will take seriously the warning signs exposed by this global emergency and work to reverse the drift toward war.

If only one of these theories for peace were worsening, concerns would be easier to dismiss. But together, they are unsettling. While the world is not yet on the brink of World War III and no two countries are destined for war, the odds of avoiding future conflicts don’t look good.

The pandemic is already degrading democracies, harming economies and curtailing international cooperation, and it also seems to be fostering internal instability within states. Rachel Brown, Heather Hurlburt and Alexandra Stark argue that the coronavirus could in fact sow more civil conflict. If this proves accurate, the increase in civil wars is likely to lead to more external meddling, and these next proxy wars could soon precipitate all-out international conflicts if outsiders aren’t careful. With the usual deterrents to conflict declining around the world, major wars could soon return.

#### Recent, robust studies prove our impact

Julian Adorney 20, Contributing Writer at the Hinrich Foundation, Young Voices Advocate, Senior SEO Analyst for Colorado SEO Pros, Writing Appeared at The Federalist, Fox Nation, The Hill, and the Mises Institute, BA from the University of Colorado, Boulder, “Want Peace? Promote Free Trade”, Hinrich Foundation for Advancing Sustainable Free Trade, 9/10/2020, https://www.hinrichfoundation.com/research/tradevistas/sustainable/trade-and-peace/

Why does protectionism lead to conflict and why does free trade help prevent it? Learn about the connection between peace and free trade.

Frédéric Bastiat famously claimed that “if goods don’t cross borders, soldiers will.”

Bastiat argued that free trade between countries could reduce international conflict because trade forges connections between nations and gives each country an incentive to avoid war with its trading partners. If every nation were an economic island, the lack of positive interaction created by trade could leave more room for conflict. Two hundred years after Bastiat, libertarians take this idea as gospel. Unfortunately, not everyone does. But as recent research shows, the historical evidence confirms Bastiat’s famous claim.

To trade or to raid

In “Peace through Trade or Free Trade?” professor Patrick J. McDonald, from the University of Texas at Austin, empirically tested whether greater levels of protectionism in a country (tariffs, quotas, etc.) would increase the probability of international conflict in that nation. He used a tool called dyads to analyze every country’s international relations from 1960 until 2000. A dyad is the interaction between one country and another country: German and French relations would be one dyad, German and Russian relations would be a second, French and Australian relations would be a third. He further broke this down into dyad-years; the relations between Germany and France in 1965 would be one dyad-year, the relations between France and Australia in 1973 would be a second, and so on.

Using these dyad-years, McDonald analyzed the behavior of every country in the world for the past 40 years. His analysis showed a negative correlation between free trade and conflict: The more freely a country trades, the fewer wars it engages in. Countries that engage in free trade are less likely to invade and less likely to be invaded.

Trading partners

The causal arrow

Of course, this finding might be a matter of confusing correlation for causation. Maybe countries engaging in free trade fight less often for some other reason, like the fact that they tend also to be more democratic. Democratic countries make war less often than empires do. But McDonald controls for these variables. Controlling for a state’s political structure is important, because democracies and republics tend to fight less than authoritarian regimes.

McDonald also controlled for a country’s economic growth, because countries in a recession are more likely to go to war than those in a boom, often in order to distract their people from their economic woes. McDonald even controlled for factors like geographic proximity: It’s easier for Germany and France to fight each other than it is for the United States and China, because troops in the former group only have to cross a shared border.

The takeaway from McDonald’s analysis is that protectionism can actually lead to conflict. McDonald found that a country in the bottom 10 percent for protectionism (meaning it is less protectionist than 90 percent of other countries) is 70 percent less likely to engage in a new conflict (either as invader or as target) than one in the top 10 percent for protectionism.



#### Protectionist fragmentation causes catastrophic geoengineering

Dr. Suzanne Fry 21, Director of the Strategic Futures Group at the National Intelligence Council (NIC), Ph.D. in Politics from New York University, B.A. in Government and International Studies from the University of Notre Dame, Member of the Council on Foreign Relations, et al., “Global Trends 2040: A More Contested World”, A Publication of the National Intelligence Council, March 2021, https://www.dni.gov/files/ODNI/documents/assessments/GlobalTrends\_2040.pdf

In 2040, the world is fragmented into several economic and security blocs of varying size and strength, centered on the United States, China, the European Union (EU), Russia, and a few regional powers, and focused on self-sufficiency, resiliency, and defense. Information flows within separate cyber-sovereign enclaves, supply chains are reoriented, and international trade is disrupted. Vulnerable developing countries are caught in the middle with some on the verge of becoming failed states. Global problems, notably climate change, are spottily addressed, if at all.

HOW WE GOT THERE

By the early 2030s, cascading global challenges from decades of job losses in some countries in part because of globalization, heated trade disputes, and health and terrorist threats crossing borders prompted states to raise barriers and impose trade restrictions to conserve resources, protect citizens, and preserve domestic industries. Many economists thought that economic decoupling or separation could not really happen because of the extensive interdependence of supply chains, economies, and technology, but security concerns and governance disputes helped drive countries to do the unthinkable, despite the extraordinary costs.

Countries with large domestic markets or sizeable neighbors successfully redirected their economies, but many developing economies with limited resources and market access were hit hard as both import and export markets dried up. Economic stagnation fostered widespread insecurity across Africa, the Middle East, and South Asia, fueling a retreat to subnational ethnic and religious identities, strained societies, fragmented states, and spreading instability. New waves of migrants headed to the developed world hoping to escape poverty, poor governance, and increasingly harsh environmental conditions. Their hopes were dashed when political pushback prompted destination countries to block most migration.

As physical barriers went up, dependence on digital commerce and communications soared, but a combination of information management challenges and repeated data security breaches led those states with strong cyber controls, like China and Iran, to reinforce their cyber barricades. Then states that once advocated for an open Internet set up new closed, protected networks to limit threats and screen out unwanted ideas. By 2040, only the United States and a few of its closest allies maintained the semblance of an open Internet while most of the world operated behind strong firewalls. With the trade and financial connections that defined the prior era of globalization disrupted, economic and security blocs formed around the United States, China, the EU, Russia, and India. Smaller powers and other states joined these blocs for protection, to pool resources, and to maintain at least some economic efficiencies. Advances in AI, energy technologies, and additive manufacturing helped some states adapt and make the blocs economically viable, but prices for consumer goods rose dramatically. States unable to join a bloc were left behind and cut off.

Security links did not disappear completely. States threatened by powerful neighbors sought out security links with other powers for their own protection or accelerated their own programs to develop nuclear weapons, as the ultimate guarantor of their security. Small conflicts occurred at the edges of these new blocs, particularly over scarce resources or emerging opportunities, like the Arctic and space. Poorer countries became increasingly unstable, and with no interest by major powers or the United Nations in intervening to help restore order, conflicts became endemic, exacerbating other problems. Lacking coordinated, multilateral efforts to mitigate emissions and address climate changes, little was done to slow greenhouse gas emissions, and some states experimented with geoengineering with disastrous consequences.

#### Extinction

Dr. Catherine E. Richards 21, Professor in the Department of Engineering at the University of Cambridge, Dr. Rick C. Lupton, Lecturer in Mechanical Engineering at the University of Bath, PhD from the University of Cambridge, and Dr. Julian M. Allwood, Professor of Engineering and the Environment at the University of Cambridge, “Re-Framing the Threat of Global Warming: An Empirical Causal Loop Diagram of Climate Change, Food Insecurity and Societal Collapse”, Climatic Change, Volume 149, Springer

Comprehensive surveys of X-risks reveal mechanisms that could cause the collapse of contemporary society. Bostrom and Ćirković (2008), Rees (2018) and Ord (2020) provide eminent scholarly treatment of the field, drawing from the academic literature. WEF (2020) and GCF (2020) produce global risk reports drawing from decision-makers and experts across intergovernmental and non-governmental organisations. These surveys establish that many historically observed mechanisms of societal collapse, including natural climate change, remain applicable as X-risks today. However, the state of existence of contemporary society has led to a different landscape in which these mechanisms apply, and to a number of unprecedented mechanisms, including anthropogenic climate change. Ehrlich and Ehrlich (2013) and Häggström (2016) note that although increased complexity, such as globalisation and technological advancement, can increase a society’s resilience and adaptability, it can also increase vulnerability. For example, globalisation increases resilience to local agricultural production shocks through access to global markets; however, it also increases vulnerability through exposure to sudden reversal in connectivity, such as trade restrictions (Rivington et al. 2015). Some geoengineering technologies, for example, may enable society to mitigate and adapt to climate change; however, they may also increase vulnerability to termination shocks, where failure of the technology exposes society to sudden temperature increases (Morton 2016). In this highly interconnected landscape, ‘synchronous’ (Homer-Dixon et al. 2015) and ‘cascading’ (Buldyrev et al. 2010) failures create the potential for mechanisms and outcomes of societal collapse, once contained to a single localised civilization, to rapidly spread across multiple nations and impact humanity on a global scale.

#### It also causes nuclear war

Dr. Duncan McLaren 21, Professor in Practice at the Lancaster Environment Centre, PhD from Lancaster University, MBA from the University of Cambridge, MSc in Rural Resources and Environmental Policy from the University of London, and Dr. Olaf Corry, Professor of Global Security Challenges at the University of Leeds, PhD in International Relations at the University of Copenhagen, MPhil in Politics and Sociology from the University of Cambridge, “Clash of Geofutures and the Remaking of Planetary Order: Faultlines Underlying Conflicts Over Geoengineering Governance”, Global Policy, Volume 12, Issue S1, April 2021, Wiley

Interestingly, most modellers’ expectations of *real-world deployment* of geoengineering echo the situated narrative more than idealised modelling. For one, the speed of SRM makes it likely to be considered as climate impacts intensify, but winning intergovernmental agreement would likely require ‘tying it up in ongoing diplomacy – trade, military cooperation etc.’ (MB:6). Others noted that ‘unilateral efforts would likely be suppressed, by trade sanctions or military threats’ (MC:2), or ‘would risk political crisis in a world of increasing nationalist division’ (MG:2), yet still expect ‘incremental, unilateral, ungoverned geoengineering’ driven by local impacts (ME:4) or even ‘as a tool of political diplomacy … countries might deploy SRM as a way to extract justice from the international community, even deliberately aiming to negatively affect perceived climate villains’ (MA:7).

Thus, in the situated geofuture ‘geoengineering’ is not simply a set of devices but an integrated part of a world-historical system, best understood, not just through climate modelling and economic theory but through disciplines of history, political economy and even religion. The notion of ‘governance’ envisaged by situated future practices is more comprehensive, going beyond state level agreements to depend effectively on a transformational process of reducing power imbalances and addressing justice beyond only impact attribution and cost distribution.

The pragmatist geofuture

If the idealised geofuture foregrounds truth-making and the situated prioritises world-making, the *pragmatist* focuses on action-making, moving issues of uncertainty and precaution centre-stage in a multi-level world of complexity and uncertainty, where truth is subject to interpretation and negotiation. Those exhibiting this position (including many negotiators) take a precautionary stance regarding both the material and political side-effects of geoengineering, and treat models as merely one means of inquiry about the future. They recognise the value of more situated assessment, not just the idealised view of the IPCC, and apply a pragmatic view of governance as potentially either constraining or enabling for technologies. Questions of fairness are part of their assessments, albeit most strongly in relation to procedural questions.

Where the other geofutures consider climate science somehow capable of precision (either in tailoring geoengineering or controlling it for vested interests) the pragmatist understands science as itself also a source of risk. Those countries supportive of a UNEA assessment of geoengineering highlighted uncertainties about side-effects, and the risks of geoengineering undermining mitigation. Geoengineering technology:

must be treated with precaution regarding potential negative impacts on the environment or other peoples. If it’s possible to use safely … and without undermining emissions reduction, then it would be OK. But it shouldn’t be used as a substitute. (NF:3)

For another state delegate SRM is ‘deeply concerning’ but the uncertainties about the stability of the climate system mean that … ‘[still] we are not ready to reject it entirely’ (NE:1).

A key pragmatist aim at UNEA was to build on (or not undermine) existing precautionary governance. One Southern delegate highlighted a choice between upholding precaution, and relaxing control, arguing in favour of ‘governance to strengthen the precautionary principle, to confirm the CBD decisions’ (ND:1). Another delegate carefully separated their own opinion from their official, more neutral, line: ‘Personally, I see geoengineering (especially SRM/Stratospheric Aerosol Injection (SAI) as “very scary” and it should be governed on a precautionary basis’ (NC:1).

This emphasis on uncertainty and risk emanating from the scientific knowledge-production means that action-making matters. Research might be usefully conducted, but is not inevitably separate from the risks of potential deployment. Supporters of the resolution called for ‘norms and regulations, not just voluntary projects … It’s like the human rights regime. The declaration [the Universal Declaration on Human Rights (UDHR)] isn’t enough, it needs regulation to implement it’ (NB:1). Governance is needed ‘because of the likelihood of transboundary impacts, and worries about geoengineering as a security issue’. This applies to CDR at scale as well as SRM: ‘It’s also of international significance if a country tries to substitute CDR for emissions reductions’ (NB:2).

In the pragmatist geofuture the multiplicity of the international is neither assumed away nor reduced to ‘Northern domination’. Rather, it demands inclusion of diverse actors in action-making: ‘With a magic wand, I’d … emphasise governance in a UNEA report. The process should also involve civil society. We share the same planet, and should work together for the benefits of the environment’ (NF:4). Discriminating governance of geoengineering (and research into it) is understood pragmatically as needed both: ‘to constrain geoengineering in the face of side effects or irreversible effects … [or to] constrain unilateral use by a large power, which could trigger wider conflicts between nuclear-armed states’ (NE:2), and ‘alternatively to enable it in the face of imminent climate crisis’ (NE:3) or to avoid the risk that, like essential drugs, without global governance ‘techniques like SRM will get into private hands, and thus be less accessible in case of need’ (NE:4). For other delegates, while CDR was seen to merit a precautionary approach, other geoengineering approaches might be ‘ruled out following assessment’ (NB:3).

### 1AC---Plan

#### Plan

#### The United States federal government should prohibit anticompetitive private cartel practices not authorized by an internationally-agreed framework of cooperation regarding competition law.

### 1AC---Harmonization ADV

#### Advantage Two is HARMONIZATION

#### The plan multilateralizes antitrust---formalizing law under international frameworks for contingent cooperation creates an opt-in system of explicit reciprocity that creates agreement AND spills over to deep economic integration

Dr. Daniel Francis 21, Climenko Fellow and Lecturer on Law at Harvard Law School, Doctorate of Laws Degree from the NYU School of Law, Master of Laws Degree from Harvard University, JD from Trinity College at Cambridge University, Former Deputy Director of the Federal Trade Commission, “Choices and Consequences: Internationalizing Competition Policy after TPP”, in Megaregulation Contested: The Global Economic Order After TPP, Ed. Kingsbury, Revised 8/26/2021, p. 40-48

B. Between Contracts and Networks: Frameworks

Another dichotomy that dominates the integration of competition policy pertains to the forms of internationalization, which in the competition policy space have generally been dominated by contract-style treaties on the one hand and by open networks on the other.166 Between these two models lies what seems to be an under-utilized alternative, which I call a “framework for contingent cooperation.”

[FOOTNOTE] 166 This binary view dominates the literature. See, e.g., Edward M. Graham, “Internationalizing” Competition Policy: An Assessment of the Two Main Alternatives, 48 Antitrust Bull. 947, 949 (2003) (“[M]echanisms [for antitrust internationalization] range from bilateral treaties creating arrangements for cooperation between or among national competition law enforcement agencies to informal working arrangements among agencies.”); Eleanor M. Fox, International Antitrust and the Doha Dome, 43 Va. J. Int’l L. 911, 912 (2003) (contrasting “horizontalism” with “globalism”); Anu Piilola, Assessing Theories of Global Governance: A Case Study of International Antitrust Regulation, 39 Stan. J. Int'l L. 207, 247 (2003) (“Rather than drafting overarching multilateral agreements on antitrust laws, cooperation efforts in the immediate future are more likely to succeed in managing existing diversity and promoting voluntary convergence based on approximation of domestically applied standards. Networks of antitrust authorities are well-suited to facilitate this process of cooperation and voluntary convergence.”). [END FOOTNOTE]

A “framework” in the sense that I am using that term is a facilitative arrangement that does not constitute a treaty under international law,167 and which does not carry the charge of international legal obligation, but which involves an exchange of specific and reciprocally contingent commitments by participant jurisdictions to engage in mutually beneficial conduct. Specifically, each party states that it will extend certain benefits to each other party so long as each other does likewise; the parties may also create supplementary mechanisms to monitor and/or adjudicate compliance with these commitments.168

A framework of this kind is not a treaty: it is what Kal Raustiala calls a “pledge,”169 and what Charles Lipson calls an “informal” agreement,170 involving no legal obligation, and it involves no commitment of the parties’ reputation for law-abiding behavior.171 On the other hand, it differs from an open, information-sharing network because it precisely specifies behavioral commitments, and because each of the parties shares an understanding that concrete consequences will promptly follow—exclusion from the benefits provided by others—if its behavior materially deviates from the terms of the commitment.172 A framework is therefore essentially a specific declaration of intention to engage in conduct that benefits others, contingent upon parallel behavior by other participating states, without obligatory status under international law.

This is, in some sense, the direct opposite of the approach typically taken in competition policy chapters in trade agreements. The provisions of competition policy chapters partake of the substance of treaty law, but are generally framed in broad terms rather than specifics, and generally do not reflect a shared understanding that specific consequences will attend breach. By contrast, frameworks do not bind in international law, are framed in specific terms than aspirational generalities, and reflect an understanding that the benefits of cooperation will be withdrawn in the event of violation.

Contingent cooperation thus depends for its effectiveness primarily upon three important dynamics. The first and most important of these is the rationality of strategic cooperation. A familiar mainstream view holds that to a significant extent states behave in international society in ways that rationally serve their interests.173 And when cooperation over a series of interactions is overall in the interests of each member of a group, but when each member faces a rational incentive to defect from the terms of cooperation in individual cases, familiar economic theory teaches that a strategic cooperative equilibrium can be maintained among the parties.174 In contingent cooperation, each party understands that if it defects materially from the terms of the framework, the other participants will withdraw the excludable benefits of cooperation, and this provides the incentive to comply.175

Contingent cooperation can be made more stable by the introduction of certain structures designed to monitor compliance (just as with a cartel among private companies).176 This might among other things involve the creation of a central “facilitator” that is responsible, in a general sense, for obtaining, collecting, and processing information necessary to sustain a cooperative equilibrium.177 Depending on the purpose and scope of the cooperation project, this could include (for example): reviewing the text of laws, regulations, and policy documents for consistency with the terms of the framework; conducting peer-review-style evaluations and certifications; hosting voluntary dispute resolution processes, including mediation and/or arbitration, to determine whether and when the framework has been violated; or even receiving and handling complaints of violations ombudsman-fashion (i.e., receiving the complaint, giving the subject of the complaint an opportunity to respond, and publishing findings and conclusions). A central facilitator could also go beyond a policing function and offer a common forum for certain forms of cooperation and information sharing. The nature of such broader functions, and the extent to which they would be useful or desirable, would depend on the nature and purpose of the cooperation.

The second dynamic that powers contingent cooperation is the normative appeal of the project itself. The point here is not unlike what Gráinne de Búrca calls “mission legitimacy”: the normative force of the underlying purpose of a cooperative project, and specifically the power of that normativity to secure the acceptance and cooperation of those who participate.178 Parties joining projects of contingent cooperation can be expected to be in some sense self-selecting: they join such endeavors because, in part, they are genuinely committed to promoting and achieving the ends that the project represents, and they embrace the project of cooperation as worthwhile.179 It may sound a little naïve to suggest that a project of cooperation may be more likely to “stick” if it has some normative appeal to the participating polities, but legal scholarship has long recognized that states do what they undertake to do more often than strictly rational analysis would predict.180 And I think the proposition that genuine commitment to a goal can contribute to compliance is in truth somewhat less naïve than the converse idea that compliance is just as likely without it.

The third source of a framework’s effectiveness is to be found in the acculturative and socializing effects of interaction in an environment in which values and practices are shared and reinforced as normative, and in which attention is paid to the existence and nature of violations. There is a rich and complex literature on the ways in which states, state actors, and the individuals within them may be “socialized” or “acculturated” by repeated engagement with others through common institutions and shared environments of normativity, eventually contributing to the emergence of obligations with genuine normative force.181 Jutta Brunnée and Stephen Toope have pointed out ways in which the force of legal obligation itself arises from shared communities of practice grounded in social reality and shared understandings, not formal commitments.182 As they put it, “[s]tability may be aided by explicit articulation of a norm in a text, but it is ultimately dependent upon [an] underlying shared understanding and a continuous practice of legality.”183

Participation in an endeavor of contingent cooperation may help to engender the development of such understandings and practices, and these may contribute to the effectiveness of the framework. In the longer term, this may even result in the creation of a legal instrument. But this progression is not necessary for acculturation to exert a reinforcing effect: for, as Anu Bradford accurately notes, there is no reason to think that “the pathway from nonbinding to binding rules” is an inevitable or even a natural one.184

The distinctive value of a framework is that it provides a low-cost way for jurisdictions to explore and participate in possible arrangements of mutual benefit that depend upon shared concrete understandings regarding future behavior, but without bearing the burden of an obligation under international law, without running the reputational risk of having to break a treaty, and without facing the domestic hurdles (or political scrutiny) that a treaty would necessitate.185 Use of such a framework may help to reduce the concerns grounded in political morality that might otherwise attend inter-jurisdictional action in sensitive areas:186 to use a term I have coined elsewhere, as contingent practices from which states could withdraw at any time, frameworks would benefit from considerable resources of “exit legitimacy.”187

Frameworks are not suited to every application. They seem particularly apt for types of international cooperation that generate excludable benefits for other participants and can be reasonably well monitored: in the sphere of competition policy, for example, this would include commitments to provide nondiscriminatory access to procurement markets as well as many forms of antitrust cooperation (including cooperation with one another’s investigations, coordination of enforcement activity, the operation of joint filing systems for merger review and cartel leniency programs, and so on). Certain guarantees of nondiscriminatory treatment by SOEs could also be extended on a selective basis. On the other hand, contingent cooperation is much less suitable for projects that require strong and highly credible guarantees of commitment from the participants (in which case a traditional treaty-contract would seem more appropriate188) or groups of parties still lacking the prerequisite agreement on the terms and ambit of desirable cooperation. Nor is it suitable in the absence of sufficient confidence in the ability or incentive of other parties to deliver on their commitments: in these cases, open dialogue and information exchange through a network would seem preferable. Nor, obviously, is it a good fit for projects in which the benefits of cooperation are non-excludable.189 To pick an obvious example, contingent cooperation would not recommend itself as a natural choice for an international project to introduce SOE discipline: the benefits are non-excludable (there is no obvious way to withdraw them selectively in the event of defection) and compliance is very difficult to monitor, so the use of a framework is unlikely to make much of a contribution.190

#### Starting by prohibiting cartels generates experience and feedback loops that spill over to broader harmonization

David J. Gerber 12, Distinguished Professor of Law at Chicago-Kent College of Law, B.A. from Trinity College, M.A. from Yale University, and J.D. from the University of Chicago, Awarded the Degree of Honorary Doctor of Laws by the University of Zurich, Former Visiting Professor at the Law Schools of the University of Pennsylvania, Northwestern University, and Washington University, Global Competition: Law, Markets, and Globalization, p. 307-312

a. *Criteria for goals*

The most obvious criteria for goals is that they must be sufficiently attractive to induce and maintain commitment from all necessary participants in the process. As we have seen, however, there is a broad range of goals in existing systems, which means that the goals of the project will have to be relatively general and flexible, becoming more specifically defined through experience along the pathway. A project which assumes that a single conception of competition law favored by one or two participants at a particular point in time will be accepted and implemented by all participants is unlikely to attract widespread commitment. Goals must also be ‘graspable’ or ‘interpretable.’ The language must identify the range of possible interpretations. If it does not, it cannot represent a common goal, and it cannot maintain support. In negotiating international agreements, it is common for parties intentionally to choose language that is too vague to guide actual decision making. That may be appropriate for other types of agreement, but it would be inconsistent with the long-term orientation of a commitment strategy.

The project’s goals must also be ‘shared’ or ‘shareable’. Where goals are shared, each participant has an interest in the effective pursuit of the goals by other participants. For example, the goal of increasing consumer welfare (as understood in neoclassical economics) is shareable, because any increase in consumer welfare on a global market benefits consumers across the market, regardless of state boundaries. In contrast, the goal of protecting a set of producers in one country would presumably not be shareable, as it relates only to those specific producers and those who benefit from their success.¹²

Finally, the agreed goals will have to be perceived as ‘fair’ by all types of participants. Goals that are likely to give significant advantages and gains to some participants (such as highly-industrialized countries) and to cause net harm to others (eg developing countries) cannot attract widespread support. At a minimum, therefore, fairness is likely to require that all participants have a reasonable prospect of benefit. Given the non-linear nature of economic development, however, it cannot require that all benefit equally.

b. Goal structure

Goals will have to be related to each other in ways that guide the development of national systems. As an example of such a structure, we use three goals which, if applied together, might form the basis of a global competition law strategy. Th ere may be others, but my purpose here is merely to illustrate how such a goal structure might look.

The basic concept is that participants would eventually all have approximately the same goals for competition law, at least insofar as it is applied to global markets. In order to achieve that result, national competition law goals would be expected to fi t within a range of goals that narrows over time. Given that national goals often vary considerably, this process will take time and affect some countries more than others. The basic goals would be set out at the time of agreement, but the pathway concept would allow variation over time on the basis of input from the participants.

The most basic goal of all competition laws is to deter anti-competitive conduct. Definitions of ‘anticompetitive’ vary, however, and the concept is notoriously difficult to operationalize in legal decision making. By itself, therefore, this goal is too broad. A second goal could give further guidance—protecting the process of competition from private restraints. The idea is contained in some form in all competition law systems, and thus it provides another shared basis for a pathway strategy. Although there can be uncertainty about the edges of the concept, it makes clear that the competitive process itself is the focus of the project, thus further limiting the set of acceptable national goals. Th e goal of providing durable benefits to consumers could further limit the acceptable range of goals. Again, virtually all competition law systems seek to protect the consumer, so it can also provide a basis for commitment. Together, a package of goals such as this might provide a viable basic goal framework.

c. Potential problem areas

The history of competition law development points to three potential problem areas in developing an acceptable goal structure. One is whether non-economic goals should be part of such a project. Competition laws have often pursued political and social goals in addition to their economic goals. In post-war Europe and in Japan, for example, competition law was often explicitly or implicitly intended to support democratic development. Experience with competition law has, however, revealed the difficulties of using competition law for non-economic goals, and the general trend has been to eliminate them. Given that a multinational project for competition law creates obligations for not one state, but many, such goals are likely to be incompatible with its objectives.

A second potentially difficult issue involves the goal of consumer welfare (in the sense of neoclassical economics). US officials and scholars (as well as many European competition officials) now generally assume that consumer welfare should provide the only goal of competition law, but many outside the US do not accept this view. Given that US support is likely to be necessary for the success of any global competition law project, this creates a potentially serious basis for conflict. Th ere may, however, be ways to minimize this conflict. For example, the consumer welfare standard is based on the application of price theory to a unified market. It does not take into account the existence of political borders. Th is at least calls into question whether it can be effective as the sole goal in a competition law strategy in which national boundaries play a central role. Moreover, the consumer welfare standard is most effectively used for short-run analysis, but a pathway project depends on maintaining political commitment over time. Those who favor consumer welfare as the sole goal of competition law may, therefore, be willing to broaden their range of acceptable goals, at least over the near term, in order to obtain the benefits of the project.

Another potential obstacle involves the goal of economic development. As we have seen, many countries have used competition law as a tool for development. Moreover, developing countries have often argued that economic development should be a goal of competition law, because economic development can be expected to create additional competitors as well as broader markets and thus enhance competition in the long run.¹³ Many kinds of policies may, however, be seen as supporting economic development, and thus identifying it as a goal for a pathway project gives little guidance. In addition, such a goal could easily be used to justify policies that are inconsistent with competition goals. In a pathway strategy, however, there may be no need for developing countries to insist on development as a goal, because the strategy provides flexibility in the timing of obligations and allows obligations regarding norms to be phased in over time. It is thus itself development-oriented. Most, perhaps all, of the arguments supporting development as a goal can be satisfied through the long-term orientation of the pathway concept.

In a pathway context, goals must guide the construction of the process and provide incentives to support it. Accordingly, in formulating goals that can perform this function effectively, the objective should be to articulate a set of goals that is specific enough to achieve commitment from states that prefer a narrow conception of goals, but broad enough to attract commitment from those who have a broader vision of goals. Each will have to accommodate the other. This can be justified if it supports a process that gives both groups most of what they want or is at least superior to its alternatives.

4. Commitment in norm-setting

Th e pathway concept requires that participants eventually restrict the norms that they apply to global markets. Th is narrowing of acceptable norms would have to be phased in over time, depending on factors in a country’s economy and political system as well as on the capacity and experience of its institutions. Some norms may be required early in the process, whereas others may be phased in as the project’s benefits are demonstrated and working relationships are created.

a. Potential obstacles

Two issues are likely to be prominent in reaching agreement on substantive norms. One is the role of economics. Recall that economics plays two basic roles in competition law: one is to interpret data, the other is to provide norms or standards of conduct. Our concern here is with its normative role. In the US, that role is central. There are few ‘rules’ that are based solely on the characteristics of the conduct itself. Legal decisions usually focus on economic analysis of the actual or probable effects of the conduct under the circumstances of a specific case. Economics here plays a normative role. It determines the lawfulness of the conduct. As we have seen, the European Commission has recently moved toward this view, at least in most areas of competition law.

Th is normative role for economics is, however, rare in other competition law systems. It creates a degree of legal uncertainty that few countries have accepted. In these systems, conduct is typically deemed unlawful where the conduct itself has specified characteristics or relatively specific effects, without requiring full analysis of its economic consequences in each specific case. A full effects-based economic analysis is expensive, and many countries do not have the resources to perform such an analysis. In the near term, therefore, it probably cannot be required as part of a global competition law strategy.

Divergence in views about the role of economics is thus likely to present challenges for any global competition law agreement, but one value of a pathway strategy is that it may be able to develop uses of economics that can bridge the gap. For example, officials and experts from participating countries could together develop common scenarios in which anti-competitive effects can be presumed or excluded.¹⁴ National competition officials and courts would be free to apply their laws according to their own procedures, but the scenarios would serve as guidelines for their decisions. Moreover, the group may eventually even include an obligation that national decision makers give reasons for reaching conclusions that are inconsistent with these scenarios. This may be a way of reducing concerns in the US and Europe about inadequate economic analysis and also meeting the demands of other systems for greater legal security.

The issue of whether norms should apply equally to all participants may also be an obstacle to agreement. It has created significant difficulties in previous discussions of global competition law, and it continues to be a major part of discussions in the area. Developing countries often argue that for historical and other reasons fi rms located in their countries have had limited opportunity to grow and to become competitive on global markets. As a result, if they are subjected to competition from larger foreign fi rms, they will have little chance of success, and global markets will forever be dominated by firms from a few countries. Th is, they claim, justifies what is often called ‘special and differential treatment’ for them. Other states have generally been unwilling to accept such treatment in the context of competition law.¹⁵

This issue is likely to be critical to competition law development, but the pathway concept may be uniquely positioned to accommodate it, because that strategy allows norms to be phased in over time, depending on factors such as the economic conditions in the participant state. A developing country’s obligations could thus automatically be tailored to its level of economic development, and differential treatment would gradually be eliminated over time.

b. Specific types of norms—cartels

A brief review of the main categories of norms illustrates some of these issues. The treatment of cartels could serve as a starting point and foundation for a pathway strategy. There is widespread agreement that cartels are generally harmful, and most, if not all, competition laws either prohibit them or contain norms intended to deter them. The economic harms from cartels are usually obvious, and even relatively low-cost deployment of economic analysis can identify them. This means that there may be little difficulty in requiring competition law systems to prohibit cartels. This would allow states to develop experience with the project and to develop trust, knowledge pathways, and feedback loops—all of which can provide momentum for further commitment. Above all, enforcement in the area can be expected to generate benefits that would further support the project.

#### Normative convergence through antitrust harmonization prevents extinction from resource depletion, human rights abuse, and war

Geoffrey A. Manne 13, Lecturer in Law at Lewis & Clark Law School, Executive Director of the International Center for Law & Economics, JD from the University of Chicago Law School, Former Olin Fellow at the University of Virginia School of Law, and Dr. Seth Weinberger, PhD and MA in Political Science from Duke University, MA in National Security Studies from Georgetown University, AB from the University of Chicago, Associate Professor in the Department of Politics and Government at the University of Puget Sound, “International Signals: The Political Dimension of International Competition Law”, The Antitrust Bulletin, Volume 57, Number 3, Last Revised 7/18/2013, p. 497-503

A. The international political environment

At the root of international political theory is the fundamental maxim that relations between sovereign nations in the absence of mitigating factors is characterized by intense competition, mutual distrust, the inability to make credible commitments, and war.20

[FOOTNOTE] 20 Political scientists characterize the international system as “anarchic.” In the absence of world government (or other mitigating force), competition between states is largely unregulated by external laws or enforcement. The world is characterized by mistrust, the inability to contract, and the ultimate reliance on a state’s own devices. See THOMAS HOBBES, LEVIATHAN 80 (Edwin Curley ed., 1994) (in the state of nature “the condition of man . . . is a condition of war of everyone against everyone”). In fuller terms:

There is no authoritative allocator of resources: we cannot talk about a ‘world society’ making decisions about economic outcomes. No consistent and enforceable set of comprehensive rules exists. If actors are to improve their welfare through coordinating their policies, they must do so through bargaining rather than by invoking central direction. In world politics, uncertainty is rife, making agreements is difficult, and no secure barriers prevent military and security questions from impinging on economic affairs.

ROBERT O. KEOHANE, AFTER HEGEMONY: COOPERATION AND DISCORD IN THE WORLD POLITICAL ECONOMY 18 (1984). Efficiency-enhancing gains from trade are difficult to appropriate because trade itself (and any other form of exchange or agreement between nations) is characterized by the absence of credible commitments to future behavior. And underlying the problem is the ever-present threat of the use of force. See, e.g., Kenneth N. Waltz, Anarchic Orders and Balances of Power, in NEOREALISM AND ITS CRITICS 98, 98 (Robert O. Keohane ed. 1986) (“The state among states . . . conducts its affairs in the brooding shadow of violence . . . . Among states, the state of nature is a state of war.”). Although this dire characterization of the international environment is, of course, a stylized approximation of the real world—there are always overlying constraints on sovereign behavior in the form of norms, reputational effects, and customary international law, HEDLEY BULL, THE ANARCHICAL SOCIETY: A STUDY OF ORDER IN WORLD POLITICS (1977)—it is a useful and widely accepted heuristic for crafting a theory of international politics. [END FOOTNOTE]

As one commentator notes, “Nations dwell in perpetual anarchy, for no central authority imposes limits on the pursuit of sovereign interests.”21 And states are “unitary actors who, at a minimum, seek their own preservation and, at a maximum, drive for universal domination.”22 As a result, states operating on the international stage are unable to judge the sincerity of each others’ stated intentions when those intentions are contrary to this manifest interest. Because of self-help rules, states are forced in the main to assess their own security environment by assessing the capabilities of competitors, downplaying their motives. Given that the nature of the competition can implicate the fundamental survival of one (or more) of the actors, actions taken by one state to improve its own security must necessarily decrease the security of its competitor; in the absence of mitigation, security is a zero-sum game.23 In a world where cooperation is exceedingly difficult (because there is no authority to enforce agreements, nor any basis for assessing the reliability of another state’s commitments), international relations are characterized by a continuous race to the bottom, a mindless arms race rather than the opportunity to realize gains from cooperation.

It is obvious that not all relations between states are characterized by the security dilemma, however. Canada, for example, shares an unprotected border with the most powerful nation in the world without degenerating into a destructive and costly arms race. By some mechanism, then, Canada must be able reliably to judge U.S. intentions, even absent the apparent ability by the United States credibly to bind itself to a nonaggressive policy toward Canada. The key to mitigating the pressures of the security dilemma is the ability to distinguish a state with aggressive and expansionist tendencies from a benign one.24 States can be distinguished by their fundamental type. They can be classified as “revisionist,” that is, they seek to subvert the dominant order, or they can be classified as “status quo,” that is, they seek to support it.25 But, as noted, a state’s ability to judge another’s intentions (as opposed simply to counting its armaments) is extremely tenuous and comes at great cost. In fact, political science offers few well-understood mechanisms for judging a state’s propensity for aggression.

At the same time, hegemonic states have an abiding interest in spreading and maintaining their dominant worldview.26 Not only is it imperative that dominant states receive credible signals about other states’ intentions, but it is also important that dominant states attempt to inculcate their norms within other states that, over time, might mount credible challenges to the dominant states’ security.27 The spread of hegemony through internalization of norms occurs for three reasons. First, states with similar institutions and sympathetic domestic norms are simply better and more reliable trading partners, and it is in the hegemon’s economic interest to instill its norms.28 Second, states with defensive military postures and that adhere to the status quo present significantly less security risk to dominant states.29 And finally, the hegemon has a normative interest in the spread of its culture, its worldview, and its norms.30 This conception of the playing field upon which states interact leads to the conclusion that, entirely apart from the immediate and substantial economic benefits to a state from well-ordered interactions with other states, hegemonic states also have a national security and a normative interest in the information to be gleaned from the fact that these interactions are, in fact, well ordered.

In the absence of centralized enforcement, privately held and nonverifiable information as to a state’s fundamental type is the critical problem in assessing motives.31

[FOOTNOTE] 31 See KEOHANE, supra note 20, at 31 (“Order in world politics is typically created by a single dominant power [or hegemon].”). States are consequently classified as one of two types, “revisionist” or “status quo,” based on their acceptance and adherence to the political norms, institutions, and rules created by the hegemon. Status quo states are those that try to improve their condition from within the framework of the accepted world order. Revisionist states, by contrast, seek to gain position both by working outside that order and by working to subvert the hegemonic order itself. For instance, the existing world order is generally accepted to be that created by the United States after World War II. It comprises a liberal international economic order, the use of multilateral institutions (such as the United Nations and the WTO), negotiation for dispute resolution rather than the threat of violence, and the promotion of liberal democratic moral norms. See, e.g., Schweller, supra note 24, at 85; HANS J. MORGENTHAU, POLITICS AMONG NATIONS: THE STRUGGLE FOR POWER AND PEACE 32 (1948). Trade disputes between status quo states (like tariff disputes between the United States and Europe) are resolved through peaceful negotiation rather than the threat of war. Although status quo states do not entirely eschew the use of violence, they typically seek international authorization and legitimization before employing military force, as in the multilateral operations in Iraq, Kosovo, and Afghanistan. Revisionist states, on the other hand, such as North Korea, Iran, and China, will more readily use military force as a bargaining tool and are more reluctant fully to participate in transparent military, economic, and political negotiations. [END FOOTNOTE]

States wishing to escape the pressures of the security dilemma and engage in cooperative behavior need a means of conveying their preferences to others in a credible manner. There are, in general, two means by which such information can be transmitted: states can either bind themselves in such a way that they are unable to deviate from a stated behavior (known as “hands tying” in Schelling),32 or they can signal their intention to engage in a specified course of action by incurring costs sufficiently large that they discourage the misrepresentation of preference.33

International institutions can play a crucial role in facilitating the transmission of this information.34 In particular, international agreements over the terms of trade, even without binding supranational enforcement authority, provide a means for states to bind themselves to a desirable course of behavior in the short run and, more importantly, to signal their acquiescence to the ruling world order in the long run. Because compliance with treaty obligations often requires signatories to alter their domestic laws to reflect the terms of the treaty, the costs of compliance can be substantial. In the short run, to the extent that states enforce their domestic laws they can bind themselves to a certain course of behavior. In the long run, a state’s willingness to incur the substantial costs of changing its laws, both the transaction costs inherent in changing domestic laws and the even more substantial costs in domestic political capital, signals a willingness to engage other states on the terms set by the reigning international power. Moreover, there may be unintended effects, as changes in domestic laws result in a new set of domestic incentives to which actors respond, and new windows of opportunity may open up through which policy entrepreneurs can push for the internalization of new norms.35 Competition laws in particular are susceptible to this mode of analysis.

Most nations have adopted competition laws as a way to actualize (as well as to symbolize) a degree of commitment to the competitive process and to the prevention of abusive business practices . . . . The introduction of competition laws and policies has also gone hand in hand with economic deregulation, regulatory reform, and the end of command and control economies.36

The surest way to remove the threat of war, increase wealth, conserve resources, and protect human rights is through fundamental agreement between all states (or at least effective agreement between verifiably status quo states) under a normative umbrella that promotes all of those values. This normative convergence can be effected through the stepwise internalization of the sorts of economic and democratic values inherent in international economic liberalization, perhaps most notably through the adoption of principled international antitrust standards.37

#### Resource depletion causes extinction

Dr. Timothy Gorringe 20, Professor in the Department of Religion and Theology at the University of Exeter, “Confession and Hope: Ekklesia’s Task in the Global Emergency”, Religions, Volume 11, Number 2, https://www.mdpi.com/2077-1444/11/2/97/htm

1. The Four Horsemen

Doubtless every generation has its own version of the four horsemen of Revelation 6, and they have been grim enough over the centuries, but never as genuinely apocalyptic, in the popular sense, as today. Today’s four horsemen—overpopulation, resource depletion, loss of biodiversity and climate change—could each separately mean civilisational collapse and put together they could mean the end of human life on earth.1

The first issue is population, which has more than doubled since 1961 to getting on for 8 billion. The UN predicts it will plateau at 11 billion at the end of the century but this cannot be guaranteed. The assumption is that women’s education, and the availability of contraception, will stabilize numbers but, as Stephen Emmot points out, both of these have been available in Niger for years, and the average birth rate is still seven children per woman. In China and Hungary larger families are officially promoted. If the current rate of global reproduction continues, there will not be eleven billion, but twenty eight billion human beings by the end of the century (Emmott 2013). While one sixth of the present world population still live in absolute poverty it remains the case that, as the Baltimore economist Herman Daly has been arguing for half a century, huge numbers mean huge impacts. Emmott argues that the pressures this size of population will generate can only end in complete collapse, in which the earth will become uninhabitable.

Population impacts are intensified by the dominant economic model, neo-liberalism, which looks for more and more growth, ignoring the warnings of the ‘Limits to Growth’ report of fifty years ago. The mission of the World Bank is to put an end to poverty, which is admirable, but the subtext is that the whole world should live like the United States—which would require five planets, and indeed more if absolute numbers keep growing. One of the results of this version of ‘economy’ (actually, an anti-economy as Wendell Berry in particular has argued) is a soaring gap between rich and poor all over the world. Today inequality is driven not primarily by inherited wealth but by salary differentials.2 Some CEOs earn more than a thousand times what their lowest paid employees earn. The French economist Thomas Piketty suggests that if it got to a stage where the top decile appropriated 90% of each year’s output, revolution would likely occur unless some peculiarly effective repressive apparatus exists to keep it from happening.3 Even in terms of the system as it is, an inegalitarian spiral cannot continue indefinitely: Ultimately there will be no place to invest the savings, and the global return on capital will fall, until an equilibrium distribution emerges.4

The second of our four horsemen is resource depletion, which includes uranium, copper, phosphorus, rare earths which are vital for renewable energy, top soil, but above all water. Sixty per cent of fresh water is found in just nine countries.5 It is estimated that within twenty years almost half the world’s population will experience water scarcity. Global consumption of water is doubling every twenty years, more than twice the rate of human population growth. Agriculture accounts for sixty five per cent (one ton of wheat requires one thousand tons of water), domestic use ten percent, and industry accounts for the rest. Even now ‘the water table in major grain producing areas in China is falling at the rate of five feet per year. Of China’s 617 cities 300 already face water shortages. 80% of their rivers no longer support fish life.’ (Kunstler 2006).

Some analysts have been predicting peak oil for many years and if this were really the case it would have huge implications for farming and therefore for the capacity to feed seven or eleven billion. However, as Emmott notes, new reserves of oil and gas are constantly being found, and shale oil and gas is coming on stream. The problem, as he puts it, is not that there are not enough fossil fuels, but, to the contrary, that we will seek to use every last drop.6

#### Human rights failure causes nuclear war

Gregory Treverton 17, Chair of the National Intelligence Council, Office of the Director of National Intelligence, National Intelligence Council Unclassified Strategic Assessment Of Global Trends, Authored by ODNI Personnel Including the Chairman of the NIC, “The Near Future: Tensions Are Rising”, 2017, <https://www.dni.gov/index.php/global-trends/near-future>

These global trends, challenging governance and changing the nature of power, will drive major consequences over the next five years. They will raise tensions across all regions and types of governments, both within and between countries. These near-term conditions will contribute to the expanding threat from terrorism and leave the future of international order in the balance.

Within countries, tensions are rising because citizens are raising basic questions about what they can expect from their governments in a constantly changing world. Publics are pushing governments to provide peace and prosperity more broadly and reliably at home when what happens abroad is increasingly shaping those conditions.

In turn, these dynamics are increasing tensions between countries—heightening the risk of interstate conflict during the next five years. A hobbled Europe, uncertainty about America’s role in the world, and weakened norms for conflict-prevention and human rights create openings for China and Russia. The combination will also embolden regional and nonstate aggressors—breathing new life into regional rivalries, such as between Riyadh and Tehran, Islamabad and New Delhi, and on the Korean Peninsula. Governance shortfalls also will drive threat perceptions and insecurity in countries such as Pakistan and North Korea.

* Economic interdependence among major powers remains a check on aggressive behavior but might be insufficient in itself to prevent a future conflict. Major and middle powers alike will search for ways to reduce the types of interdependence that leaves them vulnerable to economic coercion and financial sanctions, potentially providing them more freedom of action to aggressively pursue their interests.

Meanwhile, the threat from terrorism is likely to expand as the ability of states, groups, and individuals to impose harm diversifies. The net effect of rising tensions within and between countries—and the growing threat from terrorism—will be greater global disorder and considerable questions about the rules, institutions, and distribution of power in the international system.

Europe. Europe’s sharpening tensions and doubts about its future cohesion stem from institutions mismatched to its economic and security challenges. EU institutions set monetary policy for Eurozone states, but state capitals retain fiscal and security responsibilities—leaving poorer members saddled with debt and diminished growth prospects and each state determining its own approach to security. Public frustration with immigration, slow growth, and unemployment will fuel nativism and a preference for national solutions to continental problems.

* Outlook: Europe is likely to face additional shocks—banks remain unevenly capitalized and regulated, migration within and into Europe will continue, and Brexit will encourage regional and separatist movements in other European countries. Europe’s aging population will undermine economic output, shift consumption toward services—like health care—and away from goods and investment. A shortage of younger workers will reduce tax revenues, fueling debates over immigration to bolster the workforce. The EU’s future will hinge on its ability to reform its institutions, create jobs and growth, restore trust in elites, and address public concerns that immigration will radically alter national cultures.

United States. The next five years will test US resilience. As in Europe, tough economic times have brought out societal and class divisions. Stagnant wages and rising income inequality are fueling doubts about global economic integration and the “American Dream” of upward mobility. The share of American men age 25- 54 not seeking work is at the highest level since the Great Depression. Median incomes rose by 5 percent in 2015, however, and there are signs of renewal in some communities where real estate is affordable, returns on foreign and domestic investment are high, leveraging of immigrant talent is the norm, and expectations of federal assistance are low, according to contemporary observers.

* Outlook: Despite signs of economic improvement, challenges will be significant, with public trust in leaders and institutions sagging, politics highly polarized, and government revenue constrained by modest growth and rising entitlement outlays. Moreover, advances in robotics and artificial intelligence are likely to further disrupt labor markets. Meanwhile, uncertainty is high around the world regarding Washington’s global leadership role. The United States has rebounded from troubled times before, however, such as when the period of angst in the 1970s was followed by a stronger economic recovery and global role in the world. Innovation at the state and local level, flexible financial markets, tolerance for risk-taking, and a demographic profile more balanced than most large countries offer upside potential. Finally, America is distinct because it was founded on an inclusive ideal—the pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness for all, however imperfectly realized—rather than a race or ethnicity. This legacy remains a critical advantage for managing divisions.

Central and South America. Although state weakness and drug trafficking have and will continue to beset Central America, South America has been more stable than most regions of the world and has had many democratic advances—including recovery from populist waves from the right and the left. However, government efforts to provide greater economic and social stability are running up against budget and debt constraints. Weakened international demand for commodities has slowed growth. The expectations associated with new entrants to the middle class will strain public coffers, fuel political discontent, and possibly jeopardize the region’s significant progress against poverty and inequality Activist civil society organizations are likely to fuel social tensions by increasing awareness of elite corruption, inadequate infrastructure, and mismanagement. Some incumbents facing possible rejection by their publics are seeking to protect their power, which could lead to a period of intense political competition and democratic backsliding in some countries. Violence is particularly rampant in northern Central America, as gangs and organized criminal groups have undermined basic governance by regimes that lack capacity to provide many basic public goods and services.

* Outlook: Central and South America are likely to see more frequent changes in governments that are mismanaging the economy and beleaguered by widespread corruption. Leftist administrations already have lost power in places like Argentina, Guatemala, and Peru and are on the defensive in Venezuela, although new leaders will not have much time to show they can improve conditions. The success or failure of Mexico’s high-profile reforms might affect the willingness of other countries in the region to take similar political risks. The OECD accession process may be an opportunity—and incentive— for some countries to improve economic policies in a region with fairly balanced age demographics, significant energy resources, and well-established economic links to Asia, Europe, and the United States.

An Inward West? Among the industrial democracies of North America, Europe, Japan, South Korea, and Australia, leaders will search for ways to restore a sense of middle class wellbeing while some attempt to temper populist and nativist impulses. The result could be a more inwardly focused West than we have experienced in decades, which will seek to avoid costly foreign adventures while experimenting with domestic schemes to address fiscal limits, demographic problems, and wealth concentrations. This inward view will be far more pronounced in the European Union, which is absorbed by questions of EU governance and domestic challenges, than elsewhere.

* The European Union’s internal divisions, demographic woes, and moribund economic performance threaten its own status as a global player. For the coming five years at least, the need to restructure European relations in light of the UK’s decision to leave the EU will undermine the region’s international clout and could weaken transatlantic cooperation, while anti-immigration sentiments among the region’s populations will undermine domestic political support for Europe’s political leaders.
* Questions about the United States’ role in the world center on what the country can afford and what its public will support in backing allies, managing conflict, and overcoming its own divisions. Foreign publics and governments will be watching Washington for signs of compromise and cooperation, focusing especially on global trade, tax reform, workforce preparedness for advanced technologies, race relations, and its openness to experimentation at the state and local levels. Lack of domestic progress would signal a shift toward retrenchment, a weaker middle class, and potentially further global drift into disorder and regional spheres of influence. Yet, America’s capital, both human and security, is immense. Much of the world’s best talent seeks to live and work in the United States, and domestic and global hope for a competent and constructive foreign policy remain high.

China. China faces a daunting test—with its political stability in the balance. After three decades of historic economic growth and social change, Beijing, amid slower growth and the aftereffects of a debt binge, is transitioning from an investment-driven, export-based economy to one fueled by domestic consumption. Satisfying the demands of its new middle classes for clean air, affordable houses, improved services, and continued opportunities will be essential for the government to maintain legitimacy and political order. President Xi’s consolidation of power could threaten an established system of stable succession, while Chinese nationalism—a force Beijing occasionally encourages for support when facing foreign friction—may prove hard to control.

* Outlook: Beijing probably has ample resources to prop up growth while efforts to spur private consumption take hold. Nonetheless, the more it “doubles down” on state owned enterprises (SOEs) in the economy, the more it will be at greater risk of financial shocks that cast doubt on its ability to manage the economy. Automation and competition from lowcost producers elsewhere in Asia and even Africa will put pressure on wages for unskilled workers. The country’s rapidly shrinking working-age population will act as a strong headwind to growth.

Russia. Russia’s aspires to restore its great power status through nationalism, military modernization, nuclear saber rattling, and foreign engagements abroad. Yet, at home, it faces increasing constraints as its stagnant economy heads into a third consecutive year of recession. Moscow prizes stability and order, offering Russians security at the expense of personal freedoms and pluralism. Moscow’s ability to retain a role on the global stage—even through disruption—has also become a source of regime power and popularity at home. Russian nationalism features strongly in this story, with A Chinese man rides a bike among luxurious cars. China’s dramatic economic growth has highlighted greater gaps between rich and poor.

President Putin praising Russian culture as the last bulwark of conservative Christian values against the decadence of Europe and the tide of multiculturalism. Putin is personally popular, but approval ratings of 35 percent for the ruling party reflect public impatience with deteriorating quality of life conditions and abuse of power.

* Outlook: If the Kremlin’s tactics falter, Russia will become vulnerable to domestic instability driven by dissatisfied elites— even as a decline in status suggests more aggressive international action. Russia’s demographic picture has improved somewhat since the 1990s but remains bleak. Life expectancy among males is the lowest of the industrial world, and its population will continue to decline. The longer Moscow delays diversifying its economy, the more the government will stoke nationalism and sacrifice personal freedoms and pluralism to maintain control.

An Increasingly Assertive China and Russia. Beijing and Moscow will seek to lock in temporary competitive advantages and to right what they charge are historical wrongs before economic and demographic headwinds further slow their material progress and the West regains its footing. Both China and Russia maintain worldviews in which they are rightfully dominant in their regions and able to shape regional politics and economics to suit their security and material interests. Both have moved aggressively in recent years to exert greater influence in their regions, to contest the US geopolitically, and to force Washington to accept exclusionary regional spheres of influence—a situation that the United States has historically opposed. For example, China views the continuing presence of the US Navy in the Western Pacific, the centrality of US alliances in the region, and US protection of Taiwan as outdated and representative of the continuation of China’s “100 years of humiliation.”

* Recent Sino-Russian cooperation has been tactical, however, and is likely to return to competition if Beijing jeopardizes Russian interests in Central Asia and as Beijing enjoys more options for cheap energy supply beyond Russia. Moreover, it is not clear whether there is a mutually acceptable border between what China and Russia consider their natural spheres of influence. Meanwhile, India’s growing economic power and profile in the region will further complicate these calculations, as New Delhi navigates relations with Beijing, Moscow, and Washington to protect its own expanding interests. A Chinese development firm—with links to the Chinese Government and People’s Liberation Army— today announced that it recently purchased the uninhabited Cobia Island from the Government of Fiji for $850 million. Western security analysts assess that China plans to use the island to build a permanent military base in the South Pacific, 3,150 miles southwest of Hawaii.

Russian assertiveness will harden anti-Russian views in the Baltics and other parts of Europe, escalating the risk of conflict. Russia will seek, and sometimes feign, international cooperation, while openly challenging norms and rules it perceives as counter to its interests and providing support for leaders of fellow “managed democracies” that encourage resistance to American policies and preferences. Moscow has little stake in the rules of the global economy and can be counted on to take actions that weaken US and European institutional advantages. Moscow will test NATO and European resolve, seeking to undermine Western credibility; it will try to exploit splits between Europe’s north and south and east and west, and to drive a wedge between the United States and the EU.

* Similarly, Moscow will become more active in the Middle East and those parts of the world in which it believes it can check US influence. Finally, Russia will remain committed to nuclear weapons as a deterrent and as a counter to stronger conventional military forces, as well as its ticket to superpower status. Russian military doctrine purportedly includes the limited use of nuclear weapons in a situation where Russia’s vital interests are at stake to “deescalate” a conflict by demonstrating that continued conventional conflict risks escalating the crisis to a large scale nuclear exchange.

In Northeast Asia, growing tensions around the Korean Peninsula are likely, with the possibility of serious confrontation in the coming years. Kim Jong Un is consolidating his grip on power through a combination of patronage and terror and is doubling down on his nuclear and missile programs, developing long-range missiles that may soon threaten the continental United States. Beijing, Seoul, Tokyo, and Washington have a common incentive to manage security risks in Northeast Asia, but a history of warfare and occupation along with current mutual distrust makes cooperation difficult. Continued North Korean provocations, including additional nuclear and missile tests, might worsen stability in the region and prompt neighboring countries to take actions, sometimes unilaterally, to protect their security interests.

Competing Views on Instability

China and Russia portray global disorder as resulting from a Western plot to push what they see as self-serving American concepts and values of freedom to every corner of the planet. Western governments see instability as an underlying condition worsened by the end of the Cold War and incomplete political and economic development. Concerns over weak and fragile states rose more than a generation ago because of beliefs about the externalities they produce— whether disease, refugees, or terrorists in some instances. The growing interconnectedness of the planet, however, makes isolation from the global periphery an illusion, and the rise of human rights norms makes state violence against a governed population an unacceptable option.

#### Economic fragmentation alone causes nuclear war

Espen Barth Eide 16, Higher Degree in Political Science, University of Oslo, Former Senior Researcher and Research Director, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs, Head of Geopolitical Affairs at the World Economic Forum, “Are We Sleepwalking Into Geopolitical Turmoil?”, World Economic Forum, 1/14/2016, https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2016/01/how-can-we-prevent-the-world-sleepwalking-into-geopolitical-turmoil/

Without a concerted effort to properly address current trends, the world is at risk of [heading] ~~sleepwalking~~ into a future of widening chaos with growing danger of interstate conflict. This is the conclusion of a year-long review of global risks, The Global Risks Report 2016, being presented today in London. Geopolitical risk is among the top concerns, but it is the convergence of drivers at different levels – national, regional and global – that threatens to overwhelm existing institutions, and should push us to engage a wider range of stakeholders.

Economic and technological change is happening at a pace that leaves most political and regulatory systems unable to cope. This spurs dissatisfaction with leaders and increasing polarization in society, already weakened by a steep fall in social cohesion and trust. Trust is a fundamental element of social capital, and when it wanes, it negatively affects all aspects of society. Loss of trust results in part from a steady increase in inequality, undermining the feeling essential to the fabric of society of citizens being “in the same boat”.

Downbeat perception of future economic opportunity aggravates grievances, now also in many of the economies that only recently were labelled as “emerging”. Polarization and growing populism forces leaders to take rather ill-advised, short term measures that may give the appearance of “doing something” without really tackling protracted crises at their roots.

Individuals increasingly feel disengaged from traditional structures of power, but strongly engaged through new forms of participation and voice, but in ways that do not necessarily foster shared understanding in society.

The conflicts in Syria and Iraq show how today’s wars are not confined to the battlefront itself. They are “glocal” in the sense that while most of the fighting takes place in a specific region, accompanying terrorist attacks can happen anywhere. Sophisticated recruitment campaigns and social media based information warfare has become genuinely global, with fighters from over 100 countries involved in Syria and Iraq. The allure of joining the battle, for ideological or personal reasons, is just a click away from a teenager’s computer somewhere in a European city. Intelligence services around the world are struggling to cope with a new reality, challenged by everything from well-organized, stealthy groups to self-radicalized “lone wolves”. Three years after the Snowden revelations, the debate on privacy vs. security has been slow to move on from recriminations to the search for practical solutions that command broad-based support.

Cohesion and trust between countries and societies are also under threat. In its most extreme form, this trend may lead to successful calls for withdrawal from an integrated and interlinked world, creating the 21st Century equivalent of medieval “walled cities” that offer the few a sense of security and order, protecting them from the “sea of disorder” on the outside. For instance, the disjointed political debacle over how to manage the reality of people on the move, while not primarily a European phenomenon, has led to strong demands to undo some of Europe’s primary successes of integration, like the Schengen open borders agreement. A gradual dis-integration of Europe would not only be a regional drama, it would, if it happened, have severe implications for global norms and joint aspirations.

This lack of trust and cohesion is also a factor in the development of “hybrid” war. Adversaries – be they states or non-state actors – exploit popular mistrust of government in the design of information operations deployed through conventional media channels as well as more sophisticated campaigns to influence individuals directly via social media. Asymmetric, ambiguous, grey zone, non-linear – these have become the default mode of conflict between major powers seeking to keep their rivalry below the threshold of what is legally defined as "war".

With nuclear powers upgrading their delivery systems, confirming their continued emphasis on the ultimate tool of deterrence, such deniable or indirect ways to influence events, including the use of proxy forces, are gradually becoming the norm. The face of warfare itself is changing. Aversion to outright conflict is also a factor in the rise of geo-economics, or the use of economic relations, sanctions, trade regimes and potentially even means of payment for the purpose of geopolitical rivalry.

The implications for the infrastructure of the global economy are highlighted by the fact that every conflict today is also a cyber-conflict. Cyberspace has become a domain of warfare, on pair with land, sea, air and space. In cyberspace, however, the attacker gets an advantage that he would not have in the physical world, as distance and early warning becomes largely irrelevant. Possibly, globalization has contributed to new modes of conflict that, if left unchecked, could bear the seeds of its destruction.

For some time, the World Economic Forum has warned against globalization going into reverse. The sense of the first post-Cold War decades was that economy finally was becoming open and global, free of the geopolitical lid imposed by great powers. This assumption is again challenged. We see new institutions emerge, driven by new actors, at times complementing, at times challenging the established order. Only time will tell if this is a good or a bad development.

We could see it as a trend towards a net of interlinked regional systems coalescing around regional hegemons, displacing a unified, global economic order, but still sustained by some form of overall agreement. But it could also be read as an early indication that we are transiting into a future global system not so much built on a shared set of values, but rather on tacit understanding of each other’s interests and consensus on the lowest common denominators.

Last year's edition of the Global Risk Report featured the increase of fragility and disintegration on the one hand, and the return of strategic competition between strong and well-organized states on the other. Both trends strengthened in 2015, at times merging into a perfect storm like the one we are now observing in the Middle East: the conflicts in Syria, Iraq and Yemen, to name a few, have local, regional and global dimensions. Regional players, like Iran and Saudi Arabia, compete over the future order of the region. Major global players are simultaneously competing and cooperating, at times engaged on opposing sides in the battle but also at times seeking to forge diplomatic compromises.

#### Antitrust convergence strengthens governance globally---competition law’s the vital foundation

Geoffrey A. Manne 13, Lecturer in Law at Lewis & Clark Law School, Executive Director of the International Center for Law & Economics, JD from the University of Chicago Law School, Former Olin Fellow at the University of Virginia School of Law, and Dr. Seth Weinberger, PhD and MA in Political Science from Duke University, MA in National Security Studies from Georgetown University, AB from the University of Chicago, Associate Professor in the Department of Politics and Government at the University of Puget Sound, “International Signals: The Political Dimension of International Competition Law”, The Antitrust Bulletin, Volume 57, Number 3, Last Revised 7/18/2013, p. 495

In addition, conforming antitrust laws to the United States’ standards, for example, involves adopting principles of transparency, indiscriminate application of the law, the incorporation of economic principles into the legal code, the creation of fair and independent judiciaries, the creation of highly technical and independent enforcement agencies, and the emergence of an epistemic professional community of lawyers to interpret the changes. The adoption of all of these steps is the mechanism by which the lock-in phenomenon mentioned earlier can occur. These principles spill over into other areas of law and society and ultimately alter actors’ incentives and behaviors in ways that can result in the long-term internalization of these liberal norms. In particular, more than perhaps any other area of commercial law, antitrust principles contain within them the logic of significant constraints, not only on private, but also on government, conduct in every other facet of regulation and governance.

#### Robust governance prevents extinction

Dr. Reinhard Mechler 20, Ph.D. in Economics from the University of Karlsruhe,, Acting Director of the Risk & Resilience Research Program at the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, Anne-Sophie Stevance, Senior Science Officer at the International Science Council, Teresa M. Deubelli, Researcher with the Risk & Resilience Research Program at the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, JoAnne Linnerooth-Bayer, Emeritus Scholar with the Risk & Resilience Research Program at the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, Anna Scolobig, Associate with the Risk & Resilience Research Program at the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, Jenan Irshaid, Researcher with the Water, and with the Risk & Resilience Research Program at the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, John Handmer, Senior Science Advisor with the Risk & Resilience Research Program at the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, Stefan Hochrainer-Stigler, Senior Research Scholar with the Risk & Resilience Research Program at the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, Thomas Schinko, Deputy Program Director with the Risk & Resilience Research Program at the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, “Bouncing Forward Sustainably: Pathways to a Post-COVID World Governance for Sustainability”, International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis Background Paper, 7/1/2020, p. 5-6

Governance for Sustainability in light of (post) COVID-19 recovery

The ongoing COVID-19 crisis is generating massive adverse health and socio-economic impacts for societies around the globe, which require further attention for managing the pandemic as well as generating green, just and lasting recovery efforts. The crisis also brings many issues of relevance for ongoing sustainability transformations into the spotlight. One such issue is the role of governance, which we here broadly define as “the totality of actors, rules, conventions, processes and mechanisms concerned with how relevant…information is collected, analysed and communicated, and how management decisions are taken.” (IRGC 2005; see also Ostrom 2009).

The approaches taken to address COVID-19 bring to the fore relevant lessons – some (still to be) learnt - regarding global, national and subnational governance and potential changes needed to inform a shift towards sustainable development pathways. They also offer insights into opportunities and challenges for catalysing transformational change through decisive actions, e.g. as done with social distancing measures strongly informed by scientific advice, albeit not necessarily always based on robust evidence. Yet, COVID-19 also highlights significant gaps in the science-policy-society interface – including with regard to access to reliable, verifiable data to better inform decision making, in the prevalence of institutional mechanisms to deal with systemic and compound crises, and in the preparedness of global and national science communities and governance systems, among others.

It is widely recognised that the existential challenges that humanity is facing, such as climate change, biodiversity loss, increased prevalence of infectious diseases and others, require ‘robust’ governance structures that foster cooperation and collaboration as never before (WBGU 2014).

COVID-19 provides encouraging as well as challenging lessons for enhancing governance for sustainability. In several ‘early-mover’ countries, bold and decisive national government action coupled with clear communication initially led to containing the spread of (the first wave of) COVID-19 (e.g. South Korea, Singapore). Globally and regionally, the fact that COVID-19 has resulted in amplifying geo-political divides, such as between China and the US, and the challenges to the unity of the European Union, have been widely discussed in the media, illustrating the need for effective global governance structures that foster needed cooperation and at the same time respect local knowledge and democratic process.

What is more, COVID-19 is but one example in a string of health and other disasters and crises that the world has faced with increasing frequency in the recent past. As global warming continues, it will certainly not be the last. It is thus key to address the new set of risks and uncertainties in order to reduce risks and be prepared for other extreme events that may follow. Not all disasters are about health. Climate scientists are warning us about global tipping points (Lenton et al. 2019) and local adaptation limits (Mechler et al. 2020) as well as about ‘unknown unknowns,’ which demand capacity to take robust, nimble, yet evidence-based responses that find acceptance by affected societies.

This draft note for the IIASA-ISC COVID-19 recovery pathways initiative lays out our approach and initial thinking on the theme of “Governance for Sustainability” in terms of identifying relevant questions to learn from COVID-19 and draw lessons towards governance for sustainability pathways. We suggest four guiding questions (plus additional supporting questions), which we will further refine and seek answers to as part of the online consultations and further interactions with experts and the advisory panel. The ambition of the consultation process is to proceed towards co-generating some relevant policy recommendations for enhanced governance that is more agile, responsive, empowering, coherent, transparent, and adaptable in an ever more uncertain future, threatened by climate change and other stressors.

#### Building antitrust multilaterally stops litigants from flocking to U.S. courts---that’d derail the global development of antitrust

Sean Murray 17, JD and Stein Scholar at the Fordham University School of Law, BA in Economics and Political Science from Vassar College, Associate at Case & White LLP, Research Assistant at the Fordham Competition Law Institute, Former Intern with the Federal Trade Commission, Former Intern with the U.S. Department of Justice, Former Junior Consultant with NERA Economic Consulting, “With A Little Help From My Friends: How A US Judicial International Comity Balancing Test Can Foster Global Antitrust Private Redress”, Fordham International Law Journal, 41 Fordham Int'l L.J. 227, November 2017, Lexis

Moreover, bringing claims to the United States strips valuable opportunities for young foreign antitrust regimes to develop their own jurisprudence, depressing the effectiveness of global antitrust enforcement and stalling the emergence of private redress. 16

[FOOTNOTE] 16 See Fox, Remedies, supra note 14, at 580 (recognizing that effective enforcement by every antitrust jurisdiction would be better than the United States unilaterally strengthening its own enforcement efforts for global benefit). But see generally Dodge, supra note 2 (arguing that, due to the complexity of multilateral conflict-of-law approaches weighing foreign interests, US courts should only employ Alcoa's US-centric effects doctrine to encourage growth of international antitrust law so long as all courts similarly apply such unilateral approaches); Harry First, The Vitamins Case: Cartel Prosecutions and the Coming of International Competition Law, 68 ANTITRUST L.J. 711 (2001) (drawing on the US prosecution of the Vitamins Case cartel to show that aggressive US extraterritoriality can lead to comprehensive international antitrust enforcement).

Others have proposed ideas for multilateral international antitrust enforcement, including a proposal from a group of antitrust scholars (the Munich Group) that involves the creation of an international agency tasked with enforcing a globally adopted antitrust code. See Int'l Antitrust Code Working Grp., Draft International Antitrust Code as a GATTMTO-Plurilateral Trade Agreement, 5 WORLD TRADE MATERIALS 126 (1993) [hereinafter DIAC] (proposing the establishment of an international antitrust agency sharing the responsibility of enforcement of an international antitrust code with national governments); Wolfgang Fikentscher, On the Proposed International Antitrust Code, in ANTITRUST: A NEW INTERNATIONAL TRADE REMEDY? 345-47 (John O. Haley & Hiroshi Iyori eds., 1995) (describing the code by one of its drafters). The DIAC addresses private redress in a similar fashion to EU law: mandating that national governments provide for certain remedies, though ultimately allowing each signatory to determine the appropriate parties to seek remedial action. See DIAC, supra note 16, at 180-81 (addressing "Remedies" under Article 15 to include redressing private harm but stopping short of creating a private right of action); see also infra § II.B (summarizing the EC Directive). However, because such an international code is not yet a practical reality, this Note will focus on how US jurisprudence should operate in absence of international law to create a suitable environment for the growth of international private redress. For more information on the DIAC or other supranational antitrust law, see Steven L. Snell, Controlling Restrictive Business Practices in Global Markets: Reflections on the Concepts of Sovereignty, Fairness, and Comity, 33 STAN. J. INT'L L. 215, 221-235 (1997) (discussing the search for international consensus on antitrust law, including the DIAC); Ulrich Immenga, Export Cartels and Voluntary Export Restraints Between Trade and Competition Policy, 4 PAC. RIM L.&POL'Y J. 93, 150-51 (1995) (introducing the recommendation for the DIAC); see generally Wood, supra note 1 (examining efforts and difficulties in establishing an international antitrust code); Mark R. Joelson & Joseph P. Griffin, International Regulation of Restrictive Business Practices Engaged in by Transnational Enterprises: A Prognosis, 11 INT'L LAW. 5 (1977) (advocating for an international convention as the most effective means of curtailing restrictive business practices engaged in by transnational enterprises while detailing challenges and past attempts). [END FOOTNOTE]

#### That crushes economic stability in BRICs---antitrust is key

D. Daniel Sokol 9, Assistant Professor at the University of Florida Levin College of Law, Senior Advisor at White & Case LLP, LLM from the University of Wisconsin Law School, JD from the University of Chicago Law School, MSt in History from Oxford University, AB from Amherst College, “The Future of International Antitrust and Improving Antitrust Agency Capacity”, Northwestern University Review Collquy, 103 Nw. U. L. Rev. Colloquy 242, Spring 2009, Lexis

One of the key issues in international antitrust has been how to make antitrust more effective around the world. Most antitrust laws have been adopted or significantly modified since 1990. 1 A number of key jurisdictions are either fairly new to antitrust altogether or to an antitrust regime that effectively employs the latest in economic thinking and the legal tools necessary to promote competition. 2 Jurisdictions that have made antitrust a new and important cornerstone to economic policy include Brazil, Russia, India, and China. Because of the stakes involved in the ability of antitrust to foster economic development and to prevent misguided antitrust policy from operating as a regulatory tax, it is critical that the future of antitrust focus on improving agency capacity around the world. 3 By capacity, I mean the ability of a given antitrust agency to undertake well-reasoned and effective decisionmaking in the implementation of antitrust policy. There are two concerns for countries in various stages of antitrust development: harmonization of domestic antitrust with international antitrust "best practices" and implementation of an effective antitrust regime. 4 In an effort to solve these issues, policymakers in antitrust emphasize two dynamics to shape the development of increased capacity of younger antitrust regimes. [\*1082] The first is international antitrust institutions, such as the International Competition Network, that develop antitrust norms. 5 The other is technical assistance, either from these international antitrust institutions or directly from more developed antitrust agencies or other aid providers. By technical assistance, I mean the process through which agencies improve their capacity to undertake competition policy.

#### Nuclear war

Cynthia Roberts 19, Professor of Political Science at Hunter College, City University of New York and Research Scholar at the Saltzman Institute of War and Peace Studies at Columbia University, PhD, MPhil, and MA from Columbia University, “The BRICS in the Era of Renewed Great Power Competition”, Strategic Analysis, Volume 43, Issue 6, Taylor & Francis

The BRICS are at a turbulent crossroads as renewed great power competition intersects with countervailing tendencies in the emerging multipolar arena. Their success depends avoiding the external costs and domestic pathologies generated by great power friction. Emerging multipolarity provides opportunities for manoeuvre, but only if outsized China accommodates the other BRICS as it competes against the United States. The BRICS’ strongest common aversion concerns American hegemony and its weaponization of finance. BRICS states are defensively motivated to develop mechanisms to limit infringements on their sovereignty and autonomy. However, in China and Russia financial nationalism is also rising, bolstering Renminbi internationalization.

The multilateral group known as the BRICs (Brazil, Russia, India, China\*) first emerged during the era of post-Cold War American hegemony when the international economic order was open and offered tangible benefits, but shaped by unrivalled American power while US alliances dominated the international security landscape. Washington expected no great power challengers to emerge after the collapse of the Soviet Union, a point on which many international relations scholars concurred, discounting China’s potential power.1 At the same time, China’s economic heft—which amounted to less than 20 per cent of US GDP [in purchasing power parity (PPP) terms] in 1990 and still only about 36 per cent in 2000—had not yet dwarfed the other BRICs members (see Figure 1). Seeking to maintain its pre-eminent position by actively deterring peer competitors and co-opting potential opponents, the United States facilitated conditions for these emerging powers to behave as joiners in multilateral economic institutions, such as Bretton Woods and in international markets, but not in ways that displace America’s hegemonic positions and privileges and they were not welcome in US alliances.2

Sensitive to the costs of provoking a backlash by the incumbent powers and the need to keep their diverse coalition of democratic and authoritarian regimes intact, the BRICs adhered to a moderate revisionist strategy of the Bretton Woods order as their economies grew, and China soared. China surpassed the United States as the world’s largest economy (measured in purchasing power parity) in 2014 (see Figure 1), as the largest trading nation in 2013, and from 2000 to 2014 grew more than four times the global rate in market exchange-rate (MER) terms, although it is still about a decade away from catching up to the US in output measured in MER (see Figure 2). When the Global Financial Crisis revealed that the United States was neither omnipotent nor a guaranteed reliable steward of the international economic order, the BRICS questioned whether the Bretton Woods order was ‘losing legitimacy and effectiveness.’3 The crisis emboldened the BRICS states not only to seek seats at the top tables as creditors but also some redistribution of power to new institutions, such as from the Group of 7 (G7) to the G20 to speed their rankings among the prominent global rule-makers. As Figure 3 shows, the five BRICS’ share of global output (owing mostly to China), even measured in MER, strikingly surpassed the European Union (EU) in 2015, and the combined GDP of the BRICS even passed the G7 in PPP terms in 2016 (see Figure 1). This was despite the tapering of growth in all of the BRICS, with the exception of India, and lopsided falloff of Russia, South Africa and Brazil (see Figure 4).

Perceiving American weakness and a general decline of the West, the BRICS as a whole, and China, in particular, also began to experiment with parallel international financial institutions, such as the BRICS Development Bank and the Chinese-sponsored Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB) both created in 2015.4 The latter especially rankled the United States and former Treasury Secretary Lawrence Summers declared its creation and ‘the failure of the US to persuade dozens of its traditional allies … to stay out of it’ marked ‘the moment the United States lost its role as the underwriter of the global economic system’ (see Figure 5 for the distribution of shareholders). Summers blamed Washington, not China, for failing to take concrete steps—including International Monetary Fund (IMF) governance reforms pushed by BRICS—to substantially adjust the global economic architecture so that it better reflects the economic size of China and India and other emerging economies that now account for at least half of global economic output, and address their frustrations finding financing for needed infrastructure funds given pervasive restrictions set by US-backed development banks. Summers was primarily concerned with a loss of American leadership, assessing that China and other emerging economies were not radical revisionists seeking to topple the international economic order from which they greatly benefited.5

President Donald Trump turned the diagnosis of disengaged US leadership over a sound liberal international order on its head, blaming China for breaking the rules through forced technology transfers in exchange for US access to the growing Chinese market, predatory licencing practices, theft of intellectual property and the state-sponsored acquisition of American companies. Notwithstanding the validity of such claims, Trump is pursuing nationalist and protection remedies that could spiral into reciprocal moves that ultimately undermine the existing structures and destabilize international relations.

With broad bipartisan support, the Trump administration also aims to counter Russia’s assertive moves to expand its reach, including through influence campaigns, cyber tools, and limited military interventions. This was as Putin and Xi were deepening their partnership. In 2019, the Director of National Intelligence assessed that China and Russia are ‘more aligned than at any point since the mid-1950s.’6 Outside the BRICS format, both Russia and China are converting economic gains to military modernization programmes and leveraging national capacity to expand their geopolitical influence in their surrounding regions and overseas, while attempting to deny control to the US and its allies. Responding to these challenges, the Trump administration declared engagement a failure and in December 2017 the National Security Strategy issued by the White House announced that the United States was re-entering an era of great power competition, in which China and Russia ‘want to shape a world antithetical to US values and interests.’7

This article examines the intersection of renewed great power competition with countervailing tendencies in the emerging multipolar arena as others hedge and resist being drawn into great powers standoffs, while navigating President Trump’s disruptive policy swings. What do these antithetical tendencies imply for the BRICS countries? Can the BRICS states successfully navigate between the Scylla of a dangerous great power competition involving two BRICS heavyweights against the current hegemon and the Charybdis of losing the BRICS cement, breaking apart, and having to go it alone, whether or not the existing order fragments? Given that China is the dominant economic power propelling the BRICS, larger than the other members combined, its strategies and preferences in the new era of great power competition are likely to have an outsized impact on the future existence of BRICS.

The evidence suggests that China was the first in this competition to embrace an ambitious great power strategy for Chinese supremacy well before the election of Donald Trump. One may recall that Deng Xiaoping, appreciating that rising powers need to avoid provoking a backlash from the incumbent powers while still on the way up, developed a 14-character strategic guideline ‘tao guang yang hui’ [keep a low profile and bide our time] at the end of the Cold War when the United States became China’s chief threat. Deng admonished Chinese leaders to ‘observe calmly, secure our position, cope with affairs calmly, hide our capacities and bide our time, maintain a low profile, and never claim leadership.’ Although Deng did not advise when to abandon the non-assertiveness posture, a more confident President Xi Jinping jettisoned tao guang yang hui in favour of a strategy premised initially on co-equal great powers. Then, Xi launched a host of still more ambitious initiatives—including through its ‘Made in China 2025’programme—to dominate key growth industries in high technology, such as advanced chip design, artificial intelligence (AI) and robotics and to realize military modernization by 2035 and become a first-tier force by 2049. Thus, by the 100th anniversary of the Chinese revolution, Beijing’s strategy is to realize a modern and powerful China by ensuring that China’s comprehensive national power and international influence will be at the forefront of world politics and civilization. In so doing, Xi’s strategy is programmed to lead to the fulfilment of the ‘Chinese dream,’ a vision he articulated for the nation’s future in November 2012 to build a moderately prosperous society and realize national rejuvenation.

Whether such lofty national aspirations are helpful modernization milestones or self-defeating, tone-deaf nationalist programmes that engender a new cycle of protectionist backlashes by Washington to avoid further loss of comparative advantage in the US, or worse, is not yet clear. However, it is notable that some American elites and officials are so alarmed by China’s rapid rise as a military technological powerhouse that they see it as a major—even existential—threat to US dominance.8 They doubt the possibility of any bargain to end the trade war, which is seen as a central front in the competition for global supremacy. Moreover, in contrast to Cold War competition with the Soviet Union, many US strategists fear China is a more formidable competitor and ‘beating the Americans at their own Game.’9

The first section below considers the likely consequences of two competing tendencies propelled by great power competition and the diffusion of power and emerging multipolar arena. Next, it turns to the tools that major powers employ in economic and financial competition beyond the blunt tariffs currently wielded by the Trump administration that often prove self-defeating. US currency and financial power is one of the hegemon’s most potent weapons, and in greater use than ever before in American history.10 All of the BRICS countries at one point have suffered wounds from the US sanctions sword and it is one of their foremost common aversions. Both collectively and individually, they are defensively motivated to find mechanisms to limit infringements on their monetary sovereignty and national autonomy. In both Russia and China, in particular, financial nationalism is also rising in parallel with a desire for international status and influence.11 Beyond the weaponization of finance,12 the analysis here leaves aside the military dimensions of great power competition given their lesser relevance to the institutionalized evolution of the BRICS.

Tendencies generated by great power competitive politics

Within five years of Xi’s change of strategy, abandoning the non-assertiveness posture embodied in China’s ‘peaceful rise,’ it is notable that the United States refocused its strategic priorities for the first time since the collapse of the Soviet Union, first with the National Security Strategy in 2017 and then the National Defense Strategy in 2018. According to the National Defense Strategy, ‘The central challenge to US prosperity and security … is the reemergence of long-term, strategic competition by … revisionist powers.’13 Russia and China are identified as the major powers seeking to dominate their regions, shift the balances of power in Europe and Asia against the United States, and project power globally. The Trump administration and many analysts trace China’s rise to the failed attempt to integrate communist and post-communist states into the liberal rules-based order.14 Although bolstered by widespread, bipartisan support for a new strategy to counter the threats posed by these great power rivals, its precise parameters and scope are being contested as the Trump administration struggles to formulate effective policies to counter rival powers’ influence on multiple fronts. Despite the world’s largest defence budget in absolute terms (not as a percentage of GDP), the US has been one of the most efficient great powers in history. Now it faces competitors, particularly China, which are ramping up their efforts asymmetrically and technologically, but competing at lower cost to their economies, unlike the Soviet Union during the Cold War.

Competitive great power politics are occasionally cooperative and plus sum—sometimes zero sum—with the risk of war, and mostly in the domain of relative gains and losses, which involves positional struggles, relational power, and shifts in the balance of power. Nuclear great powers, in particular, have a stake in avoiding negative sum outcomes, where everyone loses, not only in global financial crises and economic depressions but also in crises and conflicts that may escalate to all-out war. As great power competition becomes the driving force of national policy it is likely to shape foreign policy in four important ways:

First, it sharpens distinctions between friends and foes, and pushes others to choose sides, both domestically and internationally, in political, security and economic domains. The trade war could be the tip of an iceberg in drawing lines. Demands for protection from Chinese goods and unfair trade practices have been growing over time.15 After Beijing joined the World Trade Organization (WTO), a ‘China shock’ followed, greatly disrupting the international division of labour, US comparative advantage, and especially US industry.16 China’s use of economic statecraft leveraging large investment flows through the Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) and development of anti-access/area denial (A2/AD) capabilities in the South and East China Seas fosters geo-economic influence backed by coercive power. Russia’s asymmetric political warfare campaigns against open democratic societies in the West and A2/AD capabilities in Eastern Europe add fuel to the bipartisan wellspring of support to shift US strategy beyond the initial course correction initiated by President Barack Obama. That containment strategy included bolstering defences and trip wires in Europe and negotiating the Trans-Pacific Partnership trade treaty, which all the major presidential candidates running in 2016 opposed.

Second, great power competition tends to strengthen nationalist and protectionist coalitions and policies. When this Innenpolitik drives intensified economic and geopolitical competition, it can create negative feedback loops as in security dilemmas, increasing the possibility of conflict.17 For example, China is a growing target of a nascent coalition, including Washington political and economic hawks, military industrialists and industries affected by globalization, such as coal and steel. However, an offset of this tendency is that producers that have supported protectionism in the past, such as the automotive sector, now often depend on China not for cheap labour but as one of the world’s largest consumer markets. Thus, General Motors (GM) sold more vehicles in 2018 to Chinese buyers than to Americans, including Cadillacs which posted the highest sales in the luxury brand’s 116-year history, primarily on the strength of GM’s performance in China. Before the start of the trade war, US multinational corporations were creating jobs in China at roughly four times the rate of increase than in the United States and prefer to build their products where their sales are highest.

In China, the coalition of party nationalists, government bureaucrats, and the state-owned enterprise sector has a significant built-in advantage in the authoritarian state capitalist system and is currently edging out the loose coalition of liberal economic reformers and private sector advocates since Xi’s turn away from the market-oriented reform that generated astonishing economic growth for more than three decades. Private sector firms accounted for 70 per cent of China’s output and the most successful Chinese technology companies, such as Alibaba, Baidu and Tencent. However, in 2012, Xi shifted to a more statist approach and greater economic and political control, despite poor economic results for the SOEs.18

In Russia, the security of the regime and protecting the privileges of the elite become more intertwined with and justified by great power threats, despite popular support for improved relations with the West and the fact that Russia needs capital for development. It is the only BRICS economy that has invested more abroad than it has received in foreign investment.19

Third, great power competition elevates the saliency of national security issues over wealth enhancing agendas and blurs security and trade concerns. This tendency further bolsters protectionism and restrictions given the perceived spillover costs of open trade to national security. China systematically blocks imports of most US manufactures (with few exceptions, e.g. semiconductors and Boeing aircraft). Washington is now putting pressure on US firms to reduce perceived vulnerabilities from China’s large role in supply chains and the national security dangers of doing with business with Chinese technology giants, such as ZTE and Huawei. China’s whole of government policies that contribute to market dominance in key sectors and inability to credibly commit in any trade deal that the party-state would never interfere in the private sector for security purposes go to the core of US concerns about Chinese high technology.20

However, great power competition runs the risk of financial ruin if ambitions exceed resources and strategists fail to establish priorities that help bend the cost curve. Feelings of Schadenfreude over Russia’s economic stagnation and general decline, despite Moscow’s ability to mobilize its national capacity in support of its extensive military modernization programme, will sting if US fiscal imbalances over the next decade require a significant reduction in the share of GDP that the United States can devote to military spending. Successful competitors adopt durable cost-efficient strategies that impose disproportionate costs and competitive disadvantages on their opponents while keeping their own in check.

Fourth, great power competition widens the lens through which psychological biases may operate to distort information processing and rational decision-making. Under such conditions, Jervis shows that ‘people are slow to alter incorrect beliefs in the face of discrepant information; historical analogies are applied promiscuously; subtle—and not so subtle—signals rarely are interpreted as the sender intends; and a person who has become committed to a particular course of action may underestimate its risks.’21

A worst-case outcome is when economic competition intensifies military competition and escalates to military conflict,22 perhaps spurred by erroneous beliefs, such as over-optimism about the balance of forces and resolve. Another bad outcome could emerge from faulty attempts to pursue competitive great power politics, strengthening nationalist, protectionist and security coalitions in opposing great powers while leaving the initial side with a weaker capacity to respond.

#### A tailored opt-in framework for export cartels secures global agreement

Dr. Marek Martyniszyn 12, Senior Lecturer in Law at Queen’s University Belfast, PhD from University College Dublin, LLM (with Specializations in EU Economic and World Trade Law) from the Saarland University’s European Institute, MA Degree from the Warsaw School of Economics and Postgraduate Certificate in Higher Education Teaching (PGCHET) from Queen's University Belfast, “Export Cartels: Is it Legal to Target Your Neighbour?”, Journal of International Economic Law, March 2012

In recent years competition laws were introduced in many jurisdictions and considerable effort was invested by the international community in competition advocacy and voluntary cooperation between competition authorities (best exemplified by the creation of the International Competition Network which now has more than 100 members), leading to more dialogue and understanding in this area of law. This led, for example, to international consensus on international private hard core cartels (but not export cartels) as harmful and actual cooperation in their pursuit across jurisdictions. Taking this into consideration, the time is perhaps ripe to come back to the discussion on export cartels and to revisit narrow-focused proposals in this regard which could be introduced within the WTO framework. The one suggested by Sweeney seems particularly appealing: an agreement taking into account in antitrust investigations not only domestic, but also foreign harm caused by such cartels; reinforced by a positive comity (a commitment to investigate a particular case at the request of a foreign jurisdiction). 233 Such a regime could be adopted as a plurilateral agreement, preferably on the side and not within a major negotiation round, open to all interested jurisdictions and subject to the WTO dispute settlement mechanism. Taking into consideration that China, as the discussed cases present, is caught between a rock of antidumping and a hard place of antitrust actions, it may be interested in such a solution. The US, on the other hand, facing now Chinese export cartels with considerable state involvement may find it worthwhile to sit down and negotiate as well so as to avoid similar but greater problems in the future. The European Union, which already within the framework of the WTO Woking Group took the view that the issue of export cartels should be addressed, would surely join the talks. While developing countries were quite sceptical about competition issues on the trade agenda, the Indian experience with the US soda ash export cartel, discussed above, shows that they may now find it in their best interests to work towards an international solution to export cartels, especially if approached outside the major round of trade negotiations. 234 In fact if the tipping point has not been reached yet, the recent developments allow hoping that it is not too far away and more thought should be now invested into consideration of possible scenarios addressing export cartels, both private and public, reflecting the current challenges.235

#### Reciprocal prohibitions on export cartels are feasible and easily administered

Dr. Brendan Sweeney 11, PhD in Economics from Monash University, Deputy Head of the Department of Business Law and Taxation at Monash University, “Export Cartels” in The Internationalisation of Competition Rules: The Approach of European States, ISBN 9780415685443, Routledge, 7/29/2011, p. 397-398

3. Agreement in which exporting state considers foreign harm

A more realistic arrangement is one in which the exporting state, when determining the legality of an export cartel, agrees to take into account the consumer effects suffered in the importing state. Necessarily this will require states to agree to an export cartel rule based on anti-competitive effects. 100

Proceedings in the export state could be initiated by a request from the importing state. Given that the exporting state has incentives to tolerate export cartels, the exporting state should be required to respond to another state′s request by investigating the matter and issuing a written determination. The exporting state should also provide to aggrieved importers non-discriminatory access to their local competition law and policy processes (both administrative and judicial), to provide adequate procedural rules (for example, discovery rules), and to ensure adequate transparency. 101 A private right of action would be a desirable addition to this type of positive comity agreement. 102 Hoekman and Mavroidis have even suggested that a WTO special prosecutor might be given authority (and the resources) to bring an action on behalf of the least developed states. 103

The attractions of this solution are threefold. First, there is no need to apply law extraterritorially. Secondly, it is in the interest of the importing state to provide the necessary evidence of anti-competitive effects. Thus, the problems of evidence-gathering are likely to be minimized. Thirdly, although the exporting state will have to consider foreign effects, this is less disruptive than other alternatives, for example, handing primary authority to an international institution.

#### Other major powers will say ‘yes’

Michael Ristaniemi 20, PhD Candidate in Commercial Law at the University of Turku, Vice President for Sustainability at the Metsä Group, Participant in the Visiting Scholar Programme at the University of California, Berkeley, “International Antitrust: Toward Upgrading Coordination and Enforcement”, Doctoral Dissertation, October 2020, https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/347180879.pdf

Despite the above, the major powers do have an interest in cooperating internationally in competition issues. The EU and the US appear to desire further convergence of practices and substantive thinking. Officially, China does not appear to have a strong stance on convergence, but recent practice shows that it too has engaged in an increasing amount of dialogue on competition matters. Indeed, there is an increasing amount of cooperation in relation to investigating international cartels, referring to cartels that operate in several nations concurrently and which seek to cartelize them.208

Further, the competition authorities of major powers have an incentive to ensure that merger control procedures affecting mergers benefiting their respective regions are as internationally streamlined and coordinated as possible given the number of multinationals that originate from each of their respective territories. Nonetheless, there are a few hurdles for streamlining international merger control. First is the dichotomous leadership of the US and the EU systems, with no single leading standard to become the global standard. Second, there are clear differences in nations’ scope of merger review that may arise from partially differing sets of goals should they attempt to address public interest or other non-competition related concerns concurrently with competition concerns.209 In any case, the aggregate cost of a fragmented system of international merger control is arguably higher than it would need to be. Improved, more structured coordination could help, as discussed further in Chapters 5 and 6 below.

#### Status-seeking drives agreement AND overwhelms economic costs

Geoffrey A. Manne 13, Lecturer in Law at Lewis & Clark Law School, Executive Director of the International Center for Law & Economics, JD from the University of Chicago Law School, Former Olin Fellow at the University of Virginia School of Law, and Dr. Seth Weinberger, PhD and MA in Political Science from Duke University, MA in National Security Studies from Georgetown University, AB from the University of Chicago, Associate Professor in the Department of Politics and Government at the University of Puget Sound, “International Signals: The Political Dimension of International Competition Law”, The Antitrust Bulletin, Volume 57, Number 3, Last Revised 7/18/2013, p. 490-492

The United States has an interest in obtaining credible long-term commitments from other states—particularly developing states—to the dominant norms of global economic and political liberalization preferred by the United States. To the extent that adherence to the tenets of economic liberalization preferred by the United States is costly, adherence to those standards conveys a measure of long-term commitment. Similarly, to the extent that states can be made to adapt their domestic infrastructure and institutions to conform with the United States’ preferred institutions of economic liberalization (an undoubtedly costly proposition8), the United States can credibly hope to initiate a process of internalization, whereby the adaptations made create a “lock-in” effect which helps to further the processes of market liberalization and democratization that the United States believes are essential for the maintenance of its preferred international order.9 In short, the more difficult and costly it is for a state to adhere to an international agreement, the more its continued, costly adherence signals the state’s long-term commitment to the underlying tenets with which the agreement is imbued.

Moreover and not least, the process of harmonization through successive, bilateral (or narrow, regional) agreements, particularly in the economic sphere, permits the measured, evolutionary adoption of international standards. The crass realpolitik of multilateral international institutions, even though imbued with desirable normative constraints, suggests that the product of their deliberations will be less economic than political. Many have suggested, however, that regulatory competition in an arena like antitrust (where laws are invariably applied extraterritorially and where states have no ability to lure incorporations with attractive antitrust laws) makes an evolutionary, competitive approach infeasible.10

The recognition of political costs, however, and a consideration of the broader political environment in which international economic laws are negotiated, suggest that an evolutionary, competitive approach is in fact possible. As described in more detail below,11 nations compete for favorable trade and other status. To the extent that their position in the normative order is affected favorably by incurring the costs of compliance with the dominant economic norms as embodied in particular agreements (because of the internalization effect), some measure of competition is possible. By this we mean that, rather than a race for the top (or bottom) engendered by the competition for incorporation fees, for example, states will compete in a race for political status. Because political status is conferred by entering into agreements with dominant economic powers, developing countries (and other states that have not yet solidified their political or economic positions) will enter into agreements without direct transfer payments in order to receive the benefits of credibility, normative change, and international acceptance. The net effect should be the effective export of consistent American (or, more recently, European) antitrust policy. Notably, because harmonization can be achieved over time, through limited agreements, the substance of the dominant international law can also be honed over time as experience proves it necessary.12

## 2AC

### T---Per Se---2AC

#### ‘Prohibition’ is injunction. That can happen after review.

Sarah E. Light 19, Assistant Professor of Legal Studies and Business Ethics at the The Wharton School at the University of Pennsylvania, “The Law of the Corporation as Environmental Law”, Stanford Law Review, 71 Stan. L. Rev. 137, Lexis

Section 1 of the Sherman Act prohibits "every contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce." 159 There are certain kinds of actions that are per se illegal under the antitrust laws, rendering antitrust law an absolute bar. 160 Such actions include price fixing, horizontal boycotts, and output limitations. 161 Courts apply the per se rule when firms aim to "disadvantage competitors by "either directly denying or persuading or coercing suppliers or customers to deny relationships the competitors need in the competitive struggle.'" 162 In the per se unreasonableness context, the plaintiff need not show anticompetitive effect, as harm to competition is presumed. 163

Before the enactment of the Clean Air Act, the federal government invoked antitrust law to end a collusive agreement among major automakers and their industry association to keep pollution control technology from reaching the California market. By 1952, authorities addressing air pollution in Los Angeles County had accepted scientific findings that motor vehicle emissions were the major source of the smog that blanketed the Los Angeles basin. 164 Local officials began to reach out to the major automobile [\*173] manufacturers about research on emissions-control technology. 165 In 1953, the Automobile Manufacturers' Association (AMA), an industry trade group, began a campaign to study the issue and committed to funding research. 166 In 1955, several automobile manufacturers, including the four major manufacturers - General Motors, Ford, Chrysler, and American Motors - entered into a formal cross-licensing agreement to share technological information and data on the development of emission-control technology, 167 an action that later became the subject of antitrust litigation. 168 They announced their decision publicly, garnering some praise for addressing the smog problem. 169

In 1960, California passed the California Motor Vehicle Pollution Control Act. 170 The Act mandated that manufacturers of new cars install emissions-control devices; however, the mandate was only triggered once such devices had been certified by the newly created Motor Vehicle Pollution Control Board. 171 By 1964, the Board had certified four emissions-control devices as meeting the state's standards, triggering the mandate under the Act. 172 Independent firms, rather than the major automakers, had developed these devices. 173 Shortly after the state certified these devices, the major automakers announced that they, too, had developed their own emissions-control technology, 174 arguably so that they would not be required to license technology from other firms. This sequence of events led some officials in California to conclude that the major automakers had conspired to delay making their own technologies publicly available. 175 After Los Angeles County officials asked the U.S. Attorney General to investigate possible collusion, a grand jury was convened. 176

Although the Department of Justice did not file criminal charges, in January 1969 it filed a civil antitrust suit against the AMA and the four major [\*174] automakers, alleging that the defendants had conspired among themselves and with smaller motor vehicle manufacturers "to eliminate competition in the research, development, manufacture and installation of motor vehicle air pollution control equipment, and in the purchase from others of patents and patent rights, covering such equipment," in violation of section 1 of the Sherman Act. 177 In response to the complaint, the defendants argued that their cooperation had actually accelerated the development of emissions-control devices and noted that collaboration was required to ensure that all manufacturers would be able to comply with the increasingly stringent standards. 178 After the lawsuit was filed, a partner in the law firm representing the AMA penned an article 179 explaining that individual consumers had been "unwilling to spend the additional small amount" necessary to purchase vehicles equipped with emissions-reducing devices. 180 Thus:

So far as the installation of devices was concerned, therefore, the manufacturers had a substantial and legitimate interest in cooperating. No company wanted to incur a cost disadvantage, either in terms of an increase in sales price or an adverse effect on vehicle driveability, without some assurance that all manufacturers were incurring similar disadvantages in the marketplace. 181

Arguably, this was as much a problem of the interaction between corporate law and antitrust law in competitive markets as it was one of antitrust law alone. If firms had a broader mandate beyond profit maximization, including to contribute to the public interest, perhaps they would have been more willing to incur a short-term cost disadvantage, even in a competitive market, rather than enter into an agreement to limit competition.

The parties resolved the suit by entering into a consent decree, which required the defendants not to conspire to delay the development of emissions-control devices and to make available without royalties both patent licenses and data on the emissions-control devices they had developed. 182 However, the decree did not require the defendants to admit liability or pay monetary penalties or damages for environmental harm; nor did it require the [\*175] retrofitting of vehicles. 183 Despite the lack of damages or penalties, in this case antitrust law served as a mandate to promote environmental goals, preventing collusion in the market when firms feared that developing an environmental product would put them at a competitive disadvantage.

A second, more recent example of antitrust law serving as an environmental mandate comes from the European Union, not the United States, but the example offers a similar lesson about the potential confluence, rather than conflict, between antitrust principles and environmental goals. In 2011, the European Commission fined two consumer products firms, Unilever and Procter & Gamble, more than 300 million euros combined for entering into an agreement to maintain prices for laundry detergent while the firms switched to selling a more concentrated, environmentally preferable formulation. 184 The firms switched to the more environmentally friendly formulation as a result of their participation in a voluntary industry initiative called the "Code of Good Environmental Practice for Household Laundry Detergents," 185 a classic example of private environmental governance. The voluntary initiative included reducing the amount of detergent needed for each load of laundry, as well as overall product weight and packaging. 186 The industry initiative appropriately did not include any commitments regarding price fixing. 187

However, the firms privately "agreed to keep the price unchanged" when the "products were "compacted'" in a way that might appear to a consumer that he would be able to wash fewer loads of laundry than the compacted product was capable of cleaning. 188 In addition, they engaged in other forms of price collusion, including "restricting their promotional activity" and "deciding not to pass the benefit of cost savings (reduced raw materials, packaging and transport costs) on to consumers." 189 The firms further agreed on direct price [\*176] increases and "exchanged sensitive information on prices and trading conditions, thereby facilitating the various forms of price collusion." 190

In this case, just as in the case of the automakers, antitrust law enforcement served as an environmentally positive mandate. Relying on antitrust law, the European Commission fined these firms for seeking to avoid passing cost savings from an environmentally beneficial product onto consumers. The motivations of the consumer products firms mirrored those of the automakers: In both cases, the firms feared that being the first to market an environmentally preferable product would reduce profits or create a competitive disadvantage vis-a-vis other firms in the marketplace. This example likewise suggests the importance of viewing antitrust law in connection with other fields, such as corporate law. Firms driven by a profit motive experience that motive in the context of a competitive environment. 191

B. Prohibitions and Disincentives: The Antitrust Per Se Rule and the Rule of Reason

While antitrust law can serve as an environmental mandate by prohibiting collusive behavior that keeps environmentally preferable goods from the market, there is also conflict between antitrust law's goals of promoting competition and environmental law's goals of promoting [\*177] conservation. 192 Because antitrust law's per se rule and rule of reason operate on a somewhat fluid continuum, 193 this Subpart discusses the two doctrines together. The per se rule operates as a prohibition, whereas the rule of reason operates as both a prohibition and a disincentive.

As noted above, antitrust law generally prohibits certain types of market activity - price fixing, horizontal boycotts, and output limitations - as illegal per se, and harm to competition is presumed. 194 For example, if an industry association declines to award a seal of approval necessary for a product's sale without any good faith attempt to test the product's performance, but rather simply because that product is manufactured by a competitor, such an action would be illegal per se. 195 Under this Article's framework, a per se violation is thus a prohibition.

The more fact-intensive inquiry under the rule of reason tests "whether the restraint imposed is such as merely regulates and perhaps thereby promotes competition or whether it is such as may suppress or even destroy competition." 196 While this extremely broad statement might suggest that any fact is relevant to the inquiry, the salient facts under the rule of reason are "those that tend to establish whether a restraint increases or decreases output, or decreases or increases prices." 197 If an anticompetitive effect is found, then the action is illegal and the rule of reason operates, like the per se rule, as a prohibition. 198 The rule of reason can also operate as a disincentive, even if no [\*178] court finds an anticompetitive effect, as uncertainty and litigation risk may discourage firms from undertaking legally permissible, environmentally positive industry collaborations. 199

#### ‘Practices’ can be singular

Justice Clinton 82, Supreme Court of Nebraska, Justice. Opinion in MID-SOUTH, ETC. v. Platte Valley Livestock, 315 NW 2d 229 - Neb: Supreme Court 1982

Most words, including the word "practice," encompass more than one meaning, and the particular meaning intended must be determined from the context in which it is employed. Only two of the multiple meanings of the word practice, as found in the dictionary, can possibly apply in the context of the statute. In Webster's Third New International Dictionary, Unabridged (1968), one meaning is "to make use of: use, employ." Another meaning is "to do something habitually," or "repeated or customary action." 233\*233 The words of the statute, "and every unjust, unreasonable, or discriminatory regulation or practice is prohibited and declared to be unlawful," § 208(a), do not suggest that the word practice includes only that which is done habitually or repetitively by the particular stockyard or marketing agency. (Emphasis supplied.) Rather, as we will later attempt to demonstrate from an analysis of the cases upon which the parties rely, repetition may be important only in determining whether a particular act is an unjust or unreasonable practice included within the evils which the act was intended to cure.

#### Coherence---it’s impossible to apply to ‘anticompetitive’ conduct

Donald L. Beschle 87, Associate Professor of Law at The John Marshall School of Law, B.A. from Fordham University, J.D. from the New York University School of Law, LL.M. from Temple University School of Law, “"What, Never? Well, Hardly Ever": Strict Antitrust Scrutiny as an Alternative to Per Se Antitrust Illegality”, Hastings Law Journal, March 1987, 38 Hastings L.J. 471, Lexis

This Article argues that the defenders of per se analysis have assigned themselves an impossible task. Arguing that types of activity can [\*476] be identified as invariably anticompetitive is futile; counterexamples can almost always be put forward. Consequently, defenders of per se categorization are reduced to one of two unattractive alternatives. First, they can concede that per se categories may in some instances prohibit procompetitive activity, but argue that the overall benefits of per se categorization justify the result. Such an argument is unsatisfying because it explicitly sacrifices particular blameless defendants in order to search for an increase in general welfare. Second, per se defenders can narrow their categories to eliminate procompetitive counterexamples. This strategy, however, threatens to destroy those categories entirely. And if most of the once-condemned activity is returned to the realm of the rule of reason, the insight that certain types of behavior are particularly dangerous is lost.

### T---CWS---2AC

#### ‘Core’ antitrust are the big 3

Michael A. Rataj 21, PC, Law Degree from the Detroit College of Law, “Consequences for Breaking Antitrust Laws”, 5/12/2021, https://www.michaelrataj.com/blog/2021/05/consequences-for-breaking-antitrust-laws/

The core antitrust laws are…

The three core antitrust laws are the Sherman Act, the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act. The Sherman Act primarily prohibits unreasonable restraint of trade and monopolization. Those who are in violation of the Sherman Act may face hefty fines, up to $100 million, and up to 10 years behind bars.

The FTC Act prohibits unfair practices or acts and unfair approaches to harming competition. Only the FTC can file cases under this act. The Clayton Act is a catch-all that covers every practice not covered by the Sherman and FTC Acts. Then consequences for violations of both of these acts are usually civil in nature.

#### They’ve read Arthur backwards---new rational is NOT core.

Thomas C. Arthur 9, L.Q.C. Lamar Professor, Emory University School of Law, “The Core of Antitrust and the Slow Death of Dr. Miles,” 2009, 62 SMU L. Rev. 437, <https://scholar.smu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1359&context=smulr>

Alternatively, the Court could discover a new rationale for prohibiting simple RPM, which might impel it to clear up the confusion by closing the Colgate loophole. As described below,212 the Justice Department and Warren Court came up with two in the 1960s, dealer autonomy and "spurious product differentiation," and the Colgate and consignment loopholes were closed. But as we shall see, neither rationale was part of the core of antitrust and their pursuit imposed substantial costs to productive efficiency, which later Courts and enforcers have proved unwilling to pay.

#### ‘Scope’ is authority

William R. Johnson 89, Judge on the New Hampshire Supreme Court, Appeal of Rehabilitation Assocs., 131 N.H. 560, 565-566, 556 A.2d 1183, 1187, 1989 N.H. LEXIS 22, \*11-13 (N.H. April 7, 1989), 4/7/1989, Lexis

The board, however, refused to approve the change in site from Allenstown to Concord without first having an opportunity to review the final plan, because of its belief that such a change could constitute a change in scope. The board was particularly concerned that the change in site might affect various financial variables. Although the administrative interpretation of a statute is entitled to deference, it is not ordinarily controlling. N.H. Dept. of Rev. Administration v. Public Emp. Lab. Rel. Bd., 117 N.H. 976, 977, 380 A.2d 1085, 1086 (1977). With regard to CONS, the board was given the authority by statute to determine what information must be included in an initial application; the statute, however, expressly [\*\*\*12] designated when an applicant who has submitted a completed application or a holder of a CON had to go back to the board for approval. The interpretation of the word "scope" to some extent defines the board's authority. The board's interpretation of the "scope" of the project to include a change in the site without a [\*566] change in the service area, or a change in a financial variable without a substantial change in the total expected capital expenditure, does not comport with the ordinary meaning of that term, and serves to expand the board's authority beyond its statutory limits. See Social Security Board v. Nierotko, 327 U.S. 358, 369 (1946); see also Hamby v. Adams, 117 N.H. 606, 609, 376 A.2d 519, 521 (1977) (even longstanding administrative interpretation of statute not controlling if contrary to express statutory language). We hold that a change in the site of a facility without a change in a factor affecting the "scope" of the project, as defined here, does not require prior board approval. Our decision is not intended to prevent the board from requiring the filing of a "change of scope" in accordance with RSA 151-C:12, [\*\*\*13] IV-a (Supp. 1988), effective June 1988, if any documents or materials submitted to it indicate that the change in site has changed the "location", "nature" or "scope" of the project as those terms must be understood.

#### ‘Expanding’ increases the area covered

Cesar A. Noble 17, Judge on the Connecticut Superior Court, Hartford Judicial District, 777 Residential, LLC v. Metro. Dist. Comm'n, 2017 Conn. Super. LEXIS 4178, \*4-5 (Conn. Super. Ct. August 1, 2017), 8/1/2017, Lexis

The defendant relies upon §7-249 as authority for the supplemental assessment. The statute provides that "[b]enefits to buildings or structures constructed or expanded after the initial assessment may be assessed as if the new or expanded buildings or structures had existed at the time of the initial assessment." The parties dispute whether the conversion of the property constitutes a construction or expansion of buildings or structures granting authority to the defendant to levy a supplemental assessment. The plaintiff argues that because the conversion did not constitute an expansion, that is, an increase in the volume or physical area of a building the defendant had no authority under §7-249 for the supplemental assessment. 5 In the view of the plaintiff it is significant that the conversion did not increase the physical footprint or interior square footage of the property in any way including by a vertical [\*5] enlargement. Absent such an increase, asserts the plaintiff, there can be no construction or expansion of any building or structure. The defendant assert that the construction of the 285 new residential units constitute new structures within the plain meaning of §7-249. The court agrees with the defendant.

[FOOTNOTE]

5 The plaintiff relies upon the definition of the word "expand" found in Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary (10th ed. 2002) of "to open up; to increase the extent, number, volume, or scope of."

### FTC Chevron---2AC

#### Export cartel policy is set by Sherman and Clayton and requires legislative change

Dr. Brian Ikejiaku 21, Senior Lecturer in Law at Coventry University, PhD from the Research Institute of Law, Politics, & Justice (RILPJ) at Keele University, and Cornelia Dayao, LL.M in International Business Law, “Competition Law as an Instrument of Protectionist Policy: Comparative Analysis of the EU and the US”, Utrecht Journal of International and European Law, Volume 36, Issue 1, http://doi.org/10.5334/ujiel.513

The United States, through the Webb-Pomerene Act of 1918,146 explicitly exempted export cartels and export association from the Sherman Act147 and from Section 7 of the Clayton Act,148 which has been reinforced by the Export Trading Company Act of 1982149 and the Foreign Trade Antitrust Improvements Act150 which regulated export cartels by granting them certificates. The EU, on the other hand, while it does not explicitly exempt export cartels, Articles 101 and 102 of the TFEU151 provide for the limited application of the EU competition law to conduct that produces anticompetitive effects (objective or subjective) within the internal market and to the trade between Member States. Hence, the EU competition law implicitly allows export cartels if they do not influence the EU internal market.

Strategic trade theory is often used to explain the States’ support for export cartels.152 Exporting States, by supporting their domestic firms engaged in export cartels, increase their national income through export revenues and promote producers’ (exporters’) welfare at the expense of the importing States. Under the strategic trade theory, exporting States will oppose any of the extraterritorial enforcement of competition law by the importing State, which curtails the export cartels.153 Just as blocking statuses show the applicability of domestic competition laws to anticompetitive acts and measures of State and State-owned firms internally. This is evidenced by the (Blocking) Order which hinders foreign investigations and enforcement of foreign decisions and judgments against Russian strategic enterprises.154 In addition, non-cooperation with the importing State’s investigation may also be due to the lack of incentive for an exporting State to immediately discipline the export cartel since it does not have any adverse effect on the domestic economy.155 Not only current trade laws but also national competition laws are insufficient to address the problem of anticompetitive conduct in foreign States which is prejudicial to the target State; this results from the fundamental differences between competition policy and trade policy.156

#### Courts say no and Congress backlashes

Alison Jones 20 and William E. Kovacic. Alison Jones, King’s College London, London, United Kingdom. William E. Kovacic, King’s College London, George Washington University, and United Kingdom Competition and Markets Authority, "Antitrust’s Implementation Blind Side: Challenges to Major Expansion of U.S. Competition Policy". SAGE Journals. 3/20/2020. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0003603X20912884

One possible solution to rigidities that have developed in Sherman Act jurisprudence is for the FTC to rely more heavily on the prosecution, through its own administrative process, of cases based on Section 5 of the FTC Act and its prohibition of “unfair methods of competition.”93 This section allows the FTC94 to tackle not only anticompetitive practices prohibited by the other antitrust statutes but also conduct constituting incipient violations of those statutes or behavior that exceeds their reach. The latter is possible where the conduct does not infringe the letter of the antitrust laws but contradicts their basic spirit or public policy.95

There is no doubt therefore that Section 5 was designed as an expansion joint in the U.S. antitrust system. It seems unlikely to us, nonetheless, that a majority of FTC’s current members will be minded to use it in this way. Further, even if they were to be, the reality is that such an application may encounter difficulties. Since its creation in 1914, the FTC has never prevailed before the Supreme Court in any case challenging dominant firm misconduct, whether premised on Section 2 of the Sherman Act or purely on Section 5 of the FTC Act.96 The last FTC success in federal court in a case predicated solely on Section 5 occurred in the late 1960s.97

The FTC’s record of limited success with Section 5 has not been for want of trying. In the 1970s, the FTC undertook an ambitious program to make the enforcement of claims predicated on the distinctive reach of Section 5, a foundation to develop “competition policy in its broadest sense.”98 The agency’s Section 5 agenda yielded some successes,99 but also a large number of litigation failures involving cases to address subtle forms of coordination in oligopolies, to impose new obligations on dominant firms, and to dissolve shared monopolies.100 The agency’s program elicited powerful legislative backlash from a Congress that once supported FTC’s trailblazing initiatives but turned against it as the Commission’s efforts to obtain dramatic structural remedies unfolded.101

#### The plan is FTC

Dina Kallay 14, Director, Intellectual Property and Competition, at Ericsson, Former Counsel for Intellectual Proper ty & International Antitrust at the FTC Office of International Affairs, and Marc Winerman, Former FTC Staffer, Leading Authority on FTC History, The FTC International Program at 100, 29 Antitrust ABA 39, Fall 2014, 42, Lexis

International Antitrust and Consumer Protection Work in the 1980s and 1990s

In the 1980s and 1990s a number of relevant trends emerged. First, markets became more and more global, a trend expedited with the 1994 successful conclusion of the World Trade Organization's Uruguay Negotiation Round, to which 123 jurisdictions were signatories with additional ones added later. The FTC's 1995 Annual Report reflects this trend in noting "dynamic changes in the economy such as . . . the internationalization of many markets." 59 Second, with the fall of the former Soviet Union in 1989, a growing number of jurisdictions around the world began to adopt antitrust enforcement regimes as they transformed their market model from a planned one to a market-based model. More antitrust regimes meant a greater need for case and policy coordination with non-U.S. counterparts to ensure consistent outcomes, and prevent conflicting results of actions by agencies in different countries. 60 Further, the birth of many new antitrust agencies, especially in economies that lacked a competition culture, also meant these agencies were in need of training in order to successfully develop and implement a sound anti-trust enforcement regime.

The resulting needs did not go unanswered. In 1982, an International Antitrust Program was established as a separate division within the FTC's Bureau of Competition, known as the International Antitrust Division. The program included investigation and prosecution of antitrust violations that had international features, as well as international liaison activities with foreign antitrust officials. 61 It was not until 1985 when the work of this division was first acknowledged in the Commission's Annual Report, which reported its staff as having worked that year on 25 investigations that involved international aspects and having been "active in a variety of intervention matters and international liaison activities involving transnational competition and antitrust law enforcement issues impacting upon the domestic economy." 62

#### ‘Scope’ is defined by enforcement

Frank G. Clement 16 Jr, Judge on the Tennessee Court of Appeals, “Hamer v. Southeast Res. Group, Inc.”, Court of Appeals of Tennessee, At Nashville, 2016 Tenn. App. LEXIS 176, 3/3/2016, Lexis

Under Southeast's interpretation, Plaintiff agreed to disclose and make available every business opportunity "to be marketed to credit union members." Such a broad definition appears to encompass every product or service imaginable, whether they have anything to do with Action or not. Under this interpretation, Plaintiff would be required to disclose an opportunity to sell cars to credit union members even though Action's business is not related to cars at all. The inconvenience, hardship, or absurdity that would result are weighty evidence that the parties did not intend for "scope and purpose" to have this meaning, especially when interpreting the agreement based on the ordinary meaning of "scope" avoids these difficulties. See Branscombe, 76 So. 3d at 948 HN9 ("The inconvenience, hardship, or absurdity of one interpretation of a contract or its contradiction of the general purpose is weighty evidence that such meaning was not intended when the language is open to an interpretation which is neither absurd nor frivolous and is in agreement with the general purpose of the parties.").

HN10 The ordinary meaning of words is found in the dictionary and is the most commonly understood meaning in relation to the subject matter of the parties' agreement. See Siegle, 788 So.2d at 360; Beans, 740 So. 2d at 67; J.N. Laliotis, 558 So. 2d at 68. According to one dictionary, "scope" means "1. The range of one's perceptions, thoughts, or actions. 2. Breath or opportunity to function. 3. The area covered by a given activity or subject." The American Heritage College Dictionary 1222 (3d ed. 1997). The operating agreement is concerned with the relationship of Action's members to each other and to Action, and the subject matter of section 6.6 is the duty to make certain business opportunities available to Action in order to avoid competition between Action and its members. [\*18] Based on the dictionary and the subject matter of the parties' agreement, "scope" most naturally refers to the range or breadth of the business that Action is engaged in at the relevant time.

#### It causes uncertainty AND delay

Alexander Paul Okuliar 21, Morrison & Foerster LLP, "FTC Lays Groundwork For Rulemakings: Are New Substantive Competition Rules Coming?", Mondaq, 3/25/2021, https://www.mondaq.com/unitedstates/antitrust-eu-competition-/1067906/ftc-lays-groundwork-for-rulemakings-are-new-substantive-competition-rules-coming

The FTC's foray into rulemaking could lead to a period of uncertainty and legal challenges in those areas touched by a new agency rule. There is likely to be significant debate over the scope of the FTC's authority, the particulars of the rulemaking process, the substance of any proposed rules, and, when tested in court, the extent of Chevron deference to which the agency is entitled. Substantive FTC competition rules could also create potential divergence in enforcement policy or activity between the DOJ and FTC brought about by the new rules.

#### It lacks a private right AND treble damages---that fails

John B. Kirkwood 21, Professor of Law, Seattle University School of Law. American Law Institute. Executive Committee, AALS Antitrust and Economic Regulation Section. Advisory Board, American Antitrust Institute. Advisory Board, Institute for Consumer Antitrust Studies, "Tech Giant Exclusion," Florida Law Review, Forthcoming, p. 7, 01/15/2021, SSRN.

Antitrust policy, then, should to continue to focus on protecting consumers from market power and workers and other vulnerable suppliers from monopsony power. This orientation would not immunize the tech giants – they have engaged in exclusionary tactics that appear to have harmed consumers and possibly workers. The problem is that when they have disadvantaged third parties that use their platforms, they have not violated the Sherman Act. There is no evidence, to my knowledge, that their conduct has created monopoly power or a dangerous probability of monopoly power in any relevant market. As a result, the tech giants could continue to exclude third parties with little fear of substantial financial penalties.13

[FOOTNOTE] Section 5 of the FTC Act is unlikely to fill this gap. While Section 5 does prohibit anticompetitive conduct that falls short of monopolization, there is no private right of action under Section 5 and no treble damages. The FTC might bring a restitution action in district court, but the Commission’s power to do so is in doubt and the Commission has never tried to exercise it in a case involving exclusionary conduct outside the bounds of Section 2. See infra Section V.A. Section 5, in short, is unlikely to supply the needed deterrence. [END FOOTNOTE]

#### Regulation is impossible

Dr. John Danaher 18, PhD from University College Cork (Ireland) and Senior Lecturer in the School of Law at National University of Ireland, Galway, LLM from Trinity College Dublin, “Is Effective Regulation of AI Possible? Eight Potential Regulatory Problems”, Institute for Ethics and Emerging Technologies, 9-27, https://ieet.org/index.php/IEET2/more/Danaher20180927

In this post, I want to consider Scherer’s case for thinking that AI is (and will be) exceptionally difficult to regulate. That case consists of three main arguments: (i) the definitional argument; (ii) the ex post argument and (iii) the ex ante argument. These arguments give rise to eight specific regulatory problems (illustrated below). Let’s address in each in turn.

(Note: I won’t be considering whether the risks from AI are worth taking seriously in this post, nor will I be considering the general philosophical-political question of whether regulation is a good thing or a bad thing; I’ll be assuming that it has some value, however minimal that may be).

1. The Definitional Argument

Scherer’s first argument focuses on the difficulty of defining AI. Scherer argues that an effective regulatory system needs to have some clear definition of what is being regulated. The problem is that the term ‘artificial intelligence’ admits of no easy definition. Consequently, and although Scherer does not express it in this manner, it seems like the following argument is compelling:

(1) If we cannot adequately define what it is that we are regulating, then the construction of an effective regulatory system will be difficult.

(2) We cannot adequately define ‘artificial intelligence’.

(3) Therefore, the construction of an effective regulatory system for AI will be difficult.

Scherer spends most of his time looking at premise (2). He argues that there is no widely-accepted definition of an artificially intelligent system, and that the definitions that have been offered would be unhelpful in practice. To illustrate the point, he appeals to the definitions offered in Russell and Norvig’s leading textbook on artificial intelligence. These authors note that definitions of AI tend to fit into one of four major categories: (i) thinking like a human, i.e. AI systems are ones that adopt similar thought processes to human beings; (ii) acting like a human, i.e. AI systems are ones that are behaviourally equivalent to human beings; (iii) thinking rationally, i.e. AI systems are ones that have goals and reason their way toward achieving those goals; (iv) acting rationally, i.e. AI systems are ones that act in a manner that can be described as goal-directed and goal-achieving. There are further distinctions then depending on whether the AI system is narrow/weak (i.e. focused on one task) or broad/strong (i.e. focused on many). Scherer argues that none of these definitions is satisfactory from a regulatory standpoint.

Thinking and acting like a human was a popular way of defining AI in the early days. Indeed, the pioneering paper in the field — Alan Turing’s ‘Computing Machinery and Intelligence’ — adopts an ‘acting like a human’ definition of AI. But that popularity has now waned. This is for several reasons, chief among them being the fact that designing systems that try to mimic human cognitive processes, or that are behaviourally indistinguishable from humans, is not very productive when it comes to building actual systems. The classic example of this being the development of chess-playing computers. These systems do not play chess, or think about chess, in a human-like way; but they are now better at chess than any human being. If we adopted a thinking/acting like a human definition for regulatory purposes, we would miss many of these AI systems. Since these systems are the ones that could pose the largest public risk, this wouldn’t be very useful.

Thinking and acting rationally is a more popular approach to AI definition nowadays. These definitions focus on whether the system can achieve a goal in narrow or broad domains (i.e. is the system capable of optimising a value function). But they too have their problems. Scherer argues that thinking rationally definitions are problematic because thinking in a goal-directed manner often assumes, colloquially, that the system doing the thinking has mental states like desires and intentions. It is very difficult to say whether an AI system has such mental states. At the very least, this seems like a philosophical question that legal regulators would be ill-equipped to address (not that philosophers are much better equipped). Acting rationally definitions might seem more promising, but they tend to be both under and over-inclusive. They tend to be over-inclusive insofar as virtually any machine can be said to act in a goal directed manner (Scherer gives the example of a simple stamping machine). They tend to be under-inclusive insofar as systems that act irrationally may pose an even greater risk to the public and hence warrant much closer regulatory scrutiny.

I think Scherer is right to highlight these definitional problems, but I wonder how serious they are. Regulatory architectures are made possible by law, and law is expressed in the vague and imprecise medium of language, but problems of vagueness and imprecision are everywhere in law and that doesn’t prove an insuperable bar to regulation. We regulate ‘energy’ and ‘medicine’ and ‘transport’, even though all these things are, to greater or lesser extent, vague.

This brings us back to premise (1). Everything hinges on what we deem to be an ‘adequate’ definition. If we are looking for a definition that gives us necessary and sufficient conditions for category membership, then we are probably looking for the wrong thing. If we are looking for something that covers most phenomena of interest and can be used to address the public risks associated with the technology, then there may be reason for more optimism. I tend to think we should offer vague and over-inclusive definitions in the legislation that establishes the regulatory system, and then leave it to the regulators to figure out what exactly deserves their scrutiny.

In fairness to him, Scherer admits that this argument is not a complete bar to regulation, and goes so far as to offer his own, admittedly circular, definition of an AI as any system that performs a task that, if it were performed by a human, would be said to require intelligence. I think that might be under-inclusive, but it is a start.

2. The Ex Post Argument: Liability Gaps and Control Problems

The terms ‘ex post’ and ‘ex ante’ are used frequently in legal scholarship. Their meanings will be apparent to anyone who has studied Latin or is familiar with the meanings of ‘p.m.’ and ‘a.m.’. They mean, roughly and respectively, ‘after the fact’ and ‘before the fact’. In this case, the ‘fact’ in question relates to the construction and implementation of an AI system. Scherer argues that regulatory problems arise both at the research and development of the AI (the ex ante phase) and once the AI is ‘unleashed’ into the world (the ex post phase). This might seem banal, but it is worth dividing up the regulatory challenges into these distinct phases just so as to get a clearer sense of the problems that might be out there.

We can start by looking at problems that arise once the AI is ‘unleashed’ into the world. It is, of course, very difficult to predict what these problems will be before the fact, but there are two general problems that putative regulators would need to be aware of.

The first is something we can call the ‘foreseeability problem’. It highlights the problem that AI could pose for traditional standards for legal liability. Those traditional standards hold that if some harm is done to another person somebody else may be held liable for that harm provided that the harm in question was reasonably foreseeable (there’s more to the legal standard than that, but that’s all we need to know for now). For most industrial products, this legal standard is more than adequate: the manufacturer can be held responsible for all injuries that are reasonably foreseeable from use of the product. With AI things might be trickier. AI systems are often designed to be autonomous and to act in creative ways (i.e. ways that are not always reasonably foreseeable by the original designers and engineers).

Scherer gives the example of C-Path, a cancer pathology machine learning algorithm. C-Path found that certain characteristics of stroma (supportive tissue) around cancerous cells were better prognostic indicators of disease progression than actually cancerous cells. This surprised many cancer researchers. If autonomous creativity of this sort becomes common, then what the AI does may not be reasonably foreseeable and people may not have ready access to legal compensation if an AI program causes some injury or harm.

While it is worth thinking about this problem, I suspect that it is not particularly serious. The main reason for this is that ‘reasonable foreseeability’ standards of liability are not the only game in town. The law already provides from strict liability standards (i.e. liability in the absence of fault) and for vicarious liability (i.e. liability for actions performed by another agent). These forms of liability could be expanded to cover the ‘liability gaps’ that might arise from autonomous and creative AI.

The second ex post problem is the ‘control problem’. This is the one that worries the likes of Elon Musk, Bill Gates and Nick Bostrom. It arises when an AI program acts in such a way that it is no longer capable of being controlled by its human makers. This can happen for a number of reasons. The most extreme reason would be that the AI is smarter and faster than the humans; less extreme reasons could include flawed programming and design. The loss of control can be particularly problematic when the interests of the AI and the programmers no longer align with one another. Scherer argues that there are two distinct control problems:

Local Control Problem: Arises when a particular AI system can no longer be controlled by the humans who have been assigned legal responsibility for controlling that system.

Global Control Problem: Arises when an AI can no longer be controlled by any humans.

Both of these control problems would present regulatory difficulties, but the latter would obviously be much more worrying than the former (assuming the AI is capable of doing serious harm).

I don’t have too much to say about this since I agree that this is a problem. I also like this particular framing of the control problem insofar as it doesn’t place too heavy an emphasis on the intelligence of an AI. The current furore about artificial superintelligence is philosophically interesting, but it can serve to obscure the fact that AI systems with much lower levels of ability could pose serious problems if they act outside the control of human beings (be that locally or globally).

3. The Ex Ante Argument: Discreetness, Diffuseness, Discreteness and Opacity

So much for the regulatory problems that arise after the creation and implementation of an AI system. What about the problems that arise during the research and development phase? Scherer argues that there are four such problems, each associated with the way in which AI research and development could leverage the infrastructure that has been created during the information technology age. In this sense, the regulatory problems posed by AI are not intrinsically different from the regulatory problems created by other systems of software development, but the stakes might be much higher.

The four problems are:

The Discreetness Problem: AI research and development could take place using infrastructures that are not readily visible to the regulators. The idea here is that an AI program could be assembled online, using equipment that is readily available to most people, and using small teams of programmers and developers that are located in different areas. Many regulatory institutions are designed to deal with largescale industrial manufacturers and energy producers. These entities required huge capital investments and were often highly visible; creating institutions than can deal with less visible operators could prove tricky.

The Diffuseness Problem: This is related to the preceding problem. It is the problem that arises when AI systems are developed using teams of researchers that are organisationally, geographically, and perhaps more importantly, jurisdictionally separate. Thus, for example, I could compile an AI program using researchers located in America, Europe, Asia and Africa. We need not form any coherent, legally recognisable organisation, and we could take advantage of our jurisdictional diffusion to evade regulation.

The Discreteness Problem: AI projects could leverage many discrete, pre-existing hardware and software components, some of which will be proprietary (so-called ‘off the shelf’ components). The effects of bringing all these components together may not be fully appreciated until after the fact. (Not to be confused with the discreetness problem).

The Opacity Problem: The way in which AI systems work may be much more opaque than previous technologies. This could be for a number of reasons. It could be because the systems are compiled from different components that are themselves subject to proprietary protection. Or it could be because the systems themselves are creative and autonomous, thus rendering them more difficult to reverse engineer. Again, this poses problems for regulators as there is a lack of clarity concerning the problems that may be posed by such systems and how those problems can be addressed.

Each of these problems looks to be serious and any regulatory system would need to deal with them. To my mind, the diffuseness and opacity problems are likely to be the most serious. The diffuseness problem suggests that there is a need for global coordination in relation to AI regulation, but past efforts at global coordination do not inspire confidence (e.g. climate change; nuclear proliferation). The opacity problem is also serious and likely to be compounded by the growing use of (and need for) AI in regulatory decision-making. I have written about this before.

#### AI Impact is wrong

Stephen **Pinker 18**, professor of psychology at Harvard, “Enlightenment Now: The Case for Reason, Science, Humanism, and Progress”

Prominent among the existential risks that supposedly threaten the future of humanity is a 21st-century version of the Y2K bug. This is the danger that we will be subjugated, intentionally or accidentally, by artificial intelligence (AI), a disaster sometimes called the Robopocalypse and commonly illustrated with stills from the Terminator movies. As with Y2K, some smart people take it seriously. Elon Musk, whose company makes artificially intelligent self-driving cars, called the technology “more dangerous than nukes.” Stephen Hawking, speaking through his artificially intelligent synthesizer, warned that it could “spell the end of the human race.”19 But among the smart people who aren’t losing sleep are most experts in artificial intelligence and most experts in human intelligence. The Robopocalypse is based on a muzzy conception of intelligence that owes more to the Great Chain of Being and a Nietzschean will to power than to a modern scientific understanding.21 In this conception, intelligence is an all-powerful, wish-granting potion that agents possess in different amounts. Humans have more of it than animals, and an artificially intelligent computer or robot of the future (“an AI,” in the new count-noun usage) will have more of it than humans. Since we humans have used our moderate endowment to domesticate or exterminate less well-endowed animals (and since technologically advanced societies have enslaved or annihilated technologically primitive ones), it follows that a supersmart AI would do the same to us. Since an AI will think millions of times faster than we do, and use its superintelligence to recursively improve its superintelligence (a scenario sometimes called “foom,” after the comic-book sound effect), from the instant it is turned on we will be powerless to stop it.22 But the scenario makes about as much sense as the worry that since jet planes have surpassed the flying ability of eagles, someday they will swoop out of the sky and seize our cattle. The first fallacy is a confusion of intelligence with motivation—of beliefs with desires, inferences with goals, thinking with wanting. Even if we did invent superhumanly intelligent robots, why would they want to enslave their masters or take over the world? Intelligence is the ability to deploy novel means to attain a goal. But the goals are extraneous to the intelligence: being smart is not the same as wanting something. It just so happens that the intelligence in one system, Homo sapiens, is a product of Darwinian natural selection, an inherently competitive process. In the brains of that species, reasoning comes bundled (to varying degrees in different specimens) with goals such as dominating rivals and amassing resources. But it’s a mistake to confuse a circuit in the limbic brain of a certain species of primate with the very nature of intelligence. An artificially intelligent system that was designed rather than evolved could just as easily think like shmoos, the blobby altruists in Al Capp’s comic strip Li’l Abner, who deploy their considerable ingenuity to barbecue themselves for the benefit of human eaters. There is no law of complex systems that says that intelligent agents must turn into ruthless conquistadors. Indeed, we know of one highly advanced form of intelligence that evolved without this defect. They’re called women. The second fallacy is to think of intelligence as a boundless continuum of potency, a miraculous elixir with the power to solve any problem, attain any goal.23 The fallacy leads to nonsensical questions like when an AI will “exceed human-level intelligence,” and to the image of an ultimate “Artificial General Intelligence” (AGI) with God-like omniscience and omnipotence. Intelligence is a contraption of gadgets: software modules that acquire, or are programmed with, knowledge of how to pursue various goals in various domains.24 People are equipped to find food, win friends and influence people, charm prospective mates, bring up children, move around in the world, and pursue other human obsessions and pastimes. Computers may be programmed to take on some of these problems (like recognizing faces), not to bother with others (like charming mates), and to take on still other problems that humans can’t solve (like simulating the climate or sorting millions of accounting records). The problems are different, and the kinds of knowledge needed to solve them are different. Unlike Laplace’s demon, the mythical being that knows the location and momentum of every particle in the universe and feeds them into equations for physical laws to calculate the state of everything at any time in the future, a real-life knower has to acquire information about the messy world of objects and people by engaging with it one domain at a time. Understanding does not obey Moore’s Law: knowledge is acquired by formulating explanations and testing them against reality, not by running an algorithm faster and faster.25 Devouring the information on the Internet will not confer omniscience either: big data is still finite data, and the universe of knowledge is infinite. For these reasons, many AI researchers are annoyed by the latest round of hype (the perennial bane of AI) which has misled observers into thinking that Artificial General Intelligence is just around the corner.26 As far as I know, there are no projects to build an AGI, not just because it would be commercially dubious but because the concept is barely coherent. The 2010s have, to be sure, brought us systems that can drive cars, caption photographs, recognize speech, and beat humans at Jeopardy!, Go, and Atari computer games. But the advances have not come from a better understanding of the workings of intelligence but from the brute-force power of faster chips and bigger data, which allow the programs to be trained on millions of examples and generalize to similar new ones. Each system is an idiot savant, with little ability to leap to problems it was not set up to solve, and a brittle mastery of those it was. A photo-captioning program labels an impending plane crash “An airplane is parked on the tarmac”; a game-playing program is flummoxed by the slightest change in the scoring rules.27 Though the programs will surely get better, there are no signs of foom. Nor have any of these programs made a move toward taking over the lab or enslaving their programmers. Even if an AGI tried to exercise a will to power, without the cooperation of humans it would remain an impotent brain in a vat. The computer scientist Ramez Naam deflates the bubbles surrounding foom, a technological Singularity, and exponential self-improvement: Imagine that you are a superintelligent AI running on some sort of microprocessor (or perhaps, millions of such microprocessors). In an instant, you come up with a design for an even faster, more powerful microprocessor you can run on. Now . . . drat! You have to actually manufacture those microprocessors. And those fabs [fabrication plants] take tremendous energy, they take the input of materials imported from all around the world, they take highly controlled internal environments which require airlocks, filters, and all sorts of specialized equipment to maintain, and so on. All of this takes time and energy to acquire, transport, integrate, build housing for, build power plants for, test, and manufacture. The real world has gotten in the way of your upward spiral of self-transcendence.28 The real world gets in the way of many digital apocalypses. When HAL gets uppity, Dave disables it with a screwdriver, leaving it pathetically singing “A Bicycle Built for Two” to itself. Of course, one can always imagine a Doomsday Computer that is malevolent, universally empowered, always on, and tamperproof. The way to deal with this threat is straightforward: don’t build one. As the prospect of evil robots started to seem too kitschy to take seriously, a new digital apocalypse was spotted by the existential guardians. This storyline is based not on Frankenstein or the Golem but on the Genie granting us three wishes, the third of which is needed to undo the first two, and on King Midas ruing his ability to turn everything he touched into gold, including his food and his family. The danger, sometimes called the Value Alignment Problem, is that we might give an AI a goal and then helplessly stand by as it relentlessly and literal-mindedly implemented its interpretation of that goal, the rest of our interests be damned. If we gave an AI the goal of maintaining the water level behind a dam, it might flood a town, not caring about the people who drowned. If we gave it the goal of making paper clips, it might turn all the matter in the reachable universe into paper clips, including our possessions and bodies. If we asked it to maximize human happiness, it might implant us all with intravenous dopamine drips, or rewire our brains so we were happiest sitting in jars, or, if it had been trained on the concept of happiness with pictures of smiling faces, tile the galaxy with trillions of nanoscopic pictures of smiley-faces.29 I am not making these up. These are the scenarios that supposedly illustrate the existential threat to the human species of advanced artificial intelligence. They are, fortunately, self-refuting.30 They depend on the premises that (1) humans are so gifted that they can design an omniscient and omnipotent AI, yet so moronic that they would give it control of the universe without testing how it works, and (2) the AI would be so brilliant that it could figure out how to transmute elements and rewire brains, yet so imbecilic that it would wreak havoc based on elementary blunders of misunderstanding. The ability to choose an action that best satisfies conflicting goals is not an add-on to intelligence that engineers might slap themselves in the forehead for forgetting to install; it is intelligence. So is the ability to interpret the intentions of a language user in context. Only in a television comedy like Get Smart does a robot respond to “Grab the waiter” by hefting the maître d’ over his head, or “Kill the light” by pulling out a pistol and shooting it. When we put aside fantasies like foom, digital megalomania, instant omniscience, and perfect control of every molecule in the universe, artificial intelligence is like any other technology. It is developed incrementally, designed to satisfy multiple conditions, tested before it is implemented, and constantly tweaked for efficacy and safety (chapter 12). As the AI expert Stuart Russell puts it, “No one in civil engineering talks about ‘building bridges that don’t fall down.’ They just call it ‘building bridges.’” Likewise, he notes, AI that is beneficial rather than dangerous is simply AI.

### Capitalism K---2AC

#### Capitalist market forces are the best chance to solve climate change---we have time for transition which is occurring globally. The alternative is impossible condemns billions to suffering and starvation.

Hill 20 [Victor; 11/3/20; Financial Economist with the International Finance Corporation at the World Bank, lead writer for Master Investor, holds degrees from the University of Oxford, Institut Européen d'Administration des Affaires, and Canterbury Christ Church University; "Only capitalism will save the planet," https://masterinvestor.co.uk/economics/only-capitalism-will-save-the-planet/]

While the global coronavirus pandemic has diverted attention away from the fraught issue of climate change and what to do about it, the environmental activism of groups such as Extinction Rebellion (XR) has continued to simmer. In fact, this year XR has blended with the Black Lives Matter (BLM) movement such that explicitly anti-capitalist environmental protest and anti-patriarchal, anti-colonial wokery have become intimately entwined. The underlying message is: If you want to save the planet you have to change the system. In practice, all protest movements have many threads – just look at the two-year campaign of the gilets jaunes in France – but the unifying thread is always resentment.

The irony is that both aspects of this counterculture are out-of-date. Rapid advances in technology, facilitated by the free market, have transformed the climate conversation. Whatever Mr Trump’s rhetoric on the issue (and he may well be in the departure lounge by the time you read this), the big energy companies, backed by a raft of environmentally conscious investors, are already transitioning towards renewable and zero-fossil fuel energy precisely because it is now economically viable to do so. And in that process, they are making money. Win-win.

Outright climate change denial was always a marginal school of thought. Thinking people – of which the business and investment community – understand well that manmade carbon emissions increase the concentration of CO2 in the atmosphere and thus precipitate a greenhouse effect by which the Earth’s atmosphere and seas warm up. That said, there is a respectable scientific debate about how quickly that process is taking place and how quickly it will cause irreversible results such as desertification. And it is perfectly legitimate to question the climate models which climate scientists construct to estimate these outcomes, since many have questionable inputs and methodologies. Claims that we have ten years left to save the planet can and should be challenged, though that should not be an argument for further delay in taking action.

The global policy framework has been constructed by the ongoing work of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), an agency of the United Nations (UN). This body laid down two years ago that our target should be to limit the rise in ambient temperature to no more than 1.5 Celsius above pre-industrial levels. That said, there are many climate rebels who believe that this level will itself be disastrous to human and animal life; and still others who claim that even this target is entirely unrealistic given the direction of travel.

Ms Thunberg and her disciples would have us shut down the carbon-based economy forthwith. That would cause unparalleled economic disruption, mass unemployment, poverty, adverse health outcomes and – let us be honest – starvation. No mainstream politician is going to get behind that.

Zion Lights is a writer who has been an environmental campaigner all her adult life. She doesn’t drive, fly or eat meat. In April 2018 she joined XR because she thought it was evidence-based. She soon found that many of its claims were indefensible. She wrote recently:

That is the single biggest problem with most environmental groups: they don’t offer realistic solutions to the very real climate change threat. What they offer, if you follow their arguments to their logical conclusion, is eco-austerity: that we should all use less energy, stop going on holiday, live in colder homes, and so on[i].

In the latest papal encyclical published on 04 October (the feast day of St. Francis of Assisi), Fratelli Tutti (Brothers All), Papa Francisco wrote that the Covid-19 pandemic had proven that the “magical theories” of market capitalism have failed and that the world needs a new type of politics that promotes dialogue and solidarity. (Perhaps the unjustified restrictionism pursued by First Minister Drakeford in Wales?)

In fact, much as I respect Catholic social teaching (having been brought up with it), the best chance we have to solve the immense challenge of climate change and other environmental problems (such as plastic waste in the oceans) is to harness market forces. In this way, the profit motives of finance and technology will re-engineer the global economy completely.

Big money already decided that the fossil fuel economy is doomed and that renewable energy is the future long before Dame Emma Thompson swept in from LA (business class, of course) to gesticulate on Oxford Street, in those languorous pre-Covid days. The billionaire Davos Boys have been preaching climate orthodoxy for years. And the Great Transition is already well underway.

Renewable profitability

The good news is (don’t tell XR) that the United Kingdom has managed to reduce its carbon emissions by over 40 percent since 1990 by all but phasing out coal and investing massively in renewable power generation. As I write this on a blustery day in late October, according to the GB National Grid Status website, coal powered generation is contributing precisely zero to UK power generation. The UK has the world’s largest offshore wind power market with capacity still increasing rapidly. Earlier this year the UK government effectively dropped the ban on onshore wind turbine arrays in the drive to reach net zero carbon emissions by 2050.

As the shift from carbon-heavy sources to carbon-free electricity generation has accelerated so economies of scale have kicked in and new technologies have come online. Recent data from Bloomberg New Energy Finance shows that the latest generation of solar and wind power plants can produce electricity cheaper than the most modern coal plants even without subsidy for two thirds of the global population. The price of solar panels has dropped by almost 90 percent over the past decade. By mid-decade, solar and wind power will outcompete all existing coal plants on price – at which point a swath of coal plants will be deemed uneconomic and closed.

The economics of energy storage – battery technology – are also improving. On 22 September Tesla (NASDAQ:TSLA) unveiled its new battery known as the 4680[ii]. This fuel cell reportedly offers six times the power of Tesla’s previous cells, and five times the energy capacity. The company confirmed that the new cell measures 46 millimetres by 80 millimetres – hence the name. The iconic automaker says that these new fuel cells will be able to increase the range of a vehicle by 16 percent – that could be up to about 500 miles for its latest models. That kind of range makes medium-distance travel without recharging (say, London to Edinburgh in a UK context) quite feasible.

Red China goes green

China currently has new coal plants under construction which will have a capacity of another 94 Gigawatts of electricity per annum. China already emits more CO2 than all of Europe and America combined. But China now has a target of going carbon neutral by 2060, and by so aspiring has upped the moral ante with Mr Trump’s America. Now, some analysts predict that China may abandon its programme of building coal-fired power stations as much on economic grounds as on environmental ones.

China might yet gain a strategic advantage from global warming. Last month the UK First Sea Lord, Admiral Tony Radakin (the military head of the Royal Navy), warned that the melting of ice in the Arctic would create new maritime trade routes across the top of the world – the Arctic Ocean – which would halve the transit time between East Asia and Western Europe. China already has, according to the Pentagon, the world’s largest navy with 350 warships and submarines. That opens the prospect of Chinese naval vessels being able to penetrate the North Atlantic rapidly, and possibly threatening the European and American undersea cable network.

Hydrogen in three colours

The downside with the current generation of electric vehicles is that they require batteries which use expensive rare earth minerals of which lithium, and which are costly and messy to recycle at the end of their economic life. The extraction of these rare earth minerals in countries such as the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) is itself a cause of environmental degradation and carbon emissions. That is why there is renewed focus of attention on hydrogen.

Hydrogen comes in three colours. Gray hydrogen is made using fossil fuels like oil and coal, which emit CO2 into the air as they combust. The blue variety is made in the same way, but carbon capture prevents CO2 being released, enabling the captured carbon to be safely stored deep underground or utilised in industry. BP (LON:BP.) is working on that. As its name suggests, green hydrogen is the cleanest variety, producing zero carbon emissions. It is produced by electrolysis powered by renewable energy i.e. offshore wind.

The holy grail in energy now is to extract hydrogen cheaply and cleanly from water by electrolysis (i.e. separating the hydrogen and carbon atoms). Hitherto the energy required to perform the electrolysis has been unequal to the energy value of the hydrogen thus produced. That could be about to change.

Bill Brown, founder of NET Power has claimed that his firm’s techniques can produce clean hydrogen at 0.57 cents a kilo. This is a developmental technology based on the Allam Cycle which has been around in theory for some time.

Hydrogen can power vehicles, trains, ships and even aeroplanes. When hydrogen is ignited the only by-product is water. Hydrogen could also be used to facilitate the manufacture of steel, cement, glass, chemicals and fertilisers. Goldman Sachs reckons that, if the efficiency of hydrogen electrolysis could be sufficiently improved, then about 45 percent of all global carbon emissions could be eliminated.

Electric cars

Some estimates suggest that electric battery-powered cars could compete on price with conventional cars powered by internal combustion engines (ICEs) as soon as 2024. That is one reason why Tesla shares have rocketed this year. But even if you are not a true believer in Tesla, consider that established automotive giants such as Volkswagen and Daimler-Benz are fully committed to the phase-out of ICEs. In Germany, sales of electric and hybrid cars overtook diesel cars for the first time last month.

I’ll have a lot more to say about the outlook for electric cars soon.

From coal to wind

Dalmellington in Ayrshire, Scotland, was once known as a coal-mining town. But in future it is likely to be known as the location of a 50-turbine wind farm. The new 240 Megawatt facility will be built and run by Vattenfall (owned by the Kingdom of Sweden). But the array will be owned by the infrastructure fund, Greencoat UK Wind PLC(LON:UKW), which has acquired the project for £320 million.

Greencoat has emerged as a growing renewables fund which is now included in the FTSE-250 index and which has a market capitalisation of around £2.5 billion – that’s more than the better-known UK energy company Centrica PLC (LON:CAN), the owner of British Gas. The fund has acquired 36 wind power sites which collectively produce enough electricity to power about one million homes – that’s about five percent of all wind power generated in the UK. Some of those arrays were acquired from Scottish & Southern Energy (LON:SSE). Wind power now accounts for about 20 percent of Britain’s total electricity consumption.

Greencoat’s strategy is to encourage energy giants to green up their portfolios by taking all the development risk. It then buys the asset from the generator and pockets the cash flow arising. Greencoat UK Wind is run by Greencoat Capital, a specialist investor in renewable energy which has £5 billion of assets under management across both wind and solar energy. Greencoat raised £375 million from investors in May 2019.

A report last year by the research firm, Hardman & Co. found that returns for listed renewable energy funds over five years approached 10 percent. Such funds often carry a share price premium over their net asset value. At a moment when the share prices of the oil majors are under pressure and when BP and Shell have slashed their dividends, Greencoat’s 4.8 percent dividend yield is pleasing.

Nuclear

The latest thinking is that carbon-free energy capacity could be ramped up quickly by means of a cluster of British designed and manufactured small modular reactors (SMRs)

which have a footprint smaller than two football pitches. A consortium of Rolls Royce (LON:RR), WS Atkins (LON:ATK), Laing O’Rourke (LON:JLG) and the National Nuclear Laboratory is in the vanguard of this technology. Rolls-Royce has experience and expertise in building nuclear reactors to power Britain’s fleet of nuclear submarines, so this is not new technology. Reportedly, the UK government is considering the injection of up to £2 billion of state funds to invigorate the concept – assuming it is permitted to do so by the EU (if there is an agreement).

The idea is that by 2050 more than 12 of these SMRs will be operational in the UK, each with a capacity of about 440 Megawatts – so about one seventh of the conventional nuclear plant currently under construction at Hinkley Point, Somerset. Hinkley Point C is a project led by France’s EDF (EPA:EDF), the costs of which have spiralled up to an estimated £22.5 billion. Cost considerations have caused Toshiba (TYO:6502) and Hitachi (TYO:6501) to pull out of projects to build nuclear plants in Wales and Cumbria. In contrast, SMRs might have a price tag of around £2 billion each.

SMRs are easier to switch on and off than conventional large-scale reactors; thus, they can be held on standby for when wind and solar power wanes. Thereafter, the remaining gas turbine plants that are currently used for that purpose can be phased out. But it does not follow that the new roll-out of SMRs would entail the closure of Britain’s conventional large-scale nuclear reactors which, as I write, are supplying 17.2 percent of total power to the national grid.

A US consortium, NuScale, is also looking at SMRs with a capacity of 60 Megawatts.

The fate of the oil majors

I wrote in the February 2020 edition of the MI magazine that the oil majors are here to stay. I meant by that that there would still be continued demand for oil, if much attenuated, after the transition to a net-zero carbon economy, not least because of the need for oil in petroleum derivatives (of which plastic). I did not foresee even then that the economic case for renewables would advance quite as rapidly as it has done this year; nor was it then apparent how the coronavirus pandemic would reduce the global demand for oil, at least in the short-term.

Another reason why the oil majors may not go extinct quite yet is that they have embraced carbon capture and storage (CCS). Indeed, they have become advocates of high carbon pricing, calculating that it will mobilise technology to accelerate CCS. Under US legislation enacted under the auspices of the US Department for Energy, operators can claim $50 for each tonne of CO2 sequestered underground and $35 per tonne if pumped back into declining wells.

A number of large players, including Saudi Aramco (TADAWUL:2222), ExxonMobil (NYSE:XOM), BP (LON:BP.), Shell (LON:RDSA), Total (LON:TTA) and others, have jointly formed the Oil and Gas Climate Initiative(OGCI) to drive CCS projects. The OGCI is a consortium that aims to accelerate the industry response to climate change. OGCI member companies explicitly support the Paris Agreement and its goals.

Just as with wind power and solar, the costs of CCS are in free fall. ExxonMobil has teamed up with FuelCell Energy to extract CO2 using carbonate fuel cells. Total, Shell and Equinor (NYSE:EQNR) are part of the Longship project in Norway which is planning to take CO2 captured in Europe’s industrial heartlands and pipe it to storage caverns beneath the North Sea. It hopes to lock in eight million tonnes of CO2 per year by the middle of this decade, for which they will charge around €60 per tonne. Memoranda have already been signed with ArcelorMittal and Heidelberg Cement.

Cement is responsible for an estimated eight percent of global carbon emissions. Under the auspices of the OGCI, a venture with LafargeHolcim, the materials giant, uses CO2 rather than water to cure concrete at much lower temperatures than in conventional manufacture, thereby breaking down the CO2 molecules and turning carbon into a form of glue. This enables a 70 percent reduction in CO2 emissions and an 80 percent reduction in water use.

In terms of their market capitalisations, ExxonMobil, BP and Shell combined are now worth less than Tesla alone. Exxon was once the world’s largest company by market cap. As I write it is worth just $136 billion against Tesla’s $390 billion.

The oil price is down from around $53 a barrel 12 months ago to around $37 today. That is partly a function of reduced global demand arising from the lockdowns across the world; but one should not assume that it will rebound even if the pandemic is behind us one year from now. That means that a lot of new exploration and drilling activity will be regarded as uneconomic – and a lot of known reserves will remain beneath the Earth for evermore. But if the oil majors can really crack the challenge of CCS and prospectively begin to reduce the volume of CO2 in the atmosphere, they will succeed in reinventing themselves.

#### 1. NETs.

Fred Krupp et al. 19. Nathaniel [Keohane](https://search-proquest-com.libproxy2.usc.edu/indexinglinkhandler/sng/au/Keohane,+Nathaniel/$N?accountid=14749), and Eric Pooley. \*President of Environmental Defense Fund, a United States-based nonprofit environmental advocacy group. \*\*Vice president for international climate at the Environmental Defense Fund. He used to be in academia at Yale University and served in the White House as special assistant to President Barack Obama. \*\*\*Senior Vice President, Strategy & Communications at the Environmental Defense Fund. 4-1-2019. "Less Than Zero: Can Carbon-Removal Technologies Curb Climate Change?" Foreign Affairs. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy2.usc.edu/docview/2186099162/594BA6C689D844ABPQ/13?accountid=14749/.

When it comes to generating support for climate policy, a warranted sense of alarm is only half the battle. And the other half-a shared belief that the problem is solvable-is lagging far behind. The newfound sense of urgency is at risk of being swamped by collective despair. A scant six percent of Americans, according to the Yale study, believe that the world "can and will" effectively address climate change. With carbon dioxide emissions from fossil fuels having risen by an estimated 2.7 percent in 2018 and atmospheric concentrations of carbon dioxide, which will determine the ultimate extent of warming, at their highest level in some three million years, such pessimism may seem justified-especially with a climate change denier in the White House. But it is not too late to solve the global climate crisis. A decade of extraordinary innovation has made the greening of the global economy not only feasible but also likely. The market now favors clean energy: in many U.S. states, it is cheaper to build new renewable energy plants than to run existing coal-fired power plants. By combining solar power with new, efficient batteries, Arizona and other sunny states will soon be able to provide electricity at a lower cost per megawatthour than new, efficient natural gas plants. Local, regional, and federal governments, as well as corporations, are making measurable progress on reducing carbon pollution. Since 2000, 21 countries have reduced their annual greenhouse gas emissions while growing their economies; China is expected to see emissions peak by 2025, five years earlier than it promised as part of the negotiations for the Paris climate agreement in 2015. At the UN climate talks held late last year in Poland, countries agreed on rules for how to report progress on meeting emission-reduction commitments, an important step in implementing the Paris accord. What's more, an entirely new arsenal is emerging in the fight against climate change: negative emission technologies, or nets. Nets are different from conventional approaches to climate mitigation in that they seek not to reduce the amount of greenhouse gases emitted into the atmosphere but to remove carbon dioxide that's already there. These technologies range from the old-fashioned practice of reforestation to high-tech machines that suck carbon out of the sky and store it underground. The window of opportunity to combat climate change has not closed-and with a push from policymakers, nets can keep it propped open for longer. THE HEAT IS ON How much time is left to avoid climate catastrophe? The truth is that it is impossible to answer the question with precision. Scientists know that human activity is warming the planet but still don't fully understand the sensitivity of the climate system to greenhouse gases. Nor do they fully comprehend the link between average global warming and local repercussions. So far, however, most effects of climate change have been faster and more severe than the climate models predicted. The downside risks are enormous; the most recent predictions, ever more dire. The Paris agreement aims to limit the increase in global average temperatures above preindustrial levels to well below two degrees Celsius, and ideally to no more than 1.5 degrees Celsius. Going above those levels of warming would mean more disastrous impacts. Global average temperatures have already risen by about one degree Celsius since 1880, with two-thirds of that increase occurring after 1975. An October 2018 special report by the un's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, a body of leading scientists and policymakers from around the world, found that unless the world implements "rapid and far-reaching" changes to its energy and industrial systems, the earth is likely to reach temperatures of 1.5 degrees Celsius above preindustrial levels sometime between 2030 and 2052. Limiting warming to that level, the ipcc found, would require immediate and dramatic cuts in carbon dioxide: roughly a 45 percent reduction in the next dozen years. Even meeting the less ambitious target of two degrees would require deep cuts in emissions by 2030 and sustained aggressive action far beyond then. The ipcc report also warns that seemingly small global temperature increases can have enormous consequences. For example, the half-degree difference between 1.5 degrees Celsius and two degrees Celsius of total warming could consign twice as many people to water scarcity, put ten million more at risk from rising sea levels, and plunge several hundred million more people into poverty as lower yields of key crops drive hunger across much of the developing world. At two degrees of warming, nearly all of the planet's coral reefs are expected to be lost; at 1.5 degrees, ten to 30 percent could survive. The deeper message of the IPCC report is that there is no risk-free level of climate change. Targets such as 1.5 degrees Celsius or two degrees Celsius are important political markers, but they shouldn't fool anyone into thinking that nature works so precisely. Just as the risks are lower at 1.5 degrees Celsius than at two degrees Celsius, so are they lower at two degrees Celsius than at 2.5 degrees Celsius. Indeed, the latter difference would be far more destructive, since the damages mount exponentially as temperatures rise. To manage the enormous risks of climate change, global emissions of greenhouse gases need to be cut sharply, and as soon as possible. That will require transforming energy, land, transport, and industrial systems so they emit less carbon dioxide. It will also require reducing short-lived climate pollutants such as methane, which stay in the atmosphere for only a fraction of the time that carbon dioxide does but have a disproportionate effect on near-term warming. Yet even that will not be enough. To stabilize the total atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases [GHGs], the world will have to reach net negative emissions-that is, taking more greenhouse gases out of the atmosphere than are being pumped into it. Achieving that through emission reductions alone will be extremely difficult, since some emissions, such as of methane and nitrous oxide from agriculture, are nearly impossible to eliminate. Countering the emissions that are hardest to abate, and bring concentrations down to safer levels, requires technologies that actually remove carbon dioxide from the atmosphere. That's where nets come in-not as a substitute for aggressive efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions but as a complement. By deploying technology that removes existing carbon dioxide from the atmosphere, while accelerating cuts in emissions, the world can boost its chances of keeping warming below two degrees and reduce the risk of catastrophe. Scientists and activists have tended to regard these technologies as a fallback option, to be held in reserve in case other efforts fail. Many fear that jumping ahead to carbon dioxide removal will distract from the critical need to cut pollution. But the world no longer has the luxury of waiting for emission-reduction strategies to do the job alone. Far from being a Plan B, nets must be a critical part of Plan A. What's more, embracing nets sooner rather than later makes economic sense. Because the marginal costs of emission reductions rise as more emissions are cut, it will be cheaper to deploy nets at the same time as emission-reduction technologies rather than waiting to exhaust those options first. The wider the solution set, the lower the costs. And the lower the costs, the easier it is to raise ambitions and garner the necessary political support. THE FUTURE IS NOW Even though removing carbon dioxide from the atmosphere may sound like the stuff of science fiction, there are already nets that could be deployed at scale today, according to a seminal report released by the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine in October 2018. One category involves taking advantage of carbon sinks-the earth's forests and agricultural soils, which have soaked up more carbon dioxide since the Industrial Revolution than has been released from burning petroleum. To date, the growth of carbon sinks has been inadvertent: in the United States, for example, as agriculture shifted from the rocky soils of the Northeast to the fertile Midwest, forests reclaimed abandoned farmland, breathing in carbon dioxide in the process. But this natural process can be improved through better forest management-letting trees grow longer before they are harvested and helping degraded forests grow back more quickly. The large-scale planting of trees in suitable locations around the world could increase carbon sinks further, a process that must go hand in hand with efforts to curb tropical deforestation and thereby continue to contain the vast amounts of carbon already stored in the earth's rainforests. Farmland provides additional potential for negative emissions. Around the world, conventional agricultural practices have reduced the amount of carbon in soils, decreasing their fertility in the process. Smarter approaches can reverse the process. Small and large landholders alike could add agricultural waste to soil, maximize the time that the soil is covered by living plants or mulch, and reduce tilling, which releases carbon dioxide. All these steps would decrease the amount of carbon that is lost from soil and increase the amount of carbon that is stored in it. The most technologically sophisticated net available in the near term is known as "bioenergy with carbon capture and storage," or BECCS. It is also the riskiest. Broadly defined, beccs involves burning or fermenting biomass, such as trees or crops, to generate electricity or make liquid fuel; capturing the carbon dioxide produced in the process; and sequestering it underground. It is considered a negative emission technology, and not a zero emission technology, because growing the biomass used in the process removes carbon from the atmosphere. What makes BECCS so exciting is its potential to remove significantly more carbon from the atmosphere than other approaches do. But it also brings challenges. For one, it is expensive: electricity generated from beccs could cost twice as much as that generated with natural gas, because biomass is an inefficient fuel source and capturing and sequestering carbon dioxide is costly. The technology would also require careful monitoring to ensure that the carbon dioxide pumped underground stays there and clear rules for legal liability in the event of leaks. But the fact that private companies have been successfully injecting carbon dioxide into depleted oil and gas reservoirs for decades offers good evidence that permanent storage is possible on a large scale. More worrying are the additional climate risks that BECCS poses. If BECCS drives demand for biomass and more of the carbon that is stored in the forest ecosystem is released as a result, it could end up raising the level of carbon in the atmosphere rather than reducing it. Another concern is competition for land: converting farms or forests to grow energy crops, something that the large-scale use of BEccs might require, could drive up the cost of food, reduce agricultural production, and threaten scarce habitats. These problems could be mitigated by using only biomass waste, such as residues from logging and agriculture, but that would reduce the potential scale. Although BEccs deserves consideration as part of the arsenal, these risks mean that its contribution will likely end up being smaller than some proponents claim. Taking all these land-based nets together, and factoring in the considerable economic, practical, and behavioral hurdles to bringing them to scale, the National Academies report concludes that by midcentury, nets could remove as much as five billion tons of carbon dioxide from the atmosphere annually. Given the significant risks involved, that estimate is probably too bullish. Even if it were not, that's still only half of the ten billion tons of carbon dioxide that will likely need to be removed each year to zero out the remaining greenhouse gas emissions, even with aggressive cuts. CLOSING THE GAP Removing from the atmosphere the balance of the carbon dioxide necessary will require perfecting technologies currently in development. Two deserve particular mention; both are full of promise, although neither is ready for widespread use. The first is called "direct air capture"- essentially, sucking carbon from the sky. The technology is already being tested in Canada, Iceland, Italy, and Switzerland at pilot plants where massive arrays of fans direct a stream of air toward a special substance that binds with the passing carbon dioxide. The substance is then either heated or forced into a vacuum to release the carbon dioxide, which is compressed and either stored or used as feedstocks for chemicals, fuels, or cement. These technologies are real-albeit prohibitively expensive in their current form. As a recent study led by David Sandalow of Columbia University's Center on Global Energy Policy concludes, taking them to scale means solving a variety of technological challenges to bring down the costs. Above all, these processes are highly energy intensive, so scaling them would require enormous amounts of low-carbon electricity. (A direct-air-capture facility powered by coal-fired electricity, for example, would generate more new carbon dioxide than it would capture.) These obstacles are serious, but the surprising progress of the past decade suggests that they can be overcome in the next one. The second technology, enhanced carbon mineralization, is even further from being realized, but it is full of even more possibility. Geologists have long known that when rock from the earth's mantle (the layer of the earth between its crust and its core) is exposed to the air, it binds with carbon dioxide to form carbon-containing minerals. The massive tectonic collisions that formed the Appalachian Mountains around 460 million years ago, for example, exposed subsurface rock to weathering that resulted in the absorption of substantial amounts of carbon dioxide from the atmosphere. That took tens of millions of years; enhanced carbon mineralization seeks to fast-forward the process. Scientists are exploring two ways to do this. In one approach, rocks would be brought to the surface to bind with carbon from the air. Such natural weathering already occurs in mine tailings, the waste left over from certain mining operations. But mimicking this process on a large scale-by grinding up large quantities of rock containing reactive minerals and bringing it to the earth's surface-would be highly energy intensive and thus costly, roughly on par with direct air capture. Another potential approach is pumping the carbon dioxide underground to meet the rock. As the National Academies report explains, carbon-dioxide-rich fluids injected into basalt or peridotite formations (two kinds of igneous rock that make up much of the earth's mantle) react with the rock, converting the dissolved carbon dioxide into solid carbon-containing minerals. Pilot projects in Iceland and the United States have demonstrated that this is possible. There is also evidence for how this could work in the natural world. Peridotite usually lies deep inside the earth, but some rock formations around the globe contain pockets of it on the surface. For example, scientists are studying how the surface-level peridotite in Oman's rock formations reacts with the air and absorbs large amounts of carbon. In theory, this approach offers nearly unlimited scale, because suitable rock formations are widespread and readily accessible. It would also be cheap, because it takes advantage of chemical potential energy in the rock instead of costly energy sources. And since the carbon dioxide is converted to solid rock, the effect is permanent, and it carries few of the side effects that other nets could bring. GETTING TO LESS These technologies do not come cheap. The National Academy of Sciences recommends as much as $1 billion annually in U.S. government funding for research on nets. And indeed, such funding should be an urgent priority. But to make these technologies economically viable and scale them rapidly, policymakers will also have to tap into a much more powerful force: the profit motive. Putting a price on carbon emissions creates an economic incentive for entrepreneurs to find cheaper, faster ways to cut pollution. Valuing negative emissions-for example, through an emission-trading system that awards credits for carbon removal or a carbon tax that provides rebates for them-would create an incentive for them to join the hunt for nets. Forty-five countries, along with ten U.S. states, have put in place some mechanism to price carbon. But only a handful of them offer rewards for converting land into forest, managing existing forests better, or increasing the amount of carbon stored in agricultural soils, and none offers incentives for other nets. What's needed is a carbon pricing system that not only charges those who emit carbon but also pays those who remove it. Such a system would provide new revenue streams for landowners who restored forest cover to their land and for farmers and ranchers who increased the amount of carbon stored in their soils. It would also reward the inventors and entrepreneurs who developed new, better technologies to capture carbon from the air and the investors and businesses that took them to scale. Without these incentives, those players will stay on the sidelines. By spurring innovation in lower-cost nets, incentives would also ease the way politically for an ambitious pollution limit-which, ultimately, is necessary for ensuring that the world meets it climate goals. Simply put, humanity's best hope is to promise that the next crop of billionaires will be those who figure out low-cost ways to remove carbon from the sky. The biggest hurdle for such incentives is the lack of a global market for carbon credits. Hope on that front, however, is emerging from an unlikely place: aviation. Currently responsible for roughly two percent of global greenhouse gases, aviation's emissions are expected to triple or quadruple by midcentury in the absence of effective policies to limit them. But in 2016, faced with the prospect that the eu would start capping the emissions of flights landing in and taking off from member states, the un body that governs worldwide air travel, the International Civil Aviation Organization, agreed to cap emissions from international flights at 2020 levels. The airline industry supported the agreement, hoping to avoid the messy regulatory patchwork that might result if the eu went ahead and states beyond the eu followed suit with their own approaches. The resulting program, called the Carbon Offsetting and Reduction Scheme for International Aviation (corsia), requires all airlines to start reporting emissions this year, and it will begin enforcing a cap in 2021. Once in full swing, at least 100 countries are expected to participate, covering at least three-quarters of the forecast increase in international aviation emissions. Airlines flying between participating countries will have two ways to comply: they can lower their emissions (for example, by burning less fuel or switching to alternative fuels), or they can buy emission-reduction credits from companies. Because the technologies for reducing airline emissions at scale are still a long way off, the industry will mostly choose the second option, relying on carbon credits from reductions in other sectors. It is estimated that over the first 15 years of corsia, demand for these credits will reach between 2.5 billion and 3.0 billion tons-roughly equal to the annual greenhouse gas emissions from the U.S. power and manufacturing sectors. With this new option to sell emission-reduction credits to airlines, there is a good possibility that a pot of gold will await companies that cut or offset their carbon emissions. In short, corsia could catalyze a global carbon market that drives investment in low-carbon fuels and technologies-including nets. To realize its promise, corsia must be implemented properly, and there are powerful forces working to see that it is not. Some countries, including ones negotiating on behalf of their state-owned companies, are trying to rig the system by allowing credits from projects that do not produce legitimate carbon reductions, such as Brazil's effort to allow the sale of credits from huge hydroelectric dams in the Amazon that have already been built and paid for (and thus do not represent new reductions). Allowing such credits into the system could crowd out potential rewards for genuine reductions. But there are also powerful, sometimes unexpected allies who stand to gain from a global carbon market that works. For example, some airlines are motivated to act out of a fear that millennials, concerned about their carbon footprint, may eventually begin to shun air travel. The new regulations, by creating demand for emission reductions and spurring investment in nets to produce jet fuel, could be the industry's best hope of protecting its reputation-and a critical step toward a broader global carbon market that moves nets from promising pilot projects to a gamechanging reality. Skeptics say that nets are too speculative and a possibility only, perhaps, in the distant future. It is true that these innovations are not fully understood and that not all of them will pan out. But no group of scholars and practitioners, no matter how expert, can determine exactly which technologies should be deployed and when. It is impossible to predict what future innovations will look like, but that shouldn't stop the world from pursuing them, especially when the threat is so grave. The fact remains that many nets are ready to be deployed at scale today, and they might make the difference between limiting warming to two degrees and failing to do so. Ultimately, climate change will be stopped by creating economic incentives that unleash the innovation of the private sector-not by waiting for the perfect technology to arrive ready-made, maybe when it's already too late. No one is saying that achieving all of this will be easy, but the road to climate stability has never been that. Hard does not mean impossible, however, and the transformative power of human ingenuity offers an endless source of hope.

#### 2. Developing countries.

Rasmus Karlsson 17, Associate Professor in political science at Umeå University, “The Environmental Risks of Incomplete Globalisation” DOI: 10.1080/14747731.2016.1216820

Clearly, as much as energy saving and other forms of demand-side management in the rich countries may make sense within their respective domestic contexts, such measures have the unfortunate effect of reducing the political interest in financing the kind of supply-side revolution that is needed globally. Third and finally, as it is becoming increasingly clear that the politically agreed target of keeping global warming below two degrees Celsius will not be met by conventional mitigation alone, there will most likely be a significant need for energy for carbon dioxide removal (CDR) but also for adaptation in terms of for instance mass desalination for agricultural purposes, further underscoring the inadequacies of the current soft energy approach. An alternative and very different approach to climate nationalism would be to ask, what kind of technologies would be required to achieve climate stability in a world of 10+ billion people living prosperous lives? Starting from that question and working backwards such an alternative approach would shift the focus from the immediate deployment of non-scalable technologies to the innovation of massively scalable high-energy technologies capable of providing an abundant and cheap supply of clean baseload electricity (Galiana & Green, 2010). The underlying premise would be that by making clean energy significantly cheaper than today it would be possible to rapidly displace fossil fuels and effectively overcome political and cultural inertia. No longer economically competitive, existing fossil infrastructure would then be abandoned as stranded assets, even in those countries that for political reasons may doubt the seriousness of climate change or those where fossil industries may hold a strong political influence. Most importantly, such an approach would give developing countries the reliable 7 energy they need to move away from fossil fuels at the same time as they can universalise access to modern energy services. Currently, indoor air pollution from the burning of wood and charcoal causes millions of premature deaths annually while simultaneously driving deforestation. Given its inherent merits, not the least its potential to once and for all resolve long running North-South tensions in international environmental debates (Williams, 2005), it may perhaps seem strange that such an advanced technological path to climate stability has not been widely considered in the literature (Dorr, 2016; Green, 2015; Symons & Karlsson, 2015). There are of course many reasons for this, in particular the fact that since the most obvious such “high-energy” technology would be nuclear power, it would mean moving into a minefield of political risk. Despite more than sixty years of civilian nuclear power with extremely few fatalities compared to fossil energy (it is for instance worth noting that no one has yet died from radiation after the Fukushima accident in 2011), public perception of the risk of nuclear energy has been unforgiving. Given that there seems to be no hope for a rational discussion on the risks of nuclear compared to those of uncontrollable climate change, it may matter surprisingly little to know that if all of the world were to build nuclear power at the same per capita rate that Sweden and France did during the 1970’s and 1980’s, then coal- and gas-fired electricity could be replaced worldwide within a few decades or less (Qvist & Brook, 2015). However, in addition to other concerns such as proliferation (Socolow & Glaser, 2009), existing nuclear designs are highly brittle in the sense that one single major accident could potentially mean an end to expansion plans everywhere. Given the limited remaining carbon budget if catastrophic climate change is to be avoided, such fragility is obviously a strong argument against making a global mitigation strategy dependent on existing nuclear designs. Accepting that puts the focus back on fundamental energy R&D. While nuclear technologies broadly conceived are likely to play an important part in any high-energy future, finding an energy source which is proliferation-resistant, passive safe, and which has an abundant supply of fuel that would allow it to generate baseload electricity at a cost far below fossil sources will require nothing short of an energy miracle. When Darrel Moellendorf writes that hoping for such a technological breakthrough “hardly amounts to a basis for responsible policy” (Moellendorf, 2014:183) he gives voice to a commonsensical view which is widely shared in the climate policy community. Obviously, 8 committing vast social resources to fundamentally uncertain research makes little sense if there is a meaningful alternative. Yet, after more than two decades marked by an ever more polarised climate debate (Keller, 2015:223), it should be obvious that current mitigation efforts are failing (Jamieson, 2014). Even if the progressive offshoring of carbon-intensive industries may have helped in improving the carbon inventories of certain rich countries, overall emissions (in particular when including aviation and shipping) have steadily gone up since the inception of the Kyoto Protocol. The prospect of brute force mitigation through directly reduced consumption rates, as envisioned by many Greens and theorists alike (Harris, 2010),seem as remote as ever. Contrary to the hopes of Greenpeace and other environmental NGOs, Germany, which has taken on itself to lead the world into a future of renewable energy, has seen rising carbon emissions for several years following the phase-out of nuclear energy. At a global level, the share of coal power in the world’s energy mix has not been higher since the 1970’s and the overall share of carbon fuels in the total energy consumption has remained more or less stable around 86-87% since 2000 (BP, 2015). Over time however it is likely that the very richest countries, which have sufficient numbers of affluent consumers who can afford to pay higher energy prices, will be able to complete the shift to small-scale renewable energy sources, especially if much of their overall physical infrastructure is produced elsewhere and the intermittency problem can be solved through energy storage (and not as today by fossil backup capacity). Yet, simple back-of-the-envelope calculations show that providing the several thousand exajoules of clean energy annually that would be needed for a global economic convergence is more or less impossible using such technologies (Trainer, 2013). That is one of the reasons why almost all climate scenarios that succeed in stabilising the climate over the course of the 21st century do so by inserting austere assumptions with regard to energy access and, thus, overall energy demand (Pielke, Wigley, & Green, 2008). In less technical language, such restrictions essentially mean that that the poor stay poor deep into the future. Considering this, the connection between climate nationalist thinking and the current state of incomplete globalisation becomes readily visible. According to the standard Malthusian narrative, technology can never “keep up with growth in population, affluence, and consumption” (Mitchell, 2012:25). As a consequence, the only hope of achieving climate stability hinges on constraining population growth and overall human welfare. Despite its dubious ethical implications, such an argument would perhaps 9 make sense if fairly marginal reductions in growth rates would be sufficient to achieve longterm sustainability. Yet, given how deeply unsustainable the very metabolism of modern industrial society is, this is obviously not the case. In a world of 7.3 billion people, the reductions in economic activity would have to be of an almost apocalyptic magnitude to bring down per capita emissions levels so that they would be lower than what is absorbed by natural sequestration processes. Given the political impossibility of achieving such dramatic reductions in the rich countries, it is not surprising that the political attention has shifted to the task of keeping poor people away from fossil forms of development, something which in fact has already become the explicit goal of many environmental NGOs but also a kind of “carbon conditionality” imposed by for instance the U.S. Agency for International Development’s “Power Africa” initiative. While much can be said about the morality of imposing such double standards at home and abroad respectively, the most apparent implication of this is that the poor will in effect stay poor. Even if distributed solar panels may be sufficient for charging a cell phone or powering a reading lamp at night, the energy provided is of a completely different scale compared to what was needed for the sweeping modernisation processes that made broadly shared prosperity possible in Europe, North America and, most recently, North-East Asia. Psychologically unrealistic as it may be to expect the poor to remain content with being locked out from modernity in this way, the current state of incomplete globalisation is likely to frustrate or at least delay their rise. While this may ostensibly win some time in terms of lower carbon emissions, it will also have many countervailing effects such as delaying the demographic transition that would follow from more comprehensive forms of modernisation or prolong the use of informal fuels. Failure to fully integrate the world will also have another important effect for the transition to sustainability, namely to slow overall global growth rates. While it is fashionable in more critical literature to suggest that the marginal utility of further economic growth has become negative in the advanced economies (Jackson, 2011), this is to grossly misunderstand contemporary economic and political dynamics. Not only is further economic growth indispensable to ensure the financial stability of retirement schemes and to pay the health costs associated with an ageing population, it is in fact the very life elixir of society as it lessens distributional conflicts and encourages public risk-taking (Friedman, 2006). Only in a situation of strong economic growth are politicians likely to make the bold 10 investments in energy R&D needed to bring about the kind of “high-energy miracle” discussed above. As a consequence, it is possible to see an indirect link between failure to integrate the world and the prospects of financing breakthrough innovation. Yet, beyond this indirect link, there is a much more direct link in terms of the costs of violent conflict caused by global inequality, the policing of borders, and the risks of pandemics (as most recently seen in the case of Ebola in West Africa), all diverting resources away from more urgent social needs, including energy R&D. To build a world unafraid of itself Even if analytic political philosophy may not have shown much recent enthusiasm for nationalism or other forms of metaethical particularism (Caney, 2005), the world of today is still one in which life opportunities remain largely determined by a completely randomly assigned variable (place of birth) rather than individual ambition and character. Not only does this “citizenship premium” (Milanovic, 2013) create migratory pressure and fuel resentment, it also means that billions of people never get a chance to develop their full intellectual potential and, with it, their economic productivity. Despite that many of the great hopes of the Enlightenment have been fulfilled over the last centuries, it has now become common to distrust the very possibility of social progress and to doubt that humanity can ultimately build a world unafraid of itself (Bronner, 2004). Without subscribing to teleology (Wendt, 2003) there are many reasons to think that, despite the recent rhetoric of Donald Trump or other signs of backsliding, much greater optimism is in fact warranted. Not only has there been no new wave of protectionism in the wake of the financial crisis (as was the case after the crash in 1929) but the World Value Survey and other similar studies have consistently shown a movement away from traditional values and hierarchical forms of authority towards secular-rational values, greater individual freedom, and autonomy (Welzel, 2013:143). Every year, more and more people travel by airplane and are able to experience other countries and cultures first-hand. As the world gets smaller, it is becoming increasingly difficult to deny our common humanity and insist on the artificial segregation of people based on mere geographical luck. Yet, in terms of politics or ideology, there has been surprisingly little interest in even imagining a world with universal freedom of movement and shared prosperity. It is reasonable to think that this disinterest in part derives from deeply entrenched Malthusian beliefs and fears of a coming climate crisis. 11 Malthusian discourse often portrays global climate change as ultimate evidence of irresponsibility, greed or even the “cancer stage of capitalism” (Barry, 2012:138). Such descriptions show little tolerance for learning or humility with regard to the difficulties of the task. There has never been a blueprint for how to build a prosperous planetary civilisation or for how to achieve technological maturity in a way that does not destroy the biosphere. Yet, in a world of seven billion actually existing people, the question is where to go from here? As discussed above, to try to reverse the great structural processes of modernity through intentional localisation does not only seem wholly politically unrealistic, it is also most unlikely to actually deliver greater resilience or environmental sustainability. Yet, the problem of lacking realism is just as acute for those advocating breakthrough innovation or seeking to more fully integrate the world (Karlsson, 2013). In a time of public austerity, rising xenophobia, and an almost complete absence of realistic yet transformative visions at the global level, it is not surprising that climate nationalist responses have emerged as the default policy orientation. While these responses may at best slow the rate of warming, they offer little hope for the 3.5 billion people who currently lack access to modern energy and, as such, they are likely to contribute to the creation of new patterns of climate injustice. They are also problematic in the sense that for every year that a more meaningful response is delayed, the need for CDR grows. Already now, such negative emissions technology has become more or less a necessity for achieving the two degree target according to the scenarios represented in the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) database (Anderson, 2015). Whereas breakthrough energy innovation could potentially offer a source of sustained global growth as energy would become significantly cheaper, CDR is always going to come at a net cost. If CDR eventually becomes unaffordable due to prolonged political procrastination and generally inefficient mitigation policies, it is likely that the political momentum will shift towards solar radiation management (SRM) and other more risky forms of climate engineering. Instead of fearfully backing into a warming future, there is an obvious need for bold and proactive political action (Garibaldi, 2014; Karlsson, 2016). Yet, as long as mitigation is perceived as a cost and something that runs counter to broader socio-economic goals, such action is unlikely. While accelerating the transition to a high-energy planet would undoubtedly put strong upward pressure on global emissions in the short run, it would also open up a political opportunity space for effective climate action that does not exist today. In a more 12 equal and integrated world, there would be greater financial and human resources to combat climate change. Most of all, by providing a progressive account of globalisation, there would be a meaningful counter-narrative to both nationalist and neoliberal thinking.

### Infrastructure DA---2AC

#### Biden has no PC

Adam Creighton 10/29, Washington Correspondent for The Australian, award-winning journalist with a special interest in tax and financial policy, B.S. in Economics from the University of New South Wales, M.A. in Economics from Oxford University, “Joe Biden’s stocks grow weaker as errors build,” The Australian, 10/29/21, https://www.theaustralian.com.au/world/joe-bidens-stocks-grow-weaker-as-errors-build/news-story/770507d77e5918541ebc5e2ab0c71af0

Little is going right for the Democrats in the US. President Joe Biden flew out of Washington on Thursday night for Italy and then Glasgow in the weakest political position of his presidency.

Biden’s rapidly diminishing political capital at home augurs badly for any new global agreement on climate change.

His personal approval rating has been falling, accelerating since the controversial withdrawal from Afghanistan in August, to the lowest point of any president at this stage except Donald Trump.

Economic growth has collapsed in the third quarter to 2 per cent, inflation remains stuck above 5 per cent, and the President’s reform agenda has stalled.

Almost 20 months on from the start of the pandemic the labour force remains three million smaller than it was in February last year.

Illegal arrivals at the southern border with Mexico have exploded. A Republican could even win a close-run governor election in ­Virginia next week, which a few weeks ago looked to be a shoo-in for the Democratic incumbents.

Far-left Democrats refused to support the President’s slimmed-down “infrastructure” compromise on Thursday (Friday AEDT), furious the originally massive ­social spending had shrunk from a mooted $US3.5 trillion, as promised earlier this year, to less than $US1.9 trillion to appease moderate Democrats worried about how the plans might play in the suburbs.

In other words, the President landed in Rome early on Friday for his first in-person G20 meeting without any of the legislative ­machinery he needs to make his April promise to slash US carbon emission by 50 per cent by 2030 credible.

Biden’s lacklustre first year is the product of forced and unforced errors. Inflation was always going to tick up as the economy snapped back, whoever was in office. The job market was bound to recover slowly.

But setting reform ambitions so high when the Democrats won only a tiny legislative mandate last November – barely a handful of seats in House of Representatives and none in the Senate – was bound to end in humiliation.

Biden’s proposed reforms to ­social security match Lyndon Johnson’s Great Society reforms of the late 1960s in social impact, without any of the political mandate. Similarly, the White House unexpectedly mandated that every employee in businesses with more than 100 staff – more than 100 million workers – needed to be vaccinated against Covid-19, guaranteeing to fuel angry protests, and clog US courts for years.

#### Antitrust harmonization is popular

Michael Ristaniemi 20, PhD Candidate in Commercial Law at the University of Turku, Vice President for Sustainability at the Metsä Group, Participant in the Visiting Scholar Programme at the University of California, Berkeley, “International Antitrust: Toward Upgrading Coordination and Enforcement”, Doctoral Dissertation, October 2020, https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/347180879.pdf

Despite the above, the major powers do have an interest in cooperating internationally in competition issues. The EU and the US appear to desire further convergence of practices and substantive thinking. Officially, China does not appear to have a strong stance on convergence, but recent practice shows that it too has engaged in an increasing amount of dialogue on competition matters. Indeed, there is an increasing amount of cooperation in relation to investigating international cartels, referring to cartels that operate in several nations concurrently and which seek to cartelize them.208

Further, the competition authorities of major powers have an incentive to ensure that merger control procedures affecting mergers benefiting their respective regions are as internationally streamlined and coordinated as possible given the number of multinationals that originate from each of their respective territories. Nonetheless, there are a few hurdles for streamlining international merger control. First is the dichotomous leadership of the US and the EU systems, with no single leading standard to become the global standard. Second, there are clear differences in nations’ scope of merger review that may arise from partially differing sets of goals should they attempt to address public interest or other non-competition related concerns concurrently with competition concerns.209 In any case, the aggregate cost of a fragmented system of international merger control is arguably higher than it would need to be. Improved, more structured coordination could help, as discussed further in Chapters 5 and 6 below.

#### Political context, not capital explains passage. True for Biden---empirics and polarization prove.

Ryan Telingator 21, B.A. in Political Science and Government from Bowdoin University, "When is Change Possible? Presidential Power as Shaped by Political Context, Constitutional Tools, and Legislative Skills", 5/20/2021, https://digitalcommons.bowdoin.edu/honorsprojects/258/

My research does not support Greenstein’s theory. Instead, my findings align more closely with those of George Edwards in At the Margins, where he argues that the “national preoccupation with the chief executive is misplaced,” and that presidential power is, in fact, limited in the Constitution’s “purposefully inefficient system in which the founding fathers’ handiwork in decentralizing power defeats even the most capable leaders.”50

Instead of focusing on legislative skills as a source of presidential influence, Edwards argues that party support and public support are more important. Legislative skills are only critical for “members of Congress who remain open to change after other influences have had their impact.”51 In a time as polarized as today, where very few members of Congress are “open to chang[ing]” their vote, these skills play a minor role in legislative negotiations. Similar assertions are made in another book by Edwards, Predicting the Presidency. He argues that exploiting existing opportunities (consolidating existing party and public support) is much more important for presidential success than creating opportunities (convincing legislators to change their vote vis a vis legislative skills).52

Both Lyndon Johnson and Ronald Reagan are remembered for their exemplary political skills. The Johnson Treatment, a legislating strategy in which Johnson used his imposing 6’4”, 240-pound figure – literally physically and verbally bullying, cajoling, lobbying, and threatening – to get what he wanted out of people,53 remains infamous in presidential political literature. Similarly, Ronald Reagan, “The Great Communicator,” is still revered for his oratorial prestige. Although these legislative skills were useful in passing the pieces of legislation outlined in the case studies – Johnson gaining support from southern Democrats on the EOA and Reagan compellingly speaking in favor of the ERTA – they proved impotent in political contexts not conducive to change. After Vietnam for Johnson and after the passage of the ERTA for Reagan (in conjunction with the recession in 1982), the presidents’ policy windows closed. Their renowned legislative skills could not overcome an inopportune political context.

The case studies thus demonstrate the value of skills at the margins, but also exemplify their unsubstantial influence as the major factor driving policy. Again, the research suggests that political context is the most important factor in legislative change.

5.4 Applying Lessons to the Present: Predicting Biden’s Success

With an understanding that the political context largely drives a president’s potential for change, with skills helping on the margins, it is important to assess the 2021 political climate in order make an informed prediction about Biden’s prospects.

The COVID-19 pandemic opened a significant policy window for Biden. With a U.S. death toll nearing 580,000, massive unemployment, and a severe economic contraction, the pandemic was an all-encompassing problem that the entire country wanted addressed. Thus, the three streams of problem, policy, and politics converged to open the opportunity for the Biden administration to pass the American Rescue Plan. The Rescue Plan was signed into law in March and has received bipartisan support from the American public.54

President Biden claimed a mandate from his election, arguing that “millions of Americans” “voted for [his] vision,” giving “a clear victory” and tasking him to make his “vision real.”55 However, based on the extreme polarization in D.C., it is unlikely to become a quantifiable mandate that changes Congressional voting behavior.56 Polarization has made it impossible to win cross-party support, or, in Edwardsian terms, create new opportunities. There is deep political antagonism between parties, and even within parties,57 making any sort of bipartisanship near impossible.

#### No food wars

Jonas Vestby 18, Doctoral Researcher at the Peace Research Institute Oslo, Ida Rudolfsen, doctoral researcher at the Department of Peace and Conflict Research at Uppsala University and PRIO, and Halvard Buhaug, Research Professor at the Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO); Professor of Political Science at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU); and Associate Editor of the Journal of Peace Research and Political Geography, “Does hunger cause conflict?”, 5/18/18, https://blogs.prio.org/ClimateAndConflict/2018/05/does-hunger-cause-conflict/]

It is perhaps surprising, then, that there is little scholarly merit in the notion that a short-term reduction in access to food increases the probability that conflict will break out. This is because to start or participate in violent conflict requires people to have both the means and the will. Most people on the brink of starvation are not in the position to resort to violence, whether against the government or other social groups. In fact, the urban middle classes tend to be the most likely to protest against rises in food prices, since they often have the best opportunities, the most energy, and the best skills to coordinate and participate in protests.

Accordingly, there is a widespread misapprehension that social unrest in periods of high food prices relates primarily to food shortages. In reality, the sources of discontent are considerably more complex – linked to political structures, land ownership, corruption, the desire for democratic reforms and general economic problems – where the price of food is seen in the context of general increases in the cost of living. Research has shown that while the international media have a tendency to seek simple resource-related explanations – such as drought or famine – for conflicts in the Global South, debates in the local media are permeated by more complex political relationships.

#### Global food supply is high and resilient

Indur Goklany 15, PhD from Michigan State, Assistant Director of Programs, Science and Technology Policy at the DOI, represented the United States at the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and during the negotiations that led to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, “CARBON DIOXIDE: The good news”, The Global Warming Policy Foundation, GWPF Report 18

Crop yields have increased (see Figure 3) and global food production, far from declining, has actually increased in recent decades. Between 1990–92 and 2011–13, although global population increased by 31% to 7.1 billion, available food supplies increased by 44%. Consequently, the population suffering from chronic hunger declined by 173 million despite a population increase of 1.7 billion.112 This occurred despite the diversion of land and crops from production of food to the production of biofuels. According to one estimate, in 2008 such activities helped push 130–155 million people into absolute poverty, exacerbating hunger in this most marginal of populations. This may in turn have led to 190,000 premature deaths worldwide in 2010 alone.113 Thus, ironically, a policy purporting to reduce AGW in order to reduce future poverty and hunger only magnified these problems in the present day.

### Trade-Off---2AC---Top

#### The plan’s through the IAD---that’s separate from all other FTC activity

Dina Kallay 14, Director, Intellectual Property and Competition, at Ericsson, Former Counsel for Intellectual Proper ty & International Antitrust at the FTC Office of International Affairs, and Marc Winerman, Former FTC Staffer, Leading Authority on FTC History, The FTC International Program at 100, 29 Antitrust ABA 39, Fall 2014, 42, Lexis

International Antitrust and Consumer Protection Work in the 1980s and 1990s

In the 1980s and 1990s a number of relevant trends emerged. First, markets became more and more global, a trend expedited with the 1994 successful conclusion of the World Trade Organization's Uruguay Negotiation Round, to which 123 jurisdictions were signatories with additional ones added later. The FTC's 1995 Annual Report reflects this trend in noting "dynamic changes in the economy such as . . . the internationalization of many markets." 59 Second, with the fall of the former Soviet Union in 1989, a growing number of jurisdictions around the world began to adopt antitrust enforcement regimes as they transformed their market model from a planned one to a market-based model. More antitrust regimes meant a greater need for case and policy coordination with non-U.S. counterparts to ensure consistent outcomes, and prevent conflicting results of actions by agencies in different countries. 60 Further, the birth of many new antitrust agencies, especially in economies that lacked a competition culture, also meant these agencies were in need of training in order to successfully develop and implement a sound anti-trust enforcement regime.

The resulting needs did not go unanswered. In 1982, an International Antitrust Program was established as a separate division within the FTC's Bureau of Competition, known as the International Antitrust Division. The program included investigation and prosecution of antitrust violations that had international features, as well as international liaison activities with foreign antitrust officials. 61 It was not until 1985 when the work of this division was first acknowledged in the Commission's Annual Report, which reported its staff as having worked that year on 25 investigations that involved international aspects and having been "active in a variety of intervention matters and international liaison activities involving transnational competition and antitrust law enforcement issues impacting upon the domestic economy." 62

#### Cartel enforcement generates revenue---that’s funneled back to the FTC

Dr. Marek Martyniszyn 21, Senior Lecturer in Law at Queen’s University Belfast, PhD from University College Dublin, LLM (with Specializations in EU Economic and World Trade Law) from the Saarland University’s European Institute, MA Degree from the Warsaw School of Economics and Postgraduate Certificate in Higher Education Teaching (PGCHET) from Queen's University Belfast, “Competitive Harm Crossing Borders: Regulatory Gaps And A Way Forward”, Journal of Competition Law & Economics, Volume 17, Issue 3, September 2021, https://academic.oup.com/jcle/article/17/3/686/6095856

Furthermore, international cartelists should face more severe sanctions for their violations. Despite the increasing interest in criminalization and individual liability more broadly, the most common sanctions for cartel conduct are corporate fines. The prevalent fining methodology is to impose fines that are benchmarked to the relevant in-country turnover of the culprits.71 Given the nature of the present regulatory regime, this practice is friendly to cartelists. Assuming, for the sake of argument, that corporate fines and fine-setting methodology are both sufficient and just, an international cartel would face appropriate sanctions only if it were to be held responsible in each and every affected jurisdiction. That is virtually impossible. Moreover, the common practice is to introduce maximum limits on fines. Quite often fines cannot exceed either a specific monetary amount, provided for in the relevant domestic rules, or a fixed percentage of the violator’s last year-relevant in-forum turnover, typically ten per cent.72 There is no theory or empirical evidence supporting such thresholds. Even if there were, in practice such thresholds are never met. The imposed fines are set at astonishingly low levels compared to illegal profits, even within the sanctioning jurisdictions.73 Given the practical impossibility of effective enforcement in every harmed state, those jurisdictions which have the capacity to bring transnational cases should increase the severity of their sanctions to increase deterrence. They should do so by, at least, both increasing permissible fine limits and by utilizing the full available spectrum of punitive measures. In this context, the transnational nature of a violation, leading to a transfer of wealth abroad, should be taken into account.

From the deterrence perspective it would be advisable to relate fines to overall, not just in-forum turnover. This would undoubtedly lead to the defendants’ bar raising the double jeopardy argument, conflating the question of which harm is being addressed and which legal interest is being protected with the issue of appropriate sanctions. In the current regulatory framework, each jurisdiction addresses the harm caused on its own market. Therefore, double jeopardy is not and would not become an issue. To avoid this misleading double jeopardy argument, it may be worth considering replacing turnover as a sanctioning benchmark with the overall value of the violator’s assets. In general, the type and severity of sanctions is a sovereign matter. For example, the US provides for imprisonment of up to ten years for individuals involved in a cartel,74 although in many other countries around the world such conduct is not subject to any criminal sanctions, or even to any individual sanctions. Since this is a sovereign choice and there are no binding universal norms to the contrary, it cannot be contested. That said, there is no reason why agencies and courts should not continue with the good practice, which has already emerged, of taking into account sanctions already imposed by other jurisdictions. This practice should continue as a matter of comity, especially in cases involving non-financial sanctions.

Moreover, fines levied on foreign violators could be left, at least partially, in domestic competition agencies’ budgets to facilitate future enforcement and advocacy activities. Sceptics may argue that this would skew the incentives, making the agencies more likely to bring such cases. That is, in fact, the very objective of this proposal. As explained above transnational cases are generally more complicated, presenting higher risks for enforcers. The system should reflect that and incentivize the taking of such risks. More fundamentally, given that transnational violations tend to cause greater harm and lead to outflow of wealth, they warrant agencies’ enhanced attention.

#### All efforts fail without ending national silos

Thanh Phan 18, Sessional Instructor in International Law at the University of Victoria, PhD Candidate at the Law Faculty at the University of Victoria, Doctoral Fellow at the Centre for International Governance Innovation, Former Transnational Merger Investigator and FTAs Negotiator at the Vietnam Competition Authority, Vietnam, “Realism and International Cooperation in Competition Law”, Houston Journal of International Law, Volume 40, Issue 1, 40 Hous. J. Int'l L. 297, April 2018, https://tinyurl.com/3s7rwtkc

Fourth, by conducting overlapping investigations in a certain cross-border case without cooperation, each competition authority may have a portion of evidence, but none of them may have thorough facts about the violation. 148 An international cartel may operate in different countries. Each of these countries' competition authorities can obtain evidence only within their territory, while missing any piece of evidence may make it difficult for them to prove and remedy such a transnational violation. 149 According to the OECD, cooperation allows a competition authority to use material of the counterparts and therefore offers authorities the opportunity to have more effective investigations and to generate efficiencies. 150

#### ‘Dark pattern’ enforcement increased yesterday

Kristin L. Bryan 10-29, Senior Associate at Squire Patton Boggs (US) LLP, “Breaking: FTC Announces It Will Ramp up Enforcement Against “Dark Patterns” Directed at Consumers”, National Law Review, 10/29/2021, https://www.natlawreview.com/article/breaking-ftc-announces-it-will-ramp-enforcement-against-dark-patterns-directed

This month, CPW’s Kyle Fath, Kristin Bryan, Christina Lamoureux & Elizabeth Helpling explained how data privacy and cybersecurity were Federal Trade Commission (“FTC”) priorities. As they wrote, there were “three key areas of interest to consumer privacy that are now in the FTC’s spotlight, as well as their relation to state privacy legislation and their anticipated impact to civil litigation.” One area of interest they identified was deceptive and manipulative conduct on the Internet (including so-called “dark patterns”). Today, the FTC announced that it was going to ramp up enforcement against illegal dark patterns that trick consumers into subscriptions. Read on to learn more and what it means going forward.

First, some background. The term “dark patterns” collectively applies manipulative techniques that can impair consumer autonomy and create traps for online shoppers (for instance, think of multi-click unsubscription options). As CPW previously explained, “[e]arlier this year, the FTC hosted a workshop called “Bringing Dark Patterns to Light,” and sought comments from experts and the public to evaluate how dark patterns impact customers.” The genesis for this workshop was the FTC’s concern with harms caused by dark patterns, and how dark patterns may take advantage of certain groups of vulnerable consumers.

Notably, the FTC is not alone in its attention to this issue as California’s Attorney General previously announced regulations that banned dark patterns and required disclosure to consumers of the right to opt-out of the sale of personal information collected through online cookies. Dark patterns has also been targeted in civil litigation. This year, the weight-loss app Noom faced a class action alleging deceptive acts through Noom’s cancellation policy, automatic renewal schemes, and marketing to consumers.

Building off these prior developments, today, the FTC announced a new enforcement policy statement “warning companies against deploying illegal dark patterns that trick or trap consumers into subscription services.” As the FTC cautioned, “[t]he agency is ramping up its enforcement in response to a rising number of complaints about the financial harms caused by deceptive sign up tactics, including unauthorized charges or ongoing billing that is impossible cancel.”

As summarized in the FTC’s press release announcing this development, businesses going forward must follow three key requirements in this area or run the risk of an enforcement action (including potential civil penalties):

(1) Disclose clearly and conspicuously all material terms of the product or service: This includes disclosing how much a product and/or service costs, “deadlines by which the consumer must act to stop further charges, the amount and frequency of such charges, how to cancel, and information about the product or service itself that is needed to stop consumers from being deceived about the characteristics of the product or service.”

(2) Obtain the consumer’s express informed consent before charging them for a product or services: This means “obtaining the consumer’s acceptance of the negative option feature separately from other portions of the entire transaction, not including information that interferes with, detracts from, contradicts, or otherwise undermines the consumer’s ability to provide their express informed consent.”

(3) Provide easy and simple cancellation to the consumer: Marketers are also to “provide cancellation mechanisms that are at least as easy to use as the method the consumer used to buy the product or service in the first place.”

This development is likely one of only many anticipated to be rolled out in light of the FTC’s continued focus on data privacy and cybersecurity.

#### No nuke terror

Dr. John Mueller 20, Professor of Political Science and Senior Research Scientist with the Mershon Center for International Security Studies at Ohio State University, Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute, PhD from the University of California, Los Angeles, “Assessing International Threats During and After the Cold War”, Cato Institute, 5/6/2020, https://www.cato.org/publications/study/assessing-international-threats-during-after-cold-war

In the decade after the Cold War, a similar process of threat identification took place as problems previously considered to be of minor, or at least of secondary, concern were promoted. Anxieties about international terrorism substantially increased during the 1990s and were set into highest relief with the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. Extrapolating wildly from 9/11, a terrorist event ten times more destructive than any other in history, terrorism of that sort has repeatedly been taken to present a direct, even existential, threat to the United States or to the West — or even to the world system or to civilization as we know it.6 Wild extrapolations have precipitated costly antiterrorism and antiproliferation wars and huge increases in security spending. In these ventures, trillions of dollars have been squandered and well over two hundred thousand people have perished, including more than twice as many Americans as were killed on 9/11.7 There has been a tendency to see these exercises as misguided elements of a coherent plan to establish a “liberal world order” or to apply “liberal hegemony.“8 However, the overwhelming impetus was far more banal: to get the bastards responsible for 9/11.

Islamist terrorism in the United States has killed some six people per year since 9/11, and far more people in Europe perished yearly at the hands of terrorists in most years in the 1970s and 1980s.9 But there has nonetheless been a tendency to continue to inflate al-Qaeda’s importance and effectiveness.

In fact, al‐​Qaeda Central has done remarkably little since it got horribly lucky in 2001. It has served as something of an inspiration to some Muslim extremists, has done some training, seems to have contributed a bit to the Taliban’s far larger insurgency in Afghanistan, and may have participated in a few terrorist acts in Pakistan. It has also issued a considerable number of videos filled with empty, self‐​infatuated, and essentially delusional threats.10 Even isolated and under siege, it is difficult to see why al‐​Qaeda could not have perpetrated attacks at least as costly and shocking as the shooting rampages (organized by others) that took place in Mumbai in 2008, in Paris in 2015, or in Orlando and Berlin in 2016. And, although billions of foreigners have entered legally into the United States since 2001, not one of these, it appears, has been an agent smuggled in by al‐​Qaeda. The exaggeration of terrorist capacities has been greatest in the many overstated assessments of their ability to develop nuclear weapons. In this, it has been envisioned that, because al‐​Qaeda operatives used box cutters so effectively on 9/11, they would, although under siege, soon apply equal talents in science and engineering to fabricate nuclear weapons and then detonate them on American cities.11

It is possible to argue, of course, that the damage committed by jihadists in the United States since 9/11 is so low because “American defensive measures are working,” as Peter Bergen puts it.12 However, although security measures should be given some credit, it is not at all clear that they have reduced the amount of terrorism significantly. There have been scores of terrorist plots rolled up in the US by authorities but, looked at carefully, the culprits left on their own do not seem to have had the capacity to increase the death toll very much.13 As Brian Jenkins puts it, “Their numbers remain small, their determination limp, and their competence poor.“14 Nor can security measures have deterred terrorism. Some targets, such as airliners, may have been taken off the list, but potential terrorist targets remain legion.15 To a considerable degree, terrorism is rare because as Bruce Schneier puts it bluntly, “there isn’t much of a threat of terrorism to defend against.“16
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#### Expanding the scope is key---otherwise, cartels will be green-lit

David J. Gerber 17, University Distinguished Professor, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago-Kent College of Law. Journal of Antitrust Enforcement; “Competitive Harm in Global Supply Chains: Assessing Current Responses and Identifying Potential Future Responses”, Volume 6, September 2017, p. 5–24, https://academic.oup.com/antitrust/article-pdf/6/1/5/24149036/jnx015.pdf

The FTAIA is itself a major obstacle to realizing the potential of US private enforcement. Enacted in 1982, it provides authority for US institutions to apply US antitrust law to private conduct outside US territory.29 It incorporates the effects principle of public international law and interprets it for use in US law.30 There is widespread agreement that the statute is exceptionally opaque, and its opacity hampers both US enforcement and the potential influence of US law in other countries.31

The FTAIA’s relationship to other antitrust legislation creates one level of difficulty. The statute represents an exception to the coverage of the basic antitrust statute, the Sherman act.32 If the FTAIA applies to conduct, the Sherman Act does not apply. Moreover, the FTAIA contains exceptions to its general provisions.33 As a result, interpreting the statute typically involves dealing with double negatives—ie exceptions to exceptions.

The statute’s structure increases the difficulty of using it. It establishes three basic categories of commerce—domestic, import, and foreign—and bases conclusions regarding the legality of foreign conduct on whether the conduct falls within one or more of those categories. The basic idea is that conduct in domestic commerce is subject to US antitrust law; conduct wholly in foreign commerce is not subject to it unless it has a ‘direct, substantial, and reasonably foreseeable effect’ in the United States; and conduct in or affecting import commerce may be subject to US law. The boundaries of these categories remain highly contested, however, despite more than three decades of extensive litigation.34

These categories are used in conjunction with two main operative provisions— each of which has also generated controversy and uncertainty. The first incorporates the effects principle of public international law and interprets it for application of the US antitrust laws. It exempts from the antitrust laws anticompetitive conduct outside US territory unless such conduct causes a ‘direct, substantial, and reasonably foreseeable effect’ within the United States. This language has been interpreted in a large number of cases, but the opinions have not clarified the meaning of the terms. The second requires that the conduct ‘give rise to a claim’ under the Sherman Act. Again, there have been many interpretations of this provision, but the cases have exacerbated rather than reduced uncertainty.

The history behind the statute reveals some of the factors that shaped it and that have contributed to the confusion surrounding it.35 When the United States articulated and supported the effects principle after the Second World War, many outside the United States viewed its claim to expanded jurisdiction as a vehicle through which it sought to impose its form of economic organization on other countries. For decades, several major European countries (particularly the UK) protested the validity of the effects principle under international law.36

This led US courts to develop the so-called ‘comity’ principle, according to which US courts would refrain from applying US law in situations where the US interest in such application was less than the interest of the states in which the conduct occurred. These responses to foreign concerns about US jurisdictional assertions did not implicate the authority itself, but rather the use of that authority. By the late 1970s, the courts had produced long lists of factors to be considered in applying the law extraterritorially.37 There was, however, much criticism among US commentators and judges about the viability of this effort.38

The confusion and uncertainty created by this comity approach encouraged Congress to pass the FTAIA and shaped its content. The basic objective was to clarify and limit the scope of the effects principle as incorporated in US antitrust law while assuring that the law could not be used by others to interfere with the activities of US businesses overseas.39 The statute also represents an attempt by Congress to reduce the potential for applying US law to foreign conduct and thereby to reduce criticism and resistance to US law. Defining the scope of the effects principle was seen as preferable to the failed efforts to achieve this end by relying on judicial use of the amorphous comity principle. The statute dramatically changed analysis of the issue and moved toward a potentially more effective solution. Unfortunately, however, it has not provided the clarity needed to make the solution effective.

#### It causes years of protracted litigation AND gets struck down

Nicolás Rivero 21, Tech Reporter at Quartz, BA in Journalism from Northwestern University, “Biden’s Antitrust Crusaders Can’t Crusade Without Congress”, Quartz, 3/11/2021, https://qz.com/1982437/lina-khan-and-tim-wu-need-congress-to-push-their-antitrust-agenda/

The FTC could also decide to dust off its rarely used rule-making power and declare certain anticompetitive business practices illegal. But any new rule would almost certainly trigger legal challenges, which would spark a long, expensive court battle in front of judges who aren’t likely to be sympathetic. Kovacic estimates the process could take four or five years—and in the end, judges might just strike the rule down.

#### The CP is confusing and unclear

Elizabeth B. Deutsch 15, JD Candidate at Yale Law School, MSc from the London School of Economics, MPhil from the University of Cambridge, BA from Yale University, “Expanding Conscience, Shrinking Care: The Crisis in Access to Reproductive Care and the Affordable Care Act's Nondiscrimination Mandate”, Yale Law Journal, 124 Yale L.J. 2470, May 2015, Lexis

The Department of Justice (DOJ) and the FTC have issued a statement about their antitrust oversight of post-ACA integration. While the statement makes clear that oversight will continue, it suggests that "clinical integration" is the magic phrase that healthcare entities must utter in order to pass muster. Statement of Antitrust Enforcement Policy Regarding Accountable Care Organizations Participating in the Medicare Shared Savings Program, Fed. Trade Commission & Dep't Just. (Oct. 2011), http://www.justice.gov/atr/public/health\_care/276458.pdf [http://perma.cc/6LB8-3BEN]. In its publication Clinical Integration, the American Hospital Association states that for their purposes:

Antitrust guidance is narrowly and technically drafted without any binding effect; as a result, caregivers can neither readily understand the guidance nor completely rely on it. The AHA has advocated for the antitrust agencies - the Department of Justice's Antitrust Division and the Federal Trade Commission - to issue more comprehensive, user-friendly guidance clearly explaining what issues must be resolved to ensure that clinical integration programs comply with antitrust law.

#### It gets rolled back

Amy Marshak 11, JD Candidate at the New York University School of Law, BS from Cornell University, “The Federal Trade Commission On The Frontier: Suggestions For The Use Of Section 5”, New York University Law Review, 86 N.Y.U.L. Rev. 1121, October 2011, Lexis

C. Limitations on the Federal Trade Commission's Section 5 Authority

The text of the FTC Act, its legislative history, and controlling Supreme Court precedent point toward an almost boundless authority to pursue anticompetitive conduct under section 5. However, the lower courts and Congress have affirmatively limited the FTC's ability to exercise the widest reaches of its power. This has become increasingly [\*1133] true in the wake of a widespread backlash against FTC expansion beginning in the 1970s and the retrenchment of antitrust doctrine more generally in the past few decades. 58 This change in legal and political philosophy may place significant limitations on any attempt by the FTC to expand the reach of section 5.

1. Official Airline Guides, Boise Cascade, and Ethyl

A trio of circuit-level decisions in the early 1980s - Official Airline Guides, Boise Cascade, and Ethyl 59 - significantly curtailed the Commission's use of its power to attack anticompetitive business practices that fall outside the narrowly defined categories of Sherman Act doctrine. 60 In each case, the FTC acknowledged that the practices at issue did not amount to a violation of the Sherman or Clayton Acts but declared the conduct to be an unfair method of competition independent of the other statutes. 61 However, the Second and Ninth Circuits overturned the FTC's determinations, marking the beginning of a significant rollback in the Commission's willingness to pursue stand-alone section 5 violations.

#### No emerging tech impact

Caitlin Talmadge 19, Associate Professor of Security Studies in the School of Foreign at Georgetown University, as well as Senior Non-Resident Fellow in Foreign Policy at the Brookings Institution. "Emerging Technology and Intra-War Escalation Risks: Evidence from the Cold War, Implications for Today." https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01402390.2019.1631811

Yet the future relationship between emerging technologies and escalation may not be as straightforward as these statements imply. The debate about emerging technologies tends to portray them as a powerful independent variable – an exogenous factor that is both necessary and sufficient to cause conflict escalation. This paper argues instead that emerging technologies are more likely to function as intervening variables; they may be necessary for escalation to happen in some cases, but they alone are not sufficient, and sometimes they will not even be necessary. The strongest drivers of escalation will actually lie elsewhere, in the realms of politics and strategy. As a result, concern about new technologies is warranted, but determinism is not. An overemphasis on the dangers of technology alone ignores the critical role of political and strategic choices in shaping the impact of technology, and also could lead to a misplaced faith in arms control or other means of trying to stuff the technological genie back in the bottle.5

### Capitalism K---1AR

#### Best study confirms it.

Hideo Noda & Shigeru Kano 21, Tokyo University of Science; The Shoko Chukin Bank, "Environmental Economic Modeling of Sustainable Growth and Consumption in a Zero-Emission Society," Journal of Cleaner Production, Vol. 299, 05/25/2021, pg. 1-2.

Manufacturing activities that pollute the soil, atmosphere, and water have adversely affected the environment. The abatement of pollution is therefore essential to maintaining environmental standards in the future. The purpose of this paper is to examine what kind of economic conditions should be satisfied if an economy adopts a rule stating that pollution must be cleaned up when it is produced, and whether the zero net emission of pollution flow (in the sense of a zero residual amount of pollution created minus pollution abated) is compatible with the continued growth of gross domestic product (GDP) and consumption when the economy experiences cyclical fluctuations.

A detailed understanding of the economic implications of cyclical fluctuations is crucial because actual economies inevitably undergo cycles of expansion and recession. In this respect, on the basis of the laboratory equipment model of Rivera-Batiz and Romer (1991), Matsuyama (1999) constructed a useful model that generates endogenous fluctuations. Notably, under specific conditions, an economy can perpetually oscillate between a capital-accumulation-based (no-innovation) growth phase and innovation-led growth phase. The former phase is called the Solow regime, after the work of Solow (1956), while the latter phase is called the Romer regime, after the work of Romer (1990) and Rivera-Batiz and Romer (1991).

However, Matsuyama (1999) did not pay attention to environmental aspects in a society. We therefore extend the model of Matsuyama (1999) by considering pollution abatement from the perspective of the kindergarten rule model of Brock and Taylor (2005). We thereby expect to obtain meaningful findings by analyzing endogenous fluctuations with pollution abatement, which has not been tackled in earlier studies. The term “kindergarten rule” originates from the title of a book written by Fulghum (1990) and implies that messes be cleaned up as they are created. Brock and Taylor (2005) referred to the proportion of pollution abatement expenditure in GDP for achieving zero net emissions of pollution (i.e., completely eliminating the amount of pollution created minus pollution abated) as the kindergarten rule level of abatement (or just the kindergarten rule).

Ono (2003) extended Matsuyama’s (1999) model to analyze endogenous fluctuations by accounting for environmental variables. Specifically, Ono (2003) incorporated the production structure of Matsuyama (1999) into the framework of the overlapping generations model on the basis of the work of John and Pecchenino (1994) and examined environmental taxation that maximizes the environmental quality and economic growth rate. It is found that there is a critical level of tax, and the economy achieves higher growth rates of GDP and environmental quality by raising (or reducing) tax if the initial tax is below (or above) the critical level. That is to say, the purpose of the present study differs from that of the study of Ono (2003). We analyze the feasibility of the positive growth of GDP with zero net emission that reflects the kindergarten rule of pollution abatement, while Ono (2003) focused on taxation for improving environmental quality and promoting economic growth. Recent efforts toward a zero-emission society, which are an important topic of the Paris Agreement that came into force on November 4, 2016, have received worldwide attention (see, for example, Pauli, 1997; Baumgartner and Zielowski, 2007; Tokimatsu et al., 2014). The present study is therefore of social importance and relevant. Additionally, we consider that the notion of environmental quality is vague and hence difficult to capture empirically. In contrast, the zero net emission of pollution has clear meaning.

Related studies of environment-growth models with endogenous fluctuations include those conducted by Zhang (1999), Chen and Li (2011), and Palivos and Varvarigos (2017). Zhang (1999), for example, examined the possibility of nonlinear dynamics in the model of John and Pecchenino (1994) and showed that cyclically or chaotically fluctuating equilibria are more likely to exist when people’s concerns are more towards greener preferences and the maintenance efficiency relative to degradation is not sufficiently high. Chen and Li (2011) introduced the habit formation of environmental quality and consumption tax to the model of John and Pecchenino (1994). The habit formation of environmental quality in the model of Chen and Li (2011) means that people get used to the environment while they grow up and will compare environmental quality in their old age with that when they were young. As a result, Chen and Li (2011) showed that cyclical fluctuations and entropic chaos may exist if households have a preference towards environmental quality and the maintenance efficiency is sufficiently low relative to degradation and the tax rate. The economy moves from complex to simple dynamics as the tax rate increases. Using an overlapping generations model where life expectancy is positively affected by the provision of public health services and by the environmental quality, Palivos and Varvarigos (2017) showed that, despite the presence of an aggregate learning-by-doing externality, the economy cannot sustain a positive growth rate in the long run if resources are not devoted to environmental preservation. Moreover, an active policy of environmental preservation is not only an important complementary engine of long-run growth but also a powerful tool of stabilization.

Zhang (1999), Chen and Li (2011), and Palivos and Varvarigos (2017), however, did not consider the role of innovation in economic growth. When we consider issues related to recent economic growth, it is noteworthy that the economic activities of industries in developed countries and some developing countries have increasingly become knowledge intensive. The economies of these countries are often termed knowledge-based economies. An important feature of such an economy is that it emphasizes innovation, including the creation of new products and production processes through industrial research and development (R&D), and the innovation is accompanied by accumulated knowledge that drives sustained growth. Accordingly, any study on the actual economic problems of a knowledge-based economy needs to construct a model that endogenously incorporates R&D and innovation. From such a perspective, the above-mentioned earlier studies are inadequate in terms of understanding the relationship between contemporary economic growth and environmental problems.

Our model leads to the theoretical possibility that the zero net emission of pollution flow is compatible with sustainable growth and consumption. In this regard, however, the economy requires GDP above a certain level. Moreover, to simultaneously achieve a zero net emission of pollution and sustained economic growth, the economy requires variability of the kindergarten rule level of abatement. In other words, the kindergarten rule level of abatement must not be fixed at a specific value. The present study makes two main contributions. First, we shed light on the relationship between the zero net emission of pollution and economic growth, which is not well understood, and address theoretically an important subject interesting environmental scientists, economists, and policy makers: whether both a zero net emission of pollution and sustained growth of GDP (consumption) are achievable when economies implement a zero net emission policy. In terms of the association with Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), which were adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in September 2015 and have received international attention, our considerations are conducive to providing a theoretical basis for a part of SDG 8 (“Decent Work and Economic Growth”). Second, we present a dynamic macro-environmental modeling approach based on an extension to Matsuyama’s (1999) model with the idea of the kindergarten rule of Brock and Taylor (2005). To the best of our knowledge, there have been few studies on the environmental economic modeling of endogenous growth with cyclical fluctuations in a zero-emission society. That is to say, our dynamic macroenvironmental modeling approach can be interpreted as a methodological contribution in the research field of economic growth and the environment.

#### Yes decoupling---best and most recent studies AND leakage is wrong.

Zeke Hausfather 21, Director, Climate and Energy at The Breakthrough Institute, "Absolute Decoupling of Economic Growth and Emissions in 32 Countries," Breakthrough Institute, 04/06/2021, https://thebreakthrough.org/issues/energy/absolute-decoupling-of-economic-growth-and-emissions-in-32-countries.

The past 30 years have seen immense progress in improving the quality of life for much of humanity. Extreme poverty — the number of people living on less than $1.90 per day — has fallen by nearly two-thirds, from 1.9 billion to around 650 million. Life expectancy has risen in most of the world, along with literacy and access to education, while infant mortality has fallen. Despite perceptions to the contrary, the average person born today is likely to have access to more opportunities and have a better quality of life than at any other point in human history. Much of this increase in human wellbeing has been propelled by rapid economic growth driven largely by state-led industrial policy, particularly in poor-to-middle income countries.

However, this growth has come at a cost: between 1990 and 2019, global emissions of CO2 increased by 56%. Historically, economic growth has been closely linked to increased energy consumption — and increased CO2 emissions in particular — leading some to argue that a more prosperous world is one that necessarily has more impacts on our natural environment and climate. There is a lively academic debate about our ability to “absolutely decouple” emissions and growth — that is, the extent to which the adoption of clean energy technology can allow emissions to decline while economic growth continues.

Over the past 15 years, however, something has begun to change. Rather than a 21st century dominated by coal that energy modelers foresaw, global coal use peaked in 2013 and is now in structural decline. We have succeeded in making clean energy cheap, with solar power and battery storage costs falling 10-fold since 2009. The world produced more electricity from clean energy — solar, wind, hydro, and nuclear — than from coal over the past two years. And, according to some major oil companies, peak oil is upon us — not because we have run out of cheap oil to produce, but because demand is falling and companies expect further decline as consumers increasingly shift to electric vehicles.

The world has long been experiencing a relative decoupling between economic growth and CO2 emissions, with the emissions per unit of GDP falling for the past 60 years. This is the case even in countries like India and China that have been undergoing rapid economic growth. But relative decoupling alone is inadequate in a world where global CO2 emissions need to peak and decline in the next decade to give us any chance at limiting warming to well below 2℃, in line with Paris Agreement targets.

Thankfully, there is increasing evidence that the world is on track to absolutely decouple CO2 emissions and economic growth — with global CO2 emissions potentially having peaked in 2019 and unlikely to increase substantially in the coming decade. While an emissions peak is just the first and easiest step towards eventually reaching the net-zero emissions required to stop the world from continuing to warm, it demonstrates that linkages between emissions and economic activity are not an immutable law, but rather simply a result of our current means of energy production.

In recent years we have seen more and more examples of absolute decoupling — economic growth accompanied by falling CO2 emissions. Since 2005, 32 countries with a population of at least one million people have absolutely decoupled emissions from economic growth, both for terrestrial emissions (those within national borders) and consumption emissions (emissions embodied in the goods consumed in a country). This includes the United States, Japan, Mexico, Germany, United Kingdom, France, Spain, Poland, Romania, Netherlands, Belgium, Portugal, Sweden, Hungary, Belarus, Austria, Bulgaria, El Salvador, Singapore, Denmark, Finland, Slovakia, Norway, Ireland, New Zealand, Croatia, Jamaica, Lithuania, Slovenia, Latvia, Estonia, and Cyprus. Figure 1, below, shows the declines in territorial emissions (blue) and increases in GDP (red).
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To qualify as having experienced absolute decoupling, we require countries included in this analysis to pass four separate filters: a population of at least one million (to focus the analysis on more representative cases), declining territorial emissions over the 2005-2019 period (based on a linear regression), declining consumption emissions, and increasing real GDP (on a purchasing power parity basis, using constant 2017 international $USD). We chose not to include 2020 in this analysis because it is not particularly representative of longer-term trends, and consumption and territorial emissions estimates are not yet available for many countries.

There is a wide range of rates of economic growth between 2005-2019 among countries experiencing absolute decoupling. Somewhat counterintuitively, there is no significant relationship between the rate of economic growth and the magnitude of emissions reductions within the group. While it is unlikely that there is not at least some linkage between the two factors, there are plenty of examples of countries (e.g., Singapore, Romania, and Ireland) experiencing both extremely rapid economic growth and large reductions in CO2 emissions.

One of the primary criticisms of some prior analyses of absolute decoupling is that they ignore leakage. Specifically, the offshoring of manufacturing from high-income countries over the past three decades to countries like China has led to “illusory” drops in emissions, where the emissions associated with high-income country consumption are simply shipped overseas and no longer show up in territorial emissions accounting. There is some truth in this critique, as there was a large increase in emissions embodied in imports from developing countries between 1990 and 2005. After 2005, however, structural changes in China and a growing domestic market led to a reversal of these trends; the amount of emissions “exported” from developed countries to developing countries has actually declined over the past 15 years.

This means that, for many countries, both territorial emissions and consumption emissions (which include any emissions “exported” to other countries) have jointly declined. In fact, on average, consumption emissions have been declining slightly faster than territorial emissions since 2005 in the 32 countries we identify as experiencing absolute decoupling. Figure 2, below, shows the change in consumption emissions (teal) and GDP (red) between 2005 and 2019.
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There is a pretty wide variation in the extent to which these countries have reduced their territorial and consumption emissions since 2005. Some countries — such as the UK, Denmark, Finland, and Singapore – have seen territorial emissions fall faster than consumption emissions, while the US, Japan, Germany, and Spain (among others) have seen consumption emissions fall faster. Figure 3 shows reductions in consumption and territorial emissions for each country, with the size of the dot representing the size of the population in 2019.

[Chart omitted]

Absolute decoupling is possible. There is no physical law requiring economic growth — and broader increases in human wellbeing — to necessarily be linked to CO2 emissions. All of the services that we rely on today that emit fossil fuels — electricity, transportation, heating, food — can in principle be replaced by near-zero carbon alternatives, though these are more mature in some sectors (electricity, transportation, buildings) than in others (industrial processes, agriculture).