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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 private sector export cartel practices that produce anticompetitive effects in the markets of countries that agree to a reciprocal framework 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

#### Even if some hold-out, the framework is flexible enough to create coalitions of the willing that expand later

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. 52-53

Conclusion

I have argued that strong, universalistic prescriptions regarding the internationalization of competition policy are unlikely to be very convincing or very interesting. Polities and societies have sharply differing accounts of what “free” and “fair” competition might mean, and when and how the state should shape it, interfere with it, or exclude it altogether. Liberalization and competition offer tremendous benefits to jurisdictions that embrace them; but no jurisdiction does so entirely, and each polity must find its own optimal balance between competition and the values that—so to speak—compete with it. This makes international action a very complex affair in which internationalization is likely to happen slowly when it happens at all. Sometimes it will be simply unavailable: “state preferences may be configured in such a way as to make cooperation unprofitable for all, in which case it will not occur, no matter what international mechanisms are in place.”204

As “[d]isagreement on matters of principle is . . . not the exception but the rule in politics,”205 I have suggested that there is considerable value in the provision of a wide range of tools and forms to facilitate international action. The bigger and more diverse the toolkit, the greater the likelihood of finding a solution that will serve the turn. To that end, I have emphasized the value of three forms of flexibility in this area: regionalism as a complement to bilateralism and multilateralism; frameworks as a complement to treaties and networks; and a willingness to explore cooperation on competition policy both alongside and separately from the liberalization of trade.

All the hard questions remain. But, as policymakers and scholars survey the wreckage of megaregionalism, I think there are plenty of reasons for optimism. I have emphasized that when grand megaregional bargains wrought in binding international law fail, other paths may remain open. Other combinations, other configurations, can offer the prospect of “progress”—in the right sense—to coalitions of the willing. At the time of writing, there is some evidence that many of the TPP’s parties continue to see value in deep cooperation in matters of trade and competition policy, even without the participation of the United States.206 With some creativity and imagination, and in partnership with like-minded jurisdictions, there is every reason to expect that they will achieve it.

## 2AC

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

#### ‘Prohibit’ means to create a standard that forbids incompatible conduct

John G. Koeltl 7, United States District Judge on the Southern District of New York, “United States Baseball v. City of New York”, United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, 509 F. Supp. 2d 285, 297, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 63234, 8/27/2007, Lexis

The City responds that its home rule and police powers are broader pursuant to Article IX, Section 2(c) of the New York State Constitution, New York Home Rule Law § 10(1)(a)(12), and New York General City Law § 20(13) than the plaintiffs suggest. These provisions give the City the power to enact laws for the "safety, health, well-being, and welfare" of its residents. The City asserts [\*\*29] that the Bat Ordinance does not constitute a "prohibition" because it does not condemn all use of non-wood bats. It bars their use in competitive high school baseball games, but not for example in high school practices, junior high school games, "pick up" games, or youth league games that are not school-sponsored. Moreover, the City persuasively argues that the suggested distinction between "prohibitions" and other "regulations" is artificial and untenable, because all regulations prohibit some conduct that is incompatible with the regulatory standards and all "prohibitions" leave some conduct untouched. For example, a New York court upheld as a valid exercise of the police power a New York City law banning the possession in a public place of a knife with a blade of at least four inches in length in People v. Ortiz, 125 Misc. 2d 318, 479 N.Y.S.2d 613, 620 (Crim. Ct. 1984). The plaintiffs suggest the law at issue in Ortiz was a not a "prohibition," but it appears to be at least as complete a prohibition as the Bat Ordinance, which prohibits only certain uses of bats with certain defined characteristics.

#### ‘Increases’ are by expanding the scope. That defines the medium of action.

Merriam-Webster’s 21 Online Dictionary, ‘by’, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/by

: through or through the medium (see MEDIUM entry 1 sense 2) of : VIA

enter by the door

#### ‘Scope’ is authority, not actions

Kenneth H. Kato 99, Judge on the Washington Appeals Court, Division Three, JD and BA from the University of Washington, “Spokane v. Civil Serv. Comm'n”, Court of Appeals of Washington, Division Three, Panel Four, 98 Wn. App. 574, 576, 989 P.2d 1245, 1246, 1999 Wash. App. LEXIS 2158, 12/21/1999, Lexis

For purposes of RCW 41.56.100, which provides that a public employer is not required to collectively bargain with its employees when the subject matter involved has been "delegated to any civil service commission or personnel board similar in scope, structure and authority" to the state personnel board, "scope" refers to the body's jurisdiction or authority to take various actions.

### FTC Section 5---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]

#### Technical barriers prevent synthetic pathogens.

--“select agents” are dangerous infectious agents

Eckard **Wimmer 18**. Prof @ Stony Brook University. 2018. “Synthetic Biology, Dual Use Research, and Possibilities for Control.” Defence Against Bioterrorism, Springer, Dordrecht, pp. 7–11. link.springer.com, doi:10.1007/978-94-024-1263-5\_2.

Listed below are some constraints that show how in the US the development of dangerous infectious agents, referred to as “select agents”, is controlled – perhaps misuse even prevented – through technical and administrative hurdles: I. Re-creating an already existing dangerous virus for malicious intent is a complex scientific endeavor. (i) It requires considerable scientific knowledge and experience and, more importantly, considerable financial support. That support usually comes from government and private agencies (NIH, NAF, etc.), organizations that carefully screen at multiple levels all applications for funding of ALL biological research. (ii) It requires an environment suitable for experimenting with dangerous infectious agents (containment facilities). Any work in containment facilities is also carefully regulated. II. Genetic engineering to synthesize or modify organisms relies on chemical synthesis of DNA. Synthesizing DNA is automated and carried out with sophisticated, expensive instruments. The major problem of DNA synthesis, however, is that the product is not error-free. Any single mistake in the sequence of small DNA segments (30–60 nucleotides) or large segments (>500 nucleotides) can ruin the experiment. Companies have developed strategies to produce and deliver error free, synthetic DNA, which investigators can order electronically from vendors, such as Integrated DNA Technologies (US), GenScript (US) or GeneArt (Germany). This offers a superb and easy way to control experimental procedures carried out in any laboratory: the companies will automatically scan ordered sequences in extensive data banks to monitor relationship to sequences of a select agent. If so, the order will be stalled until sufficient evidence has been provided by the investigator that she/he is carrying out experiments approved by the authorities. The entire complex issue of protecting society from the misuse of select agents has been discussed in two outstanding studies [11, 12]. III. Engineering a virus such that it will be more harmful (more contagious, more pathogenic) is generally difficult because, in principle, viruses have evolved to proliferating maximally in their natural environment. That is, genetic manipulations of a virus often lead to loss of fitness that, in turn, is unwanted in the bioterrorist agent.

### Comity CP---2AC

#### Coordination is key to insulate global supply chain disruptions.

Roger Alford 18, Deputy Assistant Attorney General Antitrust Division U.S. Department of Justice. "Antitrust Enforcement in an Interconnected World." https://www.justice.gov/opa/speech/file/1029821/download

Today, I would like to speak at more length about the third principle—recognizing the global impact of antitrust enforcement. Just as Korea and the world have fundamentally changed since the 1988 Seoul Olympics, so too has global antitrust enforcement. In 1988 there was no International Competition Network, and only a handful of competition agencies were active, as much of the world continued to embrace highly-regulated or command economies. As President Ronald Reagan put it, the attitude of governments at the time was “if it moves, tax it, if it keeps moving, regulate it, and if it stops moving, subsidize it.”7 But as companies competed on an ever more global scale, countries became ever more committed to market-based economies and to enforcing competition laws. Today there are more than 130 different jurisdictions with antitrust agencies. A merger of two multinational firms can trigger merger filings and reviews in a dozen or more jurisdictions. Cartels affecting the global supply chain may involve companies engaged in illegal activity in countries separated by thousands of miles, numerous time zones, and multiple languages. Unilateral conduct enforcement in one jurisdiction has the potential to affect marketing and licensing practices not just in that jurisdiction, but around the world.

For antitrust enforcers, this means that international coordination and cooperation are more important than ever. Without these tools, the uncertainty associated with divergent approaches to enforcement has potentially significant costs for globally active companies, and the risks of inconsistent and potentially conflicting remedies are high. Antitrust enforcers who do not consider the global impact of their enforcement decisions can create inefficiencies that ultimately harm consumers throughout our interconnected world.

### Innovation DA---2AC

#### Biden’s supercharging enforcement

Ausra Deluard 21, JD Co-Chair of the U.S. Competition and Antitrust Group and Member of Dentons' National Health Care Practice Group, and Brian O'Bleness, Co-Chair of the U.S. Competition and Antitrust Group and Member of Dentons' White Collar and Government Investigations Practice, “A New Day, A New Deal: The Biden Administration’s Antitrust Revolution”, JD Supra, 7/19/2021, https://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/a-new-day-a-new-deal-the-biden-8824526/

The Biden administration is “supercharging” antitrust enforcement with an expansive view of what constitutes anti-competitive behavior. While much attention has been paid to antitrust scrutiny of large technology companies, also in the crosshairs of the Biden administration are labor markets, agricultural markets and healthcare markets (prescription drugs, hospital consolidation and insurance) according to President Biden’s July 9 Executive Order on Competition2. The order is one of several recent developments that signal an antitrust revolution is underway. A central theme of this revolution is that competition laws can serve as a broad panacea to solve many societal problems, including privacy concerns.3

The Federal Trade Commission (“FTC”) is now led by Lina Khan, a 32-year old academic, who believes that “the current framework in antitrust – specifically its pegging competition to ‘consumer welfare,’ defined as short-term price effects – is unequipped to capture the architecture of market power in the modern economy.”4 Within her first month as chair of the FTC, Khan has moved quickly to revise guidance and protocols that may have otherwise limited expanded enforcement against broadly defined unfair competition, including predatory, exploitative and coercive practices. Transformation of current antitrust policy is also supported by pending legislation that calls for sweeping reform to “reinvigorate America’s antitrust laws and restore competition to American markets.”5

#### The collective burden is so overwhelming that innovation and growth will be impossible

Abbott B. Lipsky 9, Jr., Assistant Professor and Director of the Competition Advocacy Program at the Global Antitrust Institute, MA in Economics from Stanford University, Former Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Member of the District of Columbia Bar, JD from Stanford Law School, “Managing Antitrust Compliance Through the Continuing Surge in Global Enforcement”, Antitrust Law Review, Volume 75, Number 3, p. 993-995

IV. CONCLUSION

I have tried to describe the three waves of the continuing global antitrust surge in a way that conveys their power, scope, and potential for enterprise-threatening impact. I have also pointed out why it should be an easy decision for any business enterprise contemplating cross-border operations—and that category includes a large and increasing number of enterprises within the continuing evolution of the global economy— to adopt a global perspective on antitrust compliance. I conclude here with a few thoughts on the future of antitrust, given the reality of this massive and still-expanding global antitrust enforcement network.

This network is characterized by great diversity, extreme complexity, and by the potential for heavy legal consequences in many different jurisdictions around the world. Taking it as assumed that strong antitrust laws are desirable, the huge range of diversity in the approaches of different jurisdictions is not necessarily beneficial. The themes of convergence (“soft” and “hard”—meaning “somewhat aligned” versus “identical” or nearly so), harmonization, and the like have been much discussed in the extensive literature on international antitrust enforcement. 69 There are pros and cons and the considerations are shifting and complex.

There are real questions about the viability of an antitrust enforcement environment in which (1) over 100 national (and supranational) jurisdictions enforce their own laws through their own procedures, (2) many of these jurisdictions allow private remedies in some form—perhaps in very powerful forms, such as treble-damage opt-out class actions, (3) many of these jurisdictions allow independent antitrust enforcement efforts to be undertaken by subordinate jurisdictions, such as the states of the United States, the EU Member States, the Spanish autonomous communities, and the Canadian provinces, (4) none of these jurisdictions will defer fully or even substantially to any other, except in relatively rare and limited circumstances, (5) there is no international body—and within national jurisdictions there is often no national body—with the capacity or authority to reconcile and coordinate these additive and sometimes conflicting demands. (Consider the United States—with the longest and strongest antitrust tradition—where federal antitrust law does not generally preempt the antitrust laws of the fifty states, and even at the federal level we have two agencies that waste time squabbling over their jurisdiction in some particular matters.)

The costs and complexities of this network system are enormous. We are just beginning to adopt the most rudimentary mechanisms for reducing them. The ICN has made some progress in the area of merger notification and procedures. The United States and the European Union work hard to anticipate overlaps and conflicts in the merger review process, with apparent success. But coordinating EU-U.S. approaches to the conduct of globally significant firms—viz., IBM and Microsoft—is visibly unsuccessful. The right blend of uniformity and diversity is still not clear and may never become clear as circumstances change. (What will happen—and what should happen—to U.S.-EU cooperation in merger review when notification regimes come on line in China and India?) Are the agencies in the smaller jurisdictions destined to become bystanders in the global antitrust game? That makes no sense if an important resource or industry or class of consumers is concentrated in that jurisdiction. There seems to be no general formula by which compliance overlaps and conflicts can be reconciled.

The implication seems clear: there must be a new model—a model not based on such a huge diversity of supranational, national, and subnational enforcement structures.70 The new model might involve a clearing out of this multiplicity of enforcement structures, but even the outlines of such a model have yet to emerge. Certainly, a higher degree of unity within specific jurisdictions (e.g., state-federal in the United States; national-provincial in Canada, EU-Member State-Member State subjurisdictions, etc.) might be a logical starting point. In the meantime, as I have argued previously, the costs and complexities of antitrust enforcement cannot be permitted to climb higher at their present rate forever. At some point—we may be well past that point—costs outweigh benefits. Global economic health depends on innovation and flexibility, which are stifled by a heavy regulatory hand. Are we already past the point where the “trimming and pruning” phase should have begun? Some like ICN are toiling to bring some degree of order and harmony to this antitrust garden—but this and similar efforts are still no match for the kudzu-like growth of the global antitrust network.

As former Council of Economic Advisers Chair Herb Stein used to say, “Unsustainable trends tend not to be sustained.” Can antitrust reform itself from “within,” building on the ICN and other cooperative organizations and relationships to rein in the complexities and overlaps of international antitrust? Or will the global antitrust enforcement network ultimately lead the world economy into an era of stagnation, inviting the type of sudden and profound reform characteristic of epochal shifts in norms and standards (comparable to U.S. antitrust reforms of the early Reagan years)—an “antitrust revolution”? This seems a close question to me. If the reform is to be internal, the existing institutions need to shake a leg—in seven years the ICN has roared to life as a governmentagency forum but the reforms achieved have been limited in comparison to the complexities to be overcome. ICN had a promising start, but performance tests need to continue ratcheting up.

#### Growth’s slowing AND future COVID shocks thump biz con

Howard Schneider 21, Reporter for Federal Reserve with Thomson Reuters, and Trevor Hunnicutt, Investment Reporter at Staff Writer at Reuters, “U.S. Economy's Hot Vax Summer Ends in Cool COVID Fall as Delta Rises”, Reuters, 9/3/2021, https://www.reuters.com/business/us-economys-hot-vax-summer-ends-cool-covid-fall-delta-rises-2021-09-03/

The promise of a "normal" U.S. economy this summer, which kicked off with the June revival of restaurants, air travel and baseball games, is transforming into an uncertain fall of rising health and economic risks.

Labor Day weekend, the traditional end of the U.S. summer season, was pegged as the moment when the economy would finally transition out of the pandemic slump, with private sector jobs and wages replacing unemployment benefits.

Instead, the summer is closing with rising COVID-19 case counts, hospitals bulging with patients, a sharp slowdown in jobs and dark predictions. Most startling - the University of Washington's Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation projects that between now and Dec. 1 there will be 100,000 COVID deaths, more than in the same period last year, when a wave of winter infections took hold and vaccines were not yet available.

"I don't think fall 2021 is going to give us the catharsis we were waiting for," said Nick Bunker, economic research director for hiring site Indeed, or provide a clear view of how fast U.S. job markets can recover the 5.3 million jobs missing from before the pandemic. "The transition is going to be longer than expected. The issue is, is it a stumble or does the baton get dropped?"

Nonfarm payrolls increased by 235,000 jobs last month after surging 1.053 million in July, the Labor Department said Friday. Economists had expected 728,000 new jobs. read more

Special $300-per-week unemployment benefits end on Saturday. While employers hope that will usher new job applicants into a labor-starved market, there are signs the pandemic may have begun to curb their hiring plans instead. read more

The reopening of schools, far from smoothing the way for parents to return to full-time jobs, has been marked by erratic outbreaks, quarantines and closures, as school boards battle over masking students.

The manager at The Irish Whisper, a pub near the Gaylord National Resort and Convention Center in Oxon Hill, Maryland, said that business has fallen off since an initial summertime rush.

"It's not as great as pre-COVID, but it's better than not having anything," said the manager, who only gave his first name Andrew. "I thought we were in the clear and then this variant emerged."

After a strong start early this summer, attendance is dropping in baseball stadiums.

BIDEN'S VIRUS OVERSHADOWED

It is a particularly sensitive moment for U.S. President Joe Biden.

The Democratic president has taken a hit in the polls from the resurgent virus, faces criticism over the Afghanistan withdrawal and must deal with the aftermath of Hurricane Ida and a gauntlet of deadlines in Congress in coming weeks to keep the government funded and his economic agenda on track.

"There's a lot more work to do," to fix the U.S economy, Biden said Friday, addressing the weak jobs numbers. ""We need to make more progress in fighting the Delta variant," he said, repeating that it was a pandemic of the unvaccinated.

Biden's strategy of wiping out COVID by getting all of the United States vaccinated was hindered by a politically charged anti-vaccination movement this summer, and the pace of vaccinations has slowed since peaking in April.

A run of higher-than-expected inflation due to supply chain woes and labor shortages consumed what would otherwise have been healthy wage gains. A closely watched index of consumer confidence, which can influence spending, tumbled in August to a six-month low.

Progress on the virus "is (Biden's) No. 1 advantage, but people are discouraged and frustrated and it's also interacting with the economy," said one Biden adviser not authorized to speak on the record.

Administration officials believe the recovery largely remains on track, and infrastructure and spending plans may partly make up for the lapsed weekly unemployment insurance payments.

Democrats are hoping to finalize a $1 trillion bipartisan infrastructure bill as soon as this month while also working on a $3.5 trillion bill that could only secure party-line support.

"This bill is going to end years of gridlock," Biden said of the smaller infrastructure bill. "Both literally and figuratively it's going to change things," he said.

Republicans are fighting the administration's most ambitious spending plans. Goldman Sachs economists now estimate the "fiscal cliff," as spending rotates away from the record government transfers of the past 18 months, will be a noticeable drag on growth by late 2022.

Oxford Economics economists expect to trim their outlook for 2021 gross domestic product growth to 5.5%, down from 7% in early August.

The reduction reflects "the deteriorating health situation weighing on optimism and spending, lingering capital and labor supply constraints and a slower inventory rebuild," Oxford chief U.S. economist Gregory Daco said in an email.

DELTA WEIGHS ON HIRING

The August jobs data released Friday showed the current surge of infections, which drove the number of new cases from around 11,000 a day in mid-June to almost 150,000 daily this week, slowed hiring and the broader recovery.

"Today’s report has the Delta variant written all over it," Indeed's Bunker said. "It is clear that the recent surge in COVID-19 cases is a strong headwind to the labor market."

Economists are not expecting the sort of collapse in demand for restaurants, travel and other services seen in earlier virus waves. Many Federal Reserve officials feel businesses and families have learned to navigate the situation, either finding ways to lower the risk of infection as they resume work and business, or worrying less about infection because they're vaccinated.

The disappointing 235,000 in new jobs comes as the unemployment rate fell to 5.2% from 5.4% in July. It has, however, been understated by people misclassifying themselves as being "employed but absent from work."

Some employers argue that job growth figures could be much higher, given the record number of openings, if they had not had to compete with unemployment benefits. That hasn't been borne out in states that ended the federal benefits early over the summer, where there's little evidence more people went back to work.

Instead, employers seem to be pulling back on hiring themselves.

#### Businesses support multilat

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, Fall 2012, Volume 57, Number 3, Last Revised 7/18/2013, p. 488-489

The United States’ resistance to the multilateral effort to harmonize or internationalize antitrust laws is somewhat puzzling. It is presumably in the interests of U.S. companies and U.S. enforcement agencies to have a single international antitrust standard: for companies, a single standard would reduce the transaction costs of engaging in multinational business, and for enforcement agencies, a single standard would ensure uniform and effective enforcement of antitrust laws extraterritorially. Moreover, from the point of view of the government, required adherence to an international enforcement norm could serve as a “hands-tying” mechanism that would commit the government to a preferred long-term course of action and discourage defection caused by short-term, domestic political incentives.5

[FOOTNOTE] 5 For example, the WTO commits the United States to a particular level of tariffs and deters it from sacrificing the long-term benefits of open trade for a short-term response to domestic demands for protection. The deterrence is not perfect—as evidenced by the steel tariff kerfuffle during George W. Bush’s presidency and the Chinese tire dust-up more recently during the Obama presidency—but it substantially raises the political costs of such defections. See Dan Ackman, Bush Cuts Steel Tariffs, Declares Victory, FORBES (Dec. 5, 2003), http://www.forbes.com/2003/12/05/cx\_da\_1205topnews .html; Peter Whoriskey & Anne Komblut, U.S. to Impose Tariff on Tires from China, WASH. POST (Sept. 12, 2009), http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp -dyn /content/article/2009/09/11/AR2009091103957.html. [END FOOTNOTE]

Similarly, both U.S. companies and the U.S. government may have an interest in applying antitrust laws as extensively as possible, an effort far more amenable to a multilateral, supranational solution rather than a piecemeal bilateral one.

#### 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

### Anti-Domination K---2AC

#### Growth is sustainable AND transition fails.

Kelsey Piper 21, Staff Writer, Vox. BS, Symbolic Systems, "Can we save the planet by shrinking the economy?" Vox, 08/02/2021, https://www.vox.com/future-perfect/22408556/save-planet-shrink-economy-degrowth/

Most of the world is very poor. Billions of people go hungry, can’t afford a doctor when they get sick, don’t have adequate shelter and sanitation, and struggle to exercise the freedoms essential to a good life because of material deprivation.

But for all the immiseration around us, one thing is undeniable: For the past several centuries — and especially for the past 70 years, since the end of World War II — the world has been getting much richer.

That economic boom means a lot of things. It means cancer treatments and neonatal intensive care units and smallpox vaccines and insulin.

It means, in many parts of the world, houses have indoor plumbing and gas heating and electricity.

It means that infant mortality is down and life expectancies are longer.

But an increasingly wealthy world also means we eat more meat, mostly from factory-farmed animals. It means we emit lots more greenhouse gases. It means that consumers in developed countries buy a lot and throw away a lot.

In other words, it means a lot of good things and certainly some bad things as well.

Mainstream climate and environmental policy has developed over the years with a certain assumption — that we can get rid of the bad things while still preserving the good things. That is, it’s sought to figure out how to reduce carbon emissions, preserve ecosystems, and save endangered species while continuing to improve material living conditions for everyone in the world.

But to a vocal slice of climate activists, that approach seems increasingly doomed. The degrowth movement, as it’s called, argues that humanity can’t keep growing without driving humanity into climate catastrophe. The only solution, the argument goes, is an extreme transformation of our way of life — a transition away from treating economic growth as a policy priority to an acceptance of shrinking GDP as a prerequisite to saving the planet.

At the core of degrowth is the climate crisis. Degrowth’s proponents argue that to save Earth, humans need to shrink global economic activity, because at our current levels of consumption, the world won’t hit the IPCC target of stabilizing global temperatures at no more than 1.5 degrees of warming. The degrowth movement argues that climate change should prompt a radical rethinking of economic growth, and policymakers serious about climate change should try to build a livable world without economic growth fueling it.

It’s a bold, even romantic vision. But there are two problems with it: It doesn’t add up — and it would be nearly impossible to implement.

Addressing climate change will take genuinely radical changes to how our society works. Stirring as it might be to some, though, degrowth’s radicalism won’t fix the climate. Degrowth is most compelling as a personal ethos, a lens on your consumption habits, a way of life. What it’s not is a serious policy program to solve climate change, especially in a world where billions still live in poverty.

The basics of degrowth

Pinning down what degrowth means can be tricky because degrowthers often differ on details. But there are some common threads to their thought.

In general, degrowthers believe that in the modern world, economic growth has become unmoored from improvements in the human condition.

Jason Hickel, an anthropologist at the London School of Economics and the author of Less Is More: How Degrowth Will Save the World, has emerged as one of the leading spokespeople for the movement. To Hickel, the case for degrowth goes like this: The world is producing too much greenhouse gases. It is also overfishing, is overpolluting, is unsustainable in a dozen ways, from deforestation to plastic accumulating in the oceans.

Scientists have made impressive progress on technologies that, he argues, should have been sufficient to address the climate crisis — think solar panels, meat alternatives, eco-friendly houses. But because wealthy societies are so focused on growing the economy, those gains have been immediately plowed back into the economy, producing more stuff for the same ecological footprint, yes, but not actually shrinking the ecological footprint.

Hickel argues that this problem is unsolvable within our current framework. “In a growth-oriented economy,” he writes in Less Is More, “efficiency improvements that could help us reduce our impact are harnessed instead to advance the objectives of growth — to pull ever-larger swaths of nature into circuits of extraction and production. It’s not our technology that’s the problem. It’s growth.”

His solution? To abandon the lodestar of economic policy in nearly every country, which is to aim for economic growth over time, increasing wealth per person and expanding the ability of their citizens to purchase the things they want and need. Instead, Hickel argues, rich countries should focus on getting emissions to zero — even if the result is a much-contracted economy.

If that sounds unappealing, he devoted much of the book — and much of our interview — to arguing that it wouldn’t be. He points out that some countries, like the United States, are rich but get very little for their spending, in terms of national well-being; poorer countries like Spain have better health care systems. He argues that current levels of well-being could be maintained at a tenth of Finland’s current GDP — assuming that society also adopted wide-scale redistribution and socialist labor policies.

At the heart of Hickel’s argument is an idea that divides degrowthers and their critics: the concept of “decoupling” growth from environmental impact. Hickel and his fellow degrowthers are skeptical that economic growth as we know it can ever truly be achieved without accompanying growth in emissions.

But critics argue that not only is it possible — it’s already been happening. For the past decade, as many countries have transitioned to green energy, they have successfully seen their emissions shrink while their GDP has grown.

“There have been really big changes since 2005,” when people were debating whether decoupling was even possible, Zeke Hausfather, a climate scientist at the Breakthrough Institute, told me. “Green energy has gotten cheap. Solar power is the cheapest energy at the margins in every country today. Global coal use has peaked.” His research finds evidence of “absolute decoupling” — emissions shrinking while GDP grows — in 32 countries, including the United States, the United Kingdom, and Germany.

Degrowthers I spoke to don’t dispute that decoupling is possible. But they argue it won’t be enough to shrink emissions as rapidly as they need to. And there’s a compelling bit of evidence for that view: Even as some countries have decoupled, others have increased emissions, and overall atmospheric carbon is at its highest level ever recorded.

Where an optimist might see, in the decoupling of the past few decades, signs that growth and climate solutions can coexist, a pessimist might find the degrowth diagnosis more persuasive: that our growth-focused society clearly isn’t up to the task of solving climate change.

The pessimists have picked up momentum of late. It’s true, in one sense, that degrowth is a somewhat fringe idea: No politician has endorsed it, and no serious policy proposals based on it have been put forth. But degrowth has nonetheless drawn sympathy in some quarters — including among prominent climate thinkers.

Steven Chu, who served as secretary of energy under President Obama, has endorsed it, arguing, “You have to design an economy based on no growth or even shrinking growth.”

More than 11,000 scientists signed William Ripple’s 2019 letter “World Scientists’ Warning of a Climate Emergency,” which argues “our goals need to shift from GDP growth and the pursuit of affluence toward sustaining ecosystems and improving human well-being by prioritizing basic needs and reducing inequality.”

And a recent paper in Nature explored how a “degrowth” of 0.5 percent of GDP per year might interact with climate and emissions targets, arguing that while “substantial challenges remain regarding political feasibility,” such approaches should be “thoroughly considered.”

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

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

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

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

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

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

From a climate change perspective, though, there’s a problem. First, it means that degrowth would do nothing about the bulk of emissions, which are occurring in developing countries.

Second, the global economy is more interconnected than Hickel implies. When Covid-19 hit, poor countries were devastated not just by the virus but by the aftershocks of virus-induced slowdowns in consumption in rich countries.

There’s some genuine appeal to the idea of an end to “consumerism,” but the pandemic offered a taste of how a sudden drop in rich-world consumption would actually affect the developing world. Covid-19 dramatically curtailed Western imports and tourism for a time. The consequences in poor countries were devastating. Hunger rose, and child mortality followed.

Covid-19, of course, wreaked direct economic havoc at the same time, with lockdowns having an especially negative impact on some poor countries; the effects of the pandemic and international demand shock were combined, and in some cases they’re hard to separate. But the United Nations, the World Bank, and expert analyses point to the decline in global consumption as a significant part of the picture.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“GDP does leave out non-commercialized activities that are welfare-enhancing,” economist Branko Milanovic writes in a rebuttal of degrowth:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There’s also the knotty problem of who gets to decide which goods and services people choose to spend their money on. Many of the climate scientists I spoke to shared Hickel’s impatience for many specific carbon-intensive modern industries. “I’m not going to defend bitcoin,” the Breakthrough Institute’s Hausfather told me. (The cryptocurrency has attracted intense criticism for being astoundingly carbon-intensive.)

But there is a lot in between bitcoin and basic subsistence needs. And “enough for everyone who needs it” inherently requires value judgments about what people really need, and what things they value that are frivolous luxuries. That’s why so many anti-poverty programs have moved away from giving people “what they need” toward just giving them cash — that is, giving them wealth, which they can choose to spend however they please.

“Even poor people have so many needs for goods and services that you can’t possibly put them on a list and say, ‘Now we’re done here,’” Roser told me. “That’s the beauty of money, that you can just go out there and get what you need rather than what some researcher determines are your needs.”

Degrowth is unrealistic — and gaining traction

As a policy program, degrowth suffers from being both too radical and not radical enough.

There’s a lot of broad-brush policy prescriptions in the degrowth lit, but those details never really add up.

While it’s not a short book, Less Is More feels surprisingly sparse when it comes to envisioning how the changes it recommends could be brought about. The chapter on solutions recommends cutting the workweek and changing tax policy — two solid proposals — but then rounds that out by recommending ending technological obsolescence, advertising, food waste, and student debt.

I’m not particularly opposed to those policies. But they seem laughably inadequate for the magnitude of the task at hand: confronting the climate crisis. Degrowth successfully persuades that guiding humanity and our planet through the 21st century will be really, really hard — but not in a way degrowth particularly solves.

Where degrowth literature is relentlessly pessimistic about the prospect of our problems being solved under our current economic system, it turns oddly optimistic about the prospect that they’ll be solved once we embrace a different way of viewing wealth and progress. If cutting carbon emissions fast enough to matter requires shrinking the global economy by 0.5 percent a year indefinitely, starting right now, as the Nature paper estimates, that’ll take policy measures much larger and more ambitious than any proposed in Less Is More.

“If we are to avert catastrophic warming, we have to lower carbon emissions by a factor of two within the next 10 years. I find it highly implausible that capitalism/market economics will be abandoned by the world on that time frame,” Pennsylvania State University climatologist Michael Mann told me. “That means we have to act on the climate crisis within the framework of the current system.”

In that sense, there’s actually something anti-radical about any climate plan so radical that it can’t be concretely brought about in the next decade.

And yet, implausible as it is, degrowth is gaining a foothold in intellectual and policy circles. What accounts for its seemingly growing popularity? This was a question that puzzled me until I heard the same answer from one degrowth advocate and one opponent: that it’s not, really, exactly about climate.

“It started in the 1990s in France, picking up on radical European politics in the 1970s,” Giorgos Kallis, a researcher studying degrowth at the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, told me. “There was an in-between political space there — radical greens, putting much more emphasis on localized production, emphasis on conviviality and autonomy. This is a discourse that comes from them. It wasn’t just about avoiding a particular environmental problem. It was a holistic proposal.”

That was also the diagnosis of Zion Lights, a former spokesperson for Extinction Rebellion, who has become one of the climate movement’s internal critics, arguing that the movement focuses too much on environmentalist-friendly proposals that have nothing to do with climate.

“It has become difficult to talk about making energy policies for combating climate change, for example, without being told that such thinking is actually irrelevant because it doesn’t involve system change,” she recently argued. “We need cheap, clean energy at scale and we need it now.”

In that sense, a good analogy for degrowth might actually be locavorism — the movement that focuses on eating food grown locally. It’s popular with environmentalists, both those whose convictions are about climate change and those who long for a return to the land. Its actual climate impacts are limited or even negative — for some products, it’s better for them to be grown in their optimal environment even with carbon-intensive shipping — and it definitely does less for the climate than, for example, going vegan. But it retains its allure.

How to fight climate change while building good human societies

Degrowth’s radicalism isn’t where I part ways with it: The future will almost certainly require us to eat much less meat, dramatically change land use, and potentially invest a significant chunk of society’s resources in mitigation indefinitely.

But I don’t tend to see such efforts as fundamentally futile. Degrowthers do — even when there have been significant successes.

Climate scientists have spent a long time warning the world about climate change, but they nonetheless tend to sound a more optimistic note than degrowthers like Hickel. “It’s undoubtedly a monumental challenge,” Mann told me. “We have the technology to solve the problem — renewable energy, smart grid technology, and existing energy storage. We just need the political will to act.”

Take solar panels. Two decades ago, cheap solar panels were just a dream. Now they’re everywhere and have become a crucial tool in the fight against climate change.

Not only that, solar panels have democratized electricity. Just one small-scale instance: In rural Kenya, you can see donkeys saddled with solar panels so that farmers can charge their phones. And there are many such examples that count as a win for both human progress and our fight against climate change.

It should go without saying that since rich governments got us into this climate mess, they should be at the forefront of getting us out of it. We need massive investments in carbon capture, green energy, plant-based meat, mitigation, and straight-up cash transfers to poor countries disproportionately affected by the climate crisis.

Many of the researchers I spoke to were open to the idea that in the long run, humanity would need to rethink many of our cherished assumptions about how economies work, in order to build a civilization that can flourish for thousands or millions of years. They didn’t reject degrowth as a philosophical contribution to the question of what future human civilizations should care about.

But such articulations of different philosophies of human flourishing should not be mistaken for public policy.

We don’t have very long, and we need to decarbonize quickly. We have technologies that have made a big difference already, and they must be made available on an unprecedented scale. We have more speculative solutions, technological and societal, and we should be prepared to try those, too. The scale of the problem is such that we need to act now — and we need to be clear-eyed about which ideas truly move the needle.

#### The alt fails and causes transition wars

Smith 19 [Noah; 4/5/19; Bloomberg Opinion columnist, former assistant professor of finance at Stony Brook University; "Dumping Capitalism Won’t Save the Planet," https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2019-04-05/capitalism-is-more-likely-to-limit-climate-change-than-socialism]

It has become fashionable on social media and in certain publications to argue that capitalism is killing the planet. Even renowned investor Jeremy Grantham, hardly a radical, made that assertion last year. The basic idea is that the profit motive drives the private sector to spew carbon into the air with reckless abandon. Though many economists and some climate activists believe that the problem is best addressed by modifying market incentives with a carbon tax, many activists believe that the problem can’t be addressed without rebuilding the economy along centrally planned lines.

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

Even without international conflict, there’s little guarantee that moving away from capitalism would mitigate our impact on the environment. Since socialist leader Evo Morales took power in Bolivia, living standards have improved substantially for the average Bolivian, which is great. But this has come at the cost of higher emissions. Meanwhile, the capitalist U.S managed to decrease its per capita emissions a bit during this same period (though since the U.S. is a rich country, its absolute level of emissions is much higher).

In other words, in terms of economic growth and carbon emissions, Bolivia looks similar to more capitalist developing countries. That suggests that faced with a choice of enriching their people or helping to save the climate, even socialist leaders will often choose the former. And that same political calculus will probably hold in China and the U.S., the world’s top carbon emitters — leaders who demand draconian cuts in living standards in pursuit of environmental goals will have trouble staying in power.

The best hope for the climate therefore lies in reducing the tradeoff between material prosperity and carbon emissions. That requires technology — solar, wind and nuclear power, energy storage, electric cars and other vehicles, carbon-free cement production and so on. The best climate policy plans all involve technological improvement as a key feature.
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#### Tests can’t control export cartels

Michael Ristaniemi 17, 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, “Export Cartels and The Case for Global Welfare”, https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=3166228

One key change that is needed is to first cease the special treatment that is currently still afforded to export cartels by explicitly exempting conduct that would otherwise be considered per se illegal. While this would, in itself, be an arduous process requiring legislative changes in several countries, it would however still not suffice to handle the problem as long as implicit exemptions exists by virtue of an ‘effects’ doctrine, since effects of export cartels are mostly outside the exporting nation’s territory.79 To be comprehensive, a resolution is needed where the exporting nation has an obligation to take effects occurring in an importing nation into consideration in its competition law review, particularly provided that it has received a request to do so from said importing nation. Further, in order to be in a position to make such a request, the importing nation must also have the right to cooperate with the NCA of the exporting nation, in terms of gathering evidence and otherwise in its own investigations.80 Another interesting approach would be to utilise the GATT for combating export cartels. The nation hurt by an export cartel could, in theory, bring complaints based on a GATT violation.1

#### They demand per se

Dr. Frédéric Jenny 12, Ph.D. in Economics from Harvard University, MSc of Science in Management from the ESSEC Business School, Doctorat in Economic Sciences from the Université Paris 2 Panthéon-Assas, “Export Cartels in Primary Products: The Potash Case in Perspective”, in Trade, Competition, and The Pricing of Commodities, Ed. Evenett and Jenny, February 2012, https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=2064686

There is a large consensus on the idea that international cartels, domestic cartels and mixed export cartels (to the extent that they have a domestic impact) should be treated as per se violations of competition laws because they restrict consumer welfare without promoting efficiency.

#### 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

### Anti-Domination K---1AR

#### Financial stability is improving. Ignore fear mongering.

Tobias Adrian 17. Financial Counsellor and Director, Monetary and Capital Markets Department, IMF; previous Senior Vice President, Federal Reserve Bank of New York and Associate Director of the Research and Statistics Group; PhD, Economics, MIT. “Assessing Global Financial Stability.” Presentation at the London School of Economics. October 27. <http://www.imf.org/en/News/Articles/2017/10/27/sp-102717-assessing-global-financial-stability>.

There are good news: near-term financial stability risks are lower, driven by a decline in macroeconomic and emerging market risks.

As outlined in the IMF’s most recent World Economic Outlook, the upswing in global activity has gained further steam, with global growth projected to rise to 3.6 percent in 2017 and 3.7 percent in 2018—in both cases 0.1 percentage point above our previous forecasts, and well above the global growth rate of 3.2 percent in 2016. This is laying hopes for a sustained recovery and should allow for the eventual normalization of monetary policies.

The core of the global financial system is stronger. Systemically important banks and insurers continue to enhance their resilience by raising capital and liquidity, addressing legacy issues, and adapting their business models to the evolving regulatory and market environment.

In emerging markets, capital flows are rebounding, driven in part by stronger fundamentals. Portfolio inflows to emerging market economies are on track to reach $285 billion in 2017, more than twice the total over the past two years. The cost of financing is low, and their currencies and equity prices have strongly appreciated this year.

Globally, supportive monetary and financial conditions and buoyant financial markets have helped foster growth and repair balance sheets.