# 1AC – Wake V2

## 1AC – Wake

### Innovation Adv

#### Advantage One: Innovation

#### Parker immunity discourages disruptive healthcare innovation

Sage 17 (William Sage, James R. Dougherty Chair for Faculty Excellence in the School of Law and Professor of Surgery and Perioperative Care in the Dell Medical School, University of Texas at Austin; and David Hyman Professor at Georgetown University School of Law, “Antitrust as Disruptive Innovation in Health Care: Can Limiting State Action Immunity Help Save a Trillion Dollars?” Loyola University Chicago Law Journal, Pages 731-734, modified for ableist language indicated by strikethrough and [brackets]) MULCH

Physicians possess this power for a simple reason: the body of doctrines and practices that we call “health law” systematically supports it. Laws protect the public from individuals and therapies not controlled by physicians, and discourage medical self-help. Laws fund physicians’ tools and assure their quality—though unfortunately not their value. Laws mandate and subsidize insurance coverage for the treatments physicians recommend. Laws insulate physicians from corporate structures and contractual norms. Laws mediate disputes between physicians and patients based on professional standards. Laws apply medical criteria to most ethical issues. Finally, laws such as those challenged in North Carolina State Board delegate substantial rule making and disciplinary authority to state licensing boards (i.e., to entities populated from, and controlled by, the medical profession). States typically justify this abdication of direct oversight in terms of physicians’ scientific expertise, and their ethical duty to heal, not harm, patients.

Both individually and collectively, these laws profoundly distort competition in health care and severely hamper the market’s ability to generate the benefits of competition that we see in other industries. Production remains fragmented. Prices are both inflated and arbitrary— and price competition is minimal (when it even exists at all). There are many barriers to competitive entry—even to deliver the most basic services. Geographic markets are needlessly small and are surprisingly concentrated. Supply bottlenecks are common, often to the mutual benefit of large health insurers and dominant health care providers. And innovation is limited to the sorts of inputs that fit into existing production processes—mainly drugs, diagnostics, and medical devices.

The result is that our health care system almost never trades in the types of consumer products that dominate other costly, complex, technologically sophisticated industries. Instead of fully assembled products accompanied by a strong performance warranty, patients are expected to pay for disaggregated professional process steps (including procedures and consultations) to which billing codes have been assigned, and for equally atomized inputs and complements to those professional processes (such as diagnostic tests and surgical supplies). Health insurance agglomerates these unstructured procedural steps and physical inputs into “covered benefits,” but it does not assemble them into actual, useful products—and only a few true Health Maintenance Organizations (“HMOs”) provide comprehensive prepaid care.

The past decade has witnessed growing agreement regarding both the necessary attributes of a high-performing health care system,17 and the managerial strategies for achieving them.18 Much less attention has been paid to the legal obstacles that have long hindered attempts to redesign acute and complex care—let alone to moving the locus of basic care “upstream,” where it can be communally or self-administered, rather than professionally controlled. As currently constituted, American health law presents concrete structural impediments to accomplishing these consensus health policy goals, and also creates opportunities for incumbent providers to delay or sabotage such efforts.

C. Anticompetitive Effects of Medical Licensing The deep legal architecture of health care strongly favors physician self-regulation, and furthers physicians’ professional insularity and self interest. Physician-controlled medical licensing boards have attracted criticism for decades. Milton Friedman famously wrote in 1962: I am . . . persuaded that [restrictive] licensure has reduced both the quantity and quality of medical practice; . . . that it has forced the public to pay more for less satisfactory medical service[;] and that it has ~~retarded~~ [slowed] technological development both in medicine itself and in the organization of medical practice.19

At the time he made it, Friedman’s harsh economic critique of occupational licensing was not widely shared (except among other libertarians). Professional elites were thought to represent a progressive, prosperous alternative to industrial commodification and the supposed exploitation of labor. To be sure, there was some recognition that the professions might use ethical codes to pursue their own economic selfinterest.20 But mainstream economists such as Kenneth Arrow still believed that collective professionalism improved the marketability of health care by fostering the trust needed to overcome medical uncertainty and informational asymmetry between physicians and patients.21 More recently, a wide array of voices have questioned the economics, and even the justice, of professional privilege.22 In 2015, the Obama Administration issued a report on occupational licensing, finding that “licensing can . . . reduce employment opportunities and lower wages for excluded workers, and increase costs for consumers,” and that “the costs of licensing fall disproportionately on certain populations.”23

To be sure, medical licensing laws are not solely to blame for health care’s competitive shortcomings. Other federal and state regulations and subsidies bear responsibility as well. Still, licensing boards set the tone for the rest of health law as gatekeepers into the health professions and arbiters of practice once admitted. These boards determine the permitted scope of practice, confer authority to write prescriptions, police departures from conventional patterns of care, respond to complaints by licensees about outsiders, and decide when (and, usually, when not) to take disciplinary action against a licensed professional.

From a health policy perspective, physician-imposed barriers to market entry and innovation—typically enforced by a professional licensing board—are the most pernicious practice. Licensing boards set standards for acceptability and impose discipline on licensees who violate their dictates. Unlicensed practice is a criminal act. These entry barriers not only deter novel approaches from new directions, such as telehealth and various “upstream” self-care modalities, but they also discourage existing competitors from adopting practices introduced to the market by disruptive innovators.

#### Disruptive innovation in healthcare solves pandemics

Shaikh 15 (Affan T. Shaikh, Professor at Emory’s school of public health Lisa Ferland, Robert Hood-Cree, Loren Shaffer, and Scott J. N. McNabb, September 23rd 2015, “Disruptive Innovation Can Prevent the Next Pandemic” NCBI <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4585064/>) MULCH

Public health surveillance (PHS) is at a tipping point, where the application of novel processes, technologies, and tools promise to vastly improve efficiency and effectiveness. Yet twentieth century, entrenched ideology and lack of training results in slow uptake and resistance to change. The term disruptive innovation – used to describe advances in technology and processes that change existing markets – is useful to describe the transformation of PHS. Past disruptive innovations used in PHS, such as distance learning, the smart phone, and field-based laboratory testing have outpaced older services, practices, and technologies used in the traditional classroom, governmental offices, and personal communication, respectively. Arguably, the greatest of these is the Internet – an infrastructural innovation that continues to enable exponential benefits in seemingly limitless ways. Considering the Global Health Security Agenda and facing emerging and reemerging infectious disease threats, evolving environmental and behavioral risks, and ever changing epidemiologic trends, PHS must transform. Embracing disruptive innovation in the structures and processes of PHS can be unpredictable. However, it is necessary to strengthen and unlock the potential to prevent, detect, and respond.

Introduction

Fifty-two years ago, Alexander Langmuir articulated our modern understanding of public health surveillance (PHS) – the systematic collection, consolidation and evaluation, and dissemination of data (1). In this workflow process, public health provides epidemiologic intelligence to assess and track conditions of public health importance, define public health priorities, evaluate programs, and conduct public health research (2). However, amid this rapidly changing world, PHS has remained sluggish and hindered by the impediments of siloed, vertical (outcome-specific) systems, inadequate training and technical expertise, different information and communication technology (ICT) standards, concerns over data sharing and confidentiality, poor interoperability, and inadequate analytical approaches and tools (3–7).

Gaps and impediments in PHS have become increasingly evident to the world in the wake of the largest Ebola epidemic ever – in which these challenges impacted our ability to prevent, detect, and respond. Under the looming threat of MERS-CoV, leishmaniasis, influenza, multidrug-resistant tuberculosis, and plague, the global public health community now realizes the urgent need to address shortcomings in PHS. Properly preparing for the next major outbreak hinges on our willingness to transform; the consequences of not doing so are dire.

Transforming PHS to meet the needs of the twenty-first century requires novel approaches. A helpful concept to understand and chart this future is disruptive innovation – a term first introduced by Clayton Christensen to describe innovations in technology and processes that disrupt existing markets (8). Disruptive innovations occur when advances in technologies or processes create markets in existing industries. This differs from sustaining innovations, where existing practices are incrementally improved to meet the demands of existing customers; in contrast, newly introduced innovations with disruptive potential (typically unrefined, simple, and affordable in character) target lower-end market needs or create entirely new market segments. As sustaining innovations improve disrupting technologies or processes, these new innovations will meet increasingly greater needs, capture greater market share, and eventually reshape the industry. Christensen uses the example of increasingly smaller disk sizes in the hard disk drive industry, the introduction of hydraulic technology in the mechanical excavator industry, and the rise of minimills in the steel industry to demonstrate the impact of disruptive innovations (8). Here, we describe the need for disruptive innovation in PHS and identify opportunities for disruption in PHS structures and processes.

#### Capacity for innovation solves invisible thresholds for existential pandemics – they’re coming now – new 400 year study + statistical methods

Penn 21 (Michael Penn, Director of Communications, Marketing and Alumni Relations, Duke Global Health Initiative, citing William Pan, Ph.D., associate professor of global environmental health at Duke, Marco Marani, adjunct professor at Duke department of Global Health, where he previously was a professor of civil and environmental engineering and Anthony Parolari, Ph.D., of Marquette University, is a former Duke postdoctoral researcher, Gabriel Katul, Ph.D., the Theodore S. Coile Distinguished Professor of Hydrology and Micrometeorology at Duke, “Statistics Say Large Pandemics Are More Likely Than We Thought” Duke Global Health Institute, <https://globalhealth.duke.edu/news/statistics-say-large-pandemics-are-more-likely-we-thought>) CULTIV8

The COVID-19 pandemic may be the deadliest viral outbreak the world has seen in more than a century. But statistically, such extreme events aren’t as rare as we may think, asserts a new analysis of novel disease outbreaks over the past 400 years.

The study, appearing in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences the week of Aug. 23, used a newly assembled record of past outbreaks to estimate the intensity of those events and the yearly probability of them recurring.

It found the probability of a pandemic with similar impact to COVID-19 is about 2% in any year, meaning that someone born in the year 2000 would have about a 38% chance of experiencing one by now. And that probability is only growing, which the authors say highlights the need to adjust perceptions of pandemic risks and expectations for preparedness.

“The most important takeaway is that large pandemics like COVID-19 and the Spanish flu are relatively likely,” said William Pan, Ph.D., associate professor of global environmental health at Duke and one of the paper’s co-authors. Understanding that pandemics aren’t so rare should raise the priority of efforts to prevent and control them in the future, he said.

The study, led by Marco Marani, Ph.D., of the University of Padua in Italy, used new statistical methods to measure the scale and frequency of disease outbreaks for which there was no immediate medical intervention over the past four centuries. Their analysis, which covered a murderer’s row of pathogens including plague, smallpox, cholera, typhus and novel influenza viruses, found considerable variability in the rate at which pandemics have occurred in the past. But they also identified patterns that allowed them to describe the probabilities of similar-scale events happening again.

In the case of the deadliest pandemic in modern history – the Spanish flu, which killed more than 30 million people between 1918 and 1920 -- the probability of a pandemic of similar magnitude occurring ranged from 0.3% to 1.9% per year over the time period studied. Taken another way, those figures mean it is statistically likely that a pandemic of such extreme scale would occur within the next 400 years.

“ The most important takeaway is that large pandemics like COVID-19 and the Spanish flu are relatively likely. WILLIAM PAN — ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

In the case of the deadliest pandemic in modern history – the Spanish flu, which killed more than 30 million people between 1918 and 1920 -- the probability of a pandemic of similar magnitude occurring ranged from 0.3% to 1.9% per year over the time period studied. Taken another way, those figures mean it is statistically likely that a pandemic of such extreme scale would occur within the next 400 years.

But the data also show the risk of intense outbreaks is growing rapidly. Based on the increasing rate at which novel pathogens such as SARS-CoV-2 have broken loose in human populations in the past 50 years, the study estimates that the probability of novel disease outbreaks will likely grow three-fold in the next few decades.

Using this increased risk factor, the researchers estimate that a pandemic similar in scale to COVID-19 is likely within a span of 59 years, a result they write is “much lower than intuitively expected.” Although not included in the PNAS paper, they also calculated the probability of a pandemic capable of eliminating all human life, finding it statistically likely within the next 12,000 years.

That is not to say we can count on a 59-year reprieve from a COVID-like pandemic, nor that we’re off the hook for a calamity on the scale of the Spanish flu for another 300 years. Such events are equally probable in any year during the span, said Gabriel Katul, Ph.D., the Theodore S. Coile Distinguished Professor of Hydrology and Micrometeorology at Duke and another of the paper’s authors.

“When a 100-year flood occurs today, one may erroneously presume that one can afford to wait another 100 years before experiencing another such event,” Katul says. “This impression is false. One can get another 100-year flood the next year.”

As an environmental health scientist, Pan can speculate on the reasons outbreaks are becoming more frequent, noting that population growth, changes in food systems, environmental degradation and more frequent contact between humans and disease-harboring animals all may be significant factors. He emphasizes the statistical analysis sought only to characterize the risks, not to explain what is driving them.

But at the same time, he hopes the study will spark deeper exploration of the factors that may be making devastating pandemics more likely – and how to counteract them.

“This points to the importance of early response to disease outbreaks and building capacity for pandemic surveillance at the local and global scales, as well as for setting a research agenda for understanding why large outbreaks are becoming more common,” Pan said.

#### Disease is a non-linear existential risk – precautionary principle key

Diamandis 21 (Eleftherios P. Diamandis, Division Head of Clinical Biochemistry at Mount Sinai Hospital and Biochemist-in-Chief at the University Health Network and is Professor & Head, Clinical Biochemistry, Department of Laboratory Medicine and Pathobiology, University of Toronto, Ontario, Canada, April 14th 2021, “The Mother of All Battles: Viruses vs. Humans. Can Humans Avoid Extinction in 50-100 Years?” modified to fix author typo [“could result n” 🡪 “could result in” <https://www.preprints.org/manuscript/202104.0397/v1>) MULCH

The recent SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, which is causing COVID 19 disease, has taught us unexpected lessons about the dangers of human extinction through highly contagious and lethal diseases. As the COVID 19 pandemic is now being controlled by various isolation measures, therapeutics and vaccines, it became clear that our current lifestyle and societal functions may not be sustainable in the long term. We now have to start thinking and planning on how to face the next dangerous pandemic, not just overcoming the one that is upon us now. Is there any evidence that even worse pandemics could strike us in the near future and threaten the existence of the human race? The answer **is** unequivocally yes. It is not necessary to get infected by viruses of bats, pangolins and other exotic animals that live in remote forests in order to be in danger. Creditable scientific evidence indicates that the human gut microbiota harbor billions of viruses which are capable of affecting the function of vital human organs such as the immune system, lung, brain, liver, kidney, heart etc. It is possible that the development of pathogenic variants in the gut can lead to contagious viruses which can cause pandemics, leading to destruction of vital organs, causing death or various debilitating diseases such as blindness, respiratory, liver, heart and kidney failures. These diseases could result [in] the complete shutdown of our civilization and probably the extinction of human race. In this essay, I will first provide a few independent pieces of scientific facts and then combine this information to come up with some (but certainly not all) hypothetical scenarios that could cause human race misery, even extinction. I hope that these scary scenarios will trigger preventative measures that could reverse or delay the projected adverse outcomes.

#### **Health innovation solves ABR – kills 10 million people per year, more market access is key**

McMurry-Heath 9/16 (Michelle McMurry-Heath is president and CEO of the Biotechnology Innovation Organization, and lives in Washington, D.C. Tomaras is chief scientific officer at Forge Therapeutics, and lives in San Diego, September 16th 2021, “Opinion: Antibiotic-resistant superbugs are a ticking time bomb in global health care” San Diego Union Tribune, <https://www.sandiegouniontribune.com/opinion/commentary/story/2021-09-16/superbug-drugs-therapy-antibiotics>) MULCH

The global health-care system faces a ticking time bomb.

Deadly bacteria and fungi are evolving to resist all current antimicrobials. If that happens, everything from chemotherapy to routine surgeries will become extraordinarily risky, since patients’ weakened immune systems won’t be able to fight off these dangerous infections, and existing medicines will be of little use. The United Nations estimates that without new antibiotics, by 2050, superbugs could kill 10 million people a year.

We don’t know exactly when our last antibiotics will lose their efficacy. We don’t know which strain of “superbug” will push us past the tipping point. But we do know that America’s small biotechnology firms house some of the brain power to avert this disaster.

These firms and their scientists — many based here in California — are battling hard against this microscopic enemy. But small biotechnology firms are not just fighting microbial evolution; they are also grappling with a broken antibiotics market whose inefficiencies are putting millions of lives at risk.

Antibiotics are expensive to develop, costing upwards of $1 billion per new medicine. But doctors only prescribe advanced new antibiotics sparingly — because every dose gives bacteria a chance to evolve and become resistant. And most patients only need antibiotics for a few days, unlike insulin or statins, which many chronic disease patients need to take every day for years or even decades.

Because of the high research and development costs and low probability of earning a financial return on antibiotics, many large pharmaceutical companies have pivoted away from antibiotics development. Since the 1980s, the number of major drug companies developing new antibiotics has fallen from 18 to three.

#### Antibiotic resistant superbugs and zoonotic viruses are catastrophic risks that guarantee extinction.

Victor 20 — Gavin Victor, Pioneer Journalist and Philosophy Research Assistant for Whitman College, 2020 (“Forget coronavirus: Worry about antibiotic resistance instead,” *Whitman Wire*, March 12th, Available Online at https://whitmanwire.com/opinion/2020/03/12/forget-coronavirus-worry-about-antibiotic-resistance-instead/, Accessed 07-02-2021)

A survey of experts from the “Future of Humanity Institute” at the University of Oxford states that there is a 19 percent chance of human extinction before 2100. If this is the risk of our extinction, then consequently, an extreme decrease in quality of life is much more likely, too. Among the many risks within contemporary life, issues surrounding antibiotic resistance are almost completely unacknowledged, incredibly dangerous and subject to change with only slight cultural and industrial shifts. The WHO claims that, “without urgent action, we are heading towards a post-antibiotic era, in which common infections and minor illnesses can once again kill.” The UN claims that by 2050, ten million people will die every year from antibiotic-resistant diseases – which is more than the current figure for cancer.

Antibiotic resistance stems from the misuse of antibiotics. The more we use antibiotics, the more we allow bacteria to build up a tolerance to them. We have already seen the advent of MRSA and antibiotic-resistant salmonella. The most obvious fix for this is to only prescribe antibiotics when absolutely necessary, which doctors are beginning to do. Humans, however, only use 20 percent of the antibiotics manufactured. The rest are consumed constantly by animals waiting for slaughter in massive feeding operations. Lance Price, an expert on bacteria resistant “superbugs”, claims that our food system’s predication on a constant use of antibiotics for animals is a recipe for disaster, because it uses antibiotics in a way that will inevitably lead to antibiotic resistance.

As with almost all recent disease outbreaks – like Swine-flu, MERS and SARS – COVID-19 is zoonotic, meaning that it originated in animals. Not only did these diseases originate in animals but in a particular species of animals that inhabit unnatural conditions for the sake of humans: including Swine-flu from pigs, MERS from camels, as well as SARS and COVID-19 likely originating from bats. While viruses are not the same problem as is antibiotic resistance, overlap between them indicates that top priority global health issues are stemming from our failure to have a healthy relationship with animals. We get zoonotic diseases as a result of exploitative and unnatural relationships with animals.

We need to use the fear generated by COVID-19 to jump start legitimate action in order to mitigate the fallout from catastrophes right around the corner. The fact that we turn a blind eye to pandemics that are becoming more and more inevitable is a sign that we shouldn’t trust our natural tendency to just “deal with it later.” Dealing with it later, dealing with the pandemics that are coming, doesn’t work. We should be scared – but of much more than COVID-19.

#### Narrowing Parker immunity empowers the FTC to challenge anticompetitive business sanctioned by state regulatory schemes. Those stifle innovation – incumbent regulations are outdated and block new entrants.

Crane 19 [Daniel A. Crane, Frederick Paul Furth Sr. Professor of Law, University of Michigan, 60 Wm. & Mary L. Rev. 1175, 2019, Lexis]

INTRODUCTION

This Article's intended audience holds a common view that state and local governments frequently adopt anticompetitive regulations for the benefit of economic special interests and that these acts of cronyism are pernicious to democracy, consumers, and economic efficiency. 1 In other words, the costs to society of these regulations far outweigh any reasonable benefits. A wise, beneficent, and all-knowing Platonic guardian of the state would have little trouble in striking down such regulations.

A further point of general consensus might relate to the particularly pernicious effect of anticompetitive state and local regulation in stifling new production innovation. In a variety of ways, our constitutional order is stodgy. Its conservatism lends a hand to the beneficiaries of incumbent technologies as they seek to deploy state power to block or to slow the advent of new technologies that may eventually displace the old, thereby preventing a realignment of wealth and position. In recent years, innovative technologies developed by companies such as Tesla, Uber, Lyft, and Airbnb have encountered determined opposition from purveyors of predecessor technologies, who have often used state and local regulation to thwart innovation. 2

So much for the common ground. Where consensus quickly fragments is on the question of what, if anything, to do about such regulations given that wise, beneficent, and all-knowing Platonic guardians of the state are in short supply. In the imperfect messiness that is liberal democracy, we frequently accept a host of comparatively petty inconveniences--political and economic--in order to preserve larger values. Just as we tolerate many market failures because the attempt at a regulatory fix might aggravate matters, we may have to tolerate some political failures on the same grounds.

[\*1178] Much of the difficulty has to do with the fact that while there might be a broad consensus that state and local governments enact many unjustifiable anticompetitive regulations, there is not a clear consensus on which ones they are. The experience with economic substantive due process in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, epitomized in Lochner v. New York, 3 has left the American political psyche gun-shy about permitting judges to strike down protectionist economic regulations on constitutional grounds. Shortly after getting out of the Lochner business, the Supreme Court announced that it would not get into the same business under the guise of the antitrust laws. 4 Over time, the development of the Parker state action doctrine allowed the courts to play a somewhat expanded role with respect to anticompetitive state and local regulations, but the zone of judicial review remains relatively constricted. 5

The purpose of this Article is to compare the deployment of constitutional and antitrust tools to scrutinize potentially anticompetitive state and local regulations against the backdrop of the ubiquitous concern about "Lochnerizing" under the auspices of either constitutional or statutory authority. Here is the question in a nutshell: If one believes that courts (or perhaps federal administrative agencies) should do somewhat more than they currently do to scrutinize and potentially invalidate anticompetitive state and local regulations, which lever should they pull--constitutional doctrines, antitrust preemption, or both? Because there are some overlapping, and some separate, institutional constraints and potential pathologies between constitutional and antitrust law, it is important to compare the two tools before deploying them.

This Article is organized as follows: Part I diagnoses the underlying features of democratic government that produce anticompetitive regulation. Some of this story is quite familiar, but I present some new observations with respect to the role of technological incumbency as a strong factor in invoking regulation to thwart innovation.

[\*1179] Part II explores the historical, ideological, and institutional foundations of the current legal doctrines with respect to constitutional and antitrust scrutiny of anticompetitive regulations. It shows that, despite the narrowing of Parker immunity in recent decades and some recent revival of equal protection and substantive due process as constraints on anticompetitive regulation, a good deal of anticompetitive state and local regulation remains impervious to legal challenge.

Part III compares the potential efficacy and pitfalls of deploying constitutional or antitrust doctrines as checks on anticompetitive state and local regulations. It considers: (1) the reach and domain of constitutional and antitrust theories; (2) the ways in which each theory could accommodate genuine and sufficient justifications for the challenged regulations; (3) ways in which the antitrust and constitutional tools differ substantively and procedurally; and (4) ways in which the two theories might interact.

I. WHY ANTICOMPETITIVE REGULATION SUCCEEDS

This Article opened with the assumption that a wide universe of unjustified state and local anticompetitive regulation exists that a benevolent Platonic guardian of the state would instantly nullify. Given this conceit, the presence of such regulations necessarily represents democratic failures, as democracy should, in principle, strive for laws that confer positive, rather than negative, public benefit. What, then, accounts for the pervasive existence of these undesirable regulations? The answer comes in two parts--a generic (and largely familiar) story concerning anticompetitive regulations as a whole, and a more specific story concerning the battle between incumbent and innovative technologies.

A. The Generic Story

The generic story is largely familiar from public choice theory and the literature on the Parker state action doctrine. Democratic processes systematically fail to overcome two embedded hurdles to matching regulatory schemes to broad public preferences: (1) the asymmetrical distribution of costs and benefits of anticompetitive [\*1180] regulations, and (2) the externalization of costs on populations outside the boundaries of the relevant democratic unit. 6 In tandem, these hurdles to democratic correction of cronyistic dispensations of monopoly power by governmental regulators perpetuate regulatory schemes that a broad majority of citizens would vote to overturn if they understood the issue and were sufficiently motivated to invest political energy in correcting it. 7 The first democratic deficit, well documented in public choice literature, arises because producers typically receive a much more concentrated benefit from anticompetitive regulations in comparison to the relatively unconcentrated cost imposed on consumers. 8 A small band of producers may lobby aggressively to enact or maintain an anticompetitive scheme that permits the producers to collect significant monopoly rents. 9 Those rents, in turn, may be spread across thousands or millions of consumers, each one paying a relatively small increase in rent. 10 Collective action constraints--the cost of mobilizing consumer sentiment and action to oppose the regulation--give the producers a systematic advantage in maintaining the regulation. 11 As John Shepard Wiley explained in bringing public choice theory literature to bear on Parker immunity questions: [I]f the group [of consumers] is large, individual members have little incentive to participate because participation is personally costly and contributes little to the group's chances for successful joint action. Small groups encounter fewer of such problems. If group members behave in this rational self-interested manner, then "there is a systematic tendency for exploitation of the great by the small"; less numerous, more intensely concerned special [\*1181] interests can predictably outmatch more numerous, more mildly concerned consumer or "public" interests in legislative or regulatory fora--even though the actions of special interests impose a net loss on society. 12 The second deficit arises when governmental units--whether state or local--externalize the costs of the anticompetitive regulation outside their jurisdiction. The classic example is Parker itself, in which 90 percent of the raisins subject to California's agricultural cartel mandate were sold outside of California. 13 Out-of-state consumers could not be counted on to mobilize democratically to oppose the California regulation, as they had no political voice in California. 14 Many similar examples of jurisdictional cost externalization have been documented. 15 One arose in an important Supreme Court decision on state action immunity, Town of Hallie v. City of Eau Claire. 16 Hallie, Seymour, Union, and Washington were unincorporated towns adjacent to the city of Eau Claire, Wisconsin. 17 Their citizens could not vote in Eau Claire, but Eau Claire wanted to annex those territories into its boundaries, possibly through coercive means. 18 Eau Claire received federal funds to build a sewage treatment plant in its service area, which covered the four towns, then refused to supply sewage treatment services to the towns. 19 However, the city did agree to provide treatment services to certain homeowners in the towns if a majority of area voters voted by referendum to allow Eau Claire to annex their homes and to commit to use Eau Claire's sewage and transportation services. 20 The towns claimed this scheme was designed to keep the other towns from effectively competing with Eau Claire's sewage collection and transportation services. 21 The scheme also possibly allowed the [\*1182] city to raise costs for nonresidents while at the same time leveraging the higher prices to bring the nonresidents (and presumably their property taxes) into the city. 22 Although the city's motivation was ultimately political rather than narrowly economic, it used an anticompetitive strategy to dump monopoly costs on nonresidents who could not vote to rescind the regulations until they joined the city, at which point the question would be moot. 23 Together, these two deficits--asymmetrical costs and benefits to both producers and consumers and cost externalization--explain why democratic processes often fail to weed out anticompetitive regulations. Without concerted efforts by champions of consumer interests to overcome collective action problems and mobilize support for regulatory reform, the regulatory barriers to competition can linger indefinitely. As discussed next, these failures of democratic self-correction are exacerbated by regulations that entrench incumbent technologies at the expense of innovation.

B. Additional Considerations Affecting Product Market Innovation

Many of the contemporary regulatory battles between old and new technologies (particularly those involving the sharing economy) can be understood as follows. The incumbent regulatory scheme arose many decades ago and may well have been legitimately justified (in the sense of not imposing more costs than benefits) at the time of its adoption. 24 Our hypothesized Platonic guardian might even have approved of it at the time of its adoption. 25 The passage of time and advent of new technologies has now eroded the original basis of the regulation, and our Platonic guardian would therefore want the regulation rescinded or reformed. However, incumbent firms succeed in blocking or slowing innovative competition by circling the wagons around the incumbent regulatory schemes. 26 In [\*1183] these wars, the incumbents have a decisive advantage for at least three structural reasons.

First, if the incumbent regulatory scheme has allowed the incumbent firms to collect monopoly rents, then there may be a sharp asymmetry of incentives between old and new firms. 27 This is the same asymmetry that attends any struggle between incumbent monopolists and new competitive entrants: the monopolist is seeking to protect a large market share at a monopoly price, whereas the new entrant can only hope to gain a smaller market share at a competitive price. 28 Because the incumbent has more to gain than the new entrant has to lose, the incumbent will be willing to spend more to entrench the regulatory monopoly than the new entrant will be to challenge it. 29 This, in turn, discourages potential new entrants from investing in innovative new technologies and mounting political and market-oriented challenges to the incumbents. 30

Second, the incumbents have the advantage of status quo biases and fears about the consequences of technological change. 31 Costs of the existing system--to human safety, for example--may be seen as an inevitable baseline, whereas potential risks from the new technology may be seen as incremental threats. 32 Hence, risks and costs of the existing system may be undercounted or not counted at all, while risks and costs of the new system will be made to bear the full weight of their risks and costs.

For example, in recent months there have been widely reported stories of Uber drivers sexually abusing passengers. 33 These stories rarely report the base rate of abuse by taxi drivers or public transit [\*1184] workers, who might well present similar risks to passengers. 34 Similarly, the news media seem to wait with bated breath to report every accident involving a driverless vehicle 35 --even ones where the vehicle was stationary and hit by another at-fault vehicle--without reporting the base rate of nearly 40,000 deaths a year from human-driven vehicles. 36 The focus of news reporting seems to be on the incremental risks created by automated driving without regard to the baseline number of deaths that automated driving might diminish. 37 In principle, regulators should compare the likely risks of allowing new technologies to those of perpetuating the incumbent technology, but they often default to some version of the precautionary principle, insisting that new technologies prove their safety and efficacy in an absolute rather than comparative sense. 38 Given this baseline asymmetry, proponents of new technologies frequently must overcome significant regulatory hurdles not faced by incumbent technologies. Or, incumbent technologies may persuade regulators to force new technologies to play by rules that favor the incumbent technologies--a form of raising rivals' costs and creating regulatory entry barriers. 39

Finally, incumbents enjoy the generic benefits of incumbency in a structurally conservative constitutional and political system. The multiple "veto gates" to reform legislation--structural factors such as bicameralism, presentment, filibusters, and committee structures 40 --empower technological incumbents to ride the status quo for years or decades after our hypothetical Platonic guardian would have instituted public-minded reforms. 41

[\*1185] In combination, these three factors create additional barriers to the expected flow of democratic processes toward majoritarian equilibria--that is to say, equilibria that favor consumers' interests in competition and innovation over those of producers in capturing monopoly rents. In light of these factors and the collective action and cost externalization factors discussed earlier, 42 it is unsurprising that regulation serves as a barrier to innovation.

C. An Illustration from Automobile Distribution

The ongoing story of Tesla's efforts to break into the American automobile market illustrates the stickiness of incumbent regulations. 43 For a variety of business reasons, when Tesla entered the market in 2012, it decided that it would have to sell its all-electric vehicles (EVs) directly to consumers, meaning that it would have to open its own showrooms and service centers rather than outsourcing that function to franchised dealers. 44 Among other things, Tesla believed that traditional dealerships would be reluctant and ill-positioned to sell EVs and that Tesla therefore could not expect to convince already skeptical customers to buy EVs unless it opened its own retail facilities. 45 Since the mid-twentieth century, however, most states have adopted laws intended to protect dealers from unfair exploitation by manufacturers. 46 Among the provisions in many of these state statutes is a prohibition on a manufacturer opening its own showrooms and service centers. 47 In many states, manufacturers are required to distribute through independent dealers only. 48

Legislatures adopted these direct distribution prohibitions at a time when American car manufacturing was dominated by the "Big Three" (Chrysler, Ford, and General Motors) and many dealers were [\*1186] "mom and pop" businesses. 49 State legislatures were convinced that the dominant manufacturers were taking advantage of their franchisees by selling cars through their company-owned stores at lower prices than the dealers could afford to charge given the wholesale prices charged by the manufacturers. 50 The direct distribution prohibitions were justified as correcting a severe imbalance in bargaining power leading to contracts of adhesion and unfair exploitation in manufacturer-dealer relations. 51

Assuming that dealer protection rationale made sense in circa 1950, its basis has almost entirely vanished today. With the advent of competition from Europe and Asia, the Big Three are no longer dominant. 52 Dealers have many choices of automobile franchisors and hence considerably more power in negotiations over franchise terms. Further, the dealers are no longer mostly mom and pops. 53 Rather, most dealers are organized into multi-dealer groups, many with hundreds of millions or billions of dollars in annual revenue. 54 Indeed, some of the largest dealer groups have more annual revenue than Tesla. 55 Most significantly, the dealer protection rationale has nothing to do with a company such as Tesla that does not seek to distribute through dealers at all. 56 No dealers, no dealer exploitation.

Recognizing that the dealer protection rationale that justified the original statutes no longer works, the dealers have attempted to recast the direct distribution prohibitions as consumer protection decisions. 57 They have argued that forcing consumers to buy automobiles from dealers rather than from manufacturers will lead to more price competition, and hence lower prices, and prevent [\*1187] consumers from manufacturer exploitation. 58 These consumer protection arguments have been roundly rejected by economists, 59 the Federal Trade Commission (FTC), 60 and major proconsumer groups such as the Consumer Federation of America, Consumer Action, Consumers for Automobile Reliability and Safety, and the American Antitrust Institute. 61 Nonetheless, the dealers have succeeded in using the existing structure of dealer protection laws to block or slow Tesla's direct distribution program in a number of states. 62

The Tesla story evidences most of the factors that contribute to the persistence of anticompetitive regulations. The dealers have a concentrated interest in preserving their protected position, while the costs of that protectionism are spread out over millions of consumers. In the state with arguably the most pernicious record with respect to direct distribution reform--Michigan--there is a record of antireform advocacy by a leading incumbent--General Motors--and acquiescence by the political class to protect an in-state champion against an out-of-state challenger. 63 Even though consumers complain more about car dealers than about any other business, indicating the baseline system is not particularly attractive to them, 64 the dealers have invoked fears about the risks of direct distribution in opposition to legislative reforms. And legislative [\*1188] inertia has slowed the consideration of reform bills in some states, extending the incumbent regulatory scheme long past its reasonable expiration date. 65

The structural factors weighing against proconsumer and pro-innovation reforms will not block Tesla forever. The company has already seen significant successes in some state legislatures and courts and is progressively penetrating the market. 66 Yet it would be misguided to consider the company's eventual success a reason not to worry about the structural factors entrenching anticompetitive regulations, especially those foreclosing innovation. No monopoly is permanent--even the most persistent are eventually eroded. 67 Innovative technologies will almost always find a way out eventually, despite incumbent machinations. 68 What incumbents can buy is not monopoly in perpetuity but in extension. 69 Those years or decades of extension are costly to society. They represent significant overcharges to consumers, misallocations of social resources and, in the extreme, impairment to health and safety-- even lives lost. 70

Not every instance of anticompetitive state or local regulation exhibits the full set of explanatory factors discussed in this Article as cleanly as the ongoing Tesla saga does. Yet the Tesla story is more paradigmatic than idiosyncratic. Across the economy, incumbent technologies are structurally advantaged to deploy regulatory forces to stifle or slow innovation.

[\*1189] II. CONSTITUTIONAL AND ANTITRUST PRINCIPLES AS A CHECK ON ANTICOMPETITIVE REGULATION

If democratic processes fail to check anticompetitive state and local regulations on a systematic basis, then what can be done about it? Among the potential tools are institutional efforts to address the quality of legislation and regulation through democratic processes, such as creating governmental competition advocacy bodies within state and local governments or using federal purse strings to incentivize state and local governments to reevaluate their regulations. These democratic options are important, but they often fall prey to the pathologies of democratic decision making identified earlier. 71 Competition advocates--whether in government or in the private sector--often face formidable structural barriers to advancing the procompetition interest: entrenched incumbent monopolies, difficulties in mobilizing consumer support given the often diffuse nature of consumer harm, and institutional biases against change. 72

In addition to the democratic options, there are what could be styled counterdemocratic possibilities, insofar as they involve the use of courts or agencies to strike down anticompetitive statutes and regulations as inconsistent with some overarching norm of federal law, whether statutory or constitutional. 73 These counterdemocratic possibilities often do not run into the same structural status quo biases as the democratic possibilities do. For example, advocates of a legal theory for overruling an anticompetitive state or local regulation do not have to mobilize broad political support for their position or surmount the "veto gates" 74 built into ordinary political processes. Rather, they typically only have to persuade a small set of elite decision makers that their position is legally correct. It is with these counter-democratic possibilities that this Article is primarily interested.

[\*1190] The counterdemocratic or countermajoritarian quality of these deployments of judicial review is what places their use in some doubt, 75 even granting the assumption that they are targeting objectively undesirable regulations. 76 In the arc of American history, the courts have vacillated in their willingness to engage in such judicial review since the mid-twentieth century. Late nineteenth and early twentieth century courts were willing to engage in broad judicial review of economic regulation, 77 but the tide turned strongly against such review in the mid-twentieth century. 78 Only in recent years have glimmers of a return to some form of strong judicial review of anticompetitive regulations made a reappearance. 79

A. Lochner, anti-Lochner, and Parker

The stage for the current constellation of judicial doctrines and attitudes towards federal judicial review of anticompetitive state and local regulations was set through the progression of Lochner-era substantive due process, the anti-Lochner constitutional revolution of 1937, and the extension of anti-Lochner sentiment to federal antitrust law in the creation of Parker's state action immunity doctrine in 1943. 80 In 1905, the Supreme Court in Lochner struck down a New York law regulating bakeshop working hours on substantive due process grounds, 81 over Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes's famous objection that "[t]he Fourteenth Amendment does not enact Mr. Herbert Spencer's Social Statics." 82 During the Progressive and New Deal eras, Lochner and Lochnerism were broadly vilified for interfering with progressive reforms and substituting judges' economic views for those of legislatures. 83 In the New Deal constitutional revolution associated with the year 1937 (although spanning a few years in either direction), the Supreme [\*1191] Court announced it was getting out of the Lochner business--that it would not strike down economic legislation simply on the grounds that it was, in the judgment of the court, ill-considered. 84 Over time, it became clear that the anti-Lochner jurisprudence extended to nakedly anticompetitive regulations adopted to favor economic special interests to the detriment of the consuming public. In cases such as Williamson v. Lee Optical 85 and Ferguson v. Skrupa, 86 there was a fairly apparent record that the regulations in question had been adopted to stifle competition and benefit economic special interests, but the courts refused to create an exception to the anti-Lochner doctrine on those grounds. 87 In Williamson, the Court acknowledged that the "Oklahoma law may exact a needless, wasteful requirement in many cases," but insisted that the "day is gone when this Court uses the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to strike down state laws, regulatory of business and industrial conditions, because they may be unwise, improvident, or out of harmony with a particular school of thought." 88 Rather, the Court held that "[f]or protection against abuses by legislatures the people must resort to the polls, not to the courts." 89 In 1943, the Supreme Court in Parker v. Brown also made clear that it would not permit the federal Sherman Act to be used as an end-run around the anti-Lochner cases. 90 Parker involved both dormant commerce clause and Sherman Act challenges to California's Agricultural Prorate Act, which forced farmers into a marketing plan that effectively operated as an output reduction cartel run by farmers. 91 The Supreme Court rejected both challenges. 92 Finding "nothing in the language of the Sherman Act or in its history which suggests that its purpose was to restrain a state or its officers or agents from activities directed by its legislature," 93 the Court created a doctrine of state action immunity for anticompetitive state [\*1192] and local laws. 94 The effect of this ruling was to restrict the Sherman Act's coverage solely to purely private conduct. 95 Anticompetitive schemes orchestrated by the state would be excluded from judicial review. 96 As Judge Merrick Garland has observed, Parker is best understood as a continuation of the post-1937 jurisprudence rejecting Lochner: Parker v. Brown was much less a case about judicial faith in economic regulation than it was a case about judicial respect for the political process. Parker was indeed a child of its times, but the most salient element of that historical context was the Court's recent rejection of the Lochner-era doctrine of substantive due process, under which federal courts struck down economic regulations they viewed as unreasonably interfering with the liberty of contract. Having only just determined not to use the Constitution in that manner, the Court was not about to resurrect Lochner in the garb of the Sherman Act. 97

B. The Potential for an Increased Level of Judicial Scrutiny

As of 1943, one would have been justified in believing that, at least from the perspective of federal judicial review, anticompetitive state and local regulations would receive a free pass unless they [\*1193] committed certain egregious violations, such as disadvantaging "discrete and insular minorities" 98 or discriminating against out-of-state commerce. 99 But the judicial impulse to cast a stern glance at perniciously anticompetitive regulations could not be forever stifled, and before long cracks began to appear in the courts' anti-Lochnerian resolve.

Antitrust law and its state action immunity doctrine were the first to move in a significantly more interventionist direction. By the time of the Midcal decision, the state action immunity doctrine had been narrowed to permit judicial scrutiny unless the state regulation met a two-part test: (1) clear and affirmative expression of the anticompetitive policy by the sovereign state itself, and (2) active supervision of the policy's implementation by state actors. 100 Under this structure, the courts have invalidated a number of anticompetitive state regulatory schemes--most recently the practice of delegating regulatory power to occupational licensing boards staffed with potentially self-interested industry participants. 101

The Midcal test invokes a democracy-reinforcement theory of antitrust judicial review. 102 States may enact anticompetitive regulations so long as they take conspicuous responsibility for them. 103 If the state can be obviously identified with the scheme, then perhaps citizens will "vote out the bums" if the costs to consumers are too high. 104 Alas, many anticompetitive regulations escape Midcal's net because of the systemic factors identified in the previous section. 105 Even when a state conspicuously takes ownership of an anticompetitive scheme, democratic processes may fail to provide a remedy because of the asymmetry of costs and benefits [\*1194] between producers and consumers, the externalization of costs outside the voting jurisdiction, and the entrenched advantage of technological incumbency. 106

In light of the limited efficacy of Midcal's regime, one could consider additional ways to increase the level of antitrust scrutiny of anticompetitive state and local regulations. Commentators have proposed various such doctrinal approaches to invigorate antitrust preemption. For example, courts might adopt a cost-externalization test, which would invalidate regulatory schemes that externalize a disproportionate share of monopoly overcharges outside the boundaries of the political district enacting the regulation. 107 Or, as I have proposed elsewhere, they might read the Parker doctrine as entirely inapplicable to enforcement actions by the FTC--a legal question that the Supreme Court has held is still open. 108 In the event that the courts hold Parker inapplicable to the FTC, the Commission might play a significantly enhanced role in checking anticompetitive abuses by state and local governments.

Despite calls for a broader use of federal antitrust law to police anticompetitive state and local regulations, the Supreme Court continues to refine the Parker doctrine with an eye on Lochner. Then-Justice Rehnquist once worried that the Court should not "engage in the same wide-ranging, essentially standardless inquiry into the reasonableness of local regulation that th[e] Court … properly rejected" in terminating Lochnerism. 109 In his dissenting opinion in Community Communications Co. v. City of Boulder, Justice [\*1195] Rehnquist warned about the risks of opening up antitrust review of municipal regulations in a way that would require cities to justify their regulations, and the courts, in turn, to weigh those justifications. 110 Rehnquist wrote:

If the Rule of Reason were "modified" to permit a municipality to defend its regulation on the basis that its benefits to the community outweigh its anticompetitive effects, the courts will be called upon to review social legislation in a manner reminiscent of the Lochner era. Once again, the federal courts will be called upon to engage in the same wide-ranging, essentially standardless inquiry into the reasonableness of local regulation that this Court has properly rejected. Instead of "liberty of contract" and "substantive due process," the procompetitive principles of the Sherman Act will be the governing standard by which the reasonableness of all local regulation will be determined. Neither the Due Process Clause nor the Sherman Act authorizes federal courts to invalidate local regulation of the economy simply upon opining that the municipality has acted unwisely. The Sherman Act should not be deemed to authorize federal courts to "substitute their social and economic beliefs for the judgment of legislative bodies, who are elected to pass laws." The federal courts have not been appointed by the Sherman Act to sit as a "superlegislature to weigh the wisdom of legislation." 111

Also in the shadow of Lochner, recent years have shown glimmers of a reinvigoration of constitutional doctrines checking anticompetitive abuses by state and local governments. The negative or dormant commerce clause--limited by the Parker Court on anti-Lochner grounds--has occasionally been deployed to invalidate not only anticompetitive regulatory schemes 112 that discriminated against out-of-state interests, but also, on occasion, those that impose significant burdens on interstate commerce without a sufficient justification. 113 As of this writing, Tesla is testing the limits of these [\*1196] doctrines in its challenge to Michigan's direct distribution law. 114 Its complaint for injunctive relief asserts:

[Michigan's] [p]articularly egregious protectionist legislation … blocks Tesla from pursuing legitimate business activities and subjects it to arbitrary and unreasonable regulation in violation of the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment; subjects Tesla to arbitrary and unreasonable classifications in violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment; and discriminates against interstate commerce and restricts the free flow of goods between states in violation of the dormant Commerce Clause. 115

Thus far, Tesla has survived a motion to dismiss in federal court and won a key discovery motion seeking automobile dealers' communications concerning the Michigan ban on direct distribution. 116

Perhaps even more significant have been a handful of court of appeals decisions applying equal protection principles to invalidate anticompetitive regulations designed solely to protect a discrete group of economic actors from competition--although there remains a circuit split over this practice. Morbidly, the most significant cases have all been related to funeral parlors and casket sales.

In 2004, the Tenth Circuit in Powers v. Harris rejected a constitutional challenge to an Oklahoma statute that limited casket sales to licensed funeral parlors. 117 The court accepted the premise that the statute had no genuine health and safety rationale and was "a classic piece of special interest legislation designed to extract monopoly rents from consumers' pockets and funnel them into the coffers of a small but politically influential group of business people--namely, Oklahoma funeral directors." 118 Nonetheless, the court held its hands were tied by the anti-Lochner cases--particularly [\*1197] Williamson and Ferguson, which also involved (arguably) nakedly parochial anticompetitive regulations. 119

On the other hand, in their own casket cases, the Fifth and Sixth Circuits invalidated the anticompetitive schemes on equal protection grounds, holding that "protecting a discrete interest group from economic competition is not a legitimate governmental purpose" and therefore fails even rational basis review. 120 This exercise of what Judge Ginsburg calls "rational basis with economic bite" could grow into a significant check on anticompetitive state and local regulation if utilized more expansively. 121 If this Article's premise is valid--that regulations designed solely to protect "discrete interest group[s] from economic competition" 122 are pervasive--then the federal courts have their work cut out for them if they take up the casket maxim with seriousness.

However, it is far from certain that they will or should. Despite the movement towards enhanced scrutiny of anticompetitive economic cronyism just described, the ghosts of Lochner continue to loom large. Even judges unsympathetic to the casket regulations may be concerned about the prospect of unelected judges substituting their own economic preferences for those of democratically elected representatives. In Powers, the Tenth Circuit listed a series of classically anti-Lochner rationales (including a rejection of the role of the Platonic guardian hypothesized in this Article) for refusing to embrace the Sixth Circuit's antiparochialism principle:

First, in practical terms, we would ~~paralyze~~ state governments if we undertook a probing review of each of their actions, constantly asking them to "try again." Second, even if we assumed such an exalted role, it would be nothing more than substituting our view of the public good or the general welfare for that chosen by the states. As a creature of politics, the definition of the public good changes with the political winds. There simply is no constitutional or Platonic form against which [\*1198] we can (or could) judge the wisdom of economic regulation. Third, these admonitions ring especially true when we are reviewing the regulatory actions of states, who, in our federal system, merit great respect as separate sovereigns. 123

So here is the question for those who accept this Article's central premise regarding the prevalence of anticompetitive state and local regulation and yet worry, like the Powers court, about a return to Lochner: If one is interested in pulling additional judicial levers to scrutinize anticompetitive state and local regulations, but worried about returning to Lochnernism, how do the constitutional and antitrust levers compare? Are both equally susceptible to misuse and abuse, is one less risky than the other, and are there limits that could be placed on both to cabin their potential risks? This Article's final Part compares the constitutional and antitrust tools as potential foils to anticompetitive state and local regulation to help answer these questions.

III. COMPARING THE RISKS AND LIMITS OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL AND ANTITRUST TOOLS

A. Limiting the Scope of Judicial Review to Regulations Affecting Competition

The fear of a return to Lochnerism is in large part a fear that judicial review of economic regulatory decisions is a Pandora's box that, once open, would quickly unleash a full-scale movement toward a substitution of judicial economic philosophies for those of the democratically responsive branches. 124 Hence, in the current constellation of Lochner-phobia, it is important to explain how any doctrine that invites increased judicial scrutiny of economic regulation would be cabined or restrained by a workable limitation principle. Both the antitrust and constitutional tools under consideration embody such a limitation principle insofar as they do not propose universal federal scrutiny of all undesirable state economic regulation. Instead, they limit the scrutiny to regulations that harm [\*1199] competition for the benefit of identifiable special interests. In other words, the prima facie case in either event requires demonstration of competitive harm as opposed to merely social undesirability. 125 The "competitive harm" limitation principle excludes from judicial review a wide set of regulations and hence limits the range of judicial interference with state regulatory schemes. Many cronyist regulations line the pockets of politically connected special interests without necessarily impairing competition. Consider, for example, a city ordinance that required disposal of a certain kind of medical waste at a pharmacy. Assume further that the waste in question could be safely disposed of through ordinary garbage collection, and the sole purpose of the scheme in question was to provide pharmacies with an opportunity to charge a fee for collecting the waste. Our hypothesized Platonic guardian would wish to overturn that regulation but could not do so on the constitutional or antitrust grounds under consideration because the regulation in question does not limit competition in any important sense. Rather than stifling competition in a legitimate market, it creates a new market for an undesired and unnecessary service. Lochner-phobes may wonder whether this limitation principle is limited enough. Although the limitation carves off a large swath of cronyist regulations from review, it still includes a relatively large universe of regulations, creating the possibility that judges will have a free hand to strike down many important state regulatory programs in the name of enhanced competition. Those less worried about Lochner and more willing to encourage judicial review of economic regulation may worry that the limitation principle is too limited and that it would allow a vast universe of cronyist regulation to escape judicial scrutiny on the same grounds that much cutthroat business behavior escapes antitrust scrutiny today--it may be unethical or undesirable, but does not fall within the purview of the antitrust laws because it does not impair general market competitiveness. 126 [\*1200] Limiting the scope of judicial review to economic regulations impairing competition also raises a question of legal principle. As to antitrust, it is easy to justify such a principle. Notwithstanding Oliver Wendell Holmes's protestation that the Sherman Act "says nothing about competition," 127 a century of judicial construction has oriented the antitrust laws towards a singular focus on competition. 128 On the other hand, it is not obvious that constitutional scrutiny should rise or fall on the effects a cronyist regulation has on competition. It may be true that "protecting a discrete interest group from economic competition is not a legitimate governmental purpose," 129 but it seems equally true that dispensing economic rents to favored discrete interest groups more generally is also not a legitimate government purpose. In either case, the argument for limiting judicial review is not that the set of targeted regulations is constitutionally legitimate, but that the process of separating sheep from goats is fraught with the potential for judicial usurpation.

B. Considering Governmental Justifications for Restraints on Competition

Assuming that judicial review of anticompetitive state and local regulations is to occur with some degree of bite, the fighting question may often become how to evaluate the state's proffered justifications for the restraint on competition. Both antitrust and constitutional tools would need to allow ample room for the state to demonstrate verifiable justifications for the challenged regulations. To put this point in antitrust parlance, there are no per se unlawful state restraints on competition--the state's reasons for regulating will always be up for review in judicial or administrative proceedings challenging their validity. [\*1201] The critical question is how much interrogation into the state's proffered justifications a court or reviewing agency would, could, or should undertake. In conventional post-Lochner terms, economic regulations were subjected to no more than rational basis review--an exceedingly deferential standard of review. 130 The state did not have to advance any empirical support for its proffered justifications and, indeed, did not have to advance any justifications at all. 131 Judges were supposed to uphold the regulation if they could conceive of any justification that might plausibly support it: A State, moreover, has no obligation to produce evidence to sustain the rationality of a statutory classification. "[A] legislative choice is not subject to courtroom factfinding and may be based on rational speculation unsupported by evidence or empirical data." A statute is presumed constitutional, and "[t]he burden is on the one attacking the legislative arrangement to negative every conceivable basis which might support it," whether or not the basis has a foundation in the record. Finally, courts are compelled under rational-basis review to accept a legislature's generalizations even when there is an imperfect fit between means and ends. A classification does not fail rational-basis review because it "is not made with mathematical nicety or because in practice it results in some inequality." 132 That sort of rational basis review is far from the sort of review conducted by the Craigmiles and St. Joseph Abbey courts in striking down the Tennessee and Louisiana casket rules. 133 Those courts required evidentiary support for states' claimed justifications and subjected the states' claims to rigorous cross-examination for logical consistency. 134 In the Sixth Circuit case--Craigmiles--the court rejected the state's arguments that the casket regulation protected casket quality and public health, made it more feasible for casket sellers to advise bereaved families about which casket was most suitable for their needs, and protected against sharp business [\*1202] dealing. 135 The court found these arguments inconsistent with the state's own regulatory practices and unsupported by any record evidence. 136 Similarly, in the Fifth Circuit case--St. Joseph Abbey--the court repeated the familiar proposition that "rational basis review places no affirmative evidentiary burden on the government," but quickly added that "plaintiffs may nonetheless negate a seemingly plausible basis for the law by adducing evidence of irrationality." 137 The court then inquired into evidentiary support for the state's proferred "rational bases." 138 For example, on the ostensible consumer protection rationale for prohibiting casket sales except by licensed funeral parlors, the court observed that the FTC had largely rejected this argument as an empirical matter, noting that the FTC found "insufficient evidence that … third-party sellers of funeral goods are engaged in widespread unfair or deceptive acts or practices" and that the empirical "record [is] 'bereft of evidence indicating significant consumer injury caused by third-party sellers.'" 139 This form of review resembles antitrust litigation, where once a plaintiff raises a prima facie case of anticompetitive effect (outside of per se rules, where no justifications are allowed), the defendant typically can proffer procompetitive justifications but bears the burden of offering evidentiary support. 140 Although giving lip service to the norms of rational basis review, these courts were in fact taking a hard look at the states' proffered justifications once the regulation in question appeared prima facie to meet the description of a measure designed to protect "discrete interest group[s] from economic competition." 141 Inquiries into offsetting justifications for prima facie suspect conduct raise two doctrinal-analytical questions: (1) how tight must the fit between means and ends be in order for the conduct in question to survive scrutiny, and (2) once the conduct has been shown to advance legitimate ends, should its harms be balanced against its [\*1203] benefits, or should it simply be deemed lawful without any balancing? 142 Both constitutional and antitrust tools for addressing anticompetitive regulation would need to address these questions. As to the first question--the required tightness of means-ends fit--both constitutional and antitrust law already contain suitable doctrines. Moving up the ladder of scrutiny from rational basis review, intermediate scrutiny in constitutional law (such as that applicable to content-neutral restrictions on speech) requires that the restriction in question advance important governmental interests and not burden the protected interest (speech in the speech cases, competition in competition cases) more than necessary to further these interests. 143 The fit between means and ends need be only "reasonable," not strictly necessary or essential. 144 Unless the constitutional limitation on anticompetitive cronyism should fall into the more stringent strict scrutiny category--a very doubtful possibility--this sort of fit between regulatory means and ends would seem applicable. Antitrust law shares a similar approach to the less restrictive alternative analysis under the rule of reason, and it too would presumably apply to government restraints on competition under an expanded form of judicial review. 145 As explained in the Justice Department and FTC competitor collaboration guidelines, a reasonable, but not essential, fit between means and ends is required to credit proffered justifications for prima facie anticompetitive agreements: The Agencies consider only those efficiencies for which the relevant agreement is reasonably necessary. An agreement may be "reasonably necessary" without being essential. However, if the participants could have achieved or could achieve similar efficiencies by practical, significantly less restrictive means, then the Agencies conclude that the relevant agreement is not [\*1204] reasonably necessary to their achievement. In making this assessment, the Agencies consider only alternatives that are practical in the business situation faced by the participants; the Agencies do not search for a theoretically less restrictive alternative that is not realistic given business realities. 146 A potential difference between constitutional and antitrust analysis might arise on the second important means-ends question--whether to balance harms against benefits of the regulatory restriction. For example, suppose that a regulation limiting ride-sharing services resulted in some small safety benefit to customers but an arguably much greater harm to customers in the form of diminished choice of service options and higher prices. Should a reviewing court or agency balance the safety enhancements against the harms to competition, or should it rather conclude that, having shown a legitimate reason for its existence, the regulation should stand? Although intermediate scrutiny in constitutional law is often described as a "balancing test," courts do not generally engage in explicit balancing after passing the less restrictive alternatives inquiry. 147 Some degree of value judgment must be embedded in the inquiry into whether the state's interest is sufficiently "important," but it is rare to see a court say, in effect, that although the state's interest is concededly important and the regulation at stake is reasonably related to it, the harms caused by the regulation outweigh its benefits. 148 For purposes of the principle against protecting "discrete interest group[s] from economic competition," it seems apparent that there is no room for balancing at all, as a state [\*1205] regulation that serves some legitimate end by definition is not "simple economic protectionism." 149 By contrast, antitrust law is, in principle, supposed to require open-ended balancing at this final step: "if the monopolist's procompetitive justification stands unrebutted, then the plaintiff must demonstrate that the anticompetitive harm of the conduct outweighs the procompetitive benefit." 150 If followed in state action doctrine cases, this sort of balancing could precipitate serious accusations of Lochnerizing, as it would put judges in the position of substituting their own preferences for market outcomes over the state's legitimate regulatory objectives. Fortunately, although antitrust law nominally calls for balancing, courts typically do not engage in it. 151 Even in Microsoft--the case that most explicitly and authoritatively called for final-stage balancing--the D.C. Circuit engaged in very little, if any, true balancing. 152 Perhaps because of the incommensurability between anticompetitive or procompetitive effects or concern about chilling procompetitive conduct, courts tend to exonerate competitive behavior that is necessary to procompetitive effects without asking whether the harms outweigh the benefits. 153 In order to stave off Lochnerizing concerns, any expanded antitrust review of state and local regulations might need to formalize this practice doctrinally: Once a state demonstrates that the regulation in question is reasonably tailored to achieve some legitimate governmental objective, [\*1206] antitrust does not require balancing of the harms to competition against the legitimate governmental objectives. A final question unique to antitrust review is whether, when it comes to means-ends review, the catalogue of permissible ends is limited to those recognized by antitrust law as "procompetitive." One of the important doctrinal and policy structures of antitrust law is a division of the world into virtues that are said to be "procompetitive" and those that are not. 154 To count as a legitimate virtue in the antitrust domain, an effect must be "procompetitive," meaning that it must work to enhance or improve market competition. 155 Supposed benefits of a restraint that assume that competition is itself the problem in need of curtailment are labeled with the epithet of "ruinous competition" theories and are dismissed as inconsistent with the Sherman Act's procompetition policy. 156 While this single-minded devotion to competition may make sense as to the world of private restraints, it is less clear that it can be applied sensibly to governmental regulation. Do governments not have the right to take the view that competition of certain types causes social evils that should be curtailed? For example, many regulatory restrictions on alcohol and tobacco distribution are designed to decrease competition and hence reduce output as compared to that which would be obtained in a competitive market. 157 While it may be undesirable for private actors to limit harmful output through private means, the state's police power surely includes the right to do so, including by limiting competition. 158 This suggests that the range of regulatory interests [\*1207] states might legitimately advance in support of challenged regulations would be broader than those deemed "procompetitive" in conventional antitrust analysis. Opening the door to a wider scope of justifications in cases where the restraint on competition is imposed by governmental rather than private actors would appear on first impression to favor the government. Such a widening of the rule of reason, however, raises precisely the Lochnerizing concern raised by Justice Rehnquist in his previously quoted City of Boulder dissent. 159 If courts were called upon to balance health and safety benefits against traditional competition concerns around prices and innovation, then they might well slip into a Lochnerizing mold. But perhaps such concerns could be abated by limiting the reviewing court or agency's role to determining whether the regulation in question actually supported the state's proffered goals. As long as the goals were permissible (that is, not simply protecting discrete interest groups from competition as a form of political patronage) and the regulations were reasonably related to the goals, the reviewing court or agency would not inquire more broadly into the regulation's overall desirability.

C. Institutional and Procedural Distinctions

Antitrust preemption and constitutional review are differently situated in one significant way: Constitutional equal protection, substantive due process, and dormant commerce clause principles are privately enforceable by any party that meets the Article III standing requirements--which, in this context, means at least anyone directly affected by a regulation impairing competition. 160 Antitrust has its own private right of action standing rules, 161 as well as an additional institutional feature that might significantly limit some of the abuses associated with Lochnerizing. One proposed route for increasing the preemptive scope of federal antitrust law over anticompetitive state and local regulation is to hold the [\*1208] Parker doctrine inapplicable to the FTC. 162 This would give the FTC enhanced power to challenge anticompetitive state and local regulations. Not only would this limit the incidence of challenges to state regulation (the FTC Act is not privately enforceable and only the Commission can initiate an action under the Act), 163 but it would also put the Commission itself, rather than an Article III court, in the position of making an initial decision on the case. An Article III court could ultimately become involved, as adverse Commission decisions are appealable to any federal court of appeal in which the case could have been initially brought. 164 However, lodging the antitrust review function in the FTC would grant the Commission an initial regulatory review function and the power to make factual findings subject to "substantial evidence" review. 165

### Plan

The United States Federal Government should substantially increase prohibitions on the anticompetitive business practices of the private sector by limiting the state action immunity doctrine.

### Federalism Adv

#### Advantage Two: Federalism

#### Nextgen tech is emerging at an exponential rate – effective state regulatory experimentation avoids downsides and maximize the benefits of AI and nano

McGinnis 11(John, George C. Dix Professor of Law, Northwestern Law School, “LAWS FOR LEARNING IN AN AGE OF ACCELERATION,” <http://scholarship.law.wm.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3404&context=wmlr>)

The twenty-first century’s information age has the potential to usher in a more harmonious and productive politics. People often disagree about what policies to adopt, but the cornucopia of data that modern technology generates can allow them to better update their beliefs about policy outcomes on the basis of shared facts. In the long run, convergence on the facts can lead incrementally to more consensus on better policies. More credible factual information should over time also help make for a less divisive society, because partisans cannot as easily stoke social tensions by relying on false facts or exaggerated claims to support conflicting positions. Thus, a central task of contemporary public law is to accelerate a politics of learning whereby democracy improves a public reason focused on evaluating policy consequences. Government should be shaped into an instrument that learns from the analysis of policy consequences made available from newly available technologies of information.1 Greater computer capacity is generating more empirical analysis.2 The Internet permits the rise of prediction markets that forecast policy results even before the policies are implemented.3 The Internet also creates a dispersed media that specializes in particular topics and methodologies, gathers diverse information, and funnels salient facts about policy to legislators and citizens.4 But a public reason focused on policy consequences will improve only if our laws facilitate it. For instance, constitutional federalism must be reinvigorated to permit greater experimentation across jurisdictions, because with the rise of empiricism, decentralization has more value for social learning today than ever before.5 Congress should include mandates for experiments within its own legislation making policy initiatives contain the platforms for their own selfimprovement.6 Creating a contemporary politics of democratic updating on the basis of facts is a matter both of great historical interest and of enormous importance to our future. In the historical sweep of ideas, a government more focused on learning from new information moves toward fulfilling the Enlightenment dream of a politics of reason—but a reason based not on the abstractions of the French Revolution, but instead on the hard facts of the more empirical tradition predominating in Britain. By displacing religion from the center of politics, the Enlightenment removed issues by their nature not susceptible to factual resolution, permitting a focus on policies that could be improved by information.7 The better democratic updating afforded by modern technology can similarly increase social harmony and prosperity by facilitating policies that actually deliver the goods. For the future, a more consequentially informed politics is an urgent necessity. The same technological acceleration that potentially creates a more information-rich politics also generates a wide range of technological innovation—from nanotechnology to biotechnology to [AI] artificial intelligence. Although these technologies offer unparalleled benefits to mankind, they may also create catastrophic risks, such as rapid environmental degradation and new weapons of mass destruction.8 Only a democracy able to rapidly assimilate the facts is likely to be able to avoid disaster and reap the benefits inherent in the technology that is transforming our world at a faster pace than ever before. Every industry that touches on information—book publishing, newspapers, and college education to name just a few—is undergoing a continuous series of revolutionary changes as new technology permits delivery of more information more quickly at lower cost. The same changes that are creating innovation in such private industries can also quickly create innovation in social governance. But the difference between information-intensive private industries and political institutions is that the latter lack the strong competitive framework for these revolutions to occur spontaneously. This Essay thus attempts to set out a blueprint for reform to make better use of some available information technologies. Part I describes the reality of technology acceleration as the acceleration both creates the tools for democratic updating and prompts its necessity. Technological acceleration is the most important development of our time—more important even than globalization. Although technologists have described and discussed its significance, its implications for law and political structure have been barely noticed. Part II briefly discusses how better social knowledge can change political results. A premise of the claim is that some political disagreements revolve about facts, not simply values. As a result, better social knowledge can help democracies design policies to achieve widely shared goals. Social knowledge energizes citizens to act on those encompassing interests, like improved public education, because they come to better recognize the policy instruments to advance those interests. Better social knowledge provides better incentives for citizens to vote on these interests. Part III considers the mechanisms for creating a contemporary politics of democratic updating that begins to meet the needs of the age of accelerating technology. It focuses on two of the new resources that can have substantial synergies in improving social common knowledge and shows how an increase in common knowledge can systematically improve political results by providing better incentives for citizens to work for encompassing social goods. First, Part III considers the improvement in empirical analysis of social policy that flows from increasing computational capacity. It then discusses how specialized and innovative media does much more than disseminate opinions: it widely distributes facts and factual analysis. The combination of these technologies can better discipline experts and representatives, providing stronger incentives for them to update on the basis of new facts. Part IV discusses the information-eliciting rules that will maximize the impact of new technologies of information. These steps include a program of restoring, where possible, governmental structures that permit appropriate decentralization for experimentation, empirical testing, and learning. Congress and regulatory agencies should structure legislation and regulations to include social experiments when such experiments would help resolve disputed matters of policy. The Supreme Court should generally refrain from imposing new substantive rights for the nation so that it is easier to evaluate the consequences of different bundles of rights chosen by the states. But it should also protect the dispersed media, like blogs, from discriminatory laws, because this dispersed media plays a crucial role in modern policy evaluation. In short, the Supreme Court needs to emphasize a jurisprudence fostering social discovery and the political branches need to create frameworks for better social learning. Constitutive structures encouraging and evaluating experimentation become more valuable in an age where better evaluation of social experiments is possible. I. TECHNOLOGICAL ACCELERATION It is the premise of this Essay that technological acceleration is occurring and that our political system must adapt to the world it is creating. The case for technological acceleration rests on three mutually supporting kinds of evidence. First, from the longest-term perspective, epochal change has sped up: the transitions from hunter-gatherer society to agricultural society to the industrial age each took progressively less time to occur, and our transition to an information society is taking less time still. Second, from a technological perspective, computational power is increasing exponentially, and increasing computational power facilitates the growth of other society-changing technologies like biotechnology and nanotechnology. Third, even from our contemporary perspective, technology now changes the world on a yearly basis both in terms of hard data, like the amount of information created, and in terms of more subjective measures, like the social changes wrought by social media. From the longest-term perspective, it seems clear that technological change is accelerating and, with it, the basic shape of human society and culture is changing.9 Anthropologists suggest that for 100,000 years, members of the human species were hunter-gather- ers.10 About 10,000 years ago humans made a transition to agricultural society.11 With the advent of the Industrial Revolution, the West transformed itself into a society that thrived on manufacturing.12 Since 1950, the world has been rapidly entering the information age.13 Each of the completed epochs has been marked by a transition to substantially higher growth rates.14 The period between each epoch has become very substantially shorter.15 Thus, there is reason to extrapolate to even more and faster transitions in the future. This evolution is consistent with a more fine-grained evaluation of human development. Recently, the historian Ian Morris has rated societies in the last 15,000 years on their level of development through objective benchmarks, such as energy capture.16 The graph shows relatively steady, if modest, growth when plotted on a log linear scale, but in the last 100 years development has jumped to become sharply exponential.17 Morris concludes that these patterns suggest that there may be four times as much social development in the world in the next 100 years than there has been in the last 14,000.18 The inventor and engineer Ray Kurzweil has dubbed this phenomenon of faster transitions “the law of accelerating returns.”19 Seeking to strengthen the case for exponential change, he has looked back to the dawn of life to show that even evolution seems to make transitions to higher organisms ever faster.20 In a more granulated way, he has considered important events of the last 1000 years to show that the periods between extraordinary advances, such as great scientific discoveries and technological inventions, have decreased.21 Thus, both outside and within the great epochs of recorded human history, the story of acceleration is similar. The technology of computation provides the second perspective on accelerating change. The easiest way to grasp this perspective is to consider Moore’s Law. Moore’s Law—named after Gordon Moore, one of the founders of Intel—is the observation that the number of transistors that can be fitted onto a computer chip doubles every eighteen months to two years.22 This prediction, which has been approximately accurate for the last forty years,23 means that almost every aspect of the digital world—from computational calculation power to computer memory—is growing in density at a similarly exponential rate.24 Moore’s Law reflects the rapid rise of computers to become the fundamental engine of mankind in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries.25 The power of exponential growth is hard to overstate. As the economist Robert Lucas has said, once you start thinking about exponential growth, it is hard to think about anything else.26 The computational power in a cell phone today is a thousand times greater and a million times less expensive than all the computing power housed at MIT in 1965.27 Projecting forward, the computing power of computers twenty-five years from now is likely to prove a million times more powerful than computing power today. To be sure, many people have been predicting the imminent death of Moore’s Law for a substantial period now,29 but it has nevertheless continued. Intel—a company that has a substantial interest in accurately telling software makers what to expect—projects that Moore’s Law will continue at least until 2029.30 Ray Kurzweil shows that Moore’s Law is actually part of a more general exponential computation growth that has been gaining force for over a 100 years.31 Integrated circuits replaced transistors that previously replaced vacuum tubes that in their time had replaced electromechanical methods of computation.32 Through all of these changes in the mechanisms of computation, its power increased at an exponential rate.33 This perspective suggests that other methods under research—from carbon nanotechnology to optical computing to quantum computing—are likely to continue growing exponentially even when silicon-based computing reaches its physical limits.34 Focusing on the exponential increase in hardware capability may actually understate the acceleration in computational capacity in two ways. First, a study considering developments in a computer task using a benchmark for measuring computer speed over a fifteen-year period suggests that the improvements in software algorithms improved performance even more than the increase in hardware capability.35 Second, computers are interconnected more than ever before through the Internet, and these connections increase collective capacity, not only because of the increasing density among computer connections, but because of the increasing density of connections among humans made possible by computers. The salient feature of computers’ exponential growth is their tremendous range of application compared to previous improvements. Almost everything in the modern world can be improved by adding an independent source of computational power. That is why computational improvement has a far greater social effect than improvements in technologies of old. Energy, medicine, and communication are now being continually transformed by the increase in computational power.36 As I will discuss in Part II, even the formulation of new hypotheses in natural and social science will likely be aided by computers in the near future. The final perspective on accelerating technology is the experience that the contemporary world provides. Technology changes the whole tenor of life more rapidly than ever before. At the most basic level, technological products change faster.37 Repeated visits to a modern electronics store—or even a grocery store—reveal a whole new line of products within very few years. In contrast, someone visiting a store in 1910 and then again in 1920—let alone in 1810 and 1820—would not have noticed much difference. Even cultural generations move faster. Facebook, for instance, has changed the way college students relate in only a few years,38 whereas the tenor of college life would not have seemed very different to students in 1920 and 1960. Our current subjective sense of accelerating technology is also backed by more objective evidence from the contemporary world. Accelerating amounts of information are being generated.39 Information, of course, is a proxy for knowledge. Consistent with this general observation, we experience exponential growth in practical technical knowledge, as evidenced by the rise in patent applications.40 Thus, the combination of data from our present life, together with the more sweeping historical and technological perspectives, makes a compelling case that technological acceleration is occurring. It is this technological acceleration that creates both the capacity and the need for improving collective decision making. As technology accelerates, it creates new phenomena, from climate change to biotechnology to artificial intelligence of a human-like capacity. These technologies may themselves have very large positive or negative externalities and may require government decisions about their prohibition, regulation, or subsidization to forestall harms and capture their full benefits. They may also cause social dislocations, from unemployment to terrorism, that also require certain collective decisions. Society can best handle these crises not only by making better social policy to address them directly but by improving social policy more generally to create both more resources and more social harmony to endure them. Thus, society must deploy information technology in the service of democratic updating if it is to manage technological acceleration

#### Unregulated tech diffuses globally---acquisition by omnicidal non-state actors risks extinction via super-pathogens, eco-terrorism, and planetoid bombs.

Torres 21 (Phil Torres, Former writer for Future of Life Institute, Former Affiliate Scholar at the Institute for Ethics and Emerging Technologies, M.A. in Neuroscience from Brandeis University, Ph.D. candidate at Leibniz Universität Hannover; “International Criminal Law and the Future of Humanity: A Theory of the Crime of Omnicide;” 03-08-21, <https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3777140>, TM)

3.2 The Greatest Threats Arise from Nonstate Actors. Since the Neolithic Revolution some 12,000 years ago, groups of people—tribes, city-states, kingdoms, countries, and empires—have invariably possessed a greater potential to cause harm than individuals or small collections of individuals within those groups. For example, the Roman Empire considered as a cohesive entity was more powerful than any Roman citizen, just as Nazi Germany had more resources to leverage against the Jewish people than any single antisemite. (This idea finds expression in Max Weber’s famous characterization of the state as possessing a “monopoly of the legitimate use of violence within a given territory.”70) But this dynamic is quickly changing: the difference in “violence capacity” between state and nonstate actors is narrowing as a result of the growing power and accessibility of dual-use emerging technologies, which are almost universally being developed at an exponential or superexponential pace, in accordance with the so-called Law of Accelerating Returns, which subsumes more specific tends like Moore’s Law, Huang’s law, the Carlson curve, Dennard scaling, Keck’s law, Kryder’s law, and so on. As the “power and accessibility” locution 71 implies, there are two crucial features of such technologies, namely:

(i) Omniviolence thesis. The growing power of emerging technologies means a lower ratio of “killers to killed,” or “K/K ratio,” per incident, a phenomenon that Daniel Deudney neologizes as “omniviolence.” Consider a non-lethal recent case that exemplifies this trend: the 2016 Dyn 72 cyberattack. This distributed denial-of-service (DDoS) attack may have been perpetrated by a single “angry gamer.”73 Yet an extraordinary number of major websites were disrupted: Airbnb, Amazon, BBC, The Boston Globe, CNN, Comcast, FiveThirtyEight, Fox News, The Guardian, iHeartRadio, Imgur, National Hockey League, Netflix, The New York Times, PayPal, Pinterest, Pixlr, Reddit, SoundCloud, Squarespace, Spotify, Starbucks, Storify, the Swedish Government, Tumblr, Twitter, Verizon Communications, Visa, Vox Media, Walgreens, The Wall Street Journal, Wired, Yelp, and Zillow. This is a non-exhaustive list of the websites affected, which numbered more 74 than 60 in total. Thus, the “affecter-to-affected ratio,” so to speak, of this attack was extremely low: one person managed to take down a vast constellation of websites that hundreds of millions of people visit and depend upon every day. The point is that this trend of mass empowerment can be found within virtually every domain of emerging technology, including biotechnology, synthetic biology, nanotechnology, drone technology, and artificial intelligence. Whereas in the past, bioterrorism took the form of poisoning wells with carcasses contaminated with the plague, soon it could take the form of synthesizing a super-pathogen that combines the lethality of rabies, the incurability of Ebola, the contagiousness of the common cold, and the long incubation period of HIV. Whereas in the 75 past, destroying an enemy civilization required a physical attack involving tens or hundreds of thousands of soldiers, today a nuclear electromagnetic pulse (NEMP) could fry the electrical infrastructure of an entire country. Whereas in the past, annihilating Earth’s biosphere was technically impossible, future self-replicating nanobots could potentially disassemble all organic matter around the world, thus resulting in a lifeless, barren planet. And so on.

(ii) Democratization thesis. This refers to the phenomenon of dual-use emerging technologies becoming increasingly accessible to the demos. When combined with (i), it implies that omniviolence is being distributed among state and nonstate actors—i.e., the K/K ratio is falling while the number of potential “killers” that instantiate the first “K” is growing.

Historically speaking, the first actor—a state—to acquire the technological ability to unilaterally destroy the world was the United States, sometime around 1948 or 1949, when the United States stockpiled enough nuclear weapons, about 100 in total, to have single-handedly initiated a worldwide nuclear winter. I choose the number “100” here because a 2008 study found that a regional “nuclear exchange involving 100 Hiroshima-size bombs (15 kilotons) on cities in the subtropics” could effectively “lower temperatures regionally and globally for several years, open up new holes in the ozone layer protecting the Earth from harmful radiation, reduce global precipitation by about 10 percent, and trigger massive crop failures.” Thus, bracketing the nontrivial 76 fact that many weapons built since World War II have a far greater explosive yield than 15 kilotons of TNT, we can crudely estimate when countries acquired the capacity to unilaterally cause a global nuclear winter by identifying the years during which their arsenals exceeded 100 nuclear weapons. On this criterion—for perspective, consider that the United State’s “Castle Bravo” weapon was equivalent to 15 megatons of TNT, while the Soviet Union’s “Tsar Bomba” had an extraordinary 58 megaton yield—the Soviet Union joined the club of potential world-destroyers at least by 1952, the United Kingdom at least by 1962, China at least by 1971, France at least by 1973, and other countries like Pakistan, India, and Israel perhaps by the 2010s, depending on the make-up of their arsenals.77 Thus, since World War II, the number of entities with doomsday capabilities has grown from zero to eight.

But the democratization of dual-use emerging technologies is rapidly transforming this predicament by multiplying the number of not only state but, far more importantly, nonstate actors having the capacity to unilaterally destroy the world. As I have previously discussed, there are four axes along which this trend, which I have elsewhere dubbed the “threat of universal unilateralism,” is unfolding. In brief, these are:

(i) The intelligence threshold that must be exceeded to effect large-scale destruction is lowering. This fact is humorously, but accurately, captured by Eliezer Yudkowsky’s so-called “Moore’s Law of Mad Science,” which states that “every eighteen months, the minimum IQ necessary to destroy the world drops by one point.” (ii) The information threshold that one must exceed to use 78 a wide range of emerging technologies in a competent manner is also falling. For example, the genomes of many of the most dangerous pathogens, including Ebola and smallpox, are readily accessible online, thus making such information easy to copy-paste onto one’s computer. (iii) The skill threshold that one must exceed to convert one's know-that into actionable know-how is dropping as well. Perhaps the most conspicuous example comes from synthetic biology, which is “explicitly devoted to the minimization of the importance of tacit knowledge.” The BioBricks 79 Foundation’s standardization of biological entities and devices like digital-to-biological converters are also relevant here. Yet the irrelevance of tacit knowledge may be especially salient with respect to molecular nanotechnology—e.g., nanofactories that can manufacture virtually any technical product for virtually zero cost given a digital blueprint, source of energy, and feedstock molecule like acetone or acetylene.81 And finally, (iv) the materials and equipment necessary for omniviolence are rapidly becoming more widely available and affordable. For example, the advent of nanofactories would make it possible to produce super-high-quality technical products of all sorts at almost no cost, and third-generation laser enrichment technologies such as SILEX (whereby uranium isotopes are separated by laser excitation) could enable small groups or lone individuals to produce weapons-grade uranium without the need for costly, large centrifuges.82

To couch the implications of these four trends in terms of the 2016 Dyn cyberattack, it is no longer unreasonable to ask in the wake of a major incident spanning multiple countries and affects millions of people whether the perpetrator is a state actor like Russia or North Korea, or someone in [their] ~~her or his~~ basement, with limited knowledge of computer systems or how to initiate a DDoS attack, using a $1,000 computer. To underline this point, consider the following two scenarios that could potentially cause the extinction of humanity. Both illustrate the fact that, as Benjamin Wittes and Gabriella Blum observe, greater technological capabilities entail greater susceptibility to harm; in their words, “technologies that expand the power to attack necessarily expand vulnerability to attack.”83 However, for reasons relating to “information hazards,”84 I have not chosen the most effective ways of bringing about human extinction that scholars in the nascent field of “existential risk studies” have privately devised (and kept secret within the community for information-hazard reasons), nor will I go into much detail about the logistics of actually realizing these scenarios. The simple point is merely to emphasize that we are, indeed, entering a new era of unprecedentedly distributed destructive capabilities.

Scenario 1: The CRISPR/Cas9 system consists of a segment of DNA from bacterial immune systems—CRISPR—and a protein that acts as “molecular scissors” capable of cutting DNA at target sequences—Cas9—which are specified by an RNA guide molecule. This system has enabled scientists to alter the genomes of organisms with unprecedented precision. Now consider “gene drives,” or genetic mechanisms that enable a segment of DNA to be inherited by an organism’s offspring at a probability of greater than 50 percent, even when the allele expressed by the gene is deleterious to the organism. Gene drives are found in nature, but advancements in synthetic biology are enabling scientists to create them artificially. Combining these two technologies: CRISPR/Cas9 and gene drives will enable the synthesis of genes that propagate through and decimate entire populations of organisms. At the extreme, so-called “suppression drives” that “reduce the population of the target species (for example by damaging a gene with a function essential to survival or reproduction)” could precipitate the extinction of the affected species.85

Now imagine that a terrorist sets up a “biohacker” lab with some basic synthetic biology capabilities. It will soon be feasible for a group or lone wolf to create suppression drives that target, for example, the primary pollinators: bees, wasps, moths, butterflies, and beetles. If these short-generation species were to perish, the result would be a cascade of disasters that E.O. Wilson adumbrates as follows, to quote him at length:

A majority of flowering plants, upon being deprived of their pollinators, cease to reproduce. Most herbaceous plant species among them spiral down to extinction. Insect-pollinated shrubs and trees hang on for a few more years, in rare cases of up to centuries. The great majority of birds and other land vertebrates, now denied the specialized foliage, fruits, and insect prey on which they feed, follow the plants into oblivion. The soil remains largely unturned, accelerating plant decline, because insects, not earthworms as generally supposed, are the principal turners and renewers of the soil. Populations of fungi and bacteria explode and remain at a peak over a few years while metabolizing the dead plant and animal material that piles up. Wind-pollinated grasses and a handful of fern and conifer species spread over much of the deforested terrain, then decline to some extent as the soil deteriorates. The human species survives, able to fall back on wind-pollinated grains and marine fishing. But amid widespread starvation during the first several decades, human populations plunge to a small fraction of their former level. The wars for control of the dwindling resources, the suffering, and the tumultuous decline to dark-age barbarism would be unprecedented in human history.86

In sum, CRISPR/Cas9 plus gene drives will open the door to unprecedentedly effective omnicidal attacks.

Scenario 2: The human expansion into space has historically coincided with the militarization of space. That is to say, the very first human-made artifact to reach space was the V2 ballistic missile built by Nazi Germany. The militarization of space continues today, with President Donald Trump, for example, announcing in 2018 the creation of a “United States Space Force” branch of the Armed Forces by 2020. But the situation is becoming more complicated as space simultaneously becomes increasingly privatized. Private companies are already delivering supplies to the International Space Station (ISS), and some plan to deliver satellites and offer tourists trips up to 50 miles above the ground, where the mesosphere becomes the thermosphere. Even more, molecular nanotechnology, which would enable one to manipulate matter with absolute atomic precision, could open up the space frontier to most everyone.87 In particular, nanofactories might enable groups and even individuals with no prior knowledge of rocket science and no manufacturing skills to build their own orbital spacecraft.88

The implications of this are unsettling, not just because more objects in space would increase the probability of an accidental Kessler syndrome (whereby shrapnel initiates a positivefeedback cascade that destroys all satellites in the Lower Earth Orbit), but because of the so-called “deflection dilemma.” This arises from the fact that technologies capable of redirecting larger asteroids or comets away from Earth could also be used to direct them toward Earth, a possibility taken seriously by many astronomers. The idea is simply that Earth is not safe from extraterrestrial impacts, a view that scientists almost unanimously rejected until the Alvarez hypothesis was vindicated by tests on the Chicxulub crater in 1990. In other words, there have been major impact events in the past and there will be more in the future. Hence, it is critical that humanity designs and builds spacecraft that could nudge incoming celestial bodies past Earth. But the dual usability of such technologies would also enable [malevolent actors] “~~madmen~~”—to borrow Sagan’s preferred term90—to potentially annihilate humanity by converting otherwise non-threatening asteroids or comets into “planetoid bombs” that smash into Earth and, in doing so, initiate a global impact winter of the sort that killed-off the non-avian dinosaurs 66 million years ago. Given the democratization of space technologies, this scenario could become increasingly probable in the coming decades.

These two scenarios illustrate the proposition that nonstate actors could plausibly bring about an omnicidal catastrophe with existing and emerging dual-use technologies. Indeed, state actors are far less likely to attempt to cause human extinction than nonstate actors, since states generally value their continued existence. For example, if humanity were to go extinct, then aspiring global autocrats (perhaps Vladimir Putin or Kim Jung-un) would be unable to fulfill their megalomaniacal ambitions. Similarly, if Hitler had destroyed the world in 1941, his vision of a Thousand Year Reich would not have been realizable. Yet Sagan notes that

in the winter and spring of 1945, Hitler ordered Germany to be destroyed—even “what the people need for elementary survival”—because the surviving Germans had “betrayed” him, and at any rate were “inferior” to those who had already died. If Hitler had nuclear weapons, the threat of a counterstrike by Allied nuclear weapons, had there been any, is unlikely to have dissuaded him. It might have encouraged him.91

The point is that under normal circumstances, states are pro-human-survival; they are much less likely to attempt an omnicidal attack than nonstate actors, who may be motivated by a range of “kill everyone” ideologies. In previous papers, I have outlined a six-part typology of groups/individuals that engender what I call “agential risks,” which are defined as follows:

Agential risk: the risk posed by any agent who could initiate an existential catastrophe in the presence of sufficiently powerful dual-use technologies either on purpose or by accident.92

Not all of the six agential risk types are germane to the present discussion, since this discussion is limited to the particular existential risk of human extinction (see section 4 for additional scenarios outlined by Bostrom ). These are the three agential risk types that are relevant: 93

(1) Omnicidal ecoterrorists, or individuals who believe that the biosphere, or Gaian system, would be better off if humans were to disappear entirely.

(2) Omnicidal ethicists, or individuals who believe that humanity should go extinct for moral reasons and that this should happen involuntarily (“pro-mortalism”).

(3) Omnicidal idiosyncratic actors, a catch-all category that subsumes individuals who harbor a death wish for humanity for idiosyncratic reasons, which might arise from sadistic, anti-humanist, misanthropic, etc. proclivities.

Although no scientific surveys have yet been conducted to assess the prevalence of omnicidal ideologies in society (such surveys would likely encounter the problem known as “Lizardman’s Constant” ), I have elsewhere catalogued a number of historical groups and individuals who almost 94 certainly would have brought about human extinction if only the means had been available.95 Convincing the reader of this point goes beyond the scope of this paper; I will thus refer them to previous work. For the nonce, I will proceed on the assumption that a nontrivial number of omnicidal agents exist in the world—that is to say, while the percentage of the global population with omnicidal urges is quite small, the absolute number is worrisomely large. This fact is enough to take the issue seriously, since as John Sotos calculates, the probability of any single individual successfully causing human extinction need be only minuscule for this to accumulate over space and time to more or less guarantee doom on timescales relevant to contemporary civilization. More 96 specifically, Sotos shows that a 1-in-100 chance of only a few hundred agents releasing a speciesdestroying pathogen yields virtually certain doom within just 100 years or so.97

#### Effective regulations solve extinction

Matus 14 [Kira Matus, PhD, Havard University. Associate Head and Associate Professor, Division of Public Policy, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology. "Existential risk: challenges for risk regulation." Risk and Regulation (Winter 2014). https://futureoflife.org/data/documents/Existential%20Risk%20Resources%20(2015-08-24).pdf?x93895]

There is a trend in many areas towards attention to ‘big’ risks. Financial regulation has become increasingly concerned with so‐called systemic risks. Others, and not just Hollywood blockbusters, have been attracted to the study of civilization‐destroying catastrophic risks. Indeed, the OECD has become increasingly interested in ‘high level’ risks and ways in which different national governments seek to prepare for and manage actual events, such as the aftermath of major earthquakes, or the response to a terrorist attack. The notion of ‘existential’ risk might be adding to the cacophony of emerging ‘big’ risk concerns. However, existential risk deserves special attention as it fundamentally adds to our understanding of particular types of risks, and it also challenges common wisdom regarding actions designed to support continued survival.

What is existential risk? We can approach this question by looking at several attributes. The first attribute is what, in fact, is at risk. One set of existential risks are those that threaten survival. These are the acute catastrophes, i.e. the idea that particular events’ impacts are likely to extinguish civilization. Such risks have been identified when it comes to asteroids, nuclear war, and other largescale events that undermine the possibility for survival in general, or, at least, in large regions. A second set is based on the idea that existential risks are not just about physical survival, but about the survival of ways of life. In other words, certain risks are seen as threatening established ways of doing things, cultures, social relationships, and understandings of the ‘good life’. There is, of course, much disagreement about what the good life constitutes, and therefore there will always be disagreement as to what exactly an existential risk constitutes.

A second attribute is the degree to which an existential risk is triggered by a single catastrophic incident. Existential risks arise not merely from one‐off large incidents, such as earthquakes, tsunamis, nuclear meltdowns or, indeed, asteroid hits. Rather, existential risks are about complex, inter‐related processes that result in cascading effects that move across social systems. The overall impact of these system changes could result in the types of physical or cultural destruction that is the focus of the first two perspectives.

Whether triggered by catastrophic events or complex cascades, standard operating procedures are unlikely to be sufficient for dealing with existential risks; instead, this is a space in which improvisation and creativity are required. A third attribute of existential risks is the challenge they present to standard approaches to risk regulation. Existential risks are defined by their cross‐systematic nature; a failure within one system (say, finance) has not just catastrophic implications for the sector in question, but threatens the survival of another system (say, the environment, as funding for particular measures dries up). In other words, the focus of existential risks is not just on the systemic level, it focuses on the cross‐ systemic dimension that is even more difficult to predict and assess than attempts aimed at establishing activities that are of ‘systemic’ relevance by regulatory systems that tend to be narrowly focused and independent from each other. Existential risks are characterized by a fourth feature, namely the idea that existential risks lead to responses based upon fear. Individuals are confronted with fears about their survival (death) and about the meaning of their lives. This aspect of existential risk is particularly troublesome in an age of low trust in authority and, consequently, a political style that is intolerant of ‘blame free’ spaces. In the absence of confidence in public authority, few options remain. For some, the solution will rely on framework plans, pop intellectuals and other fashionable ideas that seem to offer redemption from the fear of extinction. Others will prefer to ‘go it alone’ and seek to develop their own plans for survival, noting that risk taking is, after all, an individual choice. Others, again, will deny the legitimacy of public authority and veer towards those choices that have been legitimized by their own communities. Finally, some will deny that existential risks exist in the first place. In other words, individual responses to existential risks vary considerably and pose challenges for any risk management and communication strategy.

#### U.S. model is key to stable nano---checks gray goo, super-weapons, and eco-collapse

Dennis 6 (Lindsay V., JD Candidate – Temple University School of Law, “Nanotechnology: Unique Science Requires Unique Solutions”, Temple Journal of Science, Technology & Environmental Law, Spring, 25 Temp. J. Sci. Tech. & Envtl. L. 87, Lexis)

Nanotechnology, a newly developing field merging science and technology, promises a future of open-ended potential. [6](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n6) Its scientific limits are unknown, and its myriad uses cross the boundaries of the technical, mechanical and medical fields. [7](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n7) Substantial research [8](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n8) has led scientists, [9](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n9) politicians [10](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n10) and academicians [11](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n11) to believe that nanotechnology has the potential to profoundly change the economy and to improve the national standard of living. [12](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n12) In addition, nanotechnology may touch every facet of human life because its products cross the boundaries of the most important industries, including electronics, biomedical and pharmaceutical  [\*89]  industries, and energy production. [13](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n13) In the future, nanotechnology could ensure longer, healthier lives with the reduction or elimination of life-threatening diseases, [14](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n14) a cleaner planet with pollution remediation and emission-free energy, [15](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n15) and the innumerable benefits of increased information technology. [16](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n16) However, certain uses, such as advanced drug delivery systems, [17](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n17) have given rise to an ethical debate similar to that surrounding cloning and stem cell research. [18](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n18) Moreover, some analysts have theorized that nanotechnology may endanger humankind with more dangerous warfare and weapons of terrorism, [19](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n19) and that nanotechnology may lead to artificial intelligence beyond human control. [20](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n20) The widespread use of nanotechnology far in the future threatens to alter the societal framework and create what has been called "gray goo." [21](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n21) Because nanotechnology has the potential to improve the products that most of us rely on in our daily lives, but also imperil society as we know it, we should research, monitor and regulate nanotechnology for the public good with trustworthy systems, and set up pervasive controls over its research, development, and deployment. In addition, its substantial impacts on existing regulations should be ascertained, and solutions incorporated into the regulatory framework. This paper addresses these concerns and provides potential solutions. Part I outlines the development of nanotechnology. Parts II and III explore the current and theoretical future applications of nanotechnology, and its potential side-effects. Then, Part IV analyzes the government's current role in monitoring nanotechnology, and the regulatory mechanisms available to manage or eliminate the negative implications of nanotechnology. Part V considers the creation of an Emerging Technologies Department as a possible solution to maximize the benefits and minimize the detrimental effects of nanotechnology. Lastly, Part VI examines certain environmental regulations to provide an example of nanotechnology's impact on existing regulatory schema.  [\*90]  Part I: Nanotechnology Defined   Nanoscience is the study of the fundamental principles of molecules and structures with at least one dimension roughly between 1 and 100 nanometers (one-billionth of a meter, or 10[su'-9']), otherwise known as the "nanoscale." [22](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n22) Called nanostructures, these are the smallest solid things possible to make. [23](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n23) Nanofabrication, or nanoscale manufacturing, is the process by which nanostructures are built. [24](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n24) Top-down nanofabrication creates nanostructures by taking a large structure and making it smaller, whereas bottom-up nanofabrication starts with individual atoms to build nanostructures. [25](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n25) Nanotechnology applies nanostructures into useful nanoscale devices. [26](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n26) The nanoscale is distinctive because it is the size scale where the properties of materials like conductivity, [27](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n27) hardness, [28](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n28) or melting point [29](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n29) are no longer similar to the properties of these same materials at the macro level. [30](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n30) Atom interactions, averaged out of existence in bulk material, give rise to unique properties. [31](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n31) In  [\*91]  nanotech research, scientists take advantage of these unique properties to develop products with applications that would not otherwise be available. [32](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n32) Although some products using nanotechnology are currently on the market, [33](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n33) nanotechnology is primarily in the research and development stage. [34](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n34) Because nanoparticles are remarkably small, tools specific to nanotechnology have been created to develop useful nanostructures and devices. [35](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n35) Two techniques exclusive to nanotechnology are self-assembly, and nanofabrication using nanotubes and nanorods. [36](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n36)  [\*92]  In self-assembly, particular atoms or molecules are put on a surface or preconstructed nanostructure, causing the molecules to align themselves into particular positions. [37](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n37) Although self-assembly is "probably the most important of the nanoscale fabrication techniques because of its generality, its ability to produce structures at different length-scales, and its low cost," [38](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n38) most nanostructures are built starting with larger molecules as components. [39](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n39) Nanotubes [40](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n40) and nanorods, [41](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n41) the first true nanomaterials engineered at the molecular level, are two examples of these building blocks. [42](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n42) They exhibit astounding physical and electrical properties. [43](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n43) Certain nanotubes have tensile strength in excess of 60 times high-grade steel while remaining light and flexible. [44](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n44) Currently, nanotubes are used in tennis rackets and golf clubs to make them lighter and stronger. [45](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n45) Part II: Nanotechnology's Uses   Researching and manipulating the properties of nanostructures are important for a number of reasons, including, most basically, to gain an understanding of how matter is constructed, and more practically, to use these unique properties to develop unique products. [46](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n46) Nanoproducts can be divided into four general categories: [47](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n47) smart materials, [48](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n48) sensors, [49](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n49) biomedical applications, [50](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n50) and optics and electronics. [51](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n51)  [\*93]  A "smart" material incorporates in its design a capability to perform several specific tasks. [52](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n52) In nanotechnology, that design is done at the molecular level. [53](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n53) Clothing, enhanced with nanotechnology, is a useful application of a smart material at the nanoscale. Certain nano-enhanced clothing contains fibers that have tiny whiskers that repel liquids, reduce static and resist stains without affecting feel. [54](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n54) Nano-enhanced rubber represents another application of a nanoscale smart material. [55](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n55) Tires using nanotech-components increase skid resistance by reducing friction, which reduces abrasion and makes the tires last longer. [56](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n56) The tires may be on the market "in the next few years" according to the National Nanotechnology Initiative (NNI). [57](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n57) Theoretically, this rubber could be used on a variety of products, ranging from tires to windshield wiper blades to athletic shoes. [58](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n58) A more complex nanotechnology smart material is a photorefractive polymer. [59](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n59) Acting as a nanoscale "barcode," these polymers could be used as information storage devices with a storage density exceeding the best available magnetic storage structures. [60](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n60) Nano-sensors may "revolutionize much of the medical care and the food packaging industries," [61](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n61) as well as the environmental field because of their ability to detect toxins and pollutants at fewer than ten molecules. [62](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n62) As the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) recognizes: Protection of human health and ecosystems requires rapid, precise sensors capable of detecting pollutants at the molecular level. Major improvements in process control, compliance monitoring, and environmental decision-making could  [\*94]  be achieved if more accurate, less costly, more sensitive techniques were available. Nanotechnology offers the possibility of sensors enabled to be selective or specific, detect multiple analytes, and monitor their presence in real time. [63](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n63) Examples of research in sensors include the development of nano-sensors for efficient and rapid biochemical detection of pollutants; sensors capable of continuous measurement over large areas; integration of nano-enabled sensors for real-time continuous monitoring; and sensors that utilize "lab-on-a-chip" technology. [64](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n64) All fundamental life processes occur at the nanoscale, making it the ideal scale at which to fight diseases. [65](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n65) Two quintessential examples of biomedical applications of nanotechnology are advanced drug delivery systems and nano-enhanced drugs. [66](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n66) The promise of advanced drug delivery systems lies in that they direct drug molecules only to where they are needed in the body. [67](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n67) One example is focusing chemotherapy on the site of the tumor, instead of the whole body, thereby improving the drug's effectiveness while decreasing its unpleasant side-effects. [68](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n68) Other researchers are working to develop nanoparticles that target and trick cancer cells into absorbing certain nanoparticles. [69](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n69) These nanoparticles would then kill tumors from within, avoiding the destruction of healthy cells, as opposed to the indiscriminate damage caused by traditional chemotherapy. [70](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n70) Nano-enhanced suicide inhibitors [71](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n71) limit enzymatic activity by forcing naturally occurring enzymes to form bonds with the nanostructured molecule. [72](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n72) This may treat conditions such as epilepsy and depression because of the enzyme action component involved in these conditions. [73](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n73) Lastly, nanotechnology has the potential to revolutionize the electronics and optics fields. [74](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n74) For instance, nanotechnology has the potential to produce clean,  [\*95]  renewable solar power. [75](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n75) Through a process called artificial photosynthesis, solar energy is produced by using nanostructures based on molecules which capture light and separate positive and negative charges. [76](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n76) Certain Swiss watches and bathroom scales are illuminated through a nanotech procedure that transforms captured sunlight into an electrical current. [77](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n77) In the electronics field, nanostructures offer many different ways to increase memory storage by substantially reducing the size of memory bits and thereby increasing the density of magnetic memory, increasing efficiency, and decreasing cost. [78](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n78) One example is storing memory bits as magnetic nanodots, which can be reduced in size until they reach the super-paramagnetic limit, the smallest possible magnetic memory structure. [79](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n79) Advances in electronics and computing brought on by nanotechnology could allow reconfigurable, "thinking" spacecraft. [80](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n80) Some uses of nano-products already on the market include suntan lotions and skin creams, tennis balls that bounce longer, faster-burning rocket fuel additives, and new cancer treatments. [81](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n81) Solar cells in roofing tiles and siding that provide electricity for homes and facilities, and the prototypic tires, supra, may be on the market in the next few years. [82](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n82) The industry expects advanced drug delivery systems with implantable devices that automatically administer drugs and sensor drug levels, and medical diagnostic tools such as cancer-tagging mechanisms to be on the market in the next two to five years. [83](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n83) It is nearly impossible to foresee what developments to expect in nanotechnology in the decades to come. [84](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n84) Nonetheless, the book Engines of Creation presented one vision of the possibilities of advanced nanotechnology. [85](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n85) Nano-machines could be designed to construct any product, from mundane items such as a chair, to exciting items such as a rocket engine. [86](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n86) These "assemblers" could also be programmed to build copies of themselves. [87](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n87) Known as "replicators," these nano-machines could alter the world by producing an exponential quantity of themselves that are to be put to work as assemblers. [88](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n88) The development of assemblers could advance the space  [\*96]  exploration program, [89](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n89) biomedical field, [90](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n90) and even repair the damage done to the world's ecological systems. [91](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n91) Over time, production costs may sharply decrease because the assemblers will be able to construct all future products from an original blueprint at virtually no additional cost. [92](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n92) Part III: Nanotechnology's Side-Effects   With the good, however, comes the bad. The "gray goo problem," the most well-known unwanted potential consequence of the spread of nanotechnology, [93](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n93) arises when replicators and assemblers produce almost anything, and subsequently spread uncontrolled, obliterating natural organisms and replacing them with nano-enhanced organisms. [94](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n94) A more foreseeable issue is environmental contamination. [95](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n95) The EPA noted   As nanotechnology progresses from research and development to commercialization and use, it is likely that manufactured nanomaterials and nanoproducts will be released into the environment... . The unique features of manufactured nanomaterials and a lack of experience with these materials hinder the risk evaluation that is needed to inform decisions about pollution prevention, environmental clean-up and other control measures, including regulation. Beyond the usual concerns for most toxic materials ... the adequacy of current toxicity tests for chemicals needs to be assessed ... . To the extent that nanoparticles  [\*97]  ... elicit novel biological responses, these concerns need to be accounted for in toxicity testing to provide relevant information needed for risk assessment to inform decision making. [96](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n96)   In addition, nanotechnology could change the face of global warfare and terrorism. [97](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n97) Assemblers could be used to duplicate existing weapons out of superior materials, and chemical and biological weapons could be created with nano-enhanced components. [98](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n98) Modern detection systems would be inadequate to detect nano-enhanced weapons built with innocuous materials such as carbon. [99](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n99) Luckily, nanotechnology offers responses to these problems, and researchers are already tackling these issues. [100](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n100) "Labs-on-a-chip," a sensor system the size of a microchip, could be woven into soldiers' uniforms to detect toxins immediately. [101](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n101) Adding smart materials could make soldiers' uniforms resistant to certain chemical and biological agents. [102](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n102) Nanotechnology also enhances threats against citizens. Drugs and bugs (electronic surveillance devices) could be used by police states to monitor and control its citizenry. [103](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n103) Viruses could be created that target specific genetic characteristics. [104](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n104) Not only is the development of technologically advanced, devastating weaponry itself a hazardous effect of nanotechnology, but also, millions of dollars have already been spent researching potential uses of nanotechnology in the military sphere, [105](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n105) thus diverting funds from more beneficial uses such as biomedical applications and clean energy. However, these negative effects are not inevitable. By analyzing the scope of potential drawbacks accompanying these research investments, lawmakers can institute regulatory controls that could mitigate these problems.  [\*98]  Part IV: Maximizing Benefits, Minimizing Catastrophe   To minimize or eliminate the problems associated with nanotechnology, while maximizing the beneficial effects, nanotechnology research and development should be monitored and regulated by "trustworthy systems." [106](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n106) Currently, the federal government oversees a massive funding and research program with the purpose of "ensuring United States global leadership in the development and application of nanotechnology." [107](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n107) Nonetheless, as nanotechnology becomes more prevalent, more thorough regulation may be necessary. [108](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n108) Nanotechnology may greatly impact some of the largest revenue producing industries in the United States, such as the pharmaceutical and medical fields, utilities and power generation, and computer electronics. [109](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n109) Thus, it is clear that nanotechnology will likely touch every facet of human life. In addition, these powerful industries have been known to promote profits over human safety, [110](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&brand=&_m=82ab008e42cdd5d1d23cfd1d96b430bb&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=f86737f923f2df1de12147f84a019421&focBudTerms=Nanotechnology%3A+Unique+Science+Requires+Unique+Solutions&focBudSel=all#n110) one of the reasons for their stringent regulation.  [\*99]

#### Only existential impact---that outweighs

Bostrom 2 – Nick Bostrom, Professor of Philosophy at Oxford University, “Existential Risks: Analyzing Human Extinction Scenarios and Related Hazards”, Journal of Evolution and Technology, 9(1), http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html

1.2 Existential risks In this paper we shall discuss risks of the sixth category, the one marked with an X. This is the category of global, terminal risks. I shall call these existential risks. Existential risks are distinct from global endurable risks. Examples of the latter kind include: threats to the biodiversity of Earth’s ecosphere, moderate global warming, global economic recessions (even major ones), and possibly stifling cultural or religious eras such as the “dark ages”, even if they encompass the whole global community, provided they are transitory (though see the section on “Shrieks” below). To say that a particular global risk is endurable is evidently not to say that it is acceptable or not very serious. A world war fought with conventional weapons or a Nazi-style Reich lasting for a decade would be extremely horrible events even though they would fall under the rubric of endurable global risks since humanity could eventually recover. (On the other hand, they could be a local terminal risk for many individuals and for persecuted ethnic groups.) I shall use the following definition of existential risks: Existential risk – One where an adverse outcome would either annihilate Earth-originating intelligent life or permanently and drastically curtail its potential. An existential risk is one where humankind as a whole is imperiled. Existential disasters have major adverse consequences for the course of human civilization for all time to come. 2 The unique challenge of existential risks Risks in this sixth category are a recent phenomenon. This is part of the reason why it is useful to distinguish them from other risks. We have not evolved mechanisms, either biologically or culturally, for managing such risks. Our intuitions and coping strategies have been shaped by our long experience with risks such as dangerous animals, hostile individuals or tribes, poisonous foods, automobile accidents, Chernobyl, Bhopal, volcano eruptions, earthquakes, draughts, World War I, World War II, epidemics of influenza, smallpox, black plague, and AIDS. These types of disasters have occurred many times and our cultural attitudes towards risk have been shaped by trial-and-error in managing such hazards. But tragic as such events are to the people immediately affected, in the big picture of things – from the perspective of humankind as a whole – even the worst of these catastrophes are mere ripples on the surface of the great sea of life. They haven’t significantly affected the total amount of human suffering or happiness or determined the long-term fate of our species. With the exception of a species-destroying comet or asteroid impact (an extremely rare occurrence), there were probably no significant existential risks in human history until the mid-twentieth century, and certainly none that it was within our power to do something about. The first manmade existential risk was the inaugural detonation of an atomic bomb. At the time, there was some concern that the explosion might start a runaway chain-reaction by “igniting” the atmosphere. Although we now know that such an outcome was physically impossible, it qualifies as an existential risk that was present at the time. For there to be a risk, given the knowledge and understanding available, it suffices that there is some subjective probability of an adverse outcome, even if it later turns out that objectively there was no chance of something bad happening. If we don’t know whether something is objectively risky or not, then it is risky in the subjective sense. The subjective sense is of course what we must base our decisions on.[2] At any given time we must use our best current subjective estimate of what the objective risk factors are.[3] A much greater existential risk emerged with the build-up of nuclear arsenals in the US and the USSR. An all-out nuclear war was a possibility with both a substantial probability and with consequences that might have been persistent enough to qualify as global and terminal. There was a real worry among those best acquainted with the information available at the time that a nuclear Armageddon would occur and that it might annihilate our species or permanently destroy human civilization.[4] Russia and the US retain large nuclear arsenals that could be used in a future confrontation, either accidentally or deliberately. There is also a risk that other states may one day build up large nuclear arsenals. Note however that a smaller nuclear exchange, between India and Pakistan for instance, is not an existential risk, since it would not destroy or thwart humankind’s potential permanently. Such a war might however be a local terminal risk for the cities most likely to be targeted. Unfortunately, we shall see that nuclear Armageddon and comet or asteroid strikes are mere preludes to the existential risks that we will encounter in the 21st century. The special nature of the challenges posed by existential risks is illustrated by the following points: · Our approach to existential risks cannot be one of trial-and-error. There is no opportunity to learn from errors. The reactive approach – see what happens, limit damages, and learn from experience – is unworkable. Rather, we must take a proactive approach. This requires foresight to anticipate new types of threats and a willingness to take decisive preventive action and to bear the costs (moral and economic) of such actions. · We cannot necessarily rely on the institutions, moral norms, social attitudes or national security policies that developed from our experience with managing other sorts of risks. Existential risks are a different kind of beast. We might find it hard to take them as seriously as we should simply because we have never yet witnessed such disasters.[5] Our collective fear-response is likely ill calibrated to the magnitude of threat. · Reductions in existential risks are global public goods [13] and may therefore be undersupplied by the market [14]. Existential risks are a menace for everybody and may require acting on the international plane. Respect for national sovereignty is not a legitimate excuse for failing to take countermeasures against a major existential risk. · If we take into account the welfare of future generations, the harm done by existential risks is multiplied by another factor, the size of which depends on whether and how much we discount future benefits [15,16]. In view of its undeniable importance, it is surprising how little systematic work has been done in this area. Part of the explanation may be that many of the gravest risks stem (as we shall see) from anticipated future technologies that we have only recently begun to understand. Another part of the explanation may be the unavoidably interdisciplinary and speculative nature of the subject. And in part the neglect may also be attributable to an aversion against thinking seriously about a depressing topic. The point, however, is not to wallow in gloom and doom but simply to take a sober look at what could go wrong so we can create responsible strategies for improving our chances of survival. In order to do that, we need to know where to focus our efforts. 3 Classification of existential risks We shall use the following four categories to classify existential risks[6]: Bangs – Earth-originating intelligent life goes extinct in relatively sudden disaster resulting from either an accident or a deliberate act of destruction. Crunches – The potential of humankind to develop into posthumanity[7] is permanently thwarted although human life continues in some form. Shrieks – Some form of posthumanity is attained but it is an extremely narrow band of what is possible and desirable. Whimpers – A posthuman civilization arises but evolves in a direction that leads gradually but irrevocably to either the complete disappearance of the things we value or to a state where those things are realized to only a minuscule degree of what could have been achieved. Armed with this taxonomy, we can begin to analyze the most likely scenarios in each category. The definitions will also be clarified as we proceed. 4 Bangs This is the most obvious kind of existential risk. It is conceptually easy to understand. Below are some possible ways for the world to end in a bang.[8] I have tried to rank them roughly in order of how probable they are, in my estimation, to cause the extinction of Earth-originating intelligent life; but my intention with the ordering is more to provide a basis for further discussion than to make any firm assertions. 4.1 Deliberate misuse of nanotechnology In a mature form, molecular nanotechnology will enable the construction of bacterium-scale self-replicating mechanical robots that can feed on dirt or other organic matter [22-25]. Such replicators could eat up the biosphere or destroy it by other means such as by poisoning it, burning it, or blocking out sunlight. A person of malicious intent in possession of this technology might cause the extinction of intelligent life on Earth by releasing such nanobots into the environment.[9] The technology to produce a destructive nanobot seems considerably easier to develop than the technology to create an effective defense against such an attack (a global nanotech immune system, an “active shield” [23]). It is therefore likely that there will be a period of vulnerability during which this technology must be prevented from coming into the wrong hands. Yet the technology could prove hard to regulate, since it doesn’t require rare radioactive isotopes or large, easily identifiable manufacturing plants, as does production of nuclear weapons [23]. Even if effective defenses against a limited nanotech attack are developed before dangerous replicators are designed and acquired by suicidal regimes or terrorists, there will still be the danger of an arms race between states possessing nanotechnology. It has been argued [26] that molecular manufacturing would lead to both arms race instability and crisis instability, to a higher degree than was the case with nuclear weapons. Arms race instability means that there would be dominant incentives for each competitor to escalate its armaments, leading to a runaway arms race. Crisis instability means that there would be dominant incentives for striking first. Two roughly balanced rivals acquiring nanotechnology would, on this view, begin a massive buildup of armaments and weapons development programs that would continue until a crisis occurs and war breaks out, potentially causing global terminal destruction. That the arms race could have been predicted is no guarantee that an international security system will be created ahead of time to prevent this disaster from happening. The nuclear arms race between the US and the USSR was predicted but occurred nevertheless. 4.2 Nuclear holocaust The US and Russia still have huge stockpiles of nuclear weapons. But would an all-out nuclear war really exterminate humankind? Note that: (i) For there to be an existential risk it suffices that we can’t be sure that it wouldn’t. (ii) The climatic effects of a large nuclear war are not well known (there is the possibility of a nuclear winter). (iii) Future arms races between other nations cannot be ruled out and these could lead to even greater arsenals than those present at the height of the Cold War. The world’s supply of plutonium has been increasing steadily to about two thousand tons, some ten times as much as remains tied up in warheads ([9], p. 26). (iv) Even if some humans survive the short-term effects of a nuclear war, it could lead to the collapse of civilization. A human race living under stone-age conditions may or may not be more resilient to extinction than other animal species. 4.3 We’re living in a simulation and it gets shut down A case can be made that the hypothesis that we are living in a computer simulation should be given a significant probability [27]. The basic idea behind this so-called “Simulation argument” is that vast amounts of computing power may become available in the future (see e.g. [28,29]), and that it could be used, among other things, to run large numbers of fine-grained simulations of past human civilizations. Under some not-too-implausible assumptions, the result can be that almost all minds like ours are simulated minds, and that we should therefore assign a significant probability to being such computer-emulated minds rather than the (subjectively indistinguishable) minds of originally evolved creatures. And if we are, we suffer the risk that the simulation may be shut down at any time. A decision to terminate our simulation may be prompted by our actions or by exogenous factors. While to some it may seem frivolous to list such a radical or “philosophical” hypothesis next the concrete threat of nuclear holocaust, we must seek to base these evaluations on reasons rather than untutored intuition. Until a refutation appears of the argument presented in [27], it would intellectually dishonest to neglect to mention simulation-shutdown as a potential extinction mode. 4.4 Badly programmed superintelligence When we create the first superintelligent entity [28-34], we might make a mistake and give it goals that lead it to annihilate humankind, assuming its enormous intellectual advantage gives it the power to do so. For example, we could mistakenly elevate a subgoal to the status of a supergoal. We tell it to solve a mathematical problem, and it complies by turning all the matter in the solar system into a giant calculating device, in the process killing the person who asked the question. (For further analysis of this, see [35].) 4.5 Genetically engineered biological agent With the fabulous advances in genetic technology currently taking place, it may become possible for a tyrant, terrorist, or lunatic to create a doomsday virus, an organism that combines long latency with high virulence and mortality [36]. Dangerous viruses can even be spawned unintentionally, as Australian researchers recently demonstrated when they created a modified mousepox virus with 100% mortality while trying to design a contraceptive virus for mice for use in pest control [37]. While this particular virus doesn’t affect humans, it is suspected that an analogous alteration would increase the mortality of the human smallpox virus. What underscores the future hazard here is that the research was quickly published in the open scientific literature [38]. It is hard to see how information generated in open biotech research programs could be contained no matter how grave the potential danger that it poses; and the same holds for research in nanotechnology. Genetic medicine will also lead to better cures and vaccines, but there is no guarantee that defense will always keep pace with offense. (Even the accidentally created mousepox virus had a 50% mortality rate on vaccinated mice.) Eventually, worry about biological weapons may be put to rest through the development of nanomedicine, but while nanotechnology has enormous long-term potential for medicine [39] it carries its own hazards. 4.6 Accidental misuse of nanotechnology (“gray goo”) The possibility of accidents can never be completely ruled out. However, there are many ways of making sure, through responsible engineering practices, that species-destroying accidents do not occur. One could avoid using self-replication; one could make nanobots dependent on some rare feedstock chemical that doesn’t exist in the wild; one could confine them to sealed environments; one could design them in such a way that any mutation was overwhelmingly likely to cause a nanobot to completely cease to function [40]. Accidental misuse is therefore a smaller concern than malicious misuse [23,25,41]. However, the distinction between the accidental and the deliberate can become blurred. While “in principle” it seems possible to make terminal nanotechnological accidents extremely improbable, the actual circumstances may not permit this ideal level of security to be realized. Compare nanotechnology with nuclear technology. From an engineering perspective, it is of course perfectly possible to use nuclear technology only for peaceful purposes such as nuclear reactors, which have a zero chance of destroying the whole planet. Yet in practice it may be very hard to avoid nuclear technology also being used to build nuclear weapons, leading to an arms race. With large nuclear arsenals on hair-trigger alert, there is inevitably a significant risk of accidental war. The same can happen with nanotechnology: it may be pressed into serving military objectives in a way that carries unavoidable risks of serious accidents. In some situations it can even be strategically advantageous to deliberately make one’s technology or control systems risky, for example in order to make a “threat that leaves something to chance” [42].

#### Defense doesn’t assume interactions of multiple simultaneous threats

Pamlin, 15 -- Dennis Pamlin, Executive Project Manager of the Global Risks Global Challenges Foundation, and Stuart Armstrong, James Martin Research Fellow at the Future of Humanity Institute of the Oxford Martin School at University of Oxford, Global Challenges Foundation, February, http://globalchallenges.org/wp-content/uploads/12-Risks-with-infinite-impact.pdf

If a safe artificial intelligence is developed, this provides a great resource for improving outcomes and mitigating all types of risk.585 Artificial intelligence risks worsening nanotechnology risks, by allowing nanomachines and weapons to be designed with intelligence and without centralised control, overcoming the main potential weaknesses of these machines586 by putting planning abilities on the other side. Conversely, nanotechnology abilities worsen artificial intelligence risk, by giving AI extra tools which it could use for developing its power base.587 Nanotechnology and synthetic biology could allow the efficient creation of vaccines and other tools to combat global pandemics.588 Nanotechnology’s increased industrial capacity could allow the creation of large amounts of efficient solar panels to combat climate change, or even potentially the efficient scrubbing of CO2 from the atmosphere.589 Nanotechnology and synthetic biology are sufficiently closely related 590 (both dealing with properties on an atomic scale) for methods developed in one to be ported over to the other, potentially worsening the other risk. They are sufficiently distinct though (a mainly technological versus a mainly biological approach) for countermeasures in one domain not necessarily to be of help in the other. Uncontrolled or malicious synthetic pathogens could wreak great damage on the ecosystem; conversely, controlled and benevolent synthetic creations could act to improve and heal current ecological damage.

#### Strong risk reduction key to prevent AI-driven extinction---it’s uniquely likely, but success solves every impact

Pamlin, 15 -- Dennis Pamlin, Executive Project Manager of the Global Risks Global Challenges Foundation, and Stuart Armstrong, James Martin Research Fellow at the Future of Humanity Institute of the Oxford Martin School at University of Oxford, Global Challenges Foundation, February, http://globalchallenges.org/wp-content/uploads/12-Risks-with-infinite-impact.pdf

Despite the uncertainty of when and how AI could be developed, there are reasons to suspect that an AI with human-comparable skills would be a major risk factor. AIs would immediately benefit from improvements to computer speed and any computer research. They could be trained in specific professions and copied at will, thus replacing most human capital in the world, causing potentially great economic disruption. Through their advantages in speed and performance, and through their better integration with standard computer software, they could quickly become extremely intelligent in one or more domains (research, planning, social skills...). If they became skilled at computer research, the recursive self-improvement could generate what is sometime called a “singularity”, 482 but is perhaps better described as an “intelligence explosion”, 483 with the AI’s intelligence increasing very rapidly.484 Such extreme intelligences could not easily be controlled (either by the groups creating them, or by some international regulatory regime),485 and would probably act in a way to boost their own intelligence and acquire maximal resources for almost all initial AI motivations.486 And if these motivations do not detail 487 the survival and value of humanity in exhaustive detail, the intelligence will be driven to construct a world without humans or without meaningful features of human existence. This makes extremely intelligent AIs a unique risk,488 in that extinction is more likely than lesser impacts. An AI would only turn on humans if it foresaw a likely chance of winning; otherwise it would remain fully integrated into society. And if an AI had been able to successfully engineer a civilisation collapse, for instance, then it could certainly drive the remaining humans to extinction. On a more positive note, an intelligence of such power could easily combat most other risks in this report, making extremely intelligent AI into a tool of great positive potential as well.489 Whether such an intelligence is developed safely depends on how much effort is invested in AI safety (“Friendly AI”)490 as opposed to simply building an AI.49

#### The Court has recently narrowed Parker immunity to limit deference to the states in antitrust law

Allensworth 16 [Rebecca Haw Allensworth, Associate Professor of Law, Vanderbilt Law School; J.D., Harvard Law School; M.Phil, University of Cambridge; B.A., Yale University, October 2016, ARTICLE: THE NEW ANTITRUST FEDERALISM, 102 Va. L. Rev. 1387]

Introduction

IN just three relatively obscure antitrust cases, 1

[Footnote 1] N.C. State Bd. of Dental Exam'rs v. FTC, 135 S. Ct. 1101 (2015) [hereinafter NC Dental]; FTC v. Phoebe Putney Health Sys., Inc., 133 S. Ct. 1003 (2013); FTC v. Ticor Title Ins. Co., 504 U.S. 621 (1992).

the U.S. Supreme Court has quietly revolutionized how states and the federal government share power. These cases addressed a doctrine - unfamiliar to those outside of the field of antitrust law - that grants "state action" immunity from federal antitrust liability 2 and thus marks the thin line that insulates state regulation from wholesale invalidation through federal antitrust lawsuits. 3 For decades, the Court conceived of this line, and the "antitrust federalism" it effected, as a formal question about where the state ended and antitrust liability began. This was the old antitrust federalism: a boundary-drawing exercise that gave strong deference to state regulation. The Court's state action revolution ushers in a new antitrust federalism, one that all but dispenses with the notion of separate spheres in favor of something less deferential to the states - procedural review of state regulation.

Antitrust federalism may be less familiar than its constitutional cousin, but it is just as important - if not more so - to the state-federal balance of power. The Sherman Act forbids anticompetitive restraints of trade and monopolization of markets, and it does not seem to limit these prohibitions to private citizens and corporations. 4 Because regulation often tinkers with the free market economy and tends to create competitive winners and losers, Sherman Act liability for state conduct would severely restrict a state's ability to regulate within its borders. 5 So when [\*1390] the Court extended the reach of the Sherman Act - along with all federal regulation passed under the Commerce Clause - during the New Deal, 6 it became necessary to define an exemption for "state action" or risk the demise of state regulatory autonomy altogether. And state action immunity from the Sherman Act was born. 7

#### But, the current interpretation fails to account for interstate spillovers. Limiting Parker is crucial to establish federal role limiting regulatory externalities

Sack 21 [John Sack, J.D., Duke Law School, Class of 2022, B.S. University of Michigan, 2019, 2021 https://scholarship.law.duke.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1196&context=djclpp\_sidebar]

III. DOCTRINAL CRITICISM

Although the Court has continued to re-affirm Parker v. Brown’s central holding, many have criticized the Parker doctrine. Both scholars and the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) have highlighted problems with the doctrine and offered a number of solutions for how to remedy its faults.63

The first common critique of the doctrine is that it does not account for out-of-state economic effects. Unless a regulation runs afoul of another constitutional barrier, no consideration of interstate spillovers applies.64 One need not look farther than Parker itself to see how the state action doctrine can impose costs on out-of-state residents, even though those residents have diminished political capital in the state. At the time Parker was decided, between 90 and 95 percent of raisins produced in California entered interstate commerce and California provided almost all of the nation’s raisins.65 Most American raisin consumers lived outside of California and had no political means to oppose the state’s legislative program, yet they bore the costs of California’s state-sanctioned monopoly.66

Second, similar concerns about political representation animate critiques of Parker immunity. The policy at issue in Parker restricted output and artificially raised prices, two results federal antitrust law generally seeks to prohibit.67 Although the benefits of such a program were borne almost exclusively by California, the costs of the program were incurred by raisin consumers across the nation.68 The political incentives to promote such a program follow closely with economic costs and benefits.69 California raisin producers have a strong incentive to lobby their own government to install such a program, but it would be nearly impossible for non-California residents to challenge such a policy through the normal political channels.70 The government of California is not the appropriate body to properly weigh the benefits to in-state raisin producers with the costs to out-of-state consumers, yet the Parker doctrine grants California per se immunity on federalism grounds.71 Although the California program was implicitly endorsed by Congress, one is just as likely to find similar programs with no similar implicit endorsement.72

The U.S. Constitution embodies a system of federalism where the federal government is sovereign in some respects, and the several states are sovereign in others.73 This system of federalism gives states the power to regulate local matters and the federal government the power to regulate issues that states are less suited to regulate.74 When costs spill over into other states, the national government becomes the appropriate body to regulate the costs and benefits of such a program.75 The Court has recognized such spillover effects, and how political actors, even government entities, can act solely in self-interest.76 Such state self-interest can directly harm consumers outside of its territorial jurisdiction.77

Parker immunity, as it stands, runs counter to longstanding ideals of national unity that harken back to the Founding era. The law has long prohibited states from imposing excessive costs on the nation as a whole, solely for the purpose of furthering its own intrastate policy interests. McCulloch v. Maryland illustrates the Court’s wariness of self-serving state action.78 In McCulloch, Chief Justice Marshall held that states may not tax the national bank, as they would be wielding power against the whole of the United States, even though the whole of the United States is not represented by each state.79 Similar to a state tax being problematic since it is the part acting on the whole, anticompetitive restraints by the states would unduly impose costs on the nation. The people of the United States, acting through Congress, christened competition and free markets through the Sherman Act.80 Just as one state could not tax the resources of the United States, one state should not be allowed to use state policy to burden the national economy. Because the potential costs to state-created monopolies are so high,81 federal policy should prohibit states from allocating those costs beyond their borders. Any state that wishes to impose monopoly costs outside of its borders to benefit itself and undermine competition should be carefully scrutinized when it does so. This scrutiny would not be fatal-in-fact for the legislation, but it should be enough for states to second-guess an attempt to enrich itself to the detriment of its sister states.

IV. PROPOSED SOLUTIONS

The Sherman Act, and specifically Parker immunity, should be interpreted in light of the above concerns. After all, the Sherman Act is the standard-bearer for the U.S. free market system, and so our interpretation of it should evolve with our understanding of constitutional principles and economic conditions.82 Justice Burger’s concurrence in City of Lafayette elaborates on this point:

Our conceptions of the limits imposed by federalism are bound to evolve, just as our understanding of Congress’ power under the Commerce Clause has evolved. Consequently, since we find it appropriate to allow the ambit of the Sherman Act to expand with evolving perceptions of congressional power under the Commerce Clause, a similar process should occur with respect to “state action” analysis under Parker. That is, we should not treat the result in the Parker case as cast in bronze; rather, the scope of the Sherman Act’s power should parallel the developing concepts of American federalism.83

As states impose costs on each other through state-sanctioned monopolies, the Court’s understanding of federalism and the Commerce Clause counsels scrutiny of the Parker doctrine. An entirely new doctrine is not necessary to curtail Parker immunity. Rather, the issue can be resolved by applying Parker immunity in light of the American dual system of federalism and the Commerce Clause. Modern scholarship critiques the lack of concern for interstate spillovers. By that token, the modern Parker doctrine fails to account for economic efficiency and undermines political representation values meant to be protected by federalism.84 So while scholars almost universally recognize that interstate economic spillovers are problematic, there is no consensus on what remedy is most appropriate.

#### The aff preserves state authority to enforce antitrust but absent clarification on the transboundary effects from broad Parker immunity turf wars cause enforcement failures

Kobayashi 20 [Bruce H. Kobayashi, George Mason University, Antonin Scalia Law School Professor, 10-4-2020 https://gaidigitalreport.com/2020/10/04/exemptions-and-immunities/#\_ftn92]

B. Spillover Effects and Antitrust Federalism

The current state action doctrine does not enable jurisdictional competition or promote the principles of federalism because it does not account for the spillover effects of anticompetitive state regulation. Judge Easterbrook examined the Court’s state action holdings and found that the Court’s rulings were indifferent as to whether the effects of the regulation were actually internalized by the regulating state.[91] Allowing states to enact anticompetitive legislation reduced the extent and effectiveness of competition among the states, and thereby increased the cost of exit and relocation.[92]

This nature of the spillover effect is exemplified in Parker v. Brown.[93] The state action doctrine was used to uphold a California regulation which authorized a raisin cartel. California raisin growers benefited greatly from that ability to price fix. However, over 90% of the grapes were exported outside of California—nationally and internationally—making the impact of the California raisin regulation reach beyond state lines.[94] The regulation harmed a large number of consumers outside of California while only benefiting a small number of private interest parties within the state.

State action doctrine, although meant to preserve that state’s independence, actually allows the state to reap the benefits of the anticompetitive regulation while displacing the costs onto other states.[95] Therefore, it is worth considering if the current state action doctrine should be thought of differently, in a way that fully takes into accounts issues of federalism. Judge Easterbrook proposes a state action rule which considers the spillover effect of anticompetitive state regulation. Instead of examining clear articulation and active supervision, the Court would uphold an anticompetitive state regulation as long as its anticompetitive effects are internalized by that state’s residents.[96] Aligning state action doctrine with the economics of federalism will not only maintain states’ roles in antitrust, but also ensure that state antitrust exemptions have a diminished negative impact on consumer welfare. Analyzing the anticompetitive overcharge of regulations is also more administrable than attempting to analyze the regulations under the dormant Commerce Clause.[97] Considered under Easterbrook’s approach, Parker’s California raisin prorate program would be subject to antitrust scrutiny because the regulation’s costs were not internalized.

State regulation of seemingly local competition is likely to effect more than just the economy of that specific state. When states grant antitrust immunities in situations involving interstate commerce, the state is exporting the anticompetitive effects of its regulations to citizens outside its own borders. Without accounting for the federal interest in an integrated national economy, state action doctrine far surpasses its narrow purpose of supervising local competition.

C. The Appropriate Role of State Attorneys General in Federal Antitrust Disputes

Federalism most often refers to the vertical relationship between the federal government and the states. Divergent viewpoints among antitrust enforcers can strain the system, thus comity and deference are crucial to efficient antitrust enforcement. A merger or acquisition is often scrutinized by multiple enforcers with multi-dimensional relationships.

For example, the Sprint/T-Mobile merger involved the Antitrust Division and Federal Communications Commission, who share a horizontal relationship, and state attorneys general, with which the federal agencies share a vertical relationship. Disagreement between enforcers may occur at either level.[98] The merger between the two telecommunications firms was cleared by the FCC, the Antitrust Division, and ten state attorneys general.[99] Although a settlement agreement—which required divestitures—was in the process of being approved, several other state attorneys general filed a lawsuit to block the merger anyway.[100] Assistant Attorney General Makan Delrahim questioned the relief sought by the states,[101] citing the federal agencies’ expertise in the matter.[102] He noted that “a minority of states and the District of Columbia” were “trying to undo [the nationwide settlement],” a situation he believed was “odd.”[103] Delrahim reaffirmed states’ rights to sue for antitrust violations but criticized their attempt to seek relief inconsistent with the federal government’s settlement.[104]

States may also enter settlement agreements with merging parties that are repugnant to sound antitrust enforcement. For example, in UnitedHealth Group/Sierra Health Services, the Nevada Attorney General required the merged firm to submit $15 million in charitable contributions which were not related to any antitrust violation.[105] Similarly, Massachusetts entered a settlement agreement with two hospitals that required increased spending on select programs and the creation of other projects and programs unrelated to antitrust concerns.[106]

On the other hand, state antitrust enforcement can play a useful role in supplementing federal antitrust enforcement. First, the use of state autonomy within a federal system allows state and local governments to act as social “laboratories,” where laws and policies are created and tested at the state level of the democratic system, in a manner similar (in theory, at least) to the scientific method.[107] Thus, even if states enter into agreements with merging parties that the federal authorities view as anticompetitive or that impose ineffective remedies for the anticompetitive effects that would be generated by the merger, the information generated by such actions can be invaluable inputs into retrospective analyses of the competitive effects of mergers. These analyses are based on causal empirical designs which require both observation of post-merger price and quality effects from consummated mergers and the ability to compare these effects with a credible control group.[108] For example, state interventions such as COPA or Certificate on Need Laws that allow hospital mergers that generate competitive effects in local geographic markets facilitate retrospective studies of hospital mergers that can be used to validate and improve the economic models and other tools used to predict merger effects.[109]

Second, in a system of federalism, the state enforcement of both the state and federal antitrust laws can be a valuable complementary resource that supplements scarce federal resources. Conflicts between the federal and state antitrust authorities are generated by the use of a cooperative or “marble cake” approach to federalism, where the tasks of the state and federal agencies are relatively undefined, overlapping, and imperfectly coordinated. In contrast, a “dual” or “layer cake” federalism approach, where power is divided ex-ante between the federal and state governments in clearly defined terms, can mitigate direct conflicts between state and federal authorities discussed above.

#### Failure to hold states accountable for spillovers destroys optimal state experimentation – correctly “right sizing” regulation impossible without accounting for externalities in interjurisdictional competition

Adler 20 [Jonathan H. Adler, Case Western University School of Law, 2020 <https://scholarlycommons.law.case.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3058&context=faculty_publications>]

The race-to-the-bottom theory presumes that interjurisdictional competition creates a prisoner’s dilemma for states. Each state wants to attract industry for the economic benefits that it provides. Each state also wishes to maintain an optimal level of environmental protection. However, in order to attract industry, the theory holds, states will lower environmental safeguards so as to reduce the regulatory burden they impose upon firms. This competition exerts downward pressure on environmental safeguards as firms seek to locate in states where regulatory burdens are the lowest, and states seek to attract industry by lessening the economic burden of environmental safeguards. Because the potential benefits of lax regulation are concentrated among relatively few firms, these firms can effectively oppose the general public’s preference for environmental protection regulation. This will lead to social welfare losses even if environmental harm does not spill over from one state to another. The result, according to the theory, is the systematic under-regulation of environmental harms, and a need for federal intervention.26

The race-to-the-bottom theory may have had some basis in the 1960s and 1970s, but there is little reason to believe that this dynamic inhibits state regulatory efforts today, particularly given how aggressive many states are in environmental policy. Empirical evidence that states race to relax their environmental regulations in pursuit of outside investment is decidedly lacking. If the prospect of interstate competition discourages state-level environmental regulation, it is hard to explain why state environmental regulation often preceded federal intervention and why many states adopt more stringent measures than federal regulations require. Numerous studies have been conducted attempting to determine whether a race-to-the-bottom can be observed in the context of environmental regulation, and they have generally failed to find any evidence that environmental quality worsens when states are given more flexibility to set their own priorities.27 Indeed, some studies have \found precisely the opposite: that when states have more flexibility to set their own environmental priorities they increase their efforts.28

None of the above should be taken as an argument against all federal environmental regulation. For just as the federal government is overly interventionist in localized environmental concerns, the federal government is unduly absent in areas where a federal presence is most necessary. That is, the undue centralization of some environmental concerns co-exists with substantial federal abdication from concerns the federal government should be addressing. The federal government devotes relatively little of its regulatory resources on those matters for which the federal government possesses a comparative advantage and abdicates its responsibility to provide the data and knowledge base necessary for successful environmental regulation at all levels of government.

It is often remarked that environmental problems do not respect state borders. This is unquestionably true, and the observation provides ample justification for federal measures to address transboundary pollution problems.29 Where pollution or other environmental problems span jurisdictional borders there is less reason to believe state and local jurisdictions will respond adequately.

Consider a simple transboundary pollution problem involving two states, A and B. When economic activity in State A causes pollution in State B, State A is unlikely to adopt measures to prevent the resulting environmental harm because it would bear the primary costs of any such regulatory measures, without capturing the primary benefits. Put simply, State A is unlikely to impose costs on itself to benefit State B. Absent some external controls or dispute resolution system, the presence of interstate spillovers can actually encourage polices that externalize environmental harms, such as subsidizing development near jurisdictional borders so as to ensure that environmental harms fall disproportionately “downstream.” Policymakers in State B may wish to take action, but they will be unable to control pollution created in State A without State A’s cooperation. Even where polluting activity imposes substantial environmental harm within State A, the externalization of a portion of the harm is likely to result in the adoption of less optimal environmental controls.

#### Biden’s XO empirically denies any FTC Parker links and more restrictions coming

Bulusu 21 [Siri Bulusu, Reporter Bloomberg Law, 7-12-2021 https://news.bloomberglaw.com/antitrust/worker-license-rules-emerge-as-ftc-competition-oversight-priority]

President Joe Biden’s order, signed Friday, calls on the Federal Trade Commission to boost labor market competition by writing new rules that limit “unnecessary, cumbersome” licensing requirements, often imposed by states’ regulatory boards and quasi-public organizations.

“Some overly restrictive occupational licensing requirements can impede workers’ ability to find jobs and to move between states,” according to the order. The order comes amid a flurry of lawsuits against state or state-backed licensing bodies that accuse them of violating antitrust law by imposing expensive fees or threatening to shut down out-of-state businesses. The text of the order didn’t include specific directions for federal antitrust agencies. But the FTC’s anticipated actions and possible rulemaking could lead to streamlined licensing requirements across states, eliminating demands for worker information unrelated to the job, enforcement of interstate commerce rules, and levying of punitive fines, market watchers say. Licenses are expensive and requirements vary among states, even in the same industry. Reining in the requirements could remove a significant employment barrier, particularly for military families and others who frequently move between states or offer services across state lines. But it also could shift states’ calculations in cracking down on frauds and impostors. Cosmetology licenses can cost up to $15,000 and sometimes years of study, said Dick Carpenter, a senior director of strategic research for the Institute for Justice. Other jobs, ranging from public health and safety positions to interior designers, barbers, and manicurists, also require licensing. “Without any kind of standardization of different licensing requirements—even if you have the same requirements in different jurisdictions—you still have to get a license for each jurisdiction, which impedes an employee’s ability to be mobile,” said Tracey Diamond, a partner at Troutman Pepper LLP’s labor and employment practice.

Potential FTC Moves

The FTC’s options include writing new rules or heightening enforcement of interstate commerce rules in areas where they overlap with antitrust violations, labor market watchers say. Under this principle, restricting labor through onerous licensing requirements would be tantamount to limiting movement of services across borders.

“In the past, occupational licensing was a matter overseen by the Department of Labor, but they don’t quite have the teeth that the Federal Trade Commission has in terms of working in specific locations,” said Morris Kleiner, a University of Minnesota professor of labor policy.

The FTC could turn its limited resources toward scrutinizing occupational licensing programs that narrow the practice scope of a certain profession and limit competition, Kleiner said.

How the commission interprets which licensing requirements are “unnecessary” could be scrutinized. Those could include common requirements such as citizenship and a clean criminal record, said Bobby Chung, a postdoctoral research associate at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign who focuses on licensing. .

“The required training, education and exams should confer the relevant skill sets,” Chung said. “If not, I would regard those requirements as unnecessary.” The agency also may impose specific guidelines that limit fees or frequency of license renewal, Kleiner said. “But more importantly, the FTC’s guidelines could be aimed specifically at states that have ratcheted up their requirements,” he said.

Gaining Attention

Burdensome licensing requirements have increasingly come under federal scrutiny as the labor market has shifted away from manufacturing jobs to service-oriented professions. States began imposing licensing requirements in order to protect consumers from bad actors and standardize services. “Licenses create a monopoly of workers who can provide a service,” Kleiner said. “But if you provide those services without a license, the police powers of the state can arrest and severely fine those individuals.” In 2020, roughly 23% of workers were required to have a license, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Over the years, many states, including Arizona, Connecticut, Nebraska, and Tennessee, have modified their rules to lower what they considered to be burdensome barriers to obtaining licenses. Biden’s move is part of states’ broader push for changes, Carpenter said. “There is a momentum building to raise awareness to the issue.” Advocates for change also cite underemployment and unemployment stemming from the burdensome licensing requirements, as well as allegations that certain industries create occupational licensing to limit competition. Immigrants also can be affected by the licensing requirements, particularly if they hold foreign degrees but are performing lesser-skilled jobs in the U.S., according to a 2017 study by the Migration Policy Institute. Licensing particularly hurts foreign nationals with temporary work visas whose immigration status impedes them from seeking a license to work within their specialty, Chung said. That in turn impedes their path to permanent residency or citizenship, he said.

State Action

The FTC has struggled to rein in licensing practices with antitrust violations partly because public entities, like state-controlled licensing boards, can claim state action immunity. Such immunity authorizes a state to carry out certain legitimate government functions, often in regulated industries that require licensing.

“Many of these state certifications don’t violate antitrust law and that’s because of this doctrine that displaces antitrust law,” said Jesse Markham, a partner at Baker & Miller PLLC’s San Francisco office. “And that’s why these certification requirements exist with impunity.”

In 2015, the Supreme Court ruled in North Carolina State Board of Dental Examiners v. FTC that the state board was operated by market participants. Without active supervision from the state, the board couldn’t claim state action immunity from federal antitrust actions.

The ruling unleashed “dozens of lawsuits"—seeking antitrust treble damages—against individual members of licensing boards, according an October 2020 statement from Reps. Mike Conaway (R-Texas), Jamie Raskin (D-Md.), and David Cicilline (D-R.I.) in support of a bill they introduced to shield board members from such suits.

Qualifying for state action immunity largely depends on whether a board is a true government actor or a private market participant. But this delineation becomes more complex if there’s a blurred line between a state agency handling its own actions or a private group acting under state guidance.

How the FTC handles that blurred line will be one issue the agency tackles as it implements the president’s order.

#### Court rulings on Parker empirically deny disad links

Grossman 15 [Jonathan M. Grossman, co-chair at Cozen O’Connor, Harvard Law School, J.D., 2000, 2-25-2015 https://www.cozen.com/news-resources/publications/2015/supreme-court-delivers-another-blow-to-state-action-antitrust-immunity]

Supreme Court Delivers another Blow to State Action Antitrust Immunity

Today’s Supreme Court decision in North Carolina State Board of Dental Examiners v. Federal Trade Commission1 is the second time in two years that the Court has spoken on the state action exemption to the federal antitrust laws, and the Court once again has made it clear that the days of an expansive interpretation of that exemption are over.

Under the state action exemption, which is based on the principles of state sovereign immunity, restraints imposed by a state as an act of government are exempt from federal antitrust laws. Parker v. Brown, 317 U.S. 341 (1943). Private parties carrying out a state’s regulatory program are also immune as long as the private party: 1) is acting pursuant to a “clearly articulated and affirmatively expressed … state policy;” and 2) is “actively supervised by the state itself.” Cal. Retail Liquor Dealers Ass'n v. Midcal Aluminum, 445 U.S. 97 (1980).

Today’s decision in NC Dental and the 2013 Supreme Court decision in Phoebe Putney2 each focused on one of the two prongs of the Midcal test, and each decision will have the effect of making it more difficult to extend the exemption beyond the state itself.

In NC Dental, the Court focused on the “active supervision” requirement and concluded that the North Carolina Board of Dental Examiners (the Board) did not meet that test. The controversy began in 2003 when non-dentists in North Carolina began to offer teeth-whitening services. The Board, which is designed as a state agency by statute, consisted of six licensed dentists, one licensed dental hygienist, and one consumer member; with the dentists and dental hygienists elected by their peers and the consumer member appointed by the governor of the state. The Board issued nearly 50 cease-and-desist letters to non-dentist providers that effectively resulted in the end of non-dentists providing teeth-whitening services in the state. In 2010, the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) issued an administrative complaint against the Board alleging that it had violated the FTC Act by excluding the non-dentist teeth-whitening providers. The Board argued that it was acting as a state agency and thus immune from federal antitrust laws. The FTC issued a final order against the Board and enjoined it from issuing further extrajudicial orders to teeth-whitening providers in North Carolina. The 4th Circuit denied the Board’s subsequent petition seeking review of the FTC order.3

In affirming the 4th Circuit decision, the Supreme Court held that a state board on which a controlling number of decision makers are active market participants in the occupation the board regulates must satisfy Midcal’s active supervision requirement in order to invoke antitrust immunity under the state action exemption. The Court noted that “when a State empowers a group of active market participants to decide who can participate in its market, and on what terms, the need for supervision is manifest.” Furthermore, while the Board did not argue that it was actively supervised by the state, the Court concluded its decision by reiterating the requirements of active state supervision: (1) the substance of the anti-competitive decision must be reviewed by a state supervisor; (2) the state supervisor must have the power to veto or modify decisions to ensure that they align with state policy; (3) the “mere potential for state supervision” is not a sufficient substitute for an actual decision by the state; and (4) the state supervisor may not be an active market participant.

The 2013 Phoebe Putney decision focused on the “clear articulation” prong of Midcal. That case arose out of a merger of a for-profit hospital with a hospital owned and operated by a county hospital authority (Authority), which was created by the state legislature but operated independently of the state government. The FTC alleged that the transaction was technically structured as an acquisition of the for-profit by the Authority, in a specific attempt to take advantage of the state action exemption. The 11th Circuit observed that Georgia’s Hospital Authorities Law granted hospital authorities the power to “operate projects” including hospitals, to “make and execute contracts and other instruments necessary to exercise the[ir] powers,” and to “acquire by purchase, lease or otherwise … projects.” Based on this broad language, the 11th Circuit found that the legislation clearly indicated that the Georgia Legislature anticipated that the powers it granted to the Authority would produce anti-competitive effects, and thus were a foreseeable result of the legislation and sufficient to meet the Midcal “clear articulation” test. The Supreme Court reversed, holding that the Georgia Legislature did not clearly articulate or affirmatively express a state policy to displace competition in the market for hospital services. The Court noted that the Authority needed to show not just that it had been delegated authority to act, but also that it was authorized to act or regulate in an anti-competitive manner.

The combined effect of NC Dental and Phoebe Putney is that any regulatory body that is not clearly part of the executive branch of a state will have a significantly higher burden to take advantage of the state action exemption. This will require state governments to review and reconsider the structure and procedures of such bodies and should force the bodies themselves to carefully consider whether the state action exemption applies before taking any action that might implicate the federal antitrust laws.

It will also mean that industry participants regulated by such quasi-governmental bodies likely will be emboldened to challenge more adverse actions in court. Given the prevalence of quasi-government entities in states – many of which include market participants – and that they regulate a wide variety of industries including energy, professional services, health care, transportation, and many others, these decisions will likely have significant policy and legal implications for years to come.

#### Only federal legal remedies solve – failure to explicitly narrow Parker over-immunizes private entities and chills state action

Weber 16 [Jayme Weber, University of Arizona, James E. Rogers College of Law, J.D., 2016 https://www.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/pubs/pdf/teladoc-285th-cir-29.pdf]

III. REFUSING SELF-INTERESTED BOARDS IMMUNITY FROM ANTITRUST LIABILITY IS FULLY CONSISTENT WITH FEDERALISM

“Federal antitrust law . . . is ‘as important to the preservation of economic freedom and our free-enterprise system as the Bill of Rights is to the protection of our fundamental personal freedoms.’” Dental Exam’rs, 135 S. Ct. at 1109 (quoting United States v. Topco Assocs., Inc., 405 U.S. 596, 610 (1972)). Every business, regardless of its size, is guaranteed the freedom “to assert with vigor, imagination, devotion, and ingenuity whatever economic muscle it can muster.” Topco, 405 U.S. at 610. Antitrust laws—particularly the Sherman Act—are “the Magna Carta of free enterprise,” and play a crucial role in upholding the national policy of economic freedom for anyone wishing to compete in the marketplace. Id.

In line with this national policy, the states clearly have an interest in preventing anticompetitive behavior and fostering robustly competitive markets within and across their borders. State governments also have an interest in reserving the ability to create regulatory subdivisions to which they can delegate some of their authority to accomplish specific tasks. At times, the states may deem it appropriate to design a regulatory body to deliberately exempt it from antitrust laws to achieve a specialized purpose.

States may confer antitrust liability on regulatory bodies—but only under certain conditions. Applying the state-action immunity doctrine too broadly and giving private actors a limitless ability to claim antitrust immunity for themselves would empower state-created cartels to “make economic choices counseled solely by their own parochial interests and without regard to their anticompetitive effects,” disrupting the free enterprise system that protects the national policy of economic freedom. Lafayette, 435 U.S. at 408.

Furthermore, broad application of the Parker-immunity doctrine would actually undermine the states’ ability to effectively delegate authority to specialized or local regulatory bodies by endowing these bodies with an antitrust immunity that state governments may have never meant to give them. “Neither federalism nor political responsibility is well-served by a rule that essential national policies are displaced by state regulations intended to achieve more limited ends.” Ticor, 504 U.S. at 636. The doctrine enables states to create regulatory subdivisions that do not interfere with the interest in preserving the benefits of competition. By “adhering in most cases to fundamental and accepted assumptions about the benefits of competition within the framework of the antitrust laws,” courts actually increase rather than diminish the states’ regulatory flexibility. Id. State legislatures may wish to make broad delegations of authority to their political subdivisions in order to maximize the benefits of the specialized governance those bodies offer— but that does not necessarily mean that state legislatures always want to give those entities the ability to violate the federal antitrust laws.

“When a state grants power to an inferior entity, it presumably grants the power to do the thing contemplated, but not to do so anticompetitively.” Phillip E. Areeda & Herbert Hovenkamp, Antitrust Law ¶ 225a, at 131 (3d ed. 2006). Relying on the backdrop of the national policy favoring competition, states may enact such broad delegations that are nevertheless intended to create specific and narrow, rather than general and wide-reaching, regulatory schemes. Giving regulatory agencies state-action immunity too readily would undermine states’ ability to do so, creating the hazard that legislatures will inadvertently authorize anticompetitive conduct. State legislatures cannot possibly anticipate every potential anticompetitive consequence of these delegations of authority and explicitly disavow antitrust immunity for every one. “‘No legislature . . . can be expected to catalog all of the anticipated effects’ of a statute delegating authority to a substate governmental entity.” Phoebe Putney, 133 S. Ct. at 1012 (quoting Hallie, 471 U.S. at 43).

If a state intends a specific anticompetitive result, it may clearly articulate that result—or make it plainly foreseeable, see id. at 1011—giving voters the chance to oppose immunity-creating legislation before it becomes law and making it easier to hold legislators accountable. Otherwise, states would be impeded in their freedom of action because they would have to act “in the shadow of state-action immunity whenever they enter[ed] the realm of economic regulation.” Ticor, 504 U.S. at 636. The limited and careful application of the state-action immunity doctrine gives states the most freedom in delegating power and crafting regulatory entities, ensuring legislatures that they will not accidentally confer immunity and allow regulatory bodies to go rogue with anticompetitive conduct that deviates from the states’ interest of preserving robust marketplace competition for the benefit of their residents.

# 2AC

## Innovation

### Innovation – A2: Link Turn – 2AC

#### Err aff – entrenched businesses are fundamentally self-interested in their defense of regs – it blocks innovation

Cooper 17 [James C. Cooper, Associate Professor of Law and Director, Program on Economics & Privacy, Antonin Scalia Law School, George Mason University 11-13- 2017, https://regproject.org/wp-content/uploads/RTP-Antitrust-Consumer-Protection-Working-Group-Paper-Occupational-Licensing.pdf]

Executive Summary

Every state has occupational licensing laws or regulations, which require individuals seeking to offer a certain service to the public first to obtain approval from the state. These laws and regulations raise numerous issues, including the economic freedom problems identified by the State and Local Working Group.1 This Paper focuses specifically upon the competitive implications of such regulations.

Occupational licensing requirements historically derive from a desire to protect unwitting consumers from bad actors. They were typically confined to professions where consumers struggled to ascertain the purported professional’s actual expertise and ability — and where the consumer’s misperceptions could have significant negative consequences. Thus, professions like medical and legal have long had self-imposed licensing regimes. The competitive concerns with occupational licensing generally do not arise at this fundamental level, when reasonable requirements directly tied to ensuring basic quality standards are established.

When, however, incumbents wield licensing requirements not as a defensive shield to protect consumers but as an offensive sword to exclude new entrants, serious concerns regarding the competitive implications of the licensing schemes arise. Self-interested incumbents have incentives that may differ from consumers, and these self-interested incumbents can — and sometimes do — impose requirements that do not enhance quality, but rather restrict output, increase prices, and hamper innovation. In other words, occupational licensing regimes can be contorted into schemes that exclude competitors and, in doing so, harm the very consumers they purport to protect. The likelihood of such abuses has increased tremendously in recent decades, as the number of licensed professions in the United States has skyrocketed:

Simultaneously, as new technologies and innovations have proliferated, these concerns have become increasingly pronounced.3 Today, incumbents relying upon older technologies frequently attempt to combat disruptive new entrants by imposing upon them licensing restrictions that are often outdated, irrelevant, or do not make sense to apply to the novel goods or services. For example, self-interested incumbents have established rules that would prevent the operation of innovative entrants and limit patients’ access to board-certified physicians in the state of Texas — a result particularly harmful in Texas, where there is a severe physician shortage.4

## Federalism

## T

### Prohibitions – Must be Practice – 2AC

#### We meet – Parker determines reach of prohibitions

Prelogar 21 [Louisiana Real Estate Appraisers Board Supreme Court Amicus Brief, Petitioner V. Federal Trade Commission On Petition For A Writ Of Certiorari To The United States Court Of Appeals For The Fifth Circuit Brief For The Respondent In Opposition James Reilly Dolan Acting General Counsel Joel Marcus Deputy General Counsel For Litigation Mark S. Hegedus Attorney Federal Trade Commission Washington, D.C. 20580 Elizabeth B. Prelogar Acting Solicitor General Counsel Of Record Brian M. Boynton Acting Assistant Attorney General Mark B. Stern Daniel Winik Attorneys https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/20/20-1018/171956/20210315160845386\_20-1018%20LREAB.pdf

As the court of appeals correctly held, “a judicial decision at this point would not resolve an issue ‘completely separate from the merits of the action,’ as required by the second prong of the collateral order doctrine.” Pet. App. 13a. The state-action doctrine reflects this Court’s interpretation of the substantive “reach” of the federal antitrust laws, ibid. (citation omitted), and “to ask what conduct [a statute] reaches is to ask what conduct [it] prohibits, which is a merits question,” Morrison v. National Austl. Bank Ltd., 561 U.S. 247, 254 (2010). Thus, far from being “completely separate from the merits of the action,” Will, 546 U.S. at 349 (citations omitted), a state-action ruling is a merits determination.

This Court’s decisions confirm that understanding. The Court has consistently framed the state-action inquiry in terms of whether antitrust law “prohibit[s]” the defendant’s conduct. Parker v. Brown, 317 U.S. 341, 352 (1943); see, e.g., City of Columbia v. Omni Outdoor Adver., Inc., 499 U.S. 365, 374 (1991) (“prohibit”); Patrick v. Burget, 486 U.S. 94, 99 (1988) (“prohibits”); Southern Motor Carriers Rate Conference, Inc. v. United States, 471 U.S. 48, 55 (1985) (“prohibit”); Community Commc’ns Co. v. City of Boulder, 455 U.S. 40, 48 (1982) (“prohibited”). The Court has described the state-action doctrine as an “implied exemption to the antitrust laws,” Southern Motor Carriers, 471 U.S. at 55 n.18, with “‘state action’” lying “outside the reach of the antitrust laws,” New Motor Vehicle Bd. v. Orrin W. Fox Co., 439 U.S. 96, 109 (1978) (citations omitted); see Goldfarb v. Virginia State Bar, 421 U.S. 773, 791-792 (1975) (because the state-action doctrine did not apply, the defendant’s conduct was not “beyond the reach of the Sherman Act”). And the Court has equated a determination that the state-action doctrine applies with a determination that the defendant’s conduct “did not violate” federal antitrust law. Cantor v. Detroit Edison Co., 428 U.S. 579, 589 (1976) (plurality opinion); see California Retail Liquor Dealers Ass’n v. Midcal Aluminum, Inc., 445 U.S. 97, 104 (1980) (“not violate”); Goldfarb, 421 U.S. at 788 (“not a violation”).

#### Prohibitions hamper business-as-usual

**Ward 21** --- Christine Ward, judge on the Allegheny County Court of Common Pleas, COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA, 3/22/2021, https://www.leechtishman.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/Ungarean-Opinion.pdf

This Court is not persuaded by Defendant’s argument that, in order to be entitled to Civil Authority coverage, the action of civil authority must be a complete and total prohibition of all access to Plaintiff’s property by any person for any reason. If this Court were to accept Defendant’s cramped interpretation of the phrase “prohibits access,” it would result in businesses being precluded from coverage in **nearly every instance** where an action of civil authority **effectively closes** the business to the vast majority of the general public, but does not necessarily preclude employees, or certain other individuals, from entering the premises to clean, maintain the building, obtain important documents, or to perform other similar functions, which, while important, remain secondary to the activities that actually generate business income.

Once again this Court notes the importance of reading the insurance contract’s provisions as a whole so that all of its parts fit together. In so doing, this Court recognizes that the insurance contract provisions at issue are generally designed to provide business owners with coverage for lost busines income in the event that their business’ operations are suspended. Accordingly, this Court’s primary focus when interpreting the phrase “prohibits access,” at least in the context of this insurance contract, is the extent to which the action of civil authority prevented the insured from accessing its premises in a manner that would normally produce actual and regular business income. Given this understanding of the insurance contract, the fact that some employees, and even some limited number of patients, were still permitted to go to Plaintiff’s property for emergency procedures does not necessarily mean that Plaintiff is altogether precluded from coverage under the Civil Authority provision. The contract merely requires that “an action of civil authority . . . prohibits access to” Plaintiff’s property. **It does not clearly and unambiguously state that any such prohibition must completely and totally bar** all persons from **any form of access** to Plaintiff’s property **whatsoever**.

#### ACBP restricts competition

**SICE 21** (Foreign Trade Information System, “Dictionary of Trade Terms,” 2021, <http://www.sice.oas.org/dictionary/cp_e.asp>)

Anticompetitive practices A wide range of business practices in which a firm or group of firms may engage in order to restrict inter-firm competition to maintain or increase their **relative market** position and profits without necessarily providing goods and services at a lower cost or of higher quality. These practices include **price fixing** and other **cartel arrangements**, abuses of a **dominant position** or **monopolization**, mergers that **limit competition** and **vertical agreements** that foreclose markets to new competitors.

#### We meet

Sandefur 14 [Timothy Sandefur, Vice President for Litigation at the Goldwater Institute's Scharf-Norton Center for Constitutional Litigation 2014 https://www.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/serials/files/regulation/2014/10/regulationv37n3-4.pdf]

If federal law is to prohibit restraints on competition and conspiracies against trade, those prohibitions should presumptively apply to everyone equally, and particularly in cases in which state laws are used to block competition. As James Madison observed in The Federalist, a legal system that exempts the government from rules that apply to ordinary citizens undermines “the communion of interests and sympathy of sentiments … without which every government degenerates into tyranny.” If Americans ever became so “debased” as to “tolerate a law not obligatory on the legislature, as well as on the people,” he warned, “the people will be prepared to tolerate any thing but liberty.” This is not a merely rhetorical concern; state-established cartels tend to reward privileged insiders against entrepreneurs who lack political influence and thus to perpetuate a class system that blocks the route to economic independence for those who need it most.

Parker immunity should thus be limited not only to cases in which state officials carefully oversee the regulations at issue, and—contrary to Southern Motor Carriers—in which states actually require anticompetitive behavior, but also where the restriction on competition passes a meaningful constitutional test. Although the North Carolina case involves antitrust statutes instead of constitutional claims, the issues are identical: where established firms wield government power, they have a strong incentive to do so in ways that restrict competition, harm consumers, and block entrepreneurs from exercising their right to earn a living. Courts must shed their infatuation with federalism in the realm of antitrust immunity and adopt a strict rule limiting such immunity to cases where states explicitly choose to restrict competition, carefully supervise those who do so, and do so for legitimate reasons. Today’s more permissive rules allow states far too much discretion to establish cartels and block entrepreneurs—who have no realistic political protection against vested interests that exploit Parker immunity—from their constitutional right to earn a living. The substantial advancement test already used in several areas of constitutional law would give states enough flexibility to restrain trade where doing so is legitimate, while ensuring that entrepreneurs are not left at the mercy of the very firms that have the strongest interest in barring them from competition

## K

### 2AC – SAI – Short

#### Link is reductionist and can’t explain US-EU divergences

Foster 19 [Chase Michael Foster was a Doctoral Candidate at Harvard University at the time of this dissertation. The author has served as a Election Observer (OSCE, ODIHR) in Moldova, Belarus, Russia, Georgia and as a Teaching Assistant at the Harvard Kennedy School of Government. At the time of this writing, the author held a MPP (Democracy, Politics, and Institutions) from the Harvard Kennedy School of Government. “The Politics of Delegation: Constitutional Structure, Bureaucratic Discretion, and the Development of Competition Policy in the United States and the European Union, 1890-2017” – Doctoral dissertation to The Department of Government, Harvard University, Graduate School of Arts & Sciences. In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the subject of Government - January 2019 - #E&F –https://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/41121359/FOSTER-DISSERTATION-2019.pdf?sequence=1]

Ideational Theories

Any analysis of the change in antitrust enforcement over time must begin with a consideration of ideas. Most of the existing social scientific scholarship on competition policy emphasizes the role of changing economic paradigms in spurring the transformation of European and American competition policy. A number of scholars of American antitrust have explained the dramatic decrease in antitrust enforcement as stemming from the shift in authority from lawyers to economists at the antitrust agencies (Eisner 1991). Others have emphasized the institutionalization of Chicago School-inspired economic ideas within antitrust jurisprudence (Ergen and Kohl 2017; Davies 2010; Pitofsky 2008). Both of these sets of accounts capture an important component of the shift. As theories of economic efficiency changed in the US academy during the 1960's and 1970's, much of the postwar enforcement program was delegitimized. Beginning in the early 1970's, both the prevailing judicial opinion on antitrust and the enforcement program of the antitrust agencies dramatically shift, leading to a precipitous drop in enforcement output, especially in areas such as vertical restraints, monopolies, and exclusionary practices.

The increase in the intensity of European enforcement has also been explained as the result of ideational change. Some EU scholars have argued that the institutionalization of neoliberal economic ideas in European regulatory law has led to the intensification of regulatory enforcement (Thatcher 2013; Buch-Hansen and Wigger 2010; Wigger 2008). Concomitant to the Single European Act, the European competition directorate began to more intensely apply competition rules, and to shift its enforcement focus to state aid, publicly-owned companies, and the promotion of competition in previously protected network industries (Quack and Djelic 2005). During the late 1990's, competition law modernization led to a more neoliberal approach to the evaluation of market competition, while also expanding the breadth and intensity of enforcement (Wigger and Nolke 2007).

While each of these accounts points to some of the real ways that ideational change affected competition policy in each system, there are problems with explaining opposite trends as the result of the same paradigm shift. An ideas-only approach leaves us in the awkward position of explaining both the increase in the intensity of competition enforcement in the EU and the decrease in antitrust enforcement in the US as resulting from the same (or similar) neoliberal policy paradigm. While any analysis of competition policy developments must account for ideational change, we need to understand why the same set of ideas has produced different patterns of enforcement in Europe and the United States.

Additionally, there are empirical gaps in the ideational explanation. Certainly, the influence of the Chicago School cannot account for why US regulators have failed to follow much of the neoliberal prescription for liberalization and industrial policy. Chicago School economists, after all, have long supported the application of antitrust in these areas (Van I lorn 2015; McChesney 1986; Bork 1978). Moreover, there is no shortage of classically-trained economists in the European competition system.

#### Alt fails---transition is impossible and causes conflict. Even if transition occurs, it doesn’t solve

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.

#### Cap’s sustainable and ensures global prosperity and environmental protection

Rhonheimer 20—teaching professor at the Pontifical University of the Holy Cross (Martin, “Capitalism is Good for the Poor – and for the Environment,” <https://austrian-institute.org/en/subjects-en/catholic-social-doctrine-2/capitalism-is-good-for-the-poor-and-for-the-environment/>, dml)

It is not social policy but capitalism that has created today’s prosperity.

What is important is that what made today’s mass prosperity possible – a phenomenon unprecedented in history – was not social policy or social legislation, organised trade union pressure, or corrective interventions in the capitalist economy, but rather market capitalism itself, due to its enormous potential for innovation and the ever-increasing productivity of human labour that resulted from it.

Increasing prosperity and quality of life are always the result of increasing labour productivity. Only increased productivity enabled higher social standards, better working conditions, the overcoming of child labour, a higher level of education, and the emergence of human capital. This process of increasing triumph over poverty and the constantly rising living standards of the general masses is taking place on a global scale – but only where the market economy and capitalist entrepreneurship are able to spread.

From industrial overexploitation of nature to ecological awareness

The first phase of industrialisation and capitalism was characterised by an enormous consumption of resources and frequent overexploitation of nature, which soon gave the impression that this process could not be sustainable. Since the end of the 19th century, disaster and doom scenarios have repeatedly been put forward, but in retrospect they have proved to be wrong: The combination of technological innovation, market competition, and entrepreneurial profit-seeking (with the compulsion to constantly minimise costs) have meant that these scenarios never occurred. The ever-increasing population has been increasingly better supplied thanks to innovative technologies, ever-increasing output with lower consumption of resources less harmful to the environment – e.g. less arable land in agriculture, or oil and electricity instead of coal for rapidly increasing mobility. More recent disaster scenarios, such as those spread by reputable scientists since the late 1960s and in the 1970s, have also proved to be inaccurate.

The reason things developed differently was the always underestimated innovative dynamism of the capitalist market economy, a growing ecological awareness and, as a result, legislative intervention that took advantage of the logic of market capitalism: As a result of the ecological movement that had come out of the United States since 1970, wise legislation began to use the price mechanism to apply market incentives to internalize negative externalities. Environmental pollution was given a price-tag.

This led to an enormous decrease in air pollution and other ecological consequences of growth, which is only possible in free, market-based societies, because the production process here is characterized by competition and constant pressure to reduce costs, i.e. to the most profitable use of resources. On the other hand, all forms of socialism, i.e. a state-controlled economy, have proved to be ecological disasters and have left behind destruction of gigantic proportions, without providing the population with anything that is near comparable in prosperity, often even by destroying existing prosperity, such as happened in Venezuela.

Capitalist profit motive combined with digitalization as a solution: Increasing decoupling of growth and resource consumption

Moreover, technological innovations combined with capitalist profit-seeking and market competition have led to a new and surprising phenomenon over the past decades, which is still hardly noticed in the public debate: the decoupling of growth and resource consumption (“dematerialization”). In a wide variety of industrial sectors, the developed countries, above all the U.S., are now achieving ever greater productive output with increasingly fewer resources. This has a lot to do with technology, especially the digitalization of the economy and of our entire lives.

As the well-known MIT professor Andrew McAfee shows in his book More from Less, published in October 2019, this process also follows the logic of capitalist profit maximization. To get it going, we do not need politics, even though wise, properly incentivizing legislation can be helpful and sometimes necessary. Above all, however, it is the combination of technological innovation, capitalist profit-seeking, and market-based entrepreneurial competition that will also solve the problem of man-made global warming.

In addition, property rights and their protection are decisive for the careful use of natural resources. And where this is not possible, legal support for collective self-governing structures, in accordance with the principle of subsidiarity, are important—as is analysed by Nobel Economic Prize winner Elinor Ostrom. By contrast, the growing ideologically motivated anti-capitalist eco-activism, and the policies influenced by it, are leading in the wrong direction, distracting precisely from what would be best for the climate and the environment—and distracting us from what could help protect us against the inevitable consequences of global warming.

### Movement

#### No one will join their movement

Buch-Hansen, 18—Department of Business and Politics, Copenhagen Business School (Hubert, “The Prerequisites for a Degrowth Paradigm Shift: Insights from Critical Political Economy,” Ecological Economics Volume 146, April 2018, Pages 157-163, dml)

6. Consent

It is also safe to say that degrowth enjoys no “passive consent” from the majority of the population. For the time being, degrowth remains unknown to most people. Yet, if it were to become generally known, most people would probably not find the vision of a smaller economic system appealing. This is not just a matter of degrowth being ‘a missile word that backfires’ because it triggers negative feelings in people when they first hear it (Drews and Antal, 2016). It is also a matter of the actual content of the degrowth project.

Two issues in particular should be mentioned in this context. First, for many, the anti-capitalist sentiments embodied in the degrowth project will inevitably be a difficult pill to swallow. Today, the vast majority of people find it almost impossible to conceive of a world without capitalism. There is a ‘widespread sense that not only is capitalism the only viable political and economic system, but also that it is now impossible to even imagine a coherent alternative to it’ (Fisher, 2009: 2). As Jameson (2003) famously observed, it is, in a sense, easier to imagine the end of the world than it is to imagine the end of capitalism. However, not only is degrowth – like other anti-capitalist projects – up against the challenge that most people consider capitalism the only system that can function; it is also up against the additional challenge that it speaks against economic growth in a world where the desirability of growth is considered common sense.

Second, degrowth is incompatible with the lifestyles to which many of us who live in rich countries have become accustomed. Economic growth in the Western world is, to no small extent, premised on the existence of consumer societies and an associated consumer culture most of us find it difficult to completely escape. In this culture, social status, happiness, well-being and identity are linked to consumption (Jackson, 2009). Indeed, it is widely considered a natural right to lead an environmentally unsustainable lifestyle – a lifestyle that includes car ownership, air travel, spacious accommodations, fashionable clothing, an omnivorous diet and all sorts of electronic gadgets. This Western norm of consumption has increasingly been exported to other parts of the world, the result being that never before have so many people taken part in consumption patterns that used to be reserved for elites (Koch, 2012). If degrowth were to be institutionalised, many citizens in the rich countries would have to adapt to a materially lower standard of living. That is, while the basic needs of the global population can be met in a non-growing economy, not all wants and preferences can be fulfilled (Koch et al., 2017). Undoubtedly, many people in the rich countries would experience various limitations on their consumption opportunities as a violent encroachment on their personal freedom. Indeed, whereas many recognize that contemporary consumer societies are environmentally unsustainable, fewer are prepared to actually change their own lifestyles to reverse/address this.

## Regs CP

### Regulation CP – 2AC

#### Perm – do the counterplan – not functionally competitive – wrecks aff ground and justifies worst normal means counterplans like the 9-0 counterplan

Robinhood 20 [Robinhood Financial LLC. “What are Antitrust Laws?”. 10-6-20. https://learn.robinhood.com/articles/4x5oCZOtg43uORfxEnxPRW/what-are-antitrust-laws/]

Antitrust laws are regulations that aim to promote fair business competition in an open market and protect consumers by banning certain predatory practices.

## States

### States CP – Regulate X – 2AC

## Trade DA

### Trade DA – 2AC

#### Global antitrust inevitable and thumps

Luniku 14 [Rubin. Ph.D. candidate in Economics, Wayne State University, “The Effects Of Competition Policy Changes On International Trade And Export Flows: Canada Case Estimates.” (2014). Wayne State University Dissertations. Paper 901. https://digitalcommons.wayne.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1900&context=oa\_dissertations]

Actually, approximately 113 countries have some type of competition law. About 83 of these laws took effect during the last two decades. This trend is likely to continue as more countries adopt competition laws and increase their enforcement in the future. Several countries have entered into either reciprocal or multilateral agreements to cooperate on competition policies and their enforcement. For example, U.S. has entered into bilateral agreements on procedural cooperation with Germany (1976), Australia (1982), EC (1991, 1998), Canada (1984 revised in 1995). Lately, the relations between E.U. and U.S. enforcement authorities have progressed toward a slow but steady convergence of review and mutual respect.

## Overstretch

### FTC OS – 2AC

#### No link – FTC capacity is high and already closely review state immunity cases

Crane 16 [Daniel A. Crane Frederick Paul Furth Sr. Professor of Law, University of Michigan Law School Adam Hester J.D., May 2016, University of Michigan Law School, 2016, State-Action Immunity and Section 5 of the FTC Act, 115 MICH. L. REV. 365, https://repository.law.umich.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1510&context=mlr]

B. Institutional Constraints and Capacities

Beyond the core concerns about the anti-democratic and pro-laissez faire tendencies of economic substantive due process, there lurk questions about institutional constraints and capacities. Allowing the Sherman Act to become an aggressive anti-regulatory charter would pose considerable risks of unwieldy and excessive challenges to state regulatory regimes and state sovereignty, since the Sherman Act is privately enforceable.251 Further, the federal courts may lack the expertise and fact-finding processes to make well-informed decisions over whether state regulatory decisions reflect exercises of police power in the public interest, or, rather, naked pork-barreling for the benefit of concentrated economic interests. On these scores, FTC enforcement under Section 5 of the FTC Act enjoys a considerable advantage over the Sherman Act.

First, Section 5 of the FTC Act is enforceable only by the FTC, not by private plaintiffs.252 Superior preemption under Section 5 would not lead to a flood of private challenges against state regulations, nor would it injure state interests by forcing the states to constantly defend anti-regulatory actions by private interests. (Recall that Parker itself involved a private challenge to state law, as have many of the important state-action immunity cases since).253 Rather, preemption of state law would depend on an administrative decision by a majority of the FTC commissioners to bring an action or otherwise declare a state law preempted. Preemption would not flow directly from the statute, but from a decision of the FTC to enforce the statute in a particular context. The burden of the intrusion on federalism interests and state sovereignty would therefore be considerably lower than if the Sherman Act were read to directly preempt anticompetitive state laws, permitting private plaintiffs to seek invalidation of state laws whenever the laws infringed on competition.

Second, and relatedly, the FTC enjoys a much greater capacity to evaluate the range of competing interests entailed by state regulations than does a federal court. Not only does the commission employ a large staff of expert economists,254 but it wields broad investigatory powers to investigate trade conditions through mandatory processes such as document requests and depositions.255 The FTC already serves the states in a consultative capacity, giving advice on proposed legislation and engaging in competition advocacy by issuing reports on various competition issues or intervening as amicus curiae in litigation.256 Unlike generalist federal courts, the FTC has the capacity to study the competitive effects and justifications for state regulatory schemes, consult formally or informally with state officials and other interested parties, and bring to bear its economic expertise in mediating competing claims about the effects of regulations on consumers or other interests.

#### Lots of thumpers

Zakrzewski 8-19 (Cat Zakrzewski, technology policy reporter at The Washington Post, covers antitrust, privacy and the debate over regulating social media companies, former reporter for Wall Street Journal Pro Venture Capital, BS Journalism, Northwestern University; **internally citing competition policy director at the consumer group Public Knowledge Charlotte Slaiman, and George Washington University professor and former FTC chair William Kovacic**; “Lina Khan’s first big test as FTC chief: Defining Facebook as a monopoly,” The Washington Post, 8-19-2021, https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2021/08/19/ftc-facebook-lawsuit-lina-khan-deadline/)

“There’s multiple signals that FTC is serious about doing their job of investigations and bringing these cases and fighting them hard,” said Charlotte Slaiman, competition policy director at the consumer group Public Knowledge.

Though the most significant, the Facebook case is but one of a wide range of issues on Khan’s plate. A month after she assumed office, the Biden administration issued a sweeping competition executive order, which called for her agency to take a tougher line on concentration throughout the economy.

So far, Khan has taken a series of steps to signal a shake-up has arrived at the FTC. She’s started hosting open meetings to open the agency’s business to the public, and she’s warned that greater scrutiny of mergers is on its way.

But the challenge will be for the agency to remain focused on the most important cases, including Facebook, Kovacic said. “She has a downpour of demands from both ends of the avenue,” he said.

And none of her other efforts will matter if she can’t show that she can win against companies, including Facebook, in court.

“The real measure to business decision-makers of your effectiveness and seriousness is your ability to prosecute and win cases,” Kovacic said.

#### No tradeoff – newest resolution creates more capacity

Gehl 9-24 (Kate, Senior Counsel for Foley and Lardner LLP, Elizabeth A. N. Haas, Partner, Alan D. Rutenberg, Partner, H. Holden Brooks, Partner, Benjamin R. Dryden, Partner, Foley and Lardner LLP“A Divided FTC Approves Omnibus Resolutions to Step Up Enforcement Actions and Votes to Withdraw the 2020 Vertical Merger Guidelines” [https://www.foley.com/en/insights/publications/2021/09/divided-ftc-approves-omnibus-resolutions Published 9-24-2021](https://www.foley.com/en/insights/publications/2021/09/divided-ftc-approves-omnibus-resolutions%20Published%209-24-2021), MSU-MJS)

According to the FTC’s press release, the resolutions are aimed at broadening its ability “to obtain evidence in critical investigations on key areas where the FTC’s work can make the most impact.” The resolutions also will purportedly permit the FTC to “better utilize its limited resources” to quickly investigate potential misconduct. The FTC views the resolutions as one method to increase efficiency at the FTC, which certain Commissioners believe has become necessary due to the “increased volume of investigatory work” caused by a “surge” in merger filings in recent months.

In practice, these resolutions allow a single Commissioner, instead of a majority of sitting Commissioners, to approve compulsory process requests in any investigation within the scope of the resolution for the next 10 years. What practical effect these resolutions will have remains to be seen; however, businesses engaged in conduct that may be implicated by the resolutions should be aware that FTC staff will now have an expedited ability to carry out compulsory process requests, which will very likely increase the number and scope of investigations conducted by the FTC.

#### Funding is normal means – AND boosts are coming

Byers 21 (Dylan Byers, senior media reporter for NBC News; **internally citing George Washington University professor and former FTC chair William Kovacic**; “Is Facebook untouchable? It's complicated,” NBC News, 7-1-2021, https://www.nbcnews.com/tech/tech-news/facebook-untouchable-complicated-rcna1323)

The House Judiciary Committee recently advanced six bills that would bolster the government's ability to regulate Big Tech. They range from simple budgeting measures — one would give more funding to the FTC and the Department of Justice for their antitrust enforcement efforts — to profound reforms — one that would stop platform companies from preferencing their products over those of their competitors and another that would make it illegal for companies to eliminate competitors through acquisitions.

This legislative package faces an arduous road ahead. House Majority Leader Steny Hoyer, who sets the House floor schedule, has said none of the six bills are ready for a vote, which suggests they don't have broad bipartisan support. If and when they do make it through the House, they face an even harder battle in the Senate.

"It's hard to imagine that the larger legislative package is accomplished this year," Kovacic said, though he predicted a few of the less-threatening bills — budgeting, for example — are likely to pass on their own.

"The funding for the FTC and DOJ antitrust divisions, it's nearly 100 percent likely that Congress will pass that law," he said. He said another bill, which would block the tech firms from moving court hearings to more favorable states, was also likely to pass.

#### Other entities can enforce.

Jones 20 [Alison Jones & William E. Kovacic, Jones is a professor at King’s College London; Kovacic is Global Competition Professor of Law and Policy, The George Washington University Law School, “Antitrust’s Implementation Blind Side: Challenges to Major Expansion of U.S. Competition Policy,” The Antitrust Bulletin, vol. 65, no. 2, SAGE Publications Inc, 06/01/2020, pp. 227–255]

C. Improving Capability: Agency Cooperation and Project Selection

The U.S. antitrust system is famous for its decentralization of the power to prosecute, giving many entities – public agencies (at both the federal and state levels), consumers, and businesses – competence to enforce the federal antitrust laws. The federal enforcement regime also coexists with state antitrust laws and with sectoral regulation, at the national and state levels, that include competition policy mandates.

The extraordinary decentralization and multiplicity of enforcement mechanisms supply valuable possibilities for experimentation and provide safeguards in case any single enforcement agent is ~~disabled~~ [hamstrung](e.g., due to capture, resource austerity, or corruption).75 Among public agencies, there is also the possibility that federal and state government institutions, while preserving the benefits of experimentation and redundancy, could improve performance through cooperation that allows them to perform tasks collectively that each could accomplish with great difficulty, or not at all, if they act in isolation. In the discussion below, we suggest approaches that preserve the multiplicity of actors in the existing U.S. regime but also promise to improve the performance of the entire system through better inter-agency cooperation – to integrate operations more fully “by contract” rather than a formal consolidation of functions in a smaller number of institutions.

### FTC OS – Biometric Privacy – 2AC

#### ZERO uniqueness – their ev’s about Khan’s wishlist – depends upon increased resources that don’t exist – GAFA focus thumps their impacts – AND multiple obstacles check implementation and effective enforcement

Rich et al 10-3-21 (Jessica Rich, Laura Riposo VanDruff, Alysa Z. Hutnik & William C. MacLeod, lawyers at Kelly Drye, “FTC Chair Khan’s Vision for Privacy – and Some Dissents,” 10-3-2021, https://www.adlawaccess.com/2021/10/articles/ftc-chair-khans-vision-for-privacy-competition-and-big-tech-and-some-dissents/)

Privacy/Competition Focus on Tech

First, Khan’s statement reiterates her commitment to address privacy through a “cross-disciplinary” approach that uses the tools of competition law, not just consumer protection law, to address privacy harms. She states that “concentrated control over data has enabled dominant firms to capture markets and erect entry barriers while commercial surveillance has allowed firms to identify and thwart emerging competitive threats,” resulting in reduced privacy.

To address these concerns, as outlined further in the report, the agency intends to focus “most” of its limited resources against the “data practices of dominant digital platforms,” including through additional compliance reviews and order modifications and enforcement, “as necessary,” against, for example, Facebook, Google, Microsoft, Twitter, and Uber.

The Report adds that (with more resources from Congress), the FTC also will prioritize:

Adtech and “Walled Garden” Advertising Practices, including:

“[B]usiness models that depend on expansive and potentially illegal data collection to fuel targeted advertising and user engagement,” and

“Exclusionary or predatory conduct by dominant digital platforms to defend their data troves, resulting in lower levels of privacy and data protections and more intrusive ads.”

Children’s Tech: “Platforms and other online services that are potentially violating COPPA, an area of particular importance given that many children may be increasingly relying on online services for both educational, entertainment, and social purposes during the pandemic.”

Other Privacy Considerations, such as data uses involving health, biometric, or other sensitive data, discriminatory algorithmic practices, or other deceptive or unfair data practices.

Even More Competition Focus on Tech:

Dominant digital platforms’ data practices that present both privacy and competition concerns due to their scope and size, and

“Acquisitions that allow dominant digital platforms to collect and control ever expanding data from consumers or block the development of more secure data protection policies.”

Privacy Rulemaking

Second, recognizing that competition may not always align with and fully address privacy concerns, Khan emphasizes the need for the FTC to use its rulemaking authority to codify baseline protections. In support of such rules, she cites a variety of factors that may mask how much consumers value their privacy and undermine their ability to make choices to protect it. These include the lack of competition among technology providers, “dark patterns” that manipulate and “nudge” users, and the inadequacies of the notice-and-consent framework. The report elaborates on this topic, stating that the FTC intends to develop new privacy rules (presumably under its inherent “Magnuson Moss” rulemaking authority) and strengthen existing ones, such as COPPA, Health Breach Notification (already expanded via policy statement as we discuss here), Red Flags, and GLB Safeguards. In other words, expect more rulemaking concerning privacy practices affecting children’s data, health, identity theft, and financial services (but likely with a much broader view of what these encompass based on the FTC’s recent activity).

New Data Use Restrictions

Third, Khan states that the FTC should consider “substantive limits,” rather than procedural protections and process requirements, in its privacy work. Here, she also discusses how behavioral ad-based business models can “incentivize constant surveillance, resulting in further mass aggregation of data, potentially heightening the risk of data privacy and security abuses—and further inviting us to consider a market-wide approach.” Her provocative discussion of behavioral advertising here (and multiple references to unlawful or intrusive surveillance on this topic) is significant, as it suggests that she intends to issue rules limiting or banning this practice, as urged in a recent petition to the FTC. Relatedly, the report states that the FTC will obtain stronger remedies in enforcement actions, including notifications to consumers when their data has been disclosed; provisions requiring companies to monitor and prevent identity theft and other privacy harms; deletion of algorithms, models, and data created or used illegally; and redress obtained in coordination with other federal and state agencies.

More Money

Finally, Khan cites the need for a substantial increase in resources to bring the FTC in line with international counterparts and enable the agency to recruit additional talent. The report elaborates on this goal, comparing the FTC’s privacy FTEs (40-45) to the UK’s (768) and stating the FTC needs about 100 more. (This point was also discussed in the Congressional hearing last week). According to the report, the FTC would use these resources for all of the activities discussed above, as well as a host of others, including conducting additional industry studies under Section 6(b) of the FTC Act; studying algorithms and bringing enforcement actions against algorithmic discrimination; hiring more technologists and subject matter experts; and addressing privacy and safety issues involving connected cars, health devices, stalking apps, and pornography platforms.

The report also reiterates the FTC’s call for federal privacy legislation, legislative clarification of the FTC’s authority to obtain consumer redress under Section 13(b), and removal of the common carrier and non-profit exceptions.

Is This News? Yes, and Here’s Why.

Many of the goals in Khan’s statement and the report are consistent with the FTC’s current authority and longstanding support for stronger federal laws and remedies. Robust injunctive and monetary relief, section 6(b) studies, vigorous order enforcement, and enhanced legislative authority and resources are all worthy goals that protect consumers and honest businesses and increase the agency’s effectiveness. However, as discussed in Commissioner Phillips’ dissent and Commissioner Wilson’s concurrence in part, dissent in part, some of them likely exceed the FTC’s statutory mandate and will run into serious obstacles when they are tested in court.

For example, as the Phillips and Wilson statements note, competition and privacy are governed by different laws with different remedies. To the extent that Khan seeks to conflate these laws and remedies, it could exceed the FTC’s authority. In addition, Phillips emphasizes that many of the goals and remedies cited by Khan and the report – including the references to “tackling [privacy] issues on a structural level” and potentially banning industry-wide practices through rulemaking – could “bar companies from engaging in legal conduct,” “let a majority of Commissioners run companies by regulatory fiat,” and usurp the role of Congress in weighing the “judgements and tradeoffs that will be required of privacy legislation…”

As mentioned in our blogpost last week, there are also many legal and practical obstacles to engaging in rulemaking of the type and number that Khan and the report appear to contemplate. Under Magnuson Moss rulemaking, the FTC must prove that any practice it seeks to regulate is unfair or deceptive, as well as prevalent. Magnuson Moss rulemaking also contains a slew of procedural steps that the agency must take (hearings, analyses, publications, etc.) and establishes a standard of judicial review that gives very little deference to the agency. These hurdles were imposed by Congress precisely because Congress was concerned about regulatory overreach in the 1970s. (For a little history tour, see “Stoning the National Nanny: Congress and the FTC in the late 1970s,” by former FTC Chairman Michael Pertschuk).

For all of these reasons, the FTC’s privacy (competition, and tech) agenda is certainly likely to face challenges. Congress could block or delay many of the bold regulatory moves being discussed now, especially as they relate to broad federal mandates banning conduct that, to date, has never been found to be illegal. Will Congress be willing to allocate additional resources to an agency that is reconceiving of itself and its privacy mandate? Will additional resources be enough to empower a new bureau of privacy without additional legal authority? How will the courts respond to the FTC’s ambitious efforts? If the Supreme Court’s AMG decision is any indication, the agency is likely to face judicial skepticism over some of these positions.

In the meantime, the road ahead appears to be filled with new rulemaking and investigations, potentially novel legal theories, and more litigation. Companies may need to make difficult decisions as they navigate these developments and consider whether to expend the resources necessary to challenge them in court. We will continue to monitor and report on developments as they occur.

## Court Politics

### Court Politics – 2AC

#### Won’t be inter-issue spillover

Redish 91 MARTIN H., Louis and Harriet Ancel Professor of Law and Public Policy, Northwestern University. ELIZABETH J., Law Clerk to Chief Judge William Bauer, United States Court of Appeals, Seventh Circuit. “CONSTITUTIONAL PERSPECTIVES: ARTICLE: "IF ANGELS WERE TO GOVERN": THE NEED FOR PRAGMATIC FORMALISM IN SEPARATION OF POWERS THEORY.”Duke Law Journal, 41 Duke L.J. 449, Lexis

Choper's assumption that the judiciary's institutional capital is transferable from structural cases to individual rights cases is no more credible. Common sense should tell us that the public's reaction to controversial individual rights cases -- for example, cases concerning abortion, n240 school prayer, n241 busing, n242 or criminal defendants' rights n243 -- will be based largely, if not exclusively, on the basis of its feelings concerning those particular issues. It is unreasonable to assume that the public's acceptance or rejection of these individual rights rulings would somehow be affected by anything the Court says about wholly unrelated structural issues.


#### Court politics is dead – solid 6-justice majority means there’s no swing and you can’t predict

Thomson-DeVeaux 10-20 [Amelia Thomson-DeVeaux is a senior writer for FiveThirtyEight., 10-20-2021 https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/the-roberts-court-vs-the-trump-court/]

But the conservative justices might still disagree with each other

That the court is increasingly tilting to the right, however, does not mean that the justices will deliver conservative victories on every high-profile issue — or that they’ll be unified about the best approach. Now that they have a solid six-justice majority, the GOP appointees have a new luxury or a new challenge, depending on how you look at it: They can disagree with each other.

That’s because for the first time in decades we’re not in a situation where a single swing justice controls the court. Instead, several justices are bunched together around the median.



Epstein said that between 2005 and 2017, when Justice Anthony Kennedy was the median justice, it was easier to foresee where the court would come down on a specific issue because in many cases where he was the deciding justice, his ideology was well-known. Similarly, when Roberts took over the role of swing justice around 2018, he appeared to take a more moderate stance in cases where the court’s institutional reputation was at stake. But now there are several potential “swing” justices. To produce an outcome that sides with the liberal justices, it now takes two conservative justices to defect in close cases. This makes it much harder to predict how the court will rule.

And fissures among the conservative justices could lead to some unpredictable and confusing outcomes. Consider the rate at which the justices joined the majority opinion last term. Even with a conservative majority, the GOP-appointed justices weren’t on the same page about every decision.

#### The Court ignores PC – they’ll deflect pressure or backlash

\*The media/GOP shield Court decisions – their ev is written by bad faith actors playing defense for right-wing justices

\*Court uses proceduralism to shield backlash – both to consequences of appearing too far right – also means the the link is false

Sewer 9-10 (Adam, staff writer @ the Atlantic, “A Strategy of Confusion,” 9/10/21, <https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2021/09/republicans-strategy-confusion/620029/)//NRG> \*edit in brackets [] to clarify the noun

“If this were New York passing a law creating a private right for citizens to sue someone for having a gun, the Court would step in in a heartbeat,” Adam Winkler, a law professor at UCLA, told me. “I don't think there's any doubt that the Court’s decison to allow Texas’s law to stand was a reflection of the justices’ belief that abortion is not a constitutionally protected right.” The notion that no harm was done here is risible—it is simply that the Texas law’s defenders are pleased with the outcome. Patients are already being turned away from clinics; those with the means to do so are going to other states for treatment, even though it is unclear whether the law allows the people who help them to be sued regardless. The Court’s supposedly narrow ruling also dissuades abortion providers from setting up a legal challenge to a law that is plainly unconstitutional under current precedent. These providers could just keep providing services and wait to be sued—mooting the weak procedural rationale on which the current majority opinion relies. But now that a majority of the Court has indicated that it no longer considers abortion a constitutional right, doing so would risk validating the Texas law rather than overturning it. “The Court's pretense that it's not sure it could do anything … is akin to someone pretending they're locked in a room while they themselves are holding the key all along,” Aderson Francois, a law professor at Georgetown University, told me. “It seems to me we've reached a point where we don't have to pretend that the Court is intellectually honest. It's not.” The Texas law’s critics have seized on its perverse social incentive—bribing Texans to inform on one another—as potentially creating a nightmare scenario, a kind of privatized surveillance state. But if no one ever sued, the law might avoid challenge and still achieve its objective, with the added reward of the law’s supporters being able to again characterize its critics as hysterical for accurately describing their means and ends. Of course, once you deputize the citizenry to seek bounties on one another, you can’t control who takes you up on the offer. The point of hiding behind proceduralism is to minimize political backlash by drawing muddled coverage of the decision. As Irin Carmon writes at New York magazine, the justices have “decided to confuse us with process.” Their political allies in the Republican establishment got the message, and are dutifully repeating it. This does not mean that Republicans are necessarily fearful of the political consequences of overturning Roe. The long-term Republican strategy—as opposed to that of the anti-abortion movement—has always involved cultivating a degree of uncertainty about the party’s objectives in order to minimize the political backlash. Few Americans support allowing abortions with no restrictions, but even fewer support outlawing the procedure entirely. In that environment, the Republican Party has pursued a balancing act—harnessing the commitment and passion of the anti-abortion movement while assuring centrist voters of a more moderate approach. The Trump era showed how easily media standards toward fairness could be manipulated to maximize uncertainty, and leave the public confused about the significance of any given development. As Laura Bassett wrote last week, Republican politicians have repeatedly insisted that their nominees to the bench would not seek to overturn Roe, and characterized critics as paranoid. Both Justice Brett Kavanaugh and Justice Amy Coney Barrett, whose defenders insisted that they were agnostic on the question, were in the majority last week. But the charade goes back decades. During his confirmation hearings, Justice Clarence Thomas insisted, “No judge worth his or her salt will prejudge a case,” and then he called Roe “plainly wrong” after less than a year on the bench. Donald Trump, with his characteristic subtlety, simply said that his appointees would overturn Roe, and they’ve given Americans little reason to believe otherwise. An upcoming case before the Court offers the justices the opportunity to overturn Roe formally, rather than by increment. Even if they do so, I am skeptical that a massive political backlash is necessarily in the offing—the era of social media has amplified the ability of committed propagandists to confuse masses of people about what is happening in their own country. The muddled media reaction to this [Texas] ruling is a case in point. Nor does the logical extension of the majority’s decision, that the entire Constitution can be nullified by states outsourcing enforcement of unconstitutional laws to private actors, mean that blue states will prevail if they, say, adopted a similar scheme to curtail gun rights. But the Republican appointees now have a majority even when they lose the vote of Chief Justice John Roberts, whose commitment to managing the Court’s reputation has occasionally placed him on the side of the Democratic-appointed justices. The conservative justices don’t fear the nullification of rights they recognize, because they know they have the power to do whatever they want. On Thursday, as the Justice Department filed suit to block the law, Attorney General Merrick Garland argued that “this kind of scheme to nullify the Constitution of the United States is one that all Americans—whatever their politics or party—should fear.” Under different circumstances, that would be true. It should be true. But the superficial proceduralism and ideological fanaticism of the Court’s unaccountable majority enable the conservative justices to allow what they want and bar what they don’t, while claiming that some legal technicality has dictated the result. The Court’s approach is ideal for hiding a radical result behind a veneer of propriety. But there’s no need for the public to be confused about what’s happening here.

#### Tons of thumpers

Gorod 9-9 [Brianne Gorod is chief counsel for the Constitutional Accountability Center. 9-9-2021https://newrepublic.com/article/163519/roe-wade-supreme-court-fall-term]

The new Supreme Court term is about to begin, and it promises to be a blockbuster. With cases involving abortion and guns already on the docket, and the possibility that an affirmative action case may be added as well, this term will present the court’s new six-member conservative supermajority with the opportunity to usher in major shifts in the law. What the justices do with those opportunities will be a test of their commitment to precedent and, for many of them, their self-professed commitment to originalism.

Perhaps the biggest issue on the court’s docket this term will be abortion. A little over a year ago, in a case called June Medical Services LLC v. Russo, the Supreme Court gave abortion rights advocates a win when it held unconstitutional a Louisiana law that required physicians who perform abortions to have admitting privileges at a nearby hospital. In his opinion concurring in the ruling, with which he joined the court’s (then) four liberal members, Chief Justice John Roberts extolled the importance of precedent, observing that “for precedent to mean anything, the doctrine must give way only to a rationale that goes beyond whether the case was decided correctly.” Because the Louisiana law was identical to a Texas law the court had previously struck down, the chief justice voted to strike down the Louisiana law.

But with the replacement of Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg by Justice Amy Coney Barrett, the chief justice’s vote will not be dispositive when the court hears Dobbs v. Jackson Women’s Health Organization this term. In Dobbs, the court will be considering a challenge to the constitutionality of a Mississippi law that, with limited exceptions, bans abortions after the fifteenth week of pregnancy. The lower courts rightly concluded that this pre-viability ban on abortion was unconstitutional under the Supreme Court’s precedents, and Mississippi now asks the court to overrule those precedents.

According to Monica Simpson, executive director of SisterSong, a Southern-based, national reproductive justice organization that works to improve policies that affect the reproductive lives of women of color, “If the Supreme Court decides to overturn ... precedent under Roe v. Wade, the consequences will be devastating for communities like mine in Georgia, where we are currently fighting against a six-week abortion ban in court.” As she further explained, “The right to access abortion care is a crucial aspect of bodily autonomy, which is too often denied to Black people and others from marginalized backgrounds.”

This case is a huge test for the court and its newest justices, all three of whom—Barrett, Brett Kavanaugh, and Neil Gorsuch—professed a commitment to precedent at their confirmation hearings. Repeatedly, the Supreme Court has been asked to overrule Roe, and repeatedly it has reaffirmed that decision. But in an ominous sign, the court, over the dissents of Chief Justice John Roberts and Justices Breyer, Sotomayor, and Kagan, recently refused an emergency request to block Texas’s six-week abortion ban from going into effect, thus functionally gutting Roe. In doing so, the court not only undermined the right to abortion, but also its own legitimacy. If the new conservative supermajority does, in fact, vote in Dobbs to fully jettison Roe and the other long-standing precedents that recognize a constitutional right to access abortion simply because they were not, in the views of those justices, “decided correctly,” it will deliver an even more significant blow not only to the right to abortion, but also to the legitimacy of the court.

It should also deliver a blow to the claims by many members of the court that they follow the text and history of the Constitution, wherever it leads. When the Reconstruction framers drafted the Fourteenth Amendment, they chose sweeping language to protect the full panoply of fundamental rights for all, and they viewed both personal liberty and control over one’s body as among those fundamental rights. The Fourteenth Amendment thus guarantees the right to access abortion, and the court’s originalists should recognize that.

Dobbs is not the only blockbuster case on the court’s docket. In New York State Rifle & Pistol Association Inc. v. Bruen, the court will be considering whether New York’s denial of two individuals’ applications for concealed-carry licenses for self-defense violates the Second Amendment. In 2008, in a case called District of Columbia v. Heller, the Supreme Court held that the Second Amendment protects an individual right to own guns for self-defense, but also made clear that “[l]ike most rights, the right secured by the Second Amendment is not unlimited.”

In the years since Heller, it has fallen to the lower courts to determine what gun regulations are constitutional, with very little guidance from the Supreme Court. The Second Circuit Court of Appeals concluded that the New York law was constitutional, explaining that because “our tradition so clearly indicates a substantial role for state regulation of the carrying of firearms in public, ... [the law] passes constitutional muster if it is substantially related to the achievement of an important governmental interest.” The circuit court went on to conclude that “New York has substantial, indeed compelling, governmental interests in public safety and crime prevention,” and the law is “substantially related” to those interests. When the Supreme Court decides Bruen, how it rules may ultimately be as important as what it rules, because the guidance it provides about how courts should decide the constitutionality of gun regulations could have ramifications that extend far beyond the New York law at issue in the case.

As if these two huge cases were not enough, the court may add another big issue to the docket before the term ends: affirmative action. And as in the abortion case, the court is being asked to overrule a long-standing precedent: Grutter v. Bollinger, the 2003 case that held that universities may consider race as a factor in admissions. In Students for Fair Admissions Inc. v. President & Fellows of Harvard College, an organization called Students for Fair Admissions sued Harvard under a federal law that prohibits entities that accept federal funds from discriminating on the basis of, among other factors, race. The lower courts rejected the challenge, concluding that Harvard’s “limited use of race in its admissions process in order to achieve diversity ... is consistent with the requirements of Supreme Court precedent.” The group challenging Harvard’s admissions policy has asked the court to hear the case, and the court has called for the views of the solicitor general.

Here, as in Dobbs, both constitutional text and history, as well as the court’s own precedent, require the same result—upholding the lower court decision. After all, at the same time the framers of the Fourteenth Amendment drafted that amendment, they also enacted a long list of race-conscious legislation designed to guarantee equality of opportunity for all persons regardless of race. The Supreme Court’s repeated rulings upholding universities’ use of race as one factor in admissions decisions are entirely consistent with that history. In other words, if the court ultimately decides to take up this case, it—no less than Dobbs—will be a real test of the justices’ commitment to the text and history of the Constitution, as well as to the court’s own precedent.

While those three cases are likely to dominate headlines about the court this term, they’re hardly the only important ones on the docket. The court will also be deciding, among many other matters, whether individuals can challenge conduct that has a disparate impact on the basis of disability, whether an important federal civil rights law allows plaintiffs to recover damages for emotional distress, and whether it is constitutional for a state to provide students with funding for private schools but prohibit them from attending schools that provide religious instruction.

### Abortion – Dobbs – 2AC

#### Dobbs dooms Roe – Court will use it to overrule Roe and, even if they don’t, they’ll eliminate the viability standard which will greenlight aggressive state regs and set the stage for inevitable Roe overturn

Ziegler 21 [Mary Ziegler is a professor at the Florida State University College of Law, 5-18-2021 https://www.cnn.com/2021/05/17/opinions/abortion-mississippi-supreme-court-dobbs-v-jackson-womens-health-ziegler]

If the justices had wanted to avoid controversy, they could have agreed to hear the appeal only on that question, concluded that Roberts' standard should apply and given states more latitude to regulate abortion. But the court bypassed that question for a direct hit: could states ban elective abortions outright before viability -- the point at which it is possible for the fetus to survive outside the womb. In the Roe v. Wade decision, the majority on the court said that government only had a valid interest in prohibiting abortion in circumstances where the fetus would be viable; in 1973, the court pronounced, that point was around 24 weeks of pregnancy.

Many advocates and Americans in general will likely see Monday's development as a sign that the writing is on the wall -- that Roe v. Wade may well be doomed. They will not be wrong. A court eager to take on abortion bans early in pregnancy seems unlikely to hesitate when the moment comes to eliminate abortion rights altogether.

Indeed, there is some reason to believe that Dobbs may be that moment. To uphold Mississippi's law, the justices would need to undo a core part of the rules that have governed abortion since 1973: the idea that states cannot criminalize abortion outright until viability. If the court is willing to jettison a key ingredient of the Roe case, there is no reason to think the justices won't be ready to ditch the rest.

But even if Dobbs does not mark the moment when the court eliminates a right to choose, the damage this case could do to Roe is hard to overstate. In theory, the court could preserve the idea of a right to choose while saying that viability as a limit makes no sense. Bioethicists and philosophers have criticized the logic of the court's viability line for some time. Conservative justices have mocked the viability line since the 1980s. After all, viability changes as technology improves. Some have questioned whether courts can or should keep up with evolving medical standards in interpreting fundamental rights. Others don't see why fetal life takes on meaning only at viability.

But the shortcomings of the 1973 rule aside, viability has been central to the court's abortion rights jurisprudence from the beginning. That fact isn't lost on antiabortion leaders. Look closely at the grab bag of abortion restrictions proposed in 2021: Arkansas's ban on abortion in cases of Down syndrome, prohibitions on common methods like Texas's law on dilation and evacuation, the most common procedure after the first trimester, heartbeat bills (which outlaw abortion after a fetal heartbeat can be detected) like the ones from South Carolina or Texas or absolute bans like the one from Alabama. Most of them have one thing in common: an aim to invalidate viability as the standard for abortion rights (and thus roll back Roe v. Wade).

That's because neither the court nor the pro-choice movement have ever offered a real alternative to fetal viability as the point at which states can criminalize all abortions. That's one reason why heartbeat bans have caught fire in so many red states. Anti-abortion activist Janet Folger Porter, the architect of many of these bills, pitches a fetal heartbeat as a more scientific, certain alternative to viability.

In practical terms, there is a world of difference between allowing bans at six weeks, when physicians can often detect fetal cardiac activity, and allowing criminalization at viability (often marked at 24 weeks gestation). By taking this case, the court may be opening the door to laws that criminalize abortion before many women know they are pregnant. But there is no guarantee that six weeks will be the limit if the court abandons the viability benchmark. There is no guarantee there will be a limit at all.

The elimination of the viability standard would also upend progressives' best argument to preserve abortion rights -- one based on respect for judicial precedent.

The court's six conservative members all have clearly expressed views against abortion rights. For that reason, it seems far-fetched to think that any of the court's conservatives really believe the Constitution protects a right to choose. So, instead, pro-choice leaders have zeroed in on stare decisis, the doctrine of respect for past precedent. From a legal standpoint, the court may take precedent seriously. From the standpoint of optics, the court knows that when it comes to Roe, the world is watching. Moving too fast, or willfully ignoring precedent, could damage the court's reputation.

Abortion foes have a solution: pick apart a precedent piece by piece, until there the right to choose is unrecognizable. If the court saves Roe but gets rid of the viability standard, it will be much harder to say that the precedent has commanded respect.

So, when the court hands down a decision in Dobbs, keep your eye on viability. If it is usurped as a standard, this case may not be the one that takes down Roe v. Wade, but it will quite likely set the stage for the one that does.

### SD

#### Kavanaugh guarantees future breaches.

**PFAW 18**. People for the Amerian Way. 7/19/2018. “Key Cases on the Way to Supreme Court that Kavanaugh and Others Could Use to Overturn Precedent and Harm Our Rights,” <http://www.pfaw.org/report/key-cases-on-the-way-to-supreme-court-that-kavanaugh-and-others-could-use-to-overturn-precedent-and-harm-our-rights/>

If confirmed, President Trump’s latest Supreme Court nominee Brett Kavanaugh will push an already-conservative Court even further to the right on numerous issues that areprofoundly important to everyday Americans. Many of these issues are already in the courts and heading to the Supreme Court, and the addition ofKavanaugh would create a rock solid 5-4 far- right majority to decide these cases—and potentially to use them to overrule key precedents like Roe v. Wade. Although it would be impossible to list all such cases, this document lays out a number of key pending cases that may well make their way to the high court. In a few instances, the Court has already agreed to review the cases in 2018–2019. In other instances, cases are pending or have recently been filed in the lower courts. In each case, the high stakes raised by the Kavanaugh nomination are clear. Senators considering the Kavanaugh nomination must fully consider all of the important near-term consequences that his confirmation could well produce, as well as the possible ramifications over the decades to come. Texas v. United States, No. 4:18-cv-00167-O (N.D. Tex. 2018) Conservative states, with the support of Attorney General Jeff Sessions and President Trump’s Department of Justice, are suing to eliminate life-saving protections for millions of people with pre-existing conditions and other key provisions of the Affordable Care Act (ACA). Appellate review, which may well include the Supreme Court, is almost certain. Stewart v. Azar, 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 108862 (D. DC. 2018) The Trump administration and Republican state legislatures have sought to drastically reduce the number of people eligible for health care benefits available under the ACA. The administration has taken steps to make benefits more expensive, to make them less comprehensive, and recently, to encourage states to impose work and other requirements on those who get benefits under the ACA’s Medicaid expansion. One federal district court has already held that Kentucky’s work requirements and benefit cutbacks approved by the Trump administration are unlawful, and the issue is likely to go to higher courts, including the Supreme Court. Planned Parenthood of Kansas & Mid-Missouri v. Andersen, 882 F.3d 1205 (10th Cir. 2018) petition for cert. filed; Planned Parenthood of Gulf Coast, Inc. v. Gee, 862 F.3d 445 (5th Cir. 2017), petition for cert. filed Hard-right conservatives in several states have sought to ban Planned Parenthood from providing birth control and other critical non-abortion health care services to women on Medicaid despite clear statutory language prohibiting that. Kansas and Louisiana have already filed petitions to ask the Supreme Court to review lower court decisions and allow them to cut off these critical health care services to thousands of women. These cases could be heard as early as the 2018–2019 term. Franciscan Alliance v. Azar, Civ. Action No. 7:16-cv-00108 (N.D. Tex.) A federal judge in Texas ruled against an ACA regulation that extended anti-discrimination protections to transgender people in implementing the law. That case and others on the issue have been stayed pending the drafting of a new rule by the Department of Health and Human Services, which will likely omit these protections, re-start the litigation, which is likely to go to higher courts. Jackson Women’s Health Center et al. v. Currier, No. 3:18-cv-171-CWR-FKB (S.D. Miss.); West Alabama Women’s Health Center v. Miller, 2017 WL 4843230 (M.D. Ala.) Federal lawsuits are pending in several courts that challenge severe state restrictions on abortion that directly conflict with Roe v. Wade and Planned Parenthood v. Casey. These include a Mississippi ban on abortion after 15 weeks of pregnancy, which was temporarily blocked via a restraining order in March, and an Alabama ban on dilation and extraction abortions, which the 11th Circuit heard arguments on in May concerning a lower court decision declaring the ban unconstitutional. Either or both of these cases could reach the Supreme Court in the next several years, and could be used to restrict or overturn Roe. Comprehensive Health of Planned Parenthood Great Plains v. Williams, 263 F. Supp. 3d 729 (W.D. Mo. 2017) In Missouri, as in many other states, anti-choice legislators have pursued efforts to abolish access to abortion by passing laws and regulations imposing burdensome and unnecessary restrictions on health clinics that provide abortion services. These efforts and ones like them have forced the closure of clinics in a number of states and have imposed immense burdens on women, particularly low-income women. The Supreme Court in Whole Woman’s Health v. Hellerstedt narrowly struck down such restrictions in Texas, with Kennedy in the 5-3 majority. A right-wing majority could easily decide to review this or similar cases and overrule or ignore Whole Women’s Health or Roe v. Wade itself.

#### Wayfair wrecked Stare Decisis.

**HLR 18**. Harvard Law Review. 11-09-18. “Article I — Stare Decisis for Constitutional Default Rules — Dormant Commerce Clause — South Dakota v. Wayfair, Inc.,” <https://harvardlawreview.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/277-286_Online.pdf>

All of the above are arguably constitutional default rules set by the Court that remain, to one degree or another, open to congressional revision. The list could be longer or shorter, depending on which default rules the Court will view as constitutional86 and on how it will answer open questions about congressional authority over certain constitutional provisions.87 But the takeaway is clear: weaker stare decisis for constitutional default rules. Pre-Wayfair, one would have thought that stare decisis applies with special force to such precedents, given congressional power to set them straight. Not anymore. Why? Because it is improper to “ask Congress to address a false constitutional premise of th[e] Court’s own creation.”88 The Latin for Wayfair’s doctrine is not stare decisis,

which should reflect a realistic, working relationship between the legislative and judicial branches. It is mea culpa. In its zeal to update the Constitution for “the Cyber Age,”89 the Court deleted Congress from stare decisis doctrine in constitutional cases. The Court had better options. It could have left Quill on Congress’s doorstep, as the dissent argued. Or it could have justified overruling Quill notwithstanding the special force of stare decisis. Instead, the Court reasoned that it doesn’t matter whether Congress is willing and able to do the job: a constitutional mess calls for a judicial clean-up crew. For constitutional default rules — a category of decisions embracing the dormant commerce clause and sweeping far beyond — Wayfair’s new theory of stare decisis makes the Court’s precedents less sticky and Congress less relevant.

# 1AR

## K

### Link – 1AR

#### Plan solves competition link---their ev only assumes unhealthy competition, which the plan solves

Joseph Heath 7, Professor of philosophy at the University of Toronto, “An Adversarial Ethic for Business: or When Sun-Tzu Met the Stakeholder”, Springer, 2007, Journal of Business Ethics 72:359-374

As soon as another buyer or seller enters the market, however, the strategic situation changes completely. The presence of multiple buyers and sellers dramatically reduces the ability of any one

buyer or seller to make a credible ‘‘take-it-or-leave-it’’ offer. If the price that the sellers are charging is above the price at the point where supply and demand curves intersect, then they will wind up with unsold goods at the end of the day. If they are both charging the same price, then one can assume that they will split the sales between them, and so both wind up with unsold goods. Yet this creates a temptation for both sellers. By dropping the asking price somewhat, it should be possible to sell one’s entire inventory. The loss of revenue caused by the lower price will then be made up for by the increased volume of sales. Of course, if one seller does this, then the other has no choice but to respond in kind. The result is lower profits for both of them. This competition will continue until the volume of sales at a given price level leaves neither of them with unsold goods. This is the point at which supply and demand curves intersect (which is why the price at that point is known as the ‘‘market clearing’’ price). The same sort of competition develops among buyers in cases where the price is lower than the market-clearing price – some buyers will be left with unsatisfied demand at the end of the day, and so will have an incentive to defect, by paying more than the going rate, in order to guarantee that they secure enough of the good.3

Clearly, it is not in the joint interest of either suppliers or buyers to compete with one another in this way. Thus, the reason that price competition is desirable is not that it benefits the people involved, but rather that it generates external benefits for society at large. In this respect, it is quite similar to athletic competition. But what are these external benefits, in the case of the competitive market? When suppliers compete with one another it benefits buyers, and vice versa. Thus the competitive market works to eliminate ‘‘deadweight losses’’ from the economy, ensuring that the maximum number of mutually beneficial economic exchanges take place. But more importantly, a competitive market also gives rise to a set of prices, which provide crucial information to everyone else in society about the relative scarcity of the various resources, skills,

goods and services being exchanged. In the same way that an infrared camera takes invisible light and converts it to a wavelength that the human eye can see, the competitive market takes people’s invisible preferences regarding both production and consumption and converts them to something that can be observed with the naked eye, viz. prices. This is what makes economically rational decision-making even roughly possible in every sector of the economy, including the public sector. The operation of the price system therefore allows for a more efficient (i.e. less wasteful) use of resources and labor.

Furthermore, the failure on the part of either producers or buyers to compete with one another can cause considerable mischief, insofar as it sends the wrong ‘‘signals,’’ via the price mechanism, to other economic actors. When suppliers, through collusion or cartelization, are able to maintain prices for some good at above-market-clearing rates, it suggest that there is ‘‘not enough’’ of that good, and so encourages a shift of resources away from other economic activities towards increased production of that good, combined with a shift among consumers toward goods that serve as substitutes (assuming such are available). Similarly, when buyers form a ‘‘consumer co-op,’’ or some similar organization, in order to hold out for lower prices, it sends the signal to suppliers that there is ‘‘too much’’ of the relevant good, and so encourages them to shift investment out of that sector.

This is, of course, the substance of ‘‘invisible hand’’ arguments for the market since Adam Smith. It is why David Gauthier, in his article ‘‘No Need for Morality: The Case of the Competitive Market,’’ argues that in market transactions, moral constraints ‘‘would be not merely pointless, but positively harmful’’ (Gauthier, 1982, 54). One is not merely encouraged to act non-cooperatively in a competitive market, social welfare considerations require one to do so, because the price mechanism requires competition in order to generate the right information about the relative scarcity or need for different goods.

Of course, it is important to recognize that there is nothing magical about the ability of markets to transform private vices into public virtues. This sort of laundering is a general feature of all competitively structured social interactions. And like all other forms of competition, market competition must be governed by a set of rules, restricting the range of strategies that individuals may employ, in order to ensure that it remains healthy. For suppliers, offering to sell at a lower price – and making the necessary changes in the production process that will enable one to do so – is the most important permissible strategy. Adjusting the quantity that is supplied, and making improvements in product quality are also permissible.

But like every other form of competition, market competition also has a tendency to go off the rails when improperly regulated. In principle, there is no reason why firms could not compete with one another by blowing up each others’ factories and hiring assassins to kill each others’ CEOs. Such a scenario is no less implausible than figure skaters sending out thugs to kneecap their opponents. In fact, one need only look at the experiences of the 364 various ‘‘transition economies’’ in the former Communist bloc to see the sort of outrageous behavior that improperly regulated marketplace competition may generate. For example, in 1994, shortly after the privatization of agriculture and food production in Hungary, the country was swept by an epidemic of lead poisoning. After searching far and wide for the cause, doctors and scientists finally tracked down the source of the problem. Manufacturers of paprika – a staple of Hungarian cuisine – had been grinding up old paint, much of it lead-based, and adding it to the spice in order to improve its color. The practice was so widespread that officials in Hungary were forced to order all the paprika in the country removed from store shelves and destroyed. This is a clear example of firms using an impermissible strategy – exploiting an information asymmetry – in order to compete, and other firms being forced to do the same, in order to retain position. The race to the top of the competitive market is thereby transformed into a race to the bottom, one that can have devastating consequences for the society at large.

#### Those conclusions exist in cognitive dissonance. Contingent deployments of law that don’t throw the baby out with the bathwater is best

Foster 19 [Chase Michael Foster was a Doctoral Candidate at Harvard University at the time of this dissertation. The author has served as a Election Observer (OSCE, ODIHR) in Moldova, Belarus, Russia, Georgia and as a Teaching Assistant at the Harvard Kennedy School of Government. At the time of this writing, the author held a MPP (Democracy, Politics, and Institutions) from the Harvard Kennedy School of Government. “The Politics of Delegation: Constitutional Structure, Bureaucratic Discretion, and the Development of Competition Policy in the United States and the European Union, 1890-2017” – Doctoral dissertation to The Department of Government, Harvard University, Graduate School of Arts & Sciences. In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the subject of Government - January 2019 - #E&F –https://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/41121359/FOSTER-DISSERTATION-2019.pdf?sequence=1]

The Implications for Public Policy

Finally, this study has implications for several policy questions of relevance to students of the American and European regulatory states. The traditional view among regulatory scholars in both the United States and Europe is that political control helps to increase democratic legitimacy. Among many Americanists, political control is seen as the only thing preventing regulatory capture and bureaucratic degeneration (e.g. Miller 2005; Epstein and O'i Ialloran 1999).'' And much of the reform program of the last century has focused on the need to constrain federal bureaucrats in the name of democratic accountability—whether through procedural rights that mostly empower industry vis-a-vis government (Grisinger 2012) 'private attorneys general' provisions that allow citizen groups to participate in enforcement directly (Burke 2002), or cost-benefit analysis that structures decision-making (Sunstein 1993).

In a different vein, the European Union is seen as having a "democratic deficit", in part, because the Commission and other technocrats possess extensive discretionary authority. While it is recognized that technocratic policymaking can increase regulatory effectiveness, many reformers think this 'output legitimacy' is limited by the weak degree of' input legitimacy.' Consequently, the institutional reforms most often proposed are to limit bureaucratic discretion and push European policymaking processes to look more like those found in the United States: to increase private enforcement opportunities (Kclcmen 2006), to expand administrative procedure limitations (Meuwese et al. 2009), to enlarge the power of the European Parliament (Follesdal and Hix 2006), and to create a directedly elected European executive.

The findings of the dissertation provide some reason to challenge the presumption that constraining the Commission would lead to more democratic legitimacy. As we have seen in the analysis of US antitrust enforcement, extensive political controls over regulatory decision-making may, in some circumstances, undermine regulatory effectiveness, while providing little by way of increased democratic legitimacy. If there is one consistent theme across the long history of the US antitrust system, it is dissatisfaction, expressed by politicians and economic interests coming from a variety of ideological positions. While political controls have, on the one hand, ensured that antitrust regulators were not overzealous in their enforcement. On the other hand, it has arguably led to underenforcement, as regulators have found it too difficult to use the law to address a range of economic challenges. Even during periods when the law has been actively applied, the pattern of enforcement has been volatile, providing little by way of rationalization in the economy or consistent limits on corporate behavior.

Furthermore, as we have seen in the analysis of European competition policy, much of the regime's apparent success stems from bureaucratic discretion. Examining the competition policy field, I have shown that the Commission's broad discretionary authority has allowed it to apply competition law in ways that fostered economic cooperation, contributed to economic development, held companies accountable and benefited consumers.

At the same time, we have seen how the Commission's decision-making has, at certain moments, lacked political accountability. Additionally, in its eagerness to use whatever vehicle appears available to advance the integration project, the Commission may have over-emphasized liberalization at the expensive of other goals (Jabko 2006). Consequently, the focus on negative integration may, in certain respects, created a 'neoliberal' bias in policymaking (e.g. Hopner and Schafer 2012).

Yet, in seeking to improve accountability, European policymakers should not throw out the bureaucratic baby with the neoliberal bathwater. As the "guardians of the Treaty", the Commission's agenda setting authority and monitoring powers, along with the European Court of Justice's power of judicial review, have arguably been the sine qua non for the process of European integration. As we have seen in the case of competition, the bureaucratic discretion and semi-autonomous structure of its decision-making process has, in certain respects, facilitated the regime's effectiveness, allowing the law to be applied to new economic challenges as they emerged. Increased accountability measures may be needed, but in pursuing these reforms, policymakers should be careful not to undermine the Commission's independence and the significant capacity and expertise that has been built up over the years.

The study also has policy implications for the design of the US antitrust system. As Robert Kagan has frequently emphasized, in addition to its myriad problems, American adversarial legalism also has strengths, not least the many opportunities the system presents to private actors who are overlooked by the state to seek justice. Another "strength of the weak state/' is the way it encourages a high degree of regulatory compliance (Dobbin and Sutton 1998). Cognizant that law can be enforced from all directions, companies may become more likely to comply with regulator)' rules, and even go beyond them, internalizing regulatory norms in their own internal policies and procedures. Such a system has arguably worked quite well in the development of capital markets, the rooting out of foreign corruption, and the protection of consumers against fraud.

But within regulatory arenas such as antitrust where compliance is not usually a matter of following or not following hard-lined rules, the American structure is hardly ideal. As we have seen in this study, when applied to complex economic problems, the adversarial legal system is marred with problems. Whether addressing problems presented by economic concentration, regulatory liberalization, or new technologies, it has been difficult for antitrust authorities to direct the law toward a consistent, coherent purpose. And it has been far too easy for the regime to be deployed toward the self-interested goals of organized interests or the parochial concerns of Congress.

Consequently, within fields such as antitrust, reforms should be considered that increase bureaucratic discretion. One idea would be to increase the funding available to both antitrust agencies, so they can play a more active role studying new industries and monitoring new market developments. Another would be to make it possible to pursue some enforcement through administrative actions, which are not as easily gamed by large corporations armed with teams of lawyers. Political principals could also delegate to the PTC the authority to write competition rules to promote liberalization in markets dominated by incumbent companies or within other emerging sectors. Eliminating some of the exemptions for regulated sectors and state-sponsored activity, while reducing the number of incentives that encourage private litigation would also be salutary. Finally, Congress should do what it can, within its constitutional limitations, to reduce the 'race to the bottom' in public subsidies. As the European model demonstrates, state aid rules need not eliminate public involvement in the economy. However, they can provide an important constraint on beggar-thy-neighbor policies that leave everyone but large companies worse off.

### Link – 1AR – Berk

#### There’s no residual link – the antimonopoly tradition mobilizes reform coalitions, and it’s compatible with the goals of redistribution

Berk 19 [Gerald Berk, Professor of Political Science at the University of Oregon, 11-25-2019, "Antimonopoly and the Democrats," Dissent Magazine, <https://www.dissentmagazine.org/online_articles/antimonopoly-and-the-democrats>]

Democrats are waking up to the realities of economic power. Less than a decade ago, the subject was taboo. Even with the economy in ruins, Democratic leadership saw no option beyond neoliberalism. But since the 2016 primaries, a split has opened up in the party. With it has come a resurgence of antimonopoly politics that neoliberal leaders can no longer ignore.

At first blush, it looks like antimonopoly heightens the conflict between socialists committed to overcoming capitalism and establishment centrists seeking to save it from populist attacks on the left and right. But antimonopoly once contributed to mobilization, coalition building, and sustained reform across the liberal-left spectrum, and it might do so again today.

The Antimonopoly Tradition

Democracy and markets are fragile and demanding systems, easily corrupted by formidable concentrations of power. The antimonopoly tradition recognizes this fragility, and it makes no sharp distinction between economic and political power. Excessive concentrations of political power undermine economic prosperity no less than excessive concentrations of economic power corrupt democracy. The problem for law and public policy in a democracy with markets seems simple: how to check the constant tendency to concentrated power. There’s no clear-cut way to do that, because those who seek to attain power and lock in privilege are endlessly inventive. Under the right conditions, institutions designed to check power can be used to opposite ends. As a result, antimonopoly is far more than an ideology. It is a political project that requires vigilance, action, and constant adaptation.

Reformers have drawn on the antimonopoly tradition—which is far more wide-ranging than just antitrust, a set of policies designed to prevent predatory competition and break up concentrations of economic power—throughout U.S. history. In the 1830s, Jacksonians used it to authorize privatization, dismantling the Second Bank of the United States because it locked in the privilege of an overweening aristocracy. Abolitionists in the 1840s and 1850s drew on the antimonopoly tradition to dismantle the slave power. In the 1880s, populists enacted state antitrust laws to check the growth of corporate power. In the first decades of the twentieth century, Progressives went further, breaking up corporate power and boosting countervailing forces in government, unions, and proprietary enterprise. In the New Deal, the antimonopoly tradition broke the power of banks and industrial corporations and paved the way for regulation, collective bargaining, and welfare provision. In the 1940s, liberals drew on it to outlaw discriminatory pricing and check the predatory power of chain stores. In the 1950s and 1960s, antitrust administrators broke up patent monopolies, opening the way to high technology.

The antimonopoly tradition, as this sketch demonstrates, has enabled diverse political projects. In the first Gilded Age, it provided a challenge to laissez-faire constitutionalism—the legal doctrine that markets were autonomous from politics, and that property and contracts always protected individual liberty. In today’s Gilded Age, the antimonopoly tradition confronts market fundamentalism: the belief that liberty is best realized in market transactions insulated from democratic interference; that it is possible to organize markets effectively without government supervision; and that we ought not worry about concentrations of economic power, either because they are efficient or temporary.

The turn to market fundamentalism had a major impact on the practice of antitrust, severing it from its roots in the antimonopoly tradition. The University of Chicago–trained lawyer Robert Bork, who published The Antitrust Paradox in 1978, convinced Reagan’s Justice Department that antitrust blocked efficient forms of business organization. Left alone, corporations and capital markets could decide better than government regulators whether mergers, hostile takeovers, outsourcing, or breaking up and selling off corporate assets would serve consumers. If the result was concentrated power, so be it. In time, the Democrats agreed that the only goal of antitrust was to protect consumers. By 1992, antitrust had disappeared from their platform for the first time in a century.

The resurgence of the antimonopoly tradition among Democrats indicates a sea change in how they approach economic governance. Rather than limiting debate to after-the-fact redistribution, they have begun to ask how markets and business organizations can be structured to check concentrations of power. Many Democrats are converging on a platform to rebuild a more democratic economy, even as they disagree in fundamental ways over what that means, who should benefit, and how to achieve it. Still, the antimonopoly tradition’s shared appeal could open new possibilities for party politics and reform. This might seem overly optimistic, but a closer look at how the antimonopoly tradition has informed three ideological factions within the Democratic Party—democratic socialists, (neo)liberals, and antimonopolists proper—illustrates the potential for a broader politics focused on challenging concentrated power and building a more democratic economy.

### 1AR---AT: Hilgrist

#### It’s a cookie-cutter over simplification to say that all scholarship or all subjectivity is neoliberal – it elides the nuance necessary to win the alt

Watts 21 [Galen Watts is Guest Professor with Special Appointment and Banting Postdoctoral Fellow, based at KU Leuven, “Are you a neoliberal subject? On the uses and abuses of a concept” 8-6-2021 Sage Journals]

On neoliberalism (4): What is a ‘neoliberal subject’?

Admittedly, scholarship on ‘neoliberal subjects’ varies in its theoretical sophistication and empirical support. Moreover, as social scientists have become increasingly familiar with the theoretical frameworks informing neoliberalisms (2) and (3), the number of empirical studies making use of one or both of these conceptions has grown exponentially. So, let me be clear: in what follows, my concern is with a particular type of social scientific scholarship on neoliberalism (4) and the distinct errors and oversimplifications it perpetrates. What distinguishes this type of scholarship is that it seeks not merely to critique the ideal typical notion of a ‘neoliberal subject’ (as defined by neo-Marxists and/ or Foucaultians), but also to demonstrate empirically the extent to which either/both neoliberalisms (2) and (3) have successfully penetrated into the psychic and embodied lives of actual individuals, by means of three discursive criteria: within this scholarship, neoliberal subjects are (a) those who invoke the language of personal responsibility or have been ‘responsibilized’; (b) those who value autonomy and speak in the language of individualism; and (c) those who employ the rhetorics of authenticity and selfrealization, and who conceive of their self as a thing to be worked on and improved. The problem with these criteria, we shall see, is that they are excessively broad, multivalent and insufficient to prove what they purport to.

Personal responsibility and responsibilization. Sociologists seem to agree on the ‘centrality of the discourse of personal responsibility in the neoliberal era’ (Foster, 2016, p. 94). As Luxton (2010, p. 180) illustratively remarks in Neoliberalism in Everyday Life, ‘The extent to which people accept personal responsibility both reveals the depth to which neoliberal ideologies have penetrated personal life and shows the centrality of such ideologies for the success of neoliberalism’. Indeed, if one had to boil what it means to be a ‘neoliberal subject’ down to a single concept, ‘responsibilization’ – the process whereby individuals are ‘made responsible’ for their choices and actions, while the state increasingly surrenders responsibility for their health, economic security and well-being – would be a legitimate candidate. Across a range of studies, scholars claiming allegiance to either/both neo-Marxist and Foucaultian theoretical traditions more and more interpret invocations of ‘personal responsibility’ as evidence of ‘neoliberalism’. For instance, in her analysis of the popular memoir Eat, Pray, Love, authored by Elizabeth Gilbert, Williams (2014, p. 620) finds in the book’s pages what she refers to as a ‘neoliberal spiritual subject’ on the grounds that this subject ‘is held responsible for putting in the “work” necessary to be happy and healthy’. And paying homage to Foucault, Williams writes that reading Gilbert’s popular memoir calls to mind ‘the neoliberal vision of the individual as entrepreneur of the self’ (2014, p. 625). Similarly, in his study of mindfulness programs in UK schools, Reveley (2016, p. 498, p. 499) draws on a synthesis of neo-Marxist and Foucaultian approaches, which he argues hold that ‘neoliberalism’s ideological correlates are personal autonomy, self-reliance, and responsibility’ in order to make the case that these programs responsibilize individual subjects because they make them ‘responsible for their own emotional well-being’. Reveley (2016, p. 498) further contends that mindfulness ‘is a practical technique that transmits the neoliberal self-responsibilizing impulse down to young people’. And in her study of Mexican migrants participating in an English language program, Ullman (2012, p. 463), drawing explicitly on the work of Harvey and Rose, argues that because her study participants view learning English as their own personal responsibility, they are repeating a ‘neoliberal mantra’. While I do not doubt the affinities between neoliberalisms (1), (2) and (3) and the rhetoric of personal responsibility, there are real problems with using the existence of the latter as evidence of the former. For one, there is nothing inherently ‘neoliberal’ about the discourse of personal responsibility, given its semantic approval by a whole gamut of other ideologies and political rationalities – be they, conservative, communitarian, civic republican and social democratic. Indeed, personal responsibility is a deeply entrenched value in democratic societies, widely considered integral to being a moral agent (Mounk, 2017, p. 160). For another, scholars have shown that in many texts alleged to disseminate ‘neoliberal discourse’, there often exist alternative conceptions of responsibility at play (e.g. Trunka & Trundle, 2014; Sletto & Nygren, 2016). Of course, an objection might be that whether or not individuals subscribe to alternative conceptions of responsibility, the fact of neoliberalism (1) cannot be dismissed. In other words, processes of responsibilization are taking place and these conditions force individuals to ‘become responsible’, regardless of their convictions. There is undoubtedly truth in this. As the Welfare State has been dismantled, leaving populaces increasingly unprotected and insecure, individuals have done what any and all humans do in the face of change: adapt. Thus, it is reasonable to conjecture that in order to ‘get by’ in these precarious times, we must become, to some extent, self-responsible subjects and furthermore, that reading Eat, Pray, Love, learning to practice mindfulness and accepting responsibility for learning English in some sense encourages and bolsters this process. Yet, even if the above story is correct, it is still not the case that what we end up with are going to be ‘neoliberal subjects’ if by this we mean something that bears some clear relation to neoliberalism (2), or even neoliberalism (3). Recall that neoliberalism (2) presumes a degree of popular, if alienated, consent; neoMarxist scholars presume that neoliberal ideology exists as doxa, in Bourdieu’s sense, informing common-sense understandings. But as Davies (2014, p. 316) remarks, there is a heated debate ‘as to whether neoliberalism is “alive,” “dead” or in some paradoxical “zombie” state’. While Don Kalb (2012, p. 319) contends that ‘neoliberalism, in whatever hybrid or even “parasitic” ... form, appears as less intellectually convincing, popularly legitimate, and more openly and radically confronted than ever in the last three decades’. In agreement, I would argue that neoliberal ideology is, in fact, extremely contested and actually not widely adhered to by ordinary citizens (even in the most ‘neoliberal’ country – America (see Saad, 2019)), so it seems unwarranted to treat the mere fact of adaptation as evidence of a wholesale embrace of neoliberal ideology. Indeed, we need to make space for the distinction proposed by Hilgers between ‘neoliberal dispositions’ and ‘dispositions produced by neoliberalism’ (2013, p. 85). But what of neoliberalism (3)? Arguably these case studies offer clear instances of neoliberal discourses and governmental technologies, which encourage individuals to become ‘entrepreneurs of the self’. But can we even say this much? Recall that, for Foucault, the new homo oeconomicus is the ultimate market actor, one who seeks opportunities for self-investment at every turn. It seems to me that this is patently not what we find in these case studies – or, more charitably, the evidence for this claim is rather weak. For why should we assume with Williams and Reveley that thinking one should bear some responsibility for one’s health and happiness is necessarily evidence of neoliberal reason? This stretches the notion of homo oeconomicus beyond anything resembling what one finds in Foucault’s writings. Or, consider how Ullman goes about identifying the ‘neoliberal mantra’ of the Mexican migrants she studied. One of her interviewees, Raul, informed her that he had a ‘failure of the will/una falta de voluntad’ because he only watched an hour of the English language program he had purchased. When asked why he did this, Raul responded that ‘it was boring’ (Ullman, 2012, p. 463) Ullman interprets this as follows: ‘This interpretation takes the program itself, its quality and the effectiveness of its pedagogical approach, out of the conversation, and makes learning English solely an individual responsibility’ – which, in Ullman’s view, is clearly ‘neoliberal’ (2012, p. 463). But is this conclusion justified? Is it really ‘neoliberal’ to feel one has failed personally because one got bored and failed to do one’s homework? Again, this is a long way from the figure of homo oeconomicus identified by Foucault. Still, there is another claim, implicit in Ullman’s analysis, which is worthy of consideration, as it has become increasingly common: discourses are allegedly ‘neoliberal’ to the extent that they obscure the structural dimensions of social life – that is, to the extent that they are methodologically individualistic.

Autonomy and individualism. Next to the discourse of personal responsibility, scholars tend to zero in on the language of autonomy and individualism as proof of ‘neoliberal subjectivity’. In fact, processes of responsibilization and ‘autonomization’ are generally considered discursively tethered, if not complementary. For instance, in their analysis of Norwegian and Turkish media discourse, Tu¨rken et al. (2016, p. 37), drawing on the work of Foucault and Rose, identify the normalization of ‘a responsible subject who needs “self-control” in order to “take charge of” and “to be able to live life”’ They write, ‘Different voices in our data discursively construct the individual as an autonomous subject who is encouraged to “take action”, “take personal responsibility”, and “work hard” to achieve a “happy life” (2016, pp. 37–38), thereby concluding that mainstream media discourse in these countries serves to disseminate ‘neoliberal thinking’ (2016, p. 35). In their study of psychotherapeutic discourse Lamarre et al. (2019, p. 239) write, ‘Neoliberal governmentality can be seen as a “conduct of conduct” (Foucault, 2008) or a strategic creation of a specific form of subjectivity’ (p. 239). They argue that psychotherapeutic discourse normalizes and produces this ‘normative neoliberal subjectivity’ which they characterize as ‘autonomous, freely choosing subjects continuously involved in self-improvement’ (2019, p. 244). They conclude, ‘Psychotherapy is inevitably informed by and potentially further perpetuates neoliberal ideology’ (Lamarre et al., 2019, p. 242). And in his study of ‘workplace spirituality’, invoking a synthesis of neoMarxist and governmentality approaches, LoRusso (2020, p. 6) contends that workplace spirituality is a ‘technology of the self’ which ‘produces the quintessential capitalist subject, a radically individualist subject for whom reality is itself merely the results of individual choices about how it is to be experienced’. Thus, for LoRusso, what makes ‘spirituality’ neoliberal is the fact that it promotes a ‘program of individual rather than social change’ (LoRusso, 2017, p. 68). Now, just as with the blanket condemnation of ‘personal responsibility’, the problem with automatically subsuming the language of autonomy and individualism under the conceptual umbrella of ‘neoliberalism’ is that it ignores Durkheim’s (1969) key insight that individualism is both a collective and polyvalent discourse, holding widely divergent consequences depending on how it is interpreted. Indeed, it is well established within sociology that there exist multiple individualisms, rooted in distinct cultural traditions (Bellah et al., 1985). Thus, as Barnett (2005, p. 11) fittingly cautions, by subsuming all individualistic rhetoric under the category ‘neoliberalism’ scholars theorize out of sight alternative political rationalities that, while wedded to the value of individual autonomy, may conceptualize this ideal in quite different ways. Moreover, as cultural sociologists have shown, individuals adopt different technologies, devices and discourses in different contexts, adapting them to their particular aims and present circumstances (Swidler, 1986). So, while it might be true that, in some instances, individuals invoke a methodologically individualistic discourse which exalts the individual over the social, it is theoretically naı¨ve to suppose that, by necessity, this discourse is always and everywhere invoked by said individual. As Scharff (2016, p. 115) remarks, ‘entrepreneurial discourses are negotiated in contexts that provide a range of discourses’. Accordingly, it seems reasonable to question any necessary connection between individualistic talk and endorsement of neoliberalism (2). Still, could we not plausibly interpret these case studies as instances of neoliberalism (3)? That is, as genealogical attempts to trace the forms of neoliberal reason underlying the governmental technologies and discourses of media, psychotherapy and workplace spirituality? Much as before, it is not clear that what we find in these case studies is in fact the kind of neoliberal reason of which Foucault has written, since mere talk of individual autonomy and free choice is insufficient evidence of homo oeconomicus. But even were we to accept this claim, it seems to me that these case studies do not actually limit themselves to neoliberalism (3), but rather make the leap to neoliberalism (4). The shift from neoliberalism (3) to neoliberalism (4) is subtle, but significant. It is characterized by a shift from the genealogical and textual analyses of Foucault and early governmentality scholars like Rose – which sought merely to chart the emergence of new discourses and associated technologies – to empirical analyses of how these discourses and technologies are allegedly internalized by actual subjects. Again, Foucault did not conceive of homo oeconomicus as a real empirical subject. Moreover, early governmentality scholars did ‘not suppose that governmental rationalities automatically determine subjectivities’ (Barnett et al., 2008, p. 629), nor did they concern themselves with the way specific discourses or technologies are implemented, adopted or refused by actual persons (Rose et al., 2006, p. 100). However, this epistemic humility has become increasingly rare in recent years – as these case studies aptly illustrate. For instance, Lamarre et al. write, ‘Following poststructuralist lines of thought, we might understand the power of the neoliberal capitalist state as both restrictive and Watts 11 productive, but always shaping what we know and how we know ourselves to be’ (2019, p. 239, emphasis added). While LoRusso maintains that, ‘At the individual level, these discourses penetrate, possess, and produce the expectations and dispositions of persons’ such that workplace spirituality ‘reshapes employees into willing participants in a neoliberal social order’ (LoRusso, 2020, p. 23, 13, emphasis added). Interestingly, Tu¨rken et al. (2016, p. 43) are more cautious. They conclude their study: ‘Although media is a powerful tool to disseminate meaning and thereby influence subjectivity in society, people do negotiate their own understandings and may even oppose media’s positioning of subjecthood’, adding, ‘The present study does not investigate how media discourse on self-development is negotiated by the readers’. And yet, after noting this critical and consequential limitation of their research, only a few lines below they boldly assert a claim for which they have provided little actual evidence: ‘the dominant individualistic subject of contemporary society is reproduced and refashioned as an entrepreneur of herself’ (Tu¨rken et al., 2016, p. 44). Accordingly, for these scholars, the homo oeconomicus identified by Foucault is no longer a mere speculative fiction of the human capital theorist’s making, but allegedly captures the psychic and embodied life of the majority of people in the twenty-first century.

The problem is that this methodological leap – from neoliberalism (3) to neoliberalism (4) – is frequently not warranted. As Tu¨rken et al. would admit, discourse analysis of media articles, psychotherapeutic manuals and workplace spirituality texts does not provide us with a transparent window into the psychic lives of individuals – what many accounts of ‘neoliberal subjectivity’ claim to have accessed. Indeed, the presumption that ‘publicly observable rationalities, procedures and techniques of state and non-state actors can be read as proxies for processes of subject-formation’ is simply untenable (Barnett et al., 2008, p. 626). And as Scharff (2016, p. 108) usefully reminds us, ‘there has been little empirical research that explores the contours of entrepreneurial subjectivity and, even more specifically, its psychic life’.

Here, then, we confront the gap between neoliberalism (3) and neoliberalism (4): It is one thing to identify discourses, technologies and apparatuses – it is something else entirely to contend that they actually induce subject-formation (Barnett, 2005, p. 10). Now, this is not to say that neoliberalism (3) cannot lead to neoliberalism (4). On the contrary, I do not doubt that neoliberal discourses have been internalized by some, shaping their behaviour and self-understanding. But the fact of the matter is these representative studies provide little evidence to show this. Furthermore, other empirical studies make clear that the story is far more complicated, involving processes of discursive contestation and refusal which are too often ignored. For instance, upon conducting interviews with freelance journalists about how they respond to popular ‘personal branding’ discourses within their industry, Vallas and Christin (2018, p. 24) found that ‘interviewees respond to entrepreneurial discourse in a multiplicity of ways, defying characterization in simple or uniform terms’. They also found that national cultural repertoires, occupational norms and the degree of material precarity experienced by these journalists considerably shapes the extent to which they become the ‘enterprising self’ naturalized in neoliberal reason (Vallas & Christin, 2018, p. 28). And in his qualitative study of how middle-class individuals read self-help books, Lichterman (1992, p. 422) writes, ‘They read books ambivalently, and in ongoing relation to other frameworks for situating personal selfhood in a social context’, thereby concluding, ‘We can not assume in advance that we know how strong or how unified an ideological message it is that self-help book readers read out of their self-help books’ (1992, p. 423). Houghton usefully explicates the implications that follow from these insights:

This difference between the actual and the ideal is a point that is at times forgotten in Foucauldian accounts of subjectivity: the extent to which individuals become a certain type of subject is always an empirical question, hence the need for empirical research. So, while we can talk of neoliberal subjects, this is not to say agents will operate exclusively through that frame. (Houghton, 2019, p. 622)

Ironically, while this might be typical of contemporary ‘Foucaultian accounts of subjectivity’, they actually conflict with the work of Foucault himself. As Green (2010, p. 318) notes, in his mature work Foucault endorsed the view that ‘disciplinary power is both more complex in its effect and perhaps less effective in subjectification than proposed by popular post-structural approaches’. It would seem, then, that even Foucault would have had trouble accepting much scholarship that claims to have identified neoliberalism (4).

Authenticity and self-realization. According to many sociologists, the ‘entrepreneurialization of subjectivity’ (Christiaens, 2019, p. 95) veils itself most conspicuously behind the language of authenticity and self-realization. The idea is that to speak, as so many today do, of the importance of ‘realizing one’s potential’, ‘improving oneself’ and ‘seeking personal growth’, is to have subjected oneself to neoliberal governmentality. To give some examples: in his analysis of the emerging discipline of Happiness Studies Binkley (2011, p. 383), an avowed disciple of Foucault, contends that ‘the current discourse on happiness’ serves as a technology of ‘neoliberal subjectification’. He writes, ‘To govern oneself through the maximization of one’s potential for happiness is to govern oneself as a subject of neoliberal enterprise’ (2011, p. 340). In their analysis of self-help discourse, Erjavec and Volcic (2009, p. 139), citing Wacquant and other neo-Marxists, critique ‘the (neo)liberal imperative of constant retraining, a “just-keep-on-learning” mentality, selfdevelopment and individual responsibility’. And in her study of contemporary spirituality, Altglas (2018, p. 87), drawing on Foucault and Rose, writes that ‘Spirituality’ entails ‘accepting the necessity for the individual to commit to a process of change, learning, and progress – what “spiritual seekers” and their teachers call “working on oneself”‘. She concludes, ‘Spirituality as self-discipline and the kind of self it celebrates... constitutes a particular way to exert power in affinity with neoliberalism’s political and economic mechanisms of privatisation’ (2018, p. 95). The notion that the rhetorics of authenticity and self-realization signal a ‘neoliberal subject’, while theoretically provocative, is problematic. For one, as Laidlaw (2015, p. 913) reminds us, ‘The idea of taking the self as a project of self-discovery in the West goes back at least to Stoicism and has been there in Asia in Buddhism and Confucianism for centuries’. In fact, the conviction that each individual has a potential that is unique to them, and that it is their life’s vocation to realize this is arguably constitutive of the modern identity (Taylor, 1989). So, why should we assume that maximizing one’s Watts 13 potential for happiness, a ‘keep-on-learning’ mentality, or continually seeking to develop one’s self are distinctly ‘neoliberal’? There seems to me no necessary connection between these qualities and endorsement of neoliberalism (2). Nor do I see a necessary connection between these features and the ‘entrepreneur of the self’ naturalized in human capital theory. Again, one potential response is that I have made an error in presuming that these scholars do, in fact, assume the success of these technologies and discourses in constituting or subjectifying actual individuals. Perhaps their only concern is with the governmental technologies and discourses themselves. That is, perhaps they are not endorsing neoliberalism (4), but rather limiting their analyses to neoliberalism (3). On this modified account, the claim would be that positive psychology, self-help and spiritual books function as technologies and devices of neoliberal governmentality, which naturalize ‘neoliberal discourse’, given their naturalization of the ideal of a self-responsible, autonomous and self-realizing subject. While this claim may be more modest, it is still not without issues. And the reason for this is that it is not merely neoliberalism which presupposes and prescribes the ideal of a self-responsible, autonomous and self-realizing subject, but that this has also been a staple of liberalism since its inception, given its critique of excessive government (Burchell, 1993). Indeed, it is for precisely this reason that Rose made sure to distinguish between ‘neoliberalism’ – which he views as a ‘highly specific rationality’ (Rose et al., 2006, p. 97) – and ‘advanced liberalism’ – which he views as ‘something with a more general salience, which underpins mentalities of government from all parts of the political spectrum’ (Rose, 1996, p. 60). In other words, according to Rose, while a neoliberal programme may well find alignment with advanced liberal forms of rule, it would be wrong to reduce the latter to the former. It should not surprise us, then, that Rose has offered strong words against what he refers to as

a kind of cookie-cutter typification or explanation, a tendency to identify any programme with neo-liberal elements as essentially neo-liberal, and to proceed as if this subsumption of the particular under a more general category provides a sufficient account of its nature or explanation of its existence. (Rose et al., 2006, p. 98).1

Furthermore, it is critical to note that Rose, like Foucault, has long distanced himself from the kind of socio-critique implicit in neoliberalism (2). And the reason for this is that he seems to think, given that advanced liberalism is the regnant form of political rule, we are all subject to it in one way or another (Barry et al., 1996).

Where does this leave us? I would put it this way: If we accept that neoliberalism (1) has created socio-economic conditions that have forced individuals to adapt and thereby become, to some extent, self-responsible subjects, then it might well be that all of us, simply by virtue of inhabiting these social conditions, have become ‘neoliberal subjects’. Indeed, if we accept Rose’s claim that we are all subject to advanced liberal forms of rule, then this would seem a natural corollary. However, the difficulty with this conception of ‘neoliberal subject’ is that it is not clear what ‘neoliberal’ in this instance actually means. It is clearly not neoliberalism (2), since this would entail not just adaptation, but acquiescence such that we, as individuals, had accepted the basic tenets of neoliberal 14 European Journal of Social Theory XX(X) ideology. Nor is it clear that it entails neoliberalism (3), which entails having one’s subjectivity constituted by neoliberal reason. Thus, it seems to me far more accurate to say that we are all (or most us, anyway) liberal subjects – those who, in one way or another, conceive of ourselves as self-responsible, autonomous and self-realizing subjects. Though it goes without saying that such a claim is not all that illuminating.

Conclusion

Let me be clear: I do not doubt that, in some cases, neoliberalisms (1), (2) and (3) have led to the production of actual ‘neoliberal subjects’ – that is, living breathing homo oeconomicus. For instance, I would conjecture that the world of corporate finance is probably densely populated with such subjects (e.g. Neely, 2020). And indeed, in my own research, I have found that Charismatic Christians who subscribe to ‘prosperity gospel’ approximate the ‘enterprising self’ normalized in human capital theory (Watts, forthcoming). However, I am quite sceptical of the claim that neoliberal subjects populate each and every social sphere, as if we are all in the thralls of neoliberal ideology, or govern ourselves exclusively according to the dictates of neoliberal reason. That said, this obviously remains an urgent research question. But if we are to pursue it, we require a methodological approach that is sensitive to institutional specificities, the extent to which discourses are polyvalent, and the complexities involved in the production of psychic and embodied subjectivities, not just a loose discourse analysis of governmental texts.

Why? For both academic and political reasons. First, the academic: to the extent that neoliberalisms (1), (2) and (3) exist, it only muddies the water to overinterpret them. Indeed, we would do better to practice analytic precision when labelling something (or someone) ‘neoliberal’. This is especially the case when researching across national contexts: it is simply not accurate that every citizen of Western liberal democracies is equally ‘neoliberal’, either in the sense that they adhere to neoliberal ideology or that they live according to neoliberal reason. And as a growing number of scholars have maintained, it is misleading to interpret the subjective lives of citizens of East Asia and the Global South as wholly colonized by either neoliberalisms (2) or (3) (Ferguson, 2009; Parnell & Robinson, 2012). However, even within specific national contexts, we must make sure to recognize that identities and discourses are multiple, such that mere invocations of aspects of ‘neoliberal discourse’ should not be taken as evidence of a comprehensive ‘neoliberal subjectivity’. In short, if our aim as social scientists is to capture the complexity, richness and diversity of subjective life in the twenty-first century, then we ought to broaden the ‘repertoire of subjectivity’ (Green, 2010, p. 331) carried in our analytic toolboxes.

Second, the political: for those of us who find something abhorrent about neoliberalisms (1), (2) and (3), it may actually undermine our cause to repeatedly give the impression that one or either of these have seeped into the subjectivities of everyone presently living. One reason for this is that to the extent that we overlook, or dismiss, extant alternative social and moral forms, we may unwittingly serve to bolster neoliberal ideology and reason, aiding and abetting their spokespeople in their goal of global domination. Indeed, John Welsh (2020, p. 68) suggests that if we are to oppose neoliberalism in all of its forms, academics must begin to ‘introduce contingency back into the interstices of this seemingly impenetrable edifice’. Interestingly, this strategy actually aligns with the mature work of Foucault, for whom scholarship should seek to disrupt that which is taken for granted. Drawing on this Foucaultian legacy, Cornelissen (2018, p. 144) convincingly argues that ‘resistance should be given a more prominent analytical role in the critique of neoliberalism’, adding, ‘resistance is not secondary to the elaboration of alternatives; rather, moments of refusal must guide the formulation of alternative analyses’. Cornelissen concludes, ‘what is at stake politically is our capacity to imagine practices or resistance to neoliberalism and to take seriously those modalities of resistance that already exist’. I could not agree more. And for this reason, I think we should be far more careful when invoking the monolithic notion of a ‘neoliberal subject’.

## T

#### It’s a scope question – Parker limited the scope of Sherman

Crane 16 [Daniel A. Crane Frederick Paul Furth Sr. Professor of Law, University of Michigan Law School Adam Hester J.D., May 2016, University of Michigan Law School, 2016, State-Action Immunity and Section 5 of the FTC Act, 115 MICH. L. REV. 365, https://repository.law.umich.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1510&context=mlr]

This Article addresses the statutory prong—federal antitrust preemption of state law—in the wider context of constitutional and institutional history. In particular, it examines the assumed, but never decided, position that the United States Federal Trade Commission (“FTC”) lacks any preemptive power over anticompetitive state and local regulations, apart from the relatively light preemptive reach of the Sherman Act. It asserts, to the contrary, that the best historically informed and institutionally sound reading of Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act suggests that the FTC should enjoy what the Supreme Court has hypothesized as “superior preemption authority” over state and local regulations that unduly restrict competition.12

As a matter of legal doctrine, the question of the FTC’s preemptive authority originates in the Supreme Court’s seminal 1943 decision in Parker v. Brown. 13 In Parker, the Court held that “[t]here is no suggestion of a purpose to restrain state action in the [Sherman] Act’s legislative history.”14 The resulting state-action immunity doctrine sharply limited any preemptive scope of the Sherman Act over anticompetitive state regulations.15 Parker also rejected a dormant commerce clause challenge to the state regulation at issue.16 The case thus showcased the Court’s uniform reluctance to permit any strand of federal law—constitutional or statutory—to revive Lochnerism.