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#### Glaring inconsistencies and bad decisions interpreting the FTAIA’s limit on the Sherman Act wreck the deterrent effect of US extraterritorial antitrust against global cartels
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IV. SHORTCOMINGS OF THE CURRENT JURISPRUDENCE

Although clarity was one of Congress’ goals in enacting the FTAIA, the statute as drafted is anything but clear, and the FTAIA itself has contributed to the ill-defined boundaries of the effects doctrine. The FTAIA has produced a number of circuit splits, one of which was decided by Empagran.151 Other circuit splits currently exist, including one between the Seventh and Ninth circuits concerning the interpretation of the FTAIA’s requirement that anticompetitive behavior have a “direct, substantial, and reasonably foreseeable effect” on US commerce which the Supreme Court has so far abstained from resolving.152 As explained in Minn-Chem, Inc. v. Agrium Inc., the “substantial” and “reasonably foreseeable” prongs have produced little dispute and are relatively straightforward.153 Rather, what it takes to show “direct” is less clear.154 The Seventh Circuit took the position that, like in tort law, recovery should be cut off for injuries that are too remote from the cause of an injury and held that the term “direct” means only “a reasonably proximate causal nexus.”155

To the contrary, the Ninth Circuit in United States v. LSL Biotechnologies looked to the Supreme Court’s definition of “direct” from a different statute germane to international relations.156 Drawing from dictionary definitions and language in the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act that is similar to that in the FTAIA, the court held that an effect is “direct” if “it follows the immediate consequence of the defendant’s activity.”157 This definition was subsequently utilized by the Ninth Circuit in its decision in United States v. Hsiung (the criminal prosecution of the defendants in Motorola Mobility), which expressly rejected Minn-Chem’s “reasonably proximate causal nexus” approach and reiterated instead the broader “immediate consequence” test.158

A. Problems Arising from the Circuit Split

Using Minn-Chem’s definition of “direct,” however, has produced a questionable holding in Motorola Mobility.159 In that case, a US company, Motorola, brought a claim under Section 1 of the Sherman Act, alleging that it was the victim of price-fixing among foreign manufacturers of liquid crystal display (“LCD”) panels used as components in the manufacture of cellphones.160 The LCD panel manufacturers had already been found guilty of participating in an illegal cartel, and those convictions were affirmed in Hsiung.161 Motorola was a major purchaser of LCD panels, but had purchased most of the price-fixed products through its majority-owned foreign subsidiaries.162 Only one percent of its purchases were made directly by Motorola in the United States and incorporated into cellphones also sold in the United States.163 The other ninety-nine percent of its purchases were made abroad.164 Of those purchases, forty-two percent were incorporated into phones destined for the United States, while the remainder were used to make phones sold abroad.165

In its first stab at the appeal of the lower court’s decision, the Seventh Circuit following Minn-Chem’s definition of “direct” held that anticompetitive behavior affecting intermediary products, rather than final products, could not have a “direct” effect on US commerce.166 After additional consideration likely influenced by the DOJ’s concern with the initial holding and its implications for international cartel enforcement, the court vacated the first opinion and opted for a different approach to the same conclusion.167 Summarizing that the case involved “components [that] were sold by their manufacturers to their foreign subsidiaries, which incorporated them into the finished product to Motorola for resale in the United States,” Judge Posner branded the wrongful conduct, effect, and injury as entirely extraterritorial because Motorola and its subsidiaries did not function as one enterprise.168 Therefore, the court construed Motorola as an indirect purchaser, barred from bringing a claim under the Sherman Act by virtue of the holding in Illinois Brick Co. v. Illinois,169 and concluded that the entire transaction falls outside of the FTAIA’s exception, though recognizing that the effect on US commerce may, perhaps, be “direct.”170

But, the court’s reliance on Illinois Brick was no better than its initial attempt to characterize the effect of the LCD cartel on US commerce. Several points suggest Motorola Mobility was wrongly decided, including inconsistencies with US precedent and statutes. In holding that Motorola and its subsidiaries did not function as one enterprise because they are governed by the different laws of the countries in which they are incorporated and operated, Judge Posner disregarded the Supreme Court’s central holding in Copperweld Corp. v. Independence Tube Corp.171 Copperweld’s progeny have found a corporation and its wholly owned subsidiaries to be a “single entity” with “complete unity of interest” and, similarly, have also found a lack of relevant differences between a corporation and its wholly owned subsidiary for Sherman Act analysis.172 Additionally, for non-wholly owned subsidiaries, courts relying on Copperweld have treated a parent and its non-wholly owned subsidiary as a single entity for antitrust purposes where the parent held a controlling majority of the subsidiary’s stock.173

In addition to precedent, other US antitrust statutes treat parents and subsidiaries as one entity. The Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvement Act (“HSR”) requires a business acquiring another business in a transaction meeting certain thresholds to file a premerger notification with the government.174 If the acquiring business is controlled by a parent corporation, the HSR mandates that the “ultimate parent entity” file the notification regardless of the nationality of the acquired business.175 Furthermore, appearing to be influenced by Copperweld, the HSR does not require filing for the merger of two wholly owned subsidiaries with a common parent.176

Motorola also argued that it was the “target” of the illegal conduct or, alternatively, the direct victim because its subsidiary “passed on” the cartel-inflated portion of the original purchase price to Motorola.177 In Illinois Brick, which also contemplated the offensive use of the illfated pass-on theory in US antitrust jurisprudence, Justice White surmised that a situation in which the pass-on defense “might be permitted” is where the direct purchaser is owned or controlled by its customer.178 Posner, highlighting the semantic difference between “might be” and “is,” brushed this off as meaningless.179

The Motorola Mobility decision has negative consequences for US antitrust law, non-US subsidiaries of American parents relying on US law for potential recovery, US businesses operating internationally with international subsidiaries, and consumers. In essence, the Seventh Circuit announced a broad rule that eliminates private antitrust remedies where the first purchase of a price-fixed component occurs offshore, drastically mitigating the ability of US antitrust law to deter harmful foreign conduct targeting US markets.180 Is Posner really suggesting that American businesses are only protected by US antitrust law when the domestic parent itself engages in such wholly foreign transactions?181

Moreover, the Seventh Circuit’s decision creates a glaring inconsonance with the Ninth Circuit’s in what should be similar outcomes to similar cases. Despite justifying its second decision the Seventh Circuit by warning that “rampant extraterritorial application of U.S. law ‘creates a serious risk of interference with a foreign nation’s ability to independently regulate its own affairs,’” the court did not delve into any meaningful comity analysis.182 Particularly troubling is that while concerned with the prospect of “rampant extraterritoriality,” the court gives no attention to whether Motorola would be able to recover abroad or, more importantly, whether the cartels’ host countries have any incentive to prosecute “when their nationals engage in hardcore cartel conduct directed at a huge U.S. consumer market” that caused harm in that, opposed to its own, market.183

B. Comity Analysis: A Possible Solution to Interpreting the FTAIA?

Ultimately, the Seventh Circuit may have initially reached a more reasonable conclusion in its first decision of Motorola Mobility had the court taken a different interpretational approach, such as one taken by the Supreme Court. Because the FTAIA’s effect test reflects an evaluation of a US jurisdictional claim, a possible method of aiding the courts’ construction of what a “direct” effect entails may be to follow Empagran’s example and in fact employ a comity analysis.184 The two most recent comity principle constructions, as discussed, are in Hartford Fire and Empagran. However, the different comity approaches the Supreme Court undertakes in both cases result in standards that are under-inclusive and over-inclusive, respectively.

The Supreme Court’s approach in Hartford Fire suggested the unhelpfulness, if not irrelevance, of comity if there was no true conflict of laws.185 Hartford Fire’s comity test is under-inclusive in the sense that comity considerations would rarely be triggered, perhaps only in cases where a foreign state established laws mandating anticompetitive behavior.186 Indeed, the First Circuit in Nippon Paper suggested that Hartford Fire had “stunted” the growth of comity in antitrust, and Professor Eleanor Fox proclaimed that “[the decision in Hartford Fire] gives U.S. jurists and enforcers license to disregard the interests of non- Americans.”187

Empagran’s comity analysis, on the other hand, may be rigidly over-inclusive to the point where important US antitrust law objectives, such as deterrence and remedy, may go unserved. Turning its back on the Supreme Court’s previous holdings in Continental Ore and Pfizer, the decision’s use of comity may in fact have created “a handicap going forward [that] would lead to under-deterrence as well as unfairness.”188 As Judge Higginbotham’s dissent in Den Norske v. HeereMac stresses, the FTAIA does not alter Pfizer’s affirmation of foreign plaintiffs’ ability to sue under the Sherman Act, which was expressly approved in the statute’s legislative history.189

#### Unrestrained cartel behavior makes global supply chains unstable and undermines domestic manufacturing

Leonardo ‘16 [Lizl Leonardo; 2016; J.D. Candidate, DePaul University College of Law, 2018; B.S., 2011, De La Salle University-Manila, Philippines; DePaul Law Review; “A Proposal to the Seventh and Ninth Circuit Split: Expand the Reach of the U.S. Antitrust Laws to Extraterritorial Conduct that Impacts U.S. Commerce.” vol. 66, https://via.library.depaul.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=4008&context=law-review]

The FTAIA was enacted to “clarify” the Sherman Act’s application to transactions that affect U.S. commerce, yet the circuit courts have not come to a consensus as to how it must be consistently interpreted.198 Similarly, despite the circuit splits that have overwhelmed the judicial system, the U.S. Supreme Court has only interpreted the FTAIA once, in Empagran. 199 The Court at that time, however, did not answer the critical question embodied in Hui Hsiung and Motorola: whether the FTAIA applies to transactions made outside of the United States but eventually have an impact upon U.S. competition, commerce, and consumers.200

The indistinguishable facts of Hui Hsiung and Motorola and the irreconcilable rulings call for a consistent rule across the circuit courts and intervention by the U.S. Supreme Court.201 Both cases involved the price-fixing of LCD panels by foreign entities, whose manufactured products eventually reached the United States.202 Yet, the Seventh and Ninth Circuits disagreed on what constitutes “import trade” or “import commerce.”203 The Seventh Circuit held that in order to be liable, a defendant must be engaged as an importer, who directly sells goods into the United States.204 Accordingly, it ruled that the one percent of LCDs sold directly to Motorola were too attenuated to become “import trade” under the Sherman Act;205 the remaining forty-two percent of LCDs, which Motorola’s foreign subsidiaries bought from the defendants, were too “remote” under FTAIA.206 In complete contrast, the Ninth Circuit held that any conduct consummated within an import market qualifies as either “import trade” or “import commerce.”207 This meant that the defendants did not have to import any goods themselves, but only needed to have engaged in conduct within the import business to satisfy both the Sherman Act and the FTAIA.208 Accordingly, the Ninth Circuit held that the defendants, although not the per se importers of the LCD panels, were liable under either the Sherman Act or the FTAIA for engaging in business that affected the finished products that were sold into the United States.209

These two contrasting rulings have placed not only the defendants—but also other foreign companies doing business with the United States—in a precarious position.210 These two cases represent the frequently recurring question of how to interpret the FTAIA.211 Foreign companies that do business, directly or indirectly, want clear guidance on how their business practices could be subjected to U.S. antitrust laws.212 No company will want to risk breaking the law in one jurisdiction, yet be absolved in the other.213 A clear ruling across all federal courts will be beneficial to international antitrust enforcement and the domestic economy, especially with the continuous expansion of global supply chains.214

A “supply chain” is defined as “a network between a company and its suppliers to produce and distribute a specific product, and the supply chain represents the steps it takes to get the product or service to the customer.”215 It essentially “encompasses each step from the supplier to the final consumer.”216 Establishing global supply chains across the world has become a strategy of companies in today’s globalized economy.217 Global supply chains have played an important role in the end-to-end production of goods sought by consumers across the world.218 In today’s globalized economy, companies use this practice to source, manufacture, transport, and distribute products internationally.219 For example, televisions are manufactured in China using displays from Taiwan and Korea.220 These televisions eventually find their way into various countries, including the United States.221 Due to this multi-step process, many businesses that utilize global supply chains become victims of anticompetitive activity by foreign cartels.222 In fact, price-fixing conspiracies have cost consumers more than $1 trillion over the last twenty-five years.223 Needless to say, the United States, holding a huge market share of these products, should protect these supply chains to some degree through the enactment and execution of an understandable U.S. antitrust law.224

The manufacturing industry, in particular, contributes more than $1.8 trillion annually to the U.S. economy and “employs nearly twelve million men and women.”225 The goods sold by foreign intermediaries eventually find their way into the United States, some of which may be used to further domestic manufacturing.226 For example, in 2014, approximately $2.8 trillion of goods were imported into the United States.227 This amount has more than doubled in the last fifteen years.228 Most of these imports act as intermediate inputs on productivity used for other businesses in the United States.229 For example, in 2006, over ten percent of intermediate inputs accounted for imported intermediaries used by private industries.230 Without a doubt, the question presented in these two cases is of tremendous economic significance to U.S. manufacturers and the United States as a whole. The harm of the price-fixing conspiracy from these two cases alone has affected well over $23.5 billion in sales of LCD panels imported into the United States, either as raw materials or as components of finished products.231 Manufacturers have had to absorb the artificially high costs of the LCD panels as they incorporate the component LCD panels into finished products, and they ultimately pass those artificially inflated costs on to U.S. consumers.232 Price-sensitive consumers, in return, may have refused to purchase these more expensive products, altering the demand-supply market and impacting the companies’ bottom lines.

#### Integrated and global supply chains solve every hotspot for conflict – material integration prevents war and encourages resolution – untangling risks the future of global stability.

Khanna '16 [Parag; 4/19/16; Senior Research Fellow in the Centre on Asia and Globalisation at the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy at the National University of Singapore; "From War to Tug-of-War: The Global Fight for Connectivity," https://nationalinterest.org/feature/war-tug-war-the-global-fight-connectivity-15831]//GJ

Here is my prediction: Taiwan won’t cause World War III. Nor will Kashmir, nor the Senkaku Islands, nor the nonexistent Iranian nuclear bomb. We aren’t very good at predicting wars. The wars that have broken out in the recent past—the U.S. invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq after 9/11, Russia invading Ukraine, the proxy war under way in Syria—weren’t predicted by anyone.

Furthermore, applying ancient wisdom such as the “Thucydides trap” only gets us so far. In 2015, respected Harvard professor Graham Allison published a study covering five hundred years of geopolitical power transitions and found that war broke out between the “ruling” power and its “rising” challenger in twelve out of sixteen cases. Based on these historical odds, war between the United States and China is likely but not inevitable. The most important strategy to avoid sleepwalking into World War III, Allison’s brilliant paper urged, is a “long pause for reflection.” Let’s take that pause.

\*\*\*

This isn’t 1914. In our haste to make analogies to a century ago, we have neglected the differences. European nations traded heavily across each other prior to World War I, but they did so as vertically integrated mercantile empires drawing on raw materials from their own vast colonies. They traded in finished goods without outsourcing production to each other. We did not have today’s internationally distributed manufacturing networks in 1914. The nineteenth and twentieth centuries brought trade interdependence; in the twenty-first century, we have complex supply chain dispersal as well—including among rival superpowers.

Even more than trade, it is investment that determines the stability of relations. Under a Cold War geopolitical paradigm, rivals wouldn’t invest in each other either; the United States and the Soviet Union certainly didn’t. But today’s robust flows of global investment among friends and enemies—“frenemies”—highlight how we have shifted from a Westphalian world to a supply-chain world. This financial and investment integration comes in the form of the trillions of dollars of assets invested in each other’s currencies and equities, as well as the tangible, productive capital—factories, real estate, banks, agriculture—they have bought and built inside other’s territory to efficiently and profitably access their markets.

If the United States and China were to go to war, the most immediate casualty would be Walmart, America’s largest retailer, 70 percent of whose merchandise is imported from China. Walmart has also been buying e-commerce companies such as Yihaodian.com to boost sales in China. The world’s most valuable company, Apple (also American), would also see its stock plummet, with so much of the market sentiment around its potential linked to growth in China. Two other American technology giants, Google and Facebook, would have to give up their cherished dreams of equal access behind China’s “Great Firewall,” and Hollywood studios, already accused of self-censorship to gain investment such as Dalian Wanda’s recent purchase of Legendary Entertainment for $3.5 billion, would find themselves banned from the world’s fastest-growing film market.

Approximately 60 percent of the Fortune 500’s revenues come from overseas sales, and the recently ratified Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) agreement is an American-led effort to nudge Asia’s share of America’s exports up even higher—with the potential for China itself to eventually join the trade area. As of March 2016, China imports American shale oil supplies from Texas. Direct confrontation is thus not in anyone’s interest so long as China needs peace for growth, America needs China for its hardware and everyone relies on shipping through the South China Sea.

Supply chains thus diminish the incentives for conflict. Leaders think twice, and step back from the brink. The growing depth of global cross-border trade and investment make geopolitics much more complex than in previous eras. When Presidents Obama and Xi held a 2013 summit at Sunnylands in California and spoke of aspiring toward “a new kind of great power relationship,” that was a reflection of the current reality—not a future scenario.

The common-sense truth is that while leaders talk about “red lines” for public consumption, and navies come dangerously close to trading direct fire, global market integration churns forward, knowing that there are two kinds of mutually assured destruction at play: military and economic. Military maneuvers don’t tell us enough about what drives leverage among great powers nor what they are willing to fight over. The tangled complexities of today’s system force leaders to think beyond borders and make functional calculations about the cost-benefit utility of their strategies—knowing full well that supply-chain warfare involves not just an enemy “over there” but also one’s own deep interests “over there.”

Waiting for World War III thus recalls Samuel Beckett’s Waiting for Godot, in which Vladimir and Estragon resolve to hang themselves if Godot does not arrive—so they simply sit endlessly. Their would-be savior, of course, never comes, but the protagonists never actually commit suicide either.

It is well documented that the number and frequency of interstate wars has fallen to nearly zero. Equally important, but far less discussed, is our ability to ring-fence conflicts, containing them at the local or regional level rather than allowing them to spillover too widely or escalate too sharply. The one genuine international conflict of the past several years, between Russia and Ukraine, is an example of this. Russia has not invaded the Baltics, marched into Poland, shut off gas to Europe in the winter or otherwise cleaved the European Union. Russia lacks the capacity to do so, and knows the repercussions of overreach.

The Arab world also continues to seize daily headlines. Syria is undeniably a regional proxy war, meaning that chaos there will continue. But it is not likely that Sunni powers such as Turkey and Saudi Arabia will directly escalate against Russia and Iran, whose forces are backing Bashar al-Assad’s Alawite regime. Saudi Arabia and Iran are also jockeying in Iraq, marking yet another chapter in Iraq’s destruction that began with the 1980s Iran-Iraq War, the disastrous invasion of Kuwait in 1990, the U.S. invasion in 2003 and brutal insurgency ever since. But Iraq, too, will not become the flash point that triggers war among great powers. While all of these conflicts are tragic, none of them, civil or international, are of world-historical significance.

A far more important driver of the long-term geopolitical positioning among key powers is not their role in any of these minor wars, but how they play the great supply-chain tug-of-war that is a far more pervasive reality than international warfare. Tug-of-war is an apt metaphor for our times. The world’s oldest team sport, its rituals are recorded in ancient stone etchings from Egypt to Greece to China to Guinea. Often conducted in resplendent royal ceremonies, tug-of-war was used by the soldiers of great armies to build strength in preparation for combat. In the eighth century, the Tang dynasty emperor Xuanzong was known to pit over five hundred warriors on each side of a rope over 150 meters long.

The rope in today’s geopolitical tug-of-war is connectivity. States want to control the transportation, energy and communications infrastructures and markets that enable them to acquire resources, access markets and move up the value chain. We don’t fight over the borders that divide us, but rather pull and yank the supply chains that connect us. While very few societies are at war, all societies are caught in this global tug-of-war, competing over the flows of money, goods, resources, technology, knowledge and talent transpiring between them.

Wars of connectivity are won by economic master planning rather than military doctrine. Think about it: twenty-first-century China is not a superpower because of the size of its military arsenal, but because it has become the central hub for the world’s manufacturing and electronics supply chains, built a sizeable trade surplus and enormous currency reserves, and penetrated most of its neighbors through robust infrastructure networks and become their main foreign investor and export destination. Do you have any clue how many nuclear weapons China has? Exactly: It doesn’t matter. But you probably know a fair bit by now about how China builds special economic zones, buys and steals foreign technology, and capitalizes companies with billions of dollars to ramp up quickly and capture global markets that range from solar panels to mobile handsets.

Britain’s elite Royal Military Academy Sandhurst publishes a manual of strategies for success in tug-of-war, pointing out that a good team “synchronizes its movements to the point that their pull feels like it comes from a single, unified being.” Does America act like this? Do Washington politicians, the Fed, Wall Street bankers, Texas oil companies, Silicon Valley tech companies and the other players on America’s team act like a single, unified being? Or does China do it better? Tug-of-war is won slowly and carefully. Smart teams dig in their heels to hold ground and tire out opponents while collectively taking small steps to ultimately gain control.

Tug-of-war is still war without end, a marathon without a finish line. Winston Churchill once advised that it is always better to “jaw-jaw” than to “war-war,” meaning diplomacy is preferable to conflict. Today’s world is a hybrid of the two: It is an endless tug-tug.

The future of global stability hinges on whether great powers think and act in terms of sovereignty or supply chains—if they learn the benefits of fighting tug-of-war instead of the real thing. It is no doubt unwise to argue that World War III is a passé risk. However, as the French scholar Raymond Aron argued, nuclear deterrence and the benefits of hindsight are crucial in warding against the uncontrolled escalations of the twentieth century or even harrowing episodes such as the Cuban missile crisis. Furthermore, China’s neo-mercantilism today is quite different from the zero-sum European colonial mercantilism of centuries ago: It is the pursuit of catch-up modernization rather than global hegemony. China seeks foreign raw materials and technology, not foreign territory. The smoother the supply chains, the more satisfied China will be.

A hyperconnected, multipolar world is uncharted and dangerous territory, but the paradox of tug-of-war may be that the longer it goes on, the more everyone wins. If we play our cards right, North Korea will become a supply-chain condominium of China and South Korea and other investors variously exploiting its tremendous mineral and agricultural resources while modernizing its nascent manufacturing capacity. India and Pakistan will revive the historic Grand Trunk Road of trade linkages stretching from Afghanistan to Bangladesh, and complete the natural gas pipeline from Iran via Pakistan to India. China and Taiwan will deepen their supply chain linkages and accept the outstanding differences in political systems. And China and Japan will settle their historical grievances through generational change in leadership, and accept with maturity the obvious hierarchy of Asia’s future.

Today’s world is full of tension, strife and hostility: nuclear standoffs, terrorist insurgencies, collapsing states and tragic civil conflicts. It is healthy to remind ourselves that many of our ongoing flash points could potentially escalate through unpredictable chain reactions into global conflagration. But it is even more important to pay attention to what we are doing that prevents the unintended slide into disaster—and do more of it. The future of global stability hinges on whether we continue global supply-chain integration and content ourselves with waging tug-of-war rather than the real thing. The world’s oldest team sport has an admirable track record: almost nobody has ever died playing it.

#### And globalized CRM supply chains are hyper-vulnerable to anticompetitive conduct that shocks global battery markets – the entire market is at risk

Umbach ‘18 [Frank; 2018; Research director of the European Centre for Energy and Resource Security (EUCERS) at King’s College, London; adjunct senior fellow at the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS) at the Nanyan Technological University (NTU) in Singapore, senior associate at the Centre for European Security Strategies (CESS GmbH), Munich, executive advisor of Proventis Partners GmbH, Munich, and a visiting professor at the College of Europe in Natolin/Warsaw (Poland); "Energy Security in a Digitalised World and its Geostrategic Implications," https://www.kas.de/documents/265079/265128/Energy+Security+in+a+Digitalised+World+and+its+Geostrategic+Implications+Final.pdf/07691140-d019-4f4c-5363-795d9aeea361?version=1.0&t=1541645390708]

The worldwide electrification of the transport and other industry sectors, the development of a new generation of batteries for electricity storage as well as the digitalization of the industries, including the spread of robotics and artificial intelligence systems in the industry (‘industry 4.0’) will further boost the worldwide demand for CRMs such as lithium, cobalt and others. As a result, it might create new and unprecedented challenges, including bottlenecks and supply shortages, for the global supply chains of the CRMs on each stage ranging from mining to processing, refining and manufacturing.

The production of CRMs is geopolitically - compared with the concentration of conventional oil and gas resources - more challenging and problematic as currently 50% of CRMs are located in fragile states or politically unstable regions. Moreover, security of supply risks are not just constrained to primary natural resources and CRMs but also to the import of semimanufactured and refined goods as well as finished products. Manipulated prices, restricted supplies and attempts at cartelization of CRM markets with wide-ranging negative economic consequences are not restricted just to producing and exporting countries. Powerful states and private companies have also been responsible for non-transparent pricing mechanisms for many precious CRMs. Global supply chains have become ever more complex due to the blurring of boundaries between physical and financial markets and weakly governed market platforms. These market imperfections lead to the manipulation of prices and threaten the stability of the future security of supply of CRMs.

Given China’s status as the world’s largest battery producer, and as the leading nation in the electrification of the national transport sector, it may increase the dependencies of the European and U.S. carmakers on China. The dependence on CRMs such as lithium, cobalt, graphite, rare earth and others will equally rise. Those geopolitical impacts have already been highlighted in 2010–2011, when China in the midst of escalating diplomatic conflict with Japan stopped all exports of Rare Earth Elements (REEs) to the world’s biggest importer and blackmailed Tokyo diplomatically by instrumentalising its status as the world’s largest producer and exporter of REEs. It has sent a troubling message to the world that the new rising Asian economic and military power might not respect international law, the existing global rules of the WTO and that Beijing may not politically be willing to accept the regional and global responsibilities that grow with its emerging superpower status. Over the last months, China has further strengthened its efforts to control the entire global supply chain of lithium, from owning international mines to the production of lithium up to manufacturing of batteries and EVs.

#### Supply chain disruptions cascade across key industries

O'Sullivan et al ‘17 [Meghan O’Sullivan; 2017; Harvard Kennedy School of Government Indra Overland Norwegian Institute of International Affairs—NUPI David Sandalow Columbia Center on Global Energy Policy; "The Geopolitics of Renewable Energy," https://energypolicy.columbia.edu/sites/default/files/CGEPTheGeopoliticsOfRenewables.pdf]

As the transition to renewable energy accelerates, cartels could develop around materials critical to renewable energy technologies. Even if these cartels were unable to generate as much impact as OPEC did with oil in years past, they might be able to exert influence over consumers of these materials. Some materials critical for renewable energy technologies are also critical in other sectors, such as consumer products and weaponry, raising the potential for competition between sectors as well.

Rare earth elements (including dysprosium, neodymium, terbium, europium and yttrium) are often considered to be critical components of renewable energy hardware.7 Ironically, rare earth elements are not rare. They are found in many countries, including China, Russia, Australia, the United States, Brazil, India, Malaysia and Thailand. However, two countries—China and Russia—together hold 57% of global reserves, while the largest remaining country, Australia, holds a mere 2.4% of global reserves.8 Furthermore, rare earths are found in dilute concentrations and are often difficult to separate, making mining, production and processing difficult and capital intensive. Today almost all mining, production and processing of rare earths is in China. Rare earths mined elsewhere generally must be exported to China for processing and then re-imported.9 As demand for renewable energy technologies continues to increase, countries may be inclined to hold rare earth elements in reserve for themselves and compete over these resources.

#### Next gen batteries solve grid stability and blackouts

Beall ‘18 [Abigail Beall; 2018; Journalist writing for Chinadialogue, citing Dr Emma Kendrick, a materials chemist at the University of Warwick; "The race to develop the next generation battery," https://www.chinadialogue.net/article/show/single/en/10808-The-race-to-develop-the-next-generation-battery]

Alongside electric cars, grid storage is another area where large-scale batteries will play an increasingly important role. The amount of renewable power from solar and wind at any given time depends on the weather, which makes it intermittent. Batteries can help stabilise grids by storing energy efficiently.

“Sodium-ion batteries could be an inexpensive alternative to lithium-ion in the grid storage market,” says Ms Cheng. Sodium-ion batteries work in a similar way to lithium-ion but use sodium instead, which is more readily available. Dr Emma Kendrick, a materials chemist at the University of Warwick, is looking into the sodium-ion battery. “This is a low-cost alternative to lithium-ion batteries,” she says. “It is still in its infancy but there are opportunities to perform research into the manufacturability and durability of the technology.” Flow batteries are another alternative.

“Flow batteries are also attractive options since they can be easily scaled up to provide high capacity," says Ms Cheng, adding: "They contain two chemical compounds that are separated by a membrane. The compounds can flow through the membrane, creating chemical energy, but they can also move back to where they started, which recharges the battery."

There are many other options. In February this year, scientists at the University of California Irvine created gold nanowire batteries that can withstand more recharging than ever before, hundreds of times within their lifetime. The team hopes this will one day lead to batteries that can last indefinitely.

Graphene may also be a component of the battery of the future. A Spanish company called Grabat says their graphene batteries can provide power for an electric vehicle to travel 500 miles on a single charge. For comparison, Tesla’s Model 3 can travel 215 miles on one charge.

While nobody can predict exactly what the next generation of batteries is going to look like, there is a huge amount of work going into solving the problem.

#### They insulate the network from attacks and build in resilience that stops collapse

Urry ‘17 [Amelia; 2/22/17; Grist's associate editor of science and technology; "Inside the Race to Build the Battery of Tomorrow," https://www.wired.com/2017/02/researchers-racing-build-battery-future/]

And here’s what a better battery stands to win: a cleaner, more reliable power system, which doesn’t rely on fossil fuels and is more robust to boot.

Every time you flip a light switch, you tap into a gigantic invisible web, the electrical grid. Somewhere, at the other end of the high-voltage transmission lines carrying power to your house, there’s a power plant (likely burning coal or, increasingly, natural gas) churning out electricity to replace the electrons that you and everyone else are draining at that moment.

The amount of power in our grid at any one time is carefully maintained—too much or too little and things start to break. Grid operators make careful observations and predictions to determine how much electricity power plants should produce, minute by minute, hour by hour. But sometimes they’re wrong, and a plant has to power up in a hurry to make up the difference.

Lucky for us, it’s a big, interconnected system, so we rarely notice changes in the quality or quantity of electricity. Imagine the difference between stepping into a bucket of water versus stepping into the ocean. In a small system, any change in the balance between supply and demand is obvious — the bucket overflows. But because the grid is so big—ocean-like—fluctuations are usually imperceptible. Only when something goes very wrong do we notice, because the lights go out.

Renewable energy is less obedient than a coal- or gas-fired power plant—you can’t just fire up a solar farm if demand spikes suddenly. Solar power peaks during the day, varies as clouds move across the sun, and disappears at night, while wind power is even less predictable. Too much of that kind of intermittency on the grid could make it more difficult to balance supply and demand, which could lead to more blackouts. Storing energy is a safety valve. If you could dump extra energy somewhere, then draw from it when supply gets low again, you can power a whole lot more stuff with renewable energy, even when the sun isn’t shining and the wind isn’t blowing. What’s more, the grid itself becomes more stable and efficient, as batteries would allow communities and regions to manage their own power supply. Our aging and overtaxed power infrastructure would go a lot further. Instead of installing new transmission lines in places where existing lines are near capacity, you could draw power during off-peak times and stash it in batteries until you need it.

Just like that, the bucket can behave a lot more like the ocean. That would mean—at least in theory—more distributed power generation and storage, more renewables, and less reliance on giant fossil-fueled power plants.

#### Grid resilience solves extinction – it’s a threat buffer and the impact is understated

Greene ‘19 [Sherrell; 2019; He is a recognized subject matter expert in nuclear reactor safety, nuclear fuel cycle technologies, and advanced reactor concept development. Mr. Greene is widely acclaimed for his systems analysis, team building, innovation, knowledge organization, presentation, and technical communication skills. Mr. Greene worked at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL) for over three decades. During his career at ORNL, he served as Director of Research Reactor Development Programs and Director of Nuclear Technology Programs; "Enhancing Electric Grid, Critical Infrastructure, and Societal Resilience with Resilient Nuclear Power Plants (rNPPs)," https://ans.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/00295450.2018.1505357?needAccess=true]

Societies and nations are examples of large-scale, complex social-physical systems. Thus, societal resilience can be defined as the ability of a nation, population, or society to anticipate and prepare for major stressors or calamities and then to absorb, adapt to, recover from, and restore normal functions in the wake of such events when they occur. A nation’s dependence on its Critical Infrastructure systems, and the resilience of those systems, are therefore major components of national and societal resilience.

There are a variety of events that could deal crippling blows to a nation’s Grid, Critical Infrastructure, and social fabric. The types of catastrophes under consideration here are “very bad day” scenarios that might result from severe GMDs induced by solar CMEs, HEMP attacks, cyber attacks, etc.5

As briefly discussed in Sec. III.C, the probability of a GMD of the magnitude of the 1859 Carrington Event is now believed to be on the order of 1%/year. The Earth narrowly missed (by only several days) intercepting a CME stream in July 2012 that would have created a GMD equal to or larger than the Carrington Event.41 Lloyd’s, in its 2013 report, “Solar Storm Risk to the North American Electric Grid,” 42 stated the following: “A Carrington-level, extreme geomagnetic storm is almost inevitable in the future…The total U.S. population at risk of extended power outage from a Carrington-level storm is between 20-40 million, with durations of 16 days to 1-2 years…The total economic cost for such a scenario is estimated at $0.6-2.6 trillion USD.” Analyses conducted subsequent to the Lloyd’s assessment indicated the geographical area impacted by the CME would be larger than that estimated in Lloyd’s analysis (extending farther northward along the New England coast of the United States and in the state of Minnesota),43 and that the actual consequences of such an event could actually be greater than estimated by Lloyd’s.

Based on “Report of the Commission to Assess the Threat to the United States from Electromagnetic Pulse (EMP) Attack: Critical National Infrastructures” to Congress in 2008 (Ref. 39), a HEMP attack over the Central U.S. could impact virtually the entire North American continent. The consequences of such an event are difficult to quantify with confidence. Experts affiliated with the aforementioned Commission and others familiar with the details of the Commission’s work have stated in Congressional testimony that such an event could “kill up to 90 percent of the national population through starvation, disease, and societal collapse.” 44,45 Most of these consequences are either direct or indirect impacts of the predicted collapse of virtually the entire U.S. Critical Infrastructure system in the wake of the attack.

Last, recent analyses by both the U.S. Department of Energy46 and the U.S. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine47 have concluded that cyber threats to the U.S. Grid from both state-level and substatelevel entities are likely to grow in number and sophistication in the coming years, posing a growing threat to the U.S. Grid.

These three “very bad day” scenarios are not creations of overzealous science fiction writers. A variety of mitigating actions to reduce both the vulnerability and the consequences of these events has been identified, and some are being implemented. However, the fact remains that events such as those described here have the potential to change life as we know it in the United States and other developed nations in the 21st century, whether the events occur individually, or simultaneously, and with or without coordinated physical attacks on Critical Infrastructure assets.

#### Solar storms and EMP strikes are inevitable and outweigh nuclear war – distributed power solves

MM ‘15 [Microgrid Media; 9/15/15; “Grid Will Not Survive Inevitable Geomagnetic Storm or EMP Attack,” microgridmedia.com/grid-will-not-survive-geomagnetic-storm-or-emp-attack/]

But as former Director of Central Intelligence James Woolsey warned in his recent congressional testimony, “The EMP threat is as real as the Sun and as inevitable as a solar flare.”

The Congressional EMP Commission, called it “one of a small number of threats that has the potential to hold our society seriously at risk” and “is capable of causing catastrophe for the nation.” These are not one commissions findings, but represent a consensus from studies by the Congressional Strategic Posture Commission, the National Academy of Sciences, the Department of Energy, the National Intelligence Council, a U.S. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission report coordinated with the Department of Defense and Oak Ridge National Laboratory, and numerous other reports.

With such overwhelming political and scientific consensus, it may come as a shock that nothing has been done to protect America from a power outage that could last several years. You may also be surprised that your energy bill could be paying the lobby efforts to keep it that way.

The Hundred Year Geomagnetic Solar Storm The worst disasters are often the result of natural events which occur less than every hundred years. The hundred year earthquake doesn’t remind us to build away from fault lines. The hundred year tsunami doesn’t remind us to build nuclear reactors above the inundation zone. Likewise, the hundred year solar storm did not remind us to build an electric grid capable of surviving it. Solar storms, or Geomagnetic Disturbances (GMD) are the result of a solar wind shock wave or a magnetic cloud interacting with the earth’s magnetic field. While solar storms happen as frequently as northern lights, experts are most concerned about a rare solar super-storm, like the 1921 Railroad Storm. The National Academy of Sciences estimates that if the Railroad Storm were to occur today, there would be a nationwide blackout for 4-10 years. The most powerful geomagnetic storm on record is the 1859 Carrington Event. Estimates are that Carrington was about 10 times more powerful than the 1921 Railroad Storm and 100 times more powerful than anything the modern grid has experienced. The Carrington Event was a worldwide phenomenon, causing forest fires from flaring telegraph lines, burning telegraph stations, and destroying the freshly laid telegraph cable at the bottom of the Atlantic Ocean.

According to Woolsey, a solar super-storm like the Carrington Event today would “collapse electric grids and life-sustaining critical infrastructures worldwide, putting at risk the lives of billions.”

A Close Call

In July 2014, NASA reported that Earth narrowly escaped another Carrington Event. Indeed, a Carrington-class coronal mass ejection crossed the path of the Earth, missing our planet by just three days. NASA assessment is that the resulting storm would have been catastrophic.

We are overdue for a hundred-year solar storm like the Carrington Event. NASA puts the likelihood of such a geomagnetic super-storm at 12 percent per decade, virtually guaranteeing that if we don’t experience a catastrophic geomagnetic super-storm, our children will. In his congressional testimony, Dr. Richard Garwin of the IBM Thomas J. Watson Research Center emphasized that “a once-per-century event could occur next week,” urging action to reduce the impact on the bulk power system.

Weaponized Electromagnetic Pulse (EMP)

If the threat of a natural geomagnetic super-storm wasn’t enough, the electric grid is equally fragile to an electromagnetic pulse attack. There are ways in which an EMP threat is more serious than a conventional nuke threat. Deterrence may not work

at all because we may not know where the pulse came from. If everything goes dark, it could be a solar event or it could be North Korea. It could be launched from a freighter off one of our coasts or from a northern satellite designed to go unnoticed. We may never know.

“An EMP attack is one of a small number of threats that has the potential to hold our society seriously at risk” and “Is capable of causing catastrophe for the nation.” — Congressional EMP Commission

“We talk a lot about a Nuclear Bomb in Manhattan, and we talk about a cyber-security threat to the grid in the Northeast. All these things would probably pale in comparison to the devastation that an EMP attack could put on Americans” — James Woolsey, Former Director of Central Intelligence

How Likely is an Electromagnetic Pulse Attack?

EMP nuclear attacks are an open part of cyber warfare doctrine in several countries.

Russian General Vladimir Slipchenko, in his military textbook ‘No Contact Wars’ describes the combined use of cyber viruses and hacking, physical attacks, non-nuclear EMP weapons, and ultimately nuclear EMP attack against electric grids and critical infrastructures as a new way of warfare that is the greatest Revolution in Military Affairs (RMA) in history. Like Nazi Germany’s Blitzkrieg (“Lightning War”) Strategy that coordinated airpower, armor, and mobile infantry to achieve strategic and technological surprise that nearly defeated the Allies in World War II, the New Blitzkrieg is, literally and figuratively an electronic “Lightning War” so potentially decisive in its effects that an entire civilization could be overthrown in hours. According to Slipchenko, EMP and the new RMA renders obsolete modern armies, navies and air forces. For the first time in history, small nations or even non-state actors can humble the most advanced nations on Earth.

China’s military doctrine sounds an identical theme. According to People’s Liberation Army textbook World War, the Third World War–Total Information Warfare, written by Shen Weiguang (allegedly the inventor of Information Warfare), “Therefore, China should focus on measures to counter computer viruses, nuclear electromagnetic pulse…and quickly achieve breakthroughs in those technologies…”

Iran in a recently translated military textbook endorses the theories of Russian General Slipchenko and the potentially decisive effects of nuclear EMP attack some 20 times. An Iranian political-military journal, in an article entitled “Electronics To Determine Fate Of Future Wars,” states that the key to defeating the United States is EMP attack and that, “If the world’s industrial countries fail to devise effective ways to defend themselves against dangerous electronic assaults, then they will disintegrate within a few years… American soldiers would not be able to find food to eat nor would they be able to fire a single shot.”

North Korea appears to have practiced the military doctrines described above against the United States–including by simulating a nuclear EMP attack against the U.S. mainland. Following North Korea’s third illegal nuclear test in February 2013, North Korean dictator Kim Jong-Un repeatedly threatened to make nuclear missile strikes against the U.S. and its allies. In what was the worst ever nuclear crisis with North Korea, that lasted months, the U.S. responded by beefing-up National Missile Defenses and flying B-2 bombers in exercises just outside the Demilitarized Zone to deter North Korea. On April 9, 2013, North Korea’s KSM-3 satellite orbited over the U.S. from a south polar trajectory, that evades U.S. early warning radars and National Missile Defenses, at the near optimum altitude and location to place an EMP field over all 48 contiguous United States.

Recently, a North Korean vessel was disrupted in Panama carrying missiles that would have been capable of carrying out an EMP attack off the coast of America. When approached out of suspicion of drug smuggling, they resisted and the captain attempted suicide. Why Hasn’t Anything Been Done? At least five US Government studies have concluded that the threat of an EMP attack is real and needs to be acted upon, but alarmingly little has been done. NERC has prevented states from taking action and kept acts bottled up and not able to be passed by congress. Texas State Senator Bob Hall, a former USAF Colonel and himself an EMP expert, has called the lobby efforts of the electric utilities in this matter as “equivalent to treason.” “As a Texas State Senator who tried in the 2015 legislative session to get a bill passed to harden the Texas grid against an EMP attack or nature’s GMD, I learned first hand the strong control the electric power company lobby has on elected officials.” What Can Be Done To Protect Critical Infrastructure?

There is a lot that can be done to harden the grid, ranging from fast warning systems to hardening the trains that deliver coal. The grid may become more secure by trends already happening with distributed renewable energy and microgrids. Long run lines, such as the electric grid are the most vulnerable to an EMP or geomagnetic storm. “Microgrids are an important part of the solution,” said Dr. George H Baker of Resilient Societies. Reminding us that microgrids can be relatively large.

For example, my own city, Harrisonburg, has the capability to isolate itself from the grid and run critical services on local gas-turbine generators.

The bulk power system in the United States is reliable but not resilient. Like most systems, the way to be resilient is by having a robust, decentralized network with built in flexibility. Although it’s not what electric utilities want to hear, Americans will remain at risk until communities can meet all critical loads without the bulk power system.

#### The aff’s balancing test deters anticompetitive behavior while balancing comity and global antitrust development – solves both under- and over-inclusion

Murray ‘17 [Sean; 2017; J.D. Candidate and Stein Scholar, Fordham University School of Law; Fordham International Law Journal; “With A Little Help From My Friends: How A Us Judicial International Comity Balancing Test Can Foster Global Antitrust Private Redress.” vol 41, iss. 1 https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2690&context=ilj]

In response to international criticism of the statute’s unbridled transnational application, the United States has curtailed the Sherman Act’s reach both judicially and legislatively.20 Judicially, courts looked to international comity, the practice of taking into account the interests of other nations.21 The Ninth Circuit was the first court to invoke international comity in Timberlane Lumber Co. v. Bank of America, N.T. & S.A., which used an interest-balancing test to determine whether exercising jurisdiction was proper.22 Legislatively, Congress enacted the Foreign Trade Antitrust Improvements Act of 1982 (“FTAIA”), which attempts to delimit and define the cross-border reach of US antitrust laws by introducing an objective test under the effects doctrine.23 Powerful arguments can be advanced in the American interest for applying US antitrust laws beyond US borders, including adequately protecting American competition and consumers, deterring inimical foreign anticompetitive behavior affecting the United States, especially in an increasingly globalized economy, and providing remedial measures to US victims of such conduct.24 However, these interests in providing protection and redress are counterbalanced by equally important rationales for limiting the extraterritorial span of US antitrust law, such as costly overregulation, avoiding international disputes, allowing nascent worldwide antitrust regimes to develop to beget increased antitrust enforcement, and avoiding harmful interference with antitrust regulators’ amnesty programs.25

The aforementioned responses to these competing concerns have been ambiguous, inconsistent, and over-inclusive or under-inclusive.26 In particular, the poorly worded FTAIA has created more problems than it has solved, including inconsistent holdings, wrongly decided cases, and disagreements among the circuit courts over interpreting the statute’s language.27 The most recent interpretational difficulty involves determining what constitutes a “direct” domestic effect under the FTAIA. Some courts have held that “direct” takes on a broader meaning, where conduct causing domestic effect need only be an “immediate consequence.”28 In comparison, other courts have narrowly interpreted the statute’s “direct” domestic effect requirement as calling for “a reasonably proximate causal nexus,” drawing from tort law to exclude an injury that is too remote from the injury’s cause.29 The most recent appellate decision involving the FTAIA, Motorola Mobility LLC v. AU Optronics Corp., has contributed to the statute’s confusion.30 There, the Seventh Circuit held that a US parent company failed to show that it suffered direct injury as a result of foreign anticompetitive conduct, despite the fact that price-fixed component products were purchased by its majority-owned foreign subsidiaries to be incorporated into final products purchased by the US parent and sold to US customers.31

Nevertheless, various delineations already exist that suggest a solution to the inconsistency is attainable and may be designed to enhance global antitrust enforcement through greater availability of worldwide private redress. What is apparent from the succession of decisions from Hartford Fire Insurance Co. v. California32 to F. Hoffman-La Roche Ltd. v. Empagran S.A. (Empagran)33 is that the FTAIA grey area has been sufficiently tapered to allow for the return of a comity balancing test to appropriately reconcile the conflicting interests at hand in the residual universe of cases.34 This Note argues that Hartford Fire, its progeny, and Empagran form confining parameters on the applicability of the FTAIA, namely that cases that do not involve a US party, domestic effect, and domestic injury arising from that effect will fail the FTAIA’s exemption test. Moreover, because the FTAIA’s “direct, substantial, and reasonably foreseeable” effect test can be construed as a proxy for the United States’ prescriptive jurisdiction interest, comity analysis is helpful in its interpretation.35 Thus, claims which are based on exclusively non-US conduct that questionably has a “direct effect” on US commerce resulting in the plaintiff’s injury are more properly decided not by the courts’ current focus on statutory interpretation, but rather by a Timberlane-style ad hoc fact-intensive balancing test that contemplates factors more suitable to the modern global economy and promoting international dialogue.36

In sum, this Note proposes the introduction of a new international comity balancing test into US antitrust jurisprudence with the aim of fostering and strengthening global antitrust enforcement and private redress. It does so in four parts. Following this introduction, Part II briefly summarizes the expansion of US antitrust extraterritorial application. Next, Part III discusses various developments undertaken to limit and demarcate the reach of US antitrust law. Part IV raises issues arising from those efforts that have resulted in inconsistent and questionable holdings. Finally in Part V, by analyzing and synthesizing the existing precedent, this Note contends that a judicial international comity balancing test would most appropriately determine the propriety of US antitrust extraterritoriality for particular types of private recompense cases that are problematic under the current framework.

#### And factoring in consideration of foreign penalties prevents over-enforcement and ensures global anti-cartel cohesion

Huizing ‘18 [Pieter Huizing; 2018; PhD student at Leiden University and a senior associate at the antitrust department of Allen & Overy LLP; "InnoLux v AU Optronics: comparing territorial limits to EU and US public enforcement of the LCD cartel," https://academic.oup.com/antitrust/article-abstract/6/2/231/4964994]

The LCD cases show that in respect of cartel conduct by multinational corporations involving their worldwide sales, the existence of a certain domestic connection to justify the exercise of jurisdiction is almost a given. It is therefore not surprising that a multitude of authorities will generally be able to assert jurisdiction over truly global cartel behaviour. Without any jurisdictional or territorial delineation between authorities on ‘who sanctions what and by how much’, domestic enforcement of international cartel conduct is bound to lead to potential or actual overlapping punishment. It is easy to see how the fining methodologies used by the Commission and the DOJ can result in the same sales being taken into account more than once for the purposes of sanctioning the same overall conduct. Such double-counting increases risks of over-enforcement and disproportionate overall punishment. To ensure that on an international level the overall penalty fits the severity of the crime, it is submitted that authorities targeting the same conduct in parallel should avoid unilaterally aiming for the maximum fine available without having any regard for the level of punishment and deterrence achieved by sanctions imposed elsewhere. This is necessary not only to safeguard overall proportionality of fines, but also with a view to comity considerations. Maintaining an isolated and expansive view on cartel enforcement may have been justifiable when antitrust laws were effectively enforced in only a few countries in the world. But with over 125 jurisdictions with active cartel enforcement, this may be the time for the European and American authorities to start adopting a more modest approach.132 As noted by Connor in the context of his support for the Motorola Mobility judgment: [h]aving invited the world to join the effort to prohibit and prosecute cartels, and that invitation having been enthusiastically accepted, it is good manners/ policy that the competition regimes set up around the globe—which continue to develop—be given due respect and that the views of our partners be given serious consideration.133 The need for international coordination of extraterritorial cartel enforcement is a hot topic in the global antitrust community. It is a recurring theme on antitrust conferences and a key focus of the advocacy efforts of international organizations such as the ICN, the OECD, and the International Bar Association (IBA). The focus of such efforts has often been on cooperation in respect of the investigation stages and less on coordination in respect of the scope and level of punishment.134 But there are more and more calls for authorities to also coordinate their cartel penalties. For example, during the OECD Roundtable on Cartels Involving Intermediate Goods in October 2015, several delegates highlighted ‘the importance of taking into account fines or sanctioning decisions already imposed by other competition agencies to minimise concerns about the fairness and proportionality of fines levied in multijurisdictional cases’.135 In June 2016, the Japanese Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (METI) published a report on its research into the enforcement of international cartels, in view of the ‘growing concern about overlapping application of competition laws or imposition of multiple surcharges by several countries’.136 Based on its research, the Ministry proposed increased coordination between authorities to take into account concurrent penalties. In December 2016, both the IBA and the American Bar Association (ABA) in their comments on the proposed new DOJ and FTC Antitrust Guidelines for International Enforcement and Cooperation called upon the US authorities to stress the need for cooperation regarding sanctioning of international cartel cases to avoid over-deterrence or double-jeopardy.137 Furthermore, also in December 2016, in one of the key submissions for the OECD’s 15th Global Forum on Competition, Hwang Lee specifically pressed for increased efforts by competition authorities to coordinate fining decisions in parallel proceedings.138 These examples indicate that—while moving slowly—progress is made in recognizing the need for commonly accepted principles for coordination between authorities in the sanctioning of international cartels.

Since internationally agreed principles on the coordination of cartel fines are yet to be developed, national self-restraint is currently required to limit the risks resulting from parallel enforcement of international cartels. Such self-restraint can be exercised in respect of any of the three elements assessed in this article: asserting jurisdiction, defining the territorial scope of punished conduct, and setting the fine.139 The Japan Fair Trade Commission (JFTC), for example, has explained that it cannot currently take into account sanctions imposed by other authorities in determining its own fine because it lacks the discretion to do so.140 However, in view of international comity, the JFTC does consider enforcement action elsewhere in respect of the same international cartel to decide whether it will also take action. Similarly, in Australia– where cartel fines are set by the court—the authority exercises prosecutorial discretion by considering whether it is more appropriate to leave enforcement activities to jurisdictions where the harm of a cartel was felt most immediately.141 In contrast, the Korean Fair Trade Commission does not consider sanctions imposed elsewhere for the decision whether or not to bring an enforcement action, but it does have the discretion to consider foreign fines in calculating the surcharge it imposes.142 The DOJ has indicated that when a sanction in respect of the same cartel is first imposed outside the USA, it may take this into account if the sanction accounts for the harm to businesses and consumers in the USA and therefore satisfies deterrent interests of the USA.143 Terzaken and Huizing have suggested altering this latter approach by focusing on whether there is any residual deterrence need following penalties already imposed elsewhere, not on whether specific national harm was considered in the fining methodology applied by a foreign authority.144

As an alternative to taking into account penalties imposed elsewhere, Bentley and Henry have proposed that authorities should solely take into account sales for the purposes of fine calculation if such sales meet the applicable jurisdictional tests.145 This seems a sensible proposal. While it is true that the basis for asserting jurisdiction can be separated from the basis for calculating a fine, as explicitly reasoned by the ECJ, it is hard to justify partly relating a penalty to conduct that in itself would not have a sufficient territorial nexus to trigger potential prosecution. In analogy to the Seventh Circuit’s assessment of Motorola’s damages claims, it is difficult to accept that foreign sales without such nexus can still be taken into account as part of domestic enforcement as long as they happened to take place alongside some import commerce. Internationally, it may not even be all that controversial to require authorities to calculate cartel fines on the basis of only those sales that create a sufficient jurisdictional link to their territory. A recent survey by the International Competition Network (ICN) already shows that many jurisdictions maintain the view that only the direct sales of cartelized products should form the basis of a cartel fine in all or most cases.146

Bentley and Henry consider their solution to be simpler than requiring authorities to take into account fines already imposed elsewhere. But it is submitted that this is still needed even if authorities only take into account sales that pass the applicable jurisdictional tests, as this does not avoid situations where more than one authority claims jurisdiction.147 This is especially the case where authorities apply a broad interpretation of a qualified effects test. In such situations, the same sales may still be taken into account more than once. And even if authorities avoid any double counting of sales, international alignment of sanctions may still be required to ensure overall proportionality and an optimal level of deterrence. A truly coordinated approach to international cartel enforcement should therefore more comprehensively focus on the ultimate outcome of the overall enforcement.

It goes beyond the scope of this article to discuss at what level cartel fines must be set to achieve both proportionality and optimal deterrence. And it must be noted that it has not been empirically tested whether overlapping cartel fines imposed in multiple jurisdictions actually create a problem of over-deterrence or whether global cartels are (still) more likely to benefit from under-deterrence.148 But it is clear that an optimal overall penalty for a global cartel is not automatically achieved by the accumulation of several national fines for the same cartel that were considered optimal by the respective authorities. First, such accumulation would likely mean that the overall fine amount increases in a certain proportion to the additional amount of affected sales in the sanctioning jurisdictions. However, proportionality and deterrence are complex principles that not necessarily (directly) related to the level of sales achieved with the cartelized products. Proportionality is typically linked to the elements of culpability of the offender and the harm caused by the offence.149 Optimal deterrence is typically linked to the expected gains from the offence and the probability of detection and punishment.150 So it is not obvious to see why in the pursuit of a proportionate and deterrent penalty, the fine amount should increase in direct proportion to the level of affected sales. It may well be that a proportionate and deterrent fine has already been achieved despite not covering all potentially affected sales. In this context, the Business and Industry Advisory Committee to the OECD reasoned that ‘once any jurisdiction sets a fine at an appropriate and proportionate level, another jurisdiction imposing penalties on top of that needs to strike a proper balance’.151 Second, several authorities may take the same factors into account in increasing a fine for deterrence purposes, such as the size of the undertaking. A single authority may determine that for a cartel fine to actually ‘hurt’, it should amount to at least 3 per cent of an undertaking’s total turnover. But if five authorities use this approach in respect of the same global cartel, the total fine amounting to 15 per cent of the total turnover may hurt much more than what was considered necessary by each individual authority.152 Thirdly, many authorities apply a maximum fine amount that is related to the total turnover of an undertaken (eg the cap of 10 per cent as applied by the Commission). Such a cap serves to ensure fines are not excessive or disproportionate153 and to limit the risks of undue financial difficulties and insolvency (and hence lessened competition) as a result of a fine. But if five authorities were to impose fines for the same global cartel up to a 10 per cent cap, the total fine amounting to 50 per cent of the undertaking’s turnover is still quite likely to jeopardize the viability of the undertaking and quite likely to be (perceived as) disproportionate in relation to the size of its economic activities.154

In AU Optronics, Judge Illston in her discretion decided that USD 500 million was sufficiently deterrent and not excessive, even though the fining guidelines had recommended a fine between USD 936 and 1872 million. Her decision was also based on the penalties and financial impact already incurred by AUO in other proceedings, something explicitly not taken into account in the DOJ sentencing recommendation. Rather than rigidly applying the domestic fining guidelines, she appears to have adopted a comprehensive approach that considered the overall proportionality of punishment for AUO’s cartel conduct and the residual deterrence need. While the EU and US authorities also seem willing to incidentally and on an ad hoc basis take a step back in view of foreign enforcement,155 sound enforcement policies that are aimed to achieving an overall appropriate fine by taking into account the international context of cartel sanctioning are still lacking.156 It is submitted that the development of such policies is necessary not only to ensure consistency in enforcement practices but also to increase legal certainty, predictability of sanctions, and confidence in the proportionality of international cartel enforcement.

#### Plan: The United States federal government should increase prohibitions on anticompetitive business practices by establishing a balancing test that expands the extraterritorial scope of its antitrust laws.

### Indigenous Development Adv

#### Ambiguous unreliable enforcement inhibits anti-cartel cohesion and undermines foreign regulatory institutions

Briggs & Bitton ‘15 [John; Daniel; 2015; Antitrust and litigation counsel of choice for dozens of major companies in the United States, Asia, Europe and Scandinavia. Client demand for his work has focused on antitrust, M&A and complex civil litigation; An attorney who represents clients in the San Francisco, California area; "Heisenberg’s Uncertainty Principle, Extraterritoriality and Comity." https://thesedonaconference.org/sites/default/files/publications/Heisenberg%27s%20Uncertainty%20Principle\_Extraterritorialty%20and%20Comity.16TSCJ327.pdf]

In a variety of settings foreign governments have expressed and are expressing concerns about the extraterritorial application of U.S. law. The United States occupies a unique position in global trade and finance. The United States also has enacted far-reaching legislation involving commerce, banking and finance, business conduct, mergers and acquisitions, foreign corrupt practices, and a variety of other matters. The extraterritorial application of laws in these areas challenges the sovereignty of other nations and is often viewed as offensive. In antitrust, the United States’ influence is the result of its status as the world’s largest importer of goods and services.18 In finance, this influence is the result of the U.S. dollar’s status as the international unit of account: “Pretty much any dollar transaction— even between two non-US entities—will go through New York City at some point, where it comes under the jurisdiction of US authorities.”19

The rampant extraterritorial application of U.S. laws has ruffled the feathers of foreign governments for a long time, beginning essentially with the cluster of private and government actions in the Uranium cartel cases back in the 1970’s and 1980’s. Close American allies, including Australia, Canada, France, South Africa, the UK, and others, reacted with hostility to the extraterritorial activism of the domestic judiciary by enacting “blocking” and “claw back” legislation.20 Such reactions included the enactment of laws by the United Kingdom and Canada that prohibit enforcement of foreign judgments awarding multiple damages21 and laws passed by the United Kingdom, France, Australia, and the Canadian provinces of Quebec and Ontario that limit or prohibit the removal of documents in response to a foreign order.22

More recently, a number of governments have expressed their concerns about the application of U.S. laws abroad through amicus briefs, including Australia, Belgium, Canada, China, France, Germany, Japan, the Netherlands, South Korea, Switzerland, Taiwan, and the United Kingdom:23 most of the United States’ top fifteen trading partners.

These foreign governments have expressed a fairly wide variety of concerns about the potential for extraterritorial application of U.S. laws to interfere with those governments’ policy decisions on such matters as liability, procedure, and damages. While most governments have regulatory regimes in place to police, for example, securities fraud and cartel behavior, these differ in many regards both from the American approach and also from each other, reflecting different cultural, social, and economic factors. These differences include the required showing for liability (e.g., definition of materiality in securities fraud cases),24 procedural protections (e.g., class-action formation and punitive) damages.26 Applying U.S. law to actors, conduct, and effects appropriately considered under a set of foreign laws undermines a foreign government’s ability to govern its own domain and, in the end, becomes an affront to its sovereignty.

Stepping on the toes of foreign governments’ regulatory regimes also risks stymying the international development of policies and regulations beneficial to the United States. Countries without well-developed regulatory apparatuses are less likely to develop them if the behavior is already policed by private plaintiffs in the United States or if the apparatuses would see their policy choices effectively overruled by U.S. policies.27

Foreign governments have also taken the view that extraterritorial application of treble damages threatens to undermine their own enforcement efforts. For example, they claim availability of private treble damages in the United States against their national companies for local conduct may have a detrimental effect on foreign leniency programs. These programs are a key tool for them in rooting out cartel activity, which has traditionally proven difficult to detect and prosecute.28 “These leniency policies seek to balance the interests of disclosure, deterrence, and punishment,” but “disclosure and reform are greatly hindered when a company risks the imposition of treble damages in a U.S. court for confessing to another nation or authority that it has participated in an international conspiracy.”29 When that reach is expanded outside of U.S. consumers in a U.S. court, “the prospect of ruinous civil liability in U.S. courts far outweighs the benefits most companies would receive from participating in an amnesty program.”30 And as Germany and Belgium informed the Supreme Court in Empagran,31 “[h]istorically, other nations have bristled at extraterritorial applications of United States antitrust laws. These concerns have resulted in foreign governments taking a number of measures to counter what they perceive to be an illegitimate encroachment into their sovereignty.”32

#### That cracks sustainable development and poverty relief.

Cheng ‘12 [Thomas; 2012; assistant professor at the Faculty of Law of the University of Hong Kong; "Convergence and Its Discontents: A Reconsideration of the Merits of Convergence of Global Competition Law." <https://chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1362&context=cjil>]

SME = small to mid-sized enterprise

Serious poverty and income inequality are prevalent in many developing economies. These phenomena present two main challenges to developing countries as far as competition law enforcement is concerned. One is the need to encourage entrepreneurship to promote inclusive growth; the other is the need to protect impoverished consumers from exploitative practices. A number of commentators, including Fox, have argued that developing countries must pursue inclusive growth that will alleviate poverty and reduce income inequality.162 Inclusive growth requires opportunities for upward economic mobility, an important avenue for which is entrepreneurship.'63 For those who are at the bottom of the economic ladder in a developing country, often the only way to break out of poverty is to start their own businesses, which are going to be, at least initially, SMEs. Therefore, encouragement of entrepreneurship and assistance to SMEs must be a central pillar in every inclusive growth strategy. If competition law is to complement an inclusive growth strategy, it must afford SMEs stronger protection than is customary in established jurisdictions and be particularly vigilant against abuse of dominance. This is especially so because dominant firms in developing countries are often former state monopolies that still benefit from official patronage or informal connections to the state. Their privileged positions make it even harder for new private firm rivals to compete with them.

The poorest in many developing countries live below the poverty line and often scrape by with no more than a dollar or two a day.'64 They are often malnourished, sick, and illiterate, which severely curtails their productivity and ability to improve their economic well-being. Therefore, an inclusive growth strategy must include policies to combat malnourishment, poor health, and illiteracy. While the bulk of the responsibility will fall on government programs that directly confront these problems, competition law has a role to play. Competition law enforcement may focus on goods that have the most direct impact on the nutritional, health, and educational needs of the poorest in developing countries. Anticompetitive conduct in these sectors should be dealt with harshly.

Beyond that, developing country competition authorities may consider taking a tougher stance on exploitative practices by dominant firms. This is despite the fact that most established jurisdictions, especially the US, have largely left exploitative practices out of the purview of competition law."' The usual justification for this stance is two-fold. First, there is a serious implementation problem of distinguishing between very high prices and excessive prices.'6 6 Such distinctions are notoriously difficult to draw. The inability to do so undermines effective enforcement and legal certainty for firms seeking to comply with the law. Second, there is the theoretical objection that the opportunity to reap temporary monopoly profit spurs firms to compete and innovate.'6 1 In the industrialized nations, the general view is that consumers are able to bear momentary high prices, which will be eroded once a new competitor enters the market. Short-run monopolistic prices are the price that consumers pay for the benefit of keener long-run competition and innovation. While consumers in developed nations may be in a position to withstand such high prices, the poorest consumers in developing countries are not. Any extra cost for a basic necessity will have a direct and severe impact on their overall standard of living. For example, 10 percent more spent on foodstuffs may require consumers to remove their children from school."' The plight of these consumers therefore may justify a more assertive stance on exploitative practices in markets for basic necessities.

#### Development diffuses multiple existential risks -- d doesn’t assume the changing nature of conflict

UNSC ‘17 [United Nations Security Council; 12/20/17; “Prevention, Development Must Be at Centre of All Efforts Tackling Emerging Complex Threats to International Peace, Secretary-General Tells Security Council,” https://www.un.org/press/en/2017/sc13131.doc.htm]

Prevention and development must be at the centre of all efforts to address both the quantitative and qualitative changes that were emerging in threats around the world, the Secretary‑General of the United Nations told the Security Council today, as some 60 Member States participated in an all‑day debate tackling complex contemporary challenges to international peace and security.

António Guterres said the perils of nuclear weapons were once again front and centre, with tensions higher than those during the Cold War. Climate change was a threat multiplier and technology advances had made it easier for extremists to communicate. Conflicts were longer, with some lasting 20 years on average, and were more complex, with armed and extremist groups linked with each other and with the worldwide threat of terrorism. Transnational drug smugglers and human traffickers were perpetuating the chaos and preying on refugees and migrants.

The changing nature of conflict meant rethinking approaches that included integrated action, he said, stressing that prevention must be at the centre of all efforts. Development was one of the best instruments of prevention. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development would help build peaceful societies. Respect for human rights was also essential and there was a need to invest in social cohesion so that all felt they had a stake in society.

He also emphasized that women’s participation was crucial to success, from conflict prevention to peacemaking and sustaining peace. Where women were in power, societies flourished, he pointed out. Sexual violence against women, therefore, must be addressed and justice pursued for perpetrators.

Prevention also included preventive diplomacy, he said, noting that the newly established High-level Advisory Board on Mediation had met for the first time. The concept of human security was a useful frame of reference for that work, as it was people‑centred and holistic and emphasized the need to act early and prioritize the most vulnerable.

“Let us work together to enhance the Council’s focus on emerging situations, expand the toolbox, increase resources for prevention, and be more systematic in avoiding conflict and sustaining peace,” he said, emphasizing the need for Council unity. Without it, he said, the parties to conflict might take more inflexible and intransigent positions, and the drivers of conflict might push situations to the point of no return.

Japan’s representative, Council President for December, spoke in his national capacity, noting that in the 25 years since the end of the Cold War, there had been a rise in complex contemporary challenges to international peace and security. That included the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, the expansion of terrorism, and non‑traditional challenges such as non‑State actors and inter‑State criminal organizations.

#### SDGs are leverage points that solve extinction BUT failure causes cascading risks that cumulatively outweigh any single risk, causing extinction

Fenner and Cernev ‘20 [Richard Fenner; Jan. 2020; Director of the MPhil in Engineering for Sustainable Development at Cambridge; Australian National University, Canberra, Australia; “The importance of achieving foundational Sustainable Development Goals in reducing global risk,” Volume 115, https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0016328719303544]

Fig. 3 demonstrates that cascade failures can be transmitted through the complex inter-relationships that link the Sustainable Development Goals. Randers, Rockstrom, Stoknes, Goluke, Collste, Cornell, Donges et al. (2018) have suggested that where meeting some SDGs impact negatively on others, this may lead to “crisis and conflict accelerators” and “threat multipliers” resulting in conflicts, instability and migrations. Ecosystem stresses are likely to disproportionately affect the security and social cohesion of fragile and poor communities, amplifying latent tensions which lead to political instabilities that spread far beyond their regions. The resulting “bad fate of the poor will end up affecting the whole global system"(Mastrojeni, 2018). Such possibilities are likely to go beyond incremental damage and lead to runaway collapse.

The World Economic Forums’ Global Risks Report for 2018 shows the top five global risks in terms of likelihood and impact have changed from being economic and social in 2008 to environmental and technological in 2018, and are closely aligned with many SDGs (World Economic Forum, 2018). The report notes “that we are much less competent when it comes to dealing with complex risks in systems characterised by feedback loops, tipping points and opaque cause-and-effect relationships that can make intervention problematic”. The most likely risks expected to have the greatest impact currently include extreme weather events natural disasters, cyber attacks, data fraud or theft, failure of climate change mitigation and water crises.

These are represented in Fig. 3 by the following exogenous variables. “Climate change” drives the need for Climate Action (SDG 13), “Cyber threat” may adversely impact technology implementation and advancement which will disrupt Sustainable Cities and Communities (SDG 11); Decent Work and Economic Growth (SDG 8) and the rate of introduction of Affordable and Clean Energy (SDG 7), with reductions in these goals having direct consequences in also reducing progress in the other goals which they are closely linked to. “Data Fraud or Threat” has the capacity to inhibit innovation and Industrial Performance (SDG 9), reducing competitiveness (and having the potential to erode societal confidence in governance processes). “Water Crises” (linked with climate change) have a direct impact on Human Health and Well Being (SDG 3) as well as reducing access to Clean Water and Sanitation (SDG 6) and reducing agricultural production which increases Hunger (SDG 2). The causal loop diagram also highlights “Conflict” as a variable (driven by multiple environmental-socio-economic factors) which together with regions most impacted by climate degradation will lead to an increase in migrant refugees enhancing the spread of disease and global pandemic risk, thus impacting directly on Human Health and Well Being (SDG 3)

4.2. Existential and catastrophic risk

The level and consequences of these risks may be severe. Existential Risks (ER) have a wide scope, with extreme danger, and are “a risk that threatens the premature extinction of humanity or the permanent and drastic destruction of its potential for desirable future development” (Farquhar et al., 2017,) essentially being an event or scenario that is “transgenerational in scope and terminal in intensity” (Baum & Handoh, 2014). With a smaller scope, and lower level of severity, global catastrophic risk is defined as a scenario or event that results in at least 10 million fatalities, or $10 trillion in damages (Bostrom & Ćirković, 2008). Global Catastrophic Risk (GCR) events are those which are global, but they are durable in that humanity is able to recover from them (Bostrom & Ćirković, 2008; Cotton-Barratt, Farquhar, Halstead, Schubert, & Snyder-Beattie, 2016) but which still have a long-term impact (Turchin & Denkenberger, 2018b).

Achieving the Sustainable Development Goals can be considered to be a means of reducing the long-term global catastrophic and existential risks for humanity. Conversely if the targets represented across the SDGs remain unachieved there is the potential for these forms of risk to develop. This association combined with the likely emergence of new challenges over the next decades (Cook, Inayatullah, Burgman, Sutherland, & Wintle, 2014) means that it is of great value to identify points within the systems representations of the Sustainable Development Goals that could both lead to global catastrophic risk and existential risk, and conversely that could act as prevention, or leverage points in order to avoid such outcomes. This identification in turn enables sensible policy responses to be constructed (Sutherland & Woodroof, 2009).

Whilst existential threats are unlikely, there is extensive peril in global catastrophic risks. Despite being lesser in severity than existential risks, they increase the likelihood of human extinction (Turchin & Denkenberger, 2018a) through chain reactions (Turchin & Denkenberger, 2018a), and inhibiting humanity’s response to other risks (Farquhar et al., 2017). It is necessary to consider risks that may seem small, as when acting together, they can have extensive consequences (Tonn, 2009). Furthermore, the high adaptability potential of humans, and society, means that for humanity to become extinct, it is most likely that there would be a series of events that culminate in extinction as opposed to one large scale event (Tonn & MacGregor, 2009; Tonn, 2009).

Whilst the prospect of existential risk, or global catastrophic risk can seem distant, the Stern Review on the Economics of Climate Change estimated the risk of extinction for humanity as 0.1 % annually, which accumulates to provide the risk of extinction over the next century as 9.5 % (Cotton-Barratt et al., 2016). With respect to identifying these risks, it is known that in particular, “positive feedback loops… represent the gravest existential risks” (Kareiva & Carranza, 2018), with pollution also having the potential to pose an existential risk.

#### Particularly in Africa – solves famine

Nwuneli ‘18 [Ndidi Okonkwo Nwuneli; 2018; Co-Founder of AACE Food Processing & Distribution, Managing Partner of Sahel Consulting Agriculture & Nutrition, Founder of LEAP Africa, and a 2018 Aspen Institute New Voices fellow; Project Syndicate; "The High Cost of Food Monopolies in Africa," https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/africa-monopoly-food-prices-by-ndidi-okonkwo-nwuneli-2018-08]

One reason for the distortion is the price of food relative to income. As Africa urbanizes, people are buying more imported semi- or fully processed foods, which cost more than locally produced foods. And in most countries, wages have not kept pace with inflation.

But the primary cause is poor public policy: African governments have failed to curb the power of agribusinesses and large food producers, a lack of oversight that has made local agriculture less competitive. In turn, prices for most commodities have risen.

The absence of antitrust laws, combined with weak consumer protection, means that in many countries, only two or three major companies control markets for items like salt, sugar, flour, milk, oil, and tea . The impact is most pronounced in African cities, where prices for white rice, frozen chicken, bread, butter, eggs, and even carbonated soft drinks are at least 24% higher than in other cities around the world. These prices hit consumers both directly and indirectly (owing to pass-through of higher input costs by food conglomerates and service providers).

The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) has long argued that food security and fair pricing depends on markets that are free from monopolistic tendencies. The OECD concurs, and has frequently called on authorities to address “anti-competitive mergers, abuse of dominance, cartels and price fixing, vertical restraints, and exclusive practices” in the food sector. And yet, in many African countries, this advice has rarely been heeded.

To be sure, this is not a new problem. Between 1997 and 2004, for example, the FAO counted 122 allegations of “anti-competitive practices” in 23 countries in Sub-Saharan Africa. Violations included a “vertical monopoly” in the Malawi sugar sector, price fixing in Kenya’s fertilizer industry, and a “buyer cartel” in the Zimbabwean cotton industry. And, despite the considerable attention such cases have received, the underlying problems persist.

According to the World Bank, more than 70% of African countries rank in the bottom half globally for efforts to protect “market-based competition.” While 27 African countries and five regional blocs do have antitrust laws on the books, enforcement is rare. The remaining countries have no regulations at all and have made little progress in drafting them.

There is one notable exception: South Africa. Since 1998, the country’s Competition Act has prohibited any company controlling at least 45% of the market from excluding other firms or seeking to exercise control over pricing. Violators face penalties of up to 10% of their earnings, and during the last two decades, some of the biggest companies in the country – including Tiger Brands, Pioneer Foods, and Sime Darby – have been penalized. As Tembinkosi Bonakele, head of South Africa’s Competition Commission, noted last year, the government is “determined to root out exploitation of consumers by cartels,” especially in the food industry.

Other countries should follow South Africa’s lead. Companies and special-interest groups will always seek to benefit from the absence of regulation. The need for reform is greatest in countries like Nigeria and Ghana, where food expenditures are high and food-industry pressure is most pronounced. Fortunately, there is growing recognition of the need to address these challenges. Babatunde Irukera, Director General of the Consumer Protection Council in Nigeria, recently asserted that, “In a large vibrant and loyal market such as Nigeria, the absence of broad competition regulation is tragic. Unregulated markets in competition context constitute the otherwise ‘legitimate’ vehicle for both financial and social extortion.”

Reducing the prices of staple food by even a modest 10% (far below the average premium cartels around the world charge) by tackling anticompetitive behavior in these sectors, or by reforming regulations that shield them from competition, could lift 270,000 people in Kenya, 200,000 in South Africa, and 20,000 in Zambia out of poverty. Such a policy would save households in these countries over $700 million (2015 US dollars) a year, with poor households gaining disproportionately more than rich ones.

#### A balancing test is goldilocks---harmonizes extraterritorial reach with international comity, generates global antitrust enforcement, AND it link-turns the Trade DA.

Murray ’17 [Sean; 2017; J.D. from Fordham University, B.A. from Vassar College; Fordham International Law Journal, “With a Little Help from my Friends: How a US Judicial International Comity Balancing Test Can Foster Global Antitrust Redress,” vol. 41]

Chiefly, this balancing test would supplement the FTAIA. The underlying impetus for the FTAIA’s enactment – responding to international criticism of expansive US extraterritorial jurisdiction and to calls for recognizing foreign sovereignty where the basis for US prescriptive jurisdiction is weak – functions as this balancing test’s modus operandi. While the difficulty in interpreting “direct” has instigated its introduction, the balancing test does not attempt to shed any more light on the FTAIA’s contemplation of “direct.” Instead, it provides an alternative framework to properly apply the FTAIA where the statute’s language makes it impossible to do so.

As was the balancing test in Timberlane, a balancing test here may also be criticized as leaving too much discretion over political inquiries (i.e., foreign policy considerations) to the judiciary rather than to the executive and legislative branches, where such decisions may rightly belong.200 Professor William Dodge, while asserting that US courts should engage in judicial unilateralism rather than international comity considerations, points out that the judiciary plays an important complementary role to a country’s political branches by encouraging dialogue and negotiation between sovereigns.201 Though Congress and antitrust agencies may be better suited than courts to take account of the interest of other nations, courts are nonetheless faced with the task of weighing those interests when judging a party’s right to redress in private antitrust litigation.202

Footnote 201:

201. Dodge, supra note 2, at 106-07. American courts are also well-versed in taking into account foreign interests through allowing sovereign representatives to articulate official positions in litigation. See, e.g., Empagran, 542 U.S. at 167-68 (relying on non-US government amicus curiae briefs asserting national interests in considering international comity); In re Vitamin C Antitrust Litig., 837 F.3d at 179 (“When, as in this instance, we receive from a foreign government an official statement explicating its own laws and regulations, we are bound to extend that explication the deference long accorded such proffers received from foreign governments.”); BREYER, supra note 7, at 92 (“Since there is no Supreme Court of the World, national courts must act piecemeal, without direct coordination, in seeking interpretations that can dovetail rather than clash with the working of foreign statutes. And so our Court does, and should, listen to foreign voices, to those who understand and can illuminate relevant foreign laws and practices.” (emphasis added)).

“Judicial unilateralism,” as defined by Professor Dodge, implies that courts should only consider whether or not the forum’s legislature intended to regulate the conduct at issue without regard to foreign interests. See Dodge, supra note 2, at 104-05 (“[A] court should apply a statute extraterritorially whenever doing so appears to advance the purposes of the statute and should not worry about resolving conflicts of jurisdiction with other nations.”); see also supra note 16.

End of footnote 201.

The balancing test should be an exercise in both comity and cooperation, an attempt to harmonize counterpoints in the debate over antitrust extraterritoriality. As Professor Fox posits, the question is not “when should we defer to the inconsistent interests of other nations?” but rather “how can the antitrust jurisdictions of the world work together to maximize their shared interest in competitive markets, to the benefit of consumers and robust or potentially robust business?”203 Indeed, this comports with Supreme Court’s current approach to comity analysis of harmonization rather than avoiding conflict among laws.204 Accordingly, the test will have a slightly different focus than the one constructed by the Ninth Circuit in Timberlane, which reflects an outdated period of international antitrust regulation lacking potent modern enforcement tools such as amnesty programs. It will, however, encourage the growth of overall worldwide antitrust enforcement, both public and private, which ultimately contributes to properly functioning international markets.205

The challenge of achieving proper adjudication of an antitrust claim consisting of conduct and injury in two different jurisdictions is that national laws must conform to a market that ignores national borders.206 With this in mind, the goal should be to promote adjudication in the most efficient locale in an effort to maximize world welfare, foster growth of antitrust jurisdictions, and avoid overregulation.207 There are currently over 120 antitrust jurisdictions, many of which are new antitrust jurisdictions or have enacted fresh laws allowing for greater access to private redress, such as Israel (2006), China (2008), the European Union (2014), the United Kingdom (2015), and Hong Kong (2015).208 Letting the laws of these jurisdictions develop and inculcate international standards for antitrust enforcement strengthens the deterrence of anticompetitive behavior and the ability of injured parties to seek recompense.209 Achieving greater international involvement in turn would ostensibly mitigate some of the need behind extraterritorial application of US antitrust law.210

Footnote 209:

209. See, e.g., First, supra note 16, at 732-34 (arguing that international political consensus is integral to effective international antitrust enforcement and that the case-by-case common law process of law development is the optimal path to that consensus in the absence of a single system of or approach to market place regulation); Org. for Econ. Co-operation & Dev., Recommendation of the Council Concerning Effective Action Against Hard Core Cartels 2 (May 1998), http://www.oecd.org/daf/competition/2350130.pdf [https://perma.cc/35HUTEWZ] (last visited Oct. 26, 2017) (“[C]loser co-operation is necessary to deal effectively with anticompetitive practices in one country that affect other countries and harm international trade.”). As noted above, while national recourse for compensating private loss is currently available in a minority of antitrust jurisdictions, it is increasingly acknowledged as a necessary tool for under-resourced national competition authorities. See Pheasant, supra note 11, at 59 (explaining that the European Commission “decided that it would be appropriate to enhance the role of private enforcement to support and supplement public enforcement of the competition rules” given insufficient resources for governmental competition authorities); Edward Cavanagh, Antitrust Remedies Revisited, 84 OR. L. REV. 147, 153-54 (2005) (“Congress created the private right of action to supplement public enforcement because it was aware that the government would not have the necessary resources to uncover, investigate, and prosecute all violations of antitrust laws.”); see also supra note 25.

End of footnote 209.

#### Food crises and refugees each cause extinction

Cribb ‘19 [Julian; 10/3/19; distinguished science writer with more than thirty awards for journalism; “Food or War.” Cambridge University Press. https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/food-or-war/2D6F728A71C0BFEA0CEC85897066DCAF]

Although actual numbers of warheads have continued to fall from its peak of 70,000 weapons in the mid 1980s, scientists argue the danger of nuclear conflict in fact increased in the first two decades of the twenty first century. This was due to the modernisation of existing stockpiles, the adoption of dangerous new technologies such as robot delivery systems, hypersonic missiles, artificial intelligence and electronic warfare, and the continuing leakage of nuclear materials and knowhow to nonnuclear nations and potential terrorist organisations. In early 2018 the hands of the ‘ Doomsday Clock ’ , maintained by the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, were re-set at two minutes to midnight, the highest risk to humanity that it has ever shown since the clock was introduced in 1953. This was due not only to the state of the world ’s nuclear arsenal, but also to irresponsible language by world leaders, the growing use of social media to destabilise rival regimes, and to the rising threat of uncontrolled climate change (see below). 12 In an historic moment on 17 July 2017, 122 nations voted in the UN for the first time ever in favour of a treaty banning all nuclear weapons. This called for comprehensive prohibition of “ a full range of nuclear-weapon-related activities, such as undertaking to develop, test, produce, manufacture, acquire, possess or stockpile nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices, as well as the use or threat of use of these weapons. ” 13 However, 71 other countries– including all the nuclear states– either opposed the ban, abstained or declined to vote. The Treaty vote was nonetheless interpreted by some as a promising first step towards abolishing the nuclear nightmare that hangs over the entire human species. In contrast, 192 countries had signed up to the Chemical Weapons Convention to ban the use of chemical weapons, and 180 to the Biological Weapons Convention. As of 2018, 96 per cent of previous world stocks of chemical weapons had been destroyed– but their continued use in the Syrian conflict and in alleged assassination attempts by Russia indicated the world remains at risk. 14 As things stand, the only entities that can afford to own nuclear weapons are nations– and if humanity is to be wiped out, it will most likely be as a result of an atomic conflict between nations. It follows from this that, if the world is to be made safe from such a fate it will need to get rid of nations as a structure of human self-organisation and replace them with wiser, less aggressive forms of self-governance. After all, the nation state really only began in the early nineteenth century and is by no means a permanent feature of self-governance, any more than monarchies, feudal systems or priest states. Although many people still tend to assume it is. Between them, nations have butchered more than 200 million people in the past 150 years and it is increasingly clear the world would be a far safer, more peaceable place without either nations or nationalism. The question is what to replace them with. Although there may at first glance appear to be no close linkage between weapons of mass destruction and food, in the twenty first century with world resources of food, land and water under growing stress, nothing can be ruled out. Indeed, chemical weapons have frequently been deployed in the Syrian civil war, which had drought, agricultural failure and hunger among its early drivers. And nuclear conflict remains a distinct possibility in South Asia and the Middle East, especially, as these regions are already stressed in terms of food, land and water, and their nuclear firepower or access to nuclear materials is multiplying. It remains an open question whether panicking regimes in Russia, the USA or even France would be ruthless enough to deploy atomic weapons in an attempt to quell invasion by tens of millions of desperate refugees, fleeing famine and climate chaos in their own homelands– but the possibility ought not to be ignored. That nuclear war is at least a possible outcome of food and climate crises was first flagged in the report The Age of Consequences by Kurt Campbell and the US-based Centre for Strategic and International Studies, which stated ‘ it is clear that even nuclear war cannot be excluded as a political consequence of global warming ’ . 15 Food insecurity is therefore a driver in the preconditions for the use of nuclear weapons, whether limited or unlimited.
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## Cartels adv

### OV

#### Seventh circuit interpretation of the direct effects doctrine wrecks extraterritorial antitrust enforcement and spurs cartel formation. Plan is key to deter price fixing

#### Plan saves global supply chains by significantly curtailing price fixing—solves great power war and hotspots

#### The aff solves by ensuring there’s sufficient enforcement mechanisms against foreign cartel behavior through private suits under US law, while also encouraging development of new antitrust regimes to bolster foreign enforcement.

### 2AC Internal Link – Private Action Key

#### Government enforcement alone fails – only private action can create sufficient deterrence

Ryu ‘16 [Jae Hyung; Fall 2016; J.D. Candidate (2017), Washington University School of Law, St. Louis, Missouri; Wake Forest Journal of Business and Intellectual Property Law; “Deterring Foreign Component Cartels in the Age of Globalized Supply Chains,” vol. 17, no. 1, https://heinonline.org/hol-cgi-bin/get\_pdf.cgi?handle=hein.journals/wakfinp17&section=6]

The purpose of the antitrust statutes is better served if the importation of finished products incorporating price-fixed components is treated as part of the import inclusion.131 At the outset and in the abstract, if the goal is to deter anticompetitive conduct because it leads to unfairness and inefficiency, who brings the suit hardly matters as long as the defendant in violation of the law must pay for the transgression-the plaintiff is merely the vehicle to mete out the punishment.132 Courts have approved this notion, emphasizing that antitrust suits are about the defendant's conduct, not the plaintiff s.133

This is especially true in today's internationally interconnected economy and globalized supply chains.134 Private suits constitute a significant part of the antitrust deterrence mechanism.135 In fact, scholars have noted that government enforcement alone fails to provide adequate deterrence against antitrust violations.136 When it comes to international cartels, the current deterrence mechanism government enforcement combined with private suits-is largely ineffective in meeting the deterrence goal. 37 In order to restore a meaningful level of deterrence, private suits need to be available even more widely, not barred or limited.138 However, if courts were to limit private suits only to direct purchaser plaintiffs (actual component importers),139 the Sherman Act would be without teeth.140 As Justice Brennan wrote in his dissent in Illinois Brick, "from the deterrence standpoint, it is irrelevant to whom damages are paid, so long as someone redresses the violation."141 If the direct purchaser fails to bring a suit for whatever reason-attorney’s fees, power imbalance against the cartel that retains absolute control over the purchaser's supply of the necessary component, to name a few-then there is effectively little deterrence against the cartel because "ultimate consumer individuals often suffer only minor damages and therefore have little incentive to bring suit." 142

This deterrence gap is even more pronounced when one considers that a large portion of finished products are assembled outside the United States.143 When finished products incorporate the price-fixed components, the increased price will be passed on to the finished products and affect the economy.144 The restrictive reading of what constitutes conduct involving import trade or commerce in the context of price-fixed components would render the Sherman Act powerless to defend the U.S. economy against an influx of price-fixed components. 145 The Seventh Circuit in Motorola justified barring private damages for price-fixed components and distinguished its seeming conflict with Hui Hsiung by reasoning that Hui Hsiung's prosecutorial context minimized the international comity concerns because the government presumably takes them into account. 146

Yet, the European counterpart is already expansively employing its antitrust laws in the context of import commerce. In 2010, the European Commission, facing the same cartel faced by the Motorola court, fined the LCD manufacturer cartel for fixing prices.147 These panels were manufactured and incorporated into televisions, computer monitors, and notebooks in Asia. 14 8

The finished products were then imported into the European Economic Area ("EEA"). 149 The European Commission found significant that the cartel was "aware" of its violation and that it harmed European buyers of finished products that use the LCDs.15 0 Innolux, one of the fined defendants, appealed to the European Union's Court of Justice ("Court of Justice") and challenged the European Commission's jurisdiction over their conduct. The Court of Justice, noting that the issue did not involve the actual cartelized components but rather finished products incorporating the components, nevertheless held the cartel's activities were subject to the European Union's competition laws.152 The court reasoned that failing to punish the cartel would overlook the adverse economic effects in the EEA.153 The Court of Justice identified two potential advantages a cartel that price-fixed components would have over competitors.154 The first advantage is passing the increased price to finished products and consumers, who take the brunt of increased prices. 155 Second is the cartel member achieving a relative cost advantage against its competitors when the component purchaser does not raise the price and forego partial revenue. 1 5 6 Either way, unless punished, the cartel would get away with the price-fix despite the adverse effects on domestic commerce. This case serves as further evidence that achieving the anticompetitive statutes' purpose requires extending their reach to the importation of finished products 157 incorporating price-fixed components.

The current pending case 8 and related guilty plea,159 involving an international cartel that price-fixed capacitors, provides a good case study of the potential economic ramifications of not enforcing the Sherman Act against the importation of finished products incorporating price-fixed components. Capacitors form an integral component in most electronic devices.160 A number of capacitors are manufactured and incorporated into electronic devices outside the United States before the finished products are sold in or delivered throughout the United States. 161 When capacitors' prices-while individually cheap, "typically under a penny," 1 6 2 -are artificially fixed higher by a cartel of global manufacturers, the increase will invariably raise the finished products' prices.163 When the finished products incorporating the price-fixed capacitors are imported into the United States, they are involved in import commerce. To resolve the uncertainty and better deter international cartel activities adversely affecting U.S. commerce, the importation of finished products incorporating price-fixed components should be treated as part of the import inclusion. If the direct effect test is applied, it may result in the same decision as Motorola.164 The failure to deter international cartels and protect the U.S. economy from the cartel's harmful effects is universally felt because capacitors are ubiquitous. 165

#### Private damages in the US are the only effective method to deter cartels – the Seventh Circuit eliminates them

Meriwether ‘15 [Ellen; Spring 2015; Litigation partner at Cafferty Clobes Meriwether & Sprengel LLP and concentrates her practice in antitrust class action litigation; Antitrust; “Motorola Mobility and the FTAIA: If Not Here, Then Where?” vol. 29, no. 2 p. 8-17)

Elimination of Private Enforcement Under Federal Law

The Seventh Circuit repeatedly stated that Motorola must seek its remedies abroad, under the laws of the country in which its subsidiaries are incorporated.105 Yet only a few Asian countries even allow for recovery of private antitrust damages, and these countries generally disallow class actions and require plaintiffs to pay all court costs.106 Moreover, in Motorola’s case, the evidence suggests that none of the injury arising from panels shipped into the United States was suffered overseas; rather, the inflated prices paid by the purchasers abroad were passed through to the United States and ultimately paid by U.S. consumers.107 It is not likely that foreign purchasers, even if they have private rights of action in their home countries, can recover without proving actual damages.108

The ease with which the Seventh Circuit dismisses concerns about the elimination of private enforcement may suggest an underlying assumption that criminal prosecution and fines here and abroad are sufficient to deter global cartel conduct. Yet successfully conducted global cartels have been highly profitable,109 and criminal fines, when issued at all, are small in comparison to profits earned by members of global cartels.110 The Sherman Act attempts to address this issue by imposing treble damages on violators, but in most other countries private actions lack this deterrent force.111Thus, the consequence of the panel decision is to remove any deterrent effect of private actions from the cost-benefit calculus of cartel members.

Given the dearth of effective private damages remedies in many foreign jurisdictions and the inability of government enforcement to adequately deter global cartel activity, private plaintiffs may be expected to argue (1) that the application of the FTAIA in Motorola II should not be accepted by other courts outside the Seventh Circuit, and (2) that the bar to indirect purchaser claims under federal antitrust law should be changed (presumably by the Supreme Court) to allow indirect purchasers to assert damages claims as the DOJ proposed.

### 2AC Impact – Supply Chains

#### Integrated supply chains stop war.

Stein Tønnesson 15, Research Professor, Peace Research Institute Oslo; Leader of East Asia Peace program, Uppsala University, 2015, “Deterrence, interdependence and Sino–US peace,” International Area Studies Review, Vol. 18, No. 3, p. 297-311

Lampton (2014: 3, 7, 122, 136) holds that peace is enhanced by ‘the idea of global interdependence’, and puts forward an ‘interdependence theory’: institutional and economic interdependence dampens impulses toward conflict. While it does not make conflict impossible, and makes war even more destructive should it occur, it provides ‘incentives to keep conflict with major partners manageable’. There is now a ‘struggle for the soul of Chinese foreign policy between the realities of interdependence and the impulses of assertive nationalism’. Lampton does not go into detail about the question of when interdependence precludes war and when it does not. Christensen (2015: 41–46), however, is more specific as to why global interdependence today is of a different kind than in the past, and more likely to hinder war: trans-national production chains make it necessary for an aggressor state to ‘persuade a diverse set of foreign investors, suppliers of key components, and logistics companies to continue doing business’ after it has invaded a territory, and it is easy to see how difficult this may be.1 Thus it is less tempting than in the past to go to war: ‘While transnational production and interdependence is certainly no guarantee against war’, says Christensen, ‘it is still a major force for peace’ (Christenen, 2015: 46). The Russian invasions of Georgia and the Crimea, and the US invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq prove Christensen’s point about how difficult and costly it is to reconstitute a functioning economy after invading a territory, but show also that some governments disregard the costs when they see weighty geopolitical reasons for resorting to force against an inferior country with no nuclear arms.

## Development adv

### OV

#### Unclear and arbitrary extraterritorial application of US antitrust law hinders development of foreign antitrust regimes—the plan’s balancing test allows nascent jurisdictions to develop where necessary

#### Well developed antitrust is key to sustainable development in growing markets—sustainable development promotes growth, alleviates poverty, and mitigates every other risk

#### Antitrust specifically key to solving famine—developed antitrust is key to breaking up ag monopolies contributing to high food prices and famine

#### The aff solves by deferring to international laws and allowing them to develop antitrust regimes which work for their markets while recognizing the interconnectedness of the global market

### 2AC Internal Link – SDGs

#### Cultivates competition in agriculture and healthcare markets – overcomes inequality.

Aydin & Büthe ’16 [Umit and Tim; Associate Professor at the Instituto de Ciencia Política, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile and George C. Lamb, Jr. Fellow at the Kenan Institute for Ethics at Duke University; Professor of Political Science and Public Policy at the Hochschule für Politik (Bavarian School of Public Policy) at the Technical University of Munich, Germany, where he holds the Chair in International Relations, as well as a senior fellow of the Kenan Institute for Ethics and a founding member of the Rethinking Regulation Initiative at Duke University; *Law and Contemporary Problems,* “Competition Law & Policy in Developing Countries: Explaining Variations in Outcomes; Exploring Possibilities and Limits,” <https://scholarship.law.duke.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=4801&context=lcp>; KS]

Bhattarcharjea, drawing on the broader notion of human (rather than “just” economic) development, suggests that competition law enforcement and policy in developing countries should focus on “sectors that directly impinge on the well-being of the poor, in particular essential consumer goods, agriculture [and its inputs] and health care.”23 And he argues that developing country agencies should initially focus on disclosing and alleviating concrete local impediments to the operation of competitive markets. Such a strategy is promising because it: allows new agencies to build technical capacity by solving relatively tractable problems; enables them to build popular support for competition policy through actions that yield clear benefits for domestic market participants; and gives the agency time to develop transgovernmental linkages with their counterparts in other countries before going after the transnational cartels that often ruthlessly target developing countries.24 These arguments suggest that the sectoral composition and geographic distribution of implementation and enforcement efforts may serve as initial measures of success, until it becomes possible to assess whether reductions in local distortions and benefits for the poor are indeed materializing.

Fox goes further, both in conceptualizing development as an operational goal of competition policy and in suggesting specific foci for competition policy implementation. Pointing out that severe inequalities in education and access to capital create highly consequential barriers to entry, she suggests that a competition policy that seeks to foster equality of opportunity to partake in the market and share in its benefits must include measures to overcome such inequality or at least its effects.25 From this perspective, competition law and policy are successful if they contribute to actual increases in market participation from previously marginalized or excluded segments of the population, and could be considered at least partly successful to the extent that they measurably reduce the barriers to entry.

#### Spurs inclusive sustainable development.

Fox ’17 [Eleanor; February 14; Walter J. Derenberg Professor of Trade Regulation at New York University School of Law; *Law and Contemporary Problems,* “Competition Policy: The Comparative Advantage of Developing Countries,” <https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2916452>; KS]

For developing countries, the overall goal is likely to be development, en route to a more robust economy and a better life for the people.20 In keeping with the imperative to include the masses of people typically left out and left behind, both for humane reasons and for efficient sustainable development, the goal may be articulated as inclusive sustainable development. Distribution and human dignity matter. More nearly equal opportunity to contest markets on the merits is an objective – and usually an efficient one.21

How can a nation reach the goal of sustainable, efficient development through markets? It might approach the challenge by keeping markets open and accessible, while protecting both buyers and suppliers from abusive exercises of power.

## AT: T-Per Se

### 2AC – AT: T-Per Se

#### We meet:

#### 1 – Prohibits price-fixing that affects US commerce indirectly:

a – activities – price-fixing is ongoing by multiple participants.

b – prohibitions – courts allow indirect price-fixing now – post-plan, all activities that don’t meet the balancing test are prohibited.

#### 2 – Plan text in a vacuum – most objective standard – otherwise neg teams generate competition for garbage CPs.

#### ‘Anticompetitive business practices’ refer to actions that harm the competitive process.

Breyer ’88 [Stephen; June 30; Federal Court of Appeals Judge on the First Circuit and later a Supreme Court Justice; Westlaw, Clamp-All Corp. v. Cast Iron Soil Pipe Inst., 851 F.2d 478]

“Anticompetitive”, too, has a special meaning. It refers not to actions that merely injure individual competitors, but rather to actions that harm the competitive process. Brown Shoe Co. v. United States, 370 U.S. 294, 319–20, 328–34, 82 S.Ct. 1502, 1521, 1525–29, 8 L.Ed.2d 510 (1962); see Brunswick Corp. v. Pueblo Bowl–O–Mat, Inc., 429 U.S. 477, 488–89, 97 S.Ct. 690, 697–98, 50 L.Ed.2d 701 (1977). And, the law assesses both harms and benefits in light of the Act's basic objectives, the protection of a competitive process that brings to consumers the benefits of lower prices, better products, and more efficient production methods. See Interface Group, Inc. v. Massachusetts Port Authority, 816 F.2d 9, 11–12 (1st Cir.1987); 7 Areeda & Turner ¶ 1502.

The joint practices and agreements that appellant attacks here are not per se unreasonable. Thus, appellant must show that the likely anticompetitive effects of these practices outweigh their business justifications, or at least that the defendants might achieve any legitimate business objectives in a significantly less restrictive way. 7 Areeda & Turner ¶ 1505b.

A

Clamp–All's major attack concerns CISPI's promulgation of a standard called the 310 Designation. That standard is entitled

Specifications for

CAST IRON SOIL PIPE INSTITUTE'S APPROVED COUPLING FOR USE IN CONNECTION WITH HUBLESS CAST IRON SOIL PIPE AND FITTINGS FOR SANITARY STORM DRAIN, WASTE AND VENT PIPING APPLICATIONS

The specification consists of several pages of detail. It also states,

Several different types of hubless joints or couplings are available for use in hubless cast iron systems.... It is the purpose of this specification ... to furnish \*487 information as to the approved characteristics of one of such type couplings which is approved by the Institute [CISPI].

And, it states on the first page,

Members of the Institute who are licensed to use the Institute's Collective MarkNO –HUB and who sell hubless couplings manufactured by or for them which conform fully to this Specification may indicate their membership in the Institute and their conformance with this Specification by marking such couplings with the Institute's Collective Mark NO–HUB.

CISPI successfully persuaded various private standard-setting bodies, as well as state and local plumbing code authorities, to make reference to the 310 Designation as the kind of coupling that would meet their respective standards.

8 a. Appellants seem to say that CISPI's very promulgation of this standard and its efforts to secure its adoption by certifying authorities amounts to an unreasonable restraint of trade. We do not see how that can be so. The standard, in specifying what counts as a CISPI coupling, provides a relatively cheap and effective way for a manufacturer or a buyer to determine whether a particular coupling is, in fact, (generically considered) a CISPI coupling. The adoption by certifiers helps users quickly and effectively determine that a particular coupling (which meets CISPI standards) also meets state, local, or private certifiers' standards of acceptability. The joint specification development, promulgation, and adoption efforts would seem less expensive than having each member of CISPI make duplicative efforts. On its face, the joint development and promulgation of the specification would seem to save money by providing information to makers and to buyers less expensively and more effectively than without the standard. It may also help to assure product quality. If such activity, in and of itself, were to hurt Clamp–All by making it more difficult for Clamp–All to compete, Clamp–All would suffer injury only as a result of the defendants' joint efforts having lowered information costs or created a better product. See George R. Whitten, Jr., Inc. v. Paddock Pool Builders, Inc., 508 F.2d 547, 558 & n. 19 (1st Cir.1974). And, that kind of harm is not “unreasonably anticompetitive.” It brings about the very benefits that the antitrust laws seek to promote. That is to say, activity that harms competitors because it lowers production or distribution costs or provides a better product carries with it an overriding justification.

Of course, what we have just written is true of ‘legitimate’ standard-setting activity. See Whitten, 508 F.2d at 558 n. 19. There could be special circumstances, showing, in an individual case, that the standard setting at issue serves no legitimate purpose, or that it is unnecessarily harmful. Id. (antitrust claim stated if market participant who establishes proprietary specifications coerces a standard-setting organization or conspires with it to get the specification officially adopted, or if it prevents competitors from competing for approval). But the plaintiff would have to show the existence of such circumstances; and, the plaintiff has not done so here. The best it can do is point to the word “approved” in the specification (“it is the purpose of this specification ... to furnish information as to the approved characteristics of one of such type couplings which is approved by the Institute.”) and to argue that that single word might mislead users into thinking that CISPI is a disinterested certifying organization, providing “approvals” for all hubless couplings, thereby hurting Clamp–All, unless, as Clamp–All seems to argue, CISPI considered Clamp–All's coupling for “approval” as well, see Radiant Burners, Inc. v. Peoples Gas Light & Coke, 364 U.S. 656, 81 S.Ct. 365, 5 L.Ed.2d 358 (1961); 2 J. von Kalinowski, Antitrust Laws and Trade Regulation, § 6I.01 (1988); Wachtel, “Products Standards and Certification Programs,” 13 Antitrust Bull. 1, 13 (1968).

9 The dispositive answer to this argument is that the record contains no significant evidence that the word “approved” misled anyone. The specification itself makes clear what it is, a specification that applies to CISPI-type hubless couplings, \*488 not to all hubless couplings. It contains no other language that might make one think that CISPI was some kind of general certifying organization. Buyers of hubless couplings are builders, plumbers, or contractors—reasonably sophisticated users—and there is no testimony that any of them was fooled. Plaintiff's best evidence consists of a comment by its expert that “people who normally use these things ... could easily be misled,” but, on cross examination, that same expert conceded that he had not talked to normal coupling users in forming that particular opinion. In our view, that opinion alone, so lacking in foundation, cannot take the issue of “being fooled” to the jury. And, if CISPI was not (or at least was not thought to be) a general certifying organization, why must it develop a specification for, or somehow “certify,” a competitor's quite different product? After all, General Motors need not certify the quality of a Toyota, nor need a group of film producers certify the quality of competing live television programs.

b. Clamp–All argues that CISPI defendants prevented an important “standard-setting and approval-granting” organization, the American Society of Sanitary Engineers (“ASSE”), from approving a hubless coupling performance standard that would have benefitted Clamp–All. In theory, one can understand how joint activity of the kind Clamp–All alleges could be unreasonably anticompetitive. Suppose, for example, the ASSE was about to adopt a performance standard that both CISPI and Clamp–All could have met; suppose further that ASSE's adoption of such a standard would have led to the adoption of a similar standard by hosts of local and state regulatory, and private certifying authorities. Then Clamp–All simply could have pointed to the standard (and its compliance) to show a contractor that its product was approved, just as CISPI does in states that have referenced the 310 Designation. If CISPI prevented the adoption of such a standard, it may have acted unreasonably.

10 The key word here, however, is “may.” Certifiers may reasonably believe that they can do their job properly (a job that benefits consumers) only if all interested parties are allowed to present proposals, frankly present their views, and vote. Thus, we do not see how plaintiff could succeed on its antitrust claim unless (at a minimum) CISPI both prevented ASSE from adopting a national performance standard that would have benefitted Clamp–All and did so through the use of unfair, or improper practices or procedures. See Indian Head, Inc. v. Allied Tube & Conduit Corp., 817 F.2d 938 (2nd Cir.) (antitrust claim stated where defendant conspired with other steel companies to block the approval of plaintiff's product by a national certifying organization; defendant acted within the letter of the organization's rules, but violated their spirit by paying for and packing a meeting with voters who had little to no professional interest in the subject matter), aff'd, 486 U.S. 492, 108 S.Ct. 1931, 100 L.Ed.2d 497 (1988) (affirming denial of Noerr–Pennington immunity for defendant's effort to influence private standard-setting organization; dismissing certiorari in respect to whether defendant's conduct was an unreasonable restraint of trade). In deciding whether this is so, courts must take account of the importance of permitting parties to express their views freely before regulatory authorities. See Eastern Railroad Presidents Conference v. Noerr Motor Freight, Inc., 365 U.S. 127, 81 S.Ct. 523, 5 L.Ed.2d 464 (1961); United Mine Workers of America v. Pennington, 381 U.S. 657, 670, 85 S.Ct. 1585, 1593, 14 L.Ed.2d 626 (1965) (“Joint efforts to influence public officials do not violate the antitrust laws even though intended to eliminate competition” (emphasis added)); cf. Allied Tube & Conduit Corp. v. Indian Head, Inc., 486 U.S. 492, 108 S.Ct. 1931, 100 L.Ed.2d 497 (1988) (efforts to influence private standard-setting organizations may violate antitrust laws).

11 The record here does not contain evidence sufficient to warrant presenting Clamp–All's claim to the jury. It shows that in 1979, at Clamp–All's request, the ASSE formed a subcommittee to write a hubless coupling standard. Clamp-All proposed a four-tier standard (rating couplings by their ability to withstand varying levels \*489 of water pressure). Initially, when only one CISPI representative was present, the subcommittee recommended a three-tier standard (which was also beneficial to Clamp–All). CISPI then decided to offer a single tier standard, which both the CISPI and Clamp–All couplings would have met. It wrote its members and urged them to attend the next meeting. At that next meeting, with six CISPI members attending out of a total of sixteen, the subcommittee changed its mind and voted for CISPI's proposed standard. The ASSE eventually decided not to accept its subcommittee's recommendation, and it took no further action.

We can find no concrete evidence in the record that CISPI acted improperly. The record here is unlike that in Indian Head, where the defendant “packed” the meeting by hiring lay voters in numbers that unfairly gave it overrepresentation. Nor is there concrete evidence that the submission of CISPI's proposal caused (or even influenced) ASSE's decision not to adopt any standard. Clamp–All points to a single statement by CISPI's general counsel that the CISPI one-tier proposal was “not really a performance standard.” We do not see how that statement shows a significant abuse of ASSE's procedural standards or practices. Rather, as far as the record is concerned, CISPI acted within the letter and the spirit of the ASSE rules in presenting its proposal and urging its members to attend the meeting.

B

Clamp–All claims that the defendants have jointly engaged in several unreasonably anticompetitive “business practices.” For the most part these claims amount to charges of state-law business torts, not violations of the federal antitrust laws. Whitten, 508 F.2d 560–62. We assume that point aside, however, for the sake of argument, and because of appellant's later Lanham Act claim, see pp. 491–492 infra. We have examined the evidence in respect to each alleged act, and we conclude that no reasonable jury could find a significant, unreasonably anticompetitive business practice that harmed Clamp–All.

#### Prohibition includes per se and rule of reason.

Anu Bradford and Adam S. Chilton 18. Anu Bradford Henry L. Moses Professor of Law and International Organization, Columbia Law School. Adam S. Chilton. Assistant Professor of Law and Walter Mander Research Scholar.

Before discussing our data and the coding of the CLI, it is important to recognize that there are limitations to any index that attempts to quantify competition regulation. This is because it is difficult to produce a single metric that tells the comprehensive story of country’s competition regime. For example, if a specific type of conduct is prohibited, is it prohibited always (per se) or sometimes (rule of reason)? This seems like a relevant distinction to code, but it turns out to be difficult to capture systematically in many jurisdictions. For instance, Article 101(3) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) seems to regulate anticompetitive agreements under the rule of reason standard in the European Union, but, in practice, cartels are per se prohibited. This highlights the challenge of coding even just the law in books, let alone accounting for all the nuances of a country’s competition policies.20

#### Increase means to expand the existence of an already existing policy

Buckley ’6 [Jeremiah S, Joseph M. Kolar; November 13; partners at Buckley Kolar LLP; Westlaw, Brief of Amici Curiae for “Mortgage Insurance Companies of America and Consumer Mortgage Coalition,” WL 3309503]

First, the court said that the ordinary meaning of the word “increase” is “to make something greater,” which it believed should not “be limited to cases in which a company raises the rate that an individual has previously been charged.” 435 F.3d at 1091. Yet the definition offered by the Ninth Circuit compels the opposite conclusion. Because “increase” means “to make something greater,” there must necessarily have been an existing premium, to which Edo's actual premium may be compared, to determine whether an \*26 “increase” occurred. Congress could have provided that “adverse action” in the insurance context means charging an amount greater than the optimal premium, but instead chose to define adverse action in terms of an “increase.” That definitional choice must be respected, not ignored. See Colautti v. Franklin, 439 U.S. 379, 392-93 n.10 (1979) (“[a] definition which declares what a term ‘means' … excludes any meaning that is not stated”).

Next, the Ninth Circuit reasoned that because the Insurance Prong includes the words “existing or applied for,” Congress intended that an “increase in any charge” for insurance must “apply to all insurance transactions - from an initial policy of insurance to a renewal of a long-held policy.” 435 F.3d at 1091. This interpretation reads the words “existing or applied for” in isolation. Other types of adverse action described in the Insurance Prong apply only to situations where a consumer had an existing policy of insurance, such as a “cancellation,” “reduction,” or “change” in insurance. Each of these forms of adverse action presupposes an already-existing policy, and under usual canons of statutory construction the term “increase” also should be construed to apply to increases of an already-existing policy. See Hibbs v. Winn, 542 U.S. 88, 101 (2004) (“a phrase gathers meaning from the words around it”) (citation omitted).

#### Prohibitions can be partial

Clopton ’85 [David; December 1, 1885; Justice on the Supreme Court of Alabama; Westlaw, “Miller v. Jones,” 80 Ala. 89]

The title of the act is, “An act to regulate the sale, giving away, or otherwise disposing of spirituous, vinous or malt liquors, or intoxicating bitters, or patent medicines having alcohol as a base, in Talladega County.” But one subject is expressed in the title--the regulation of the sale, giving away or otherwise disposing of liquors--and the enquiry is, does the title express the subject contained in the enactment: in other words, are regulation and prohibition the same or distinct subjects? Regulate and prohibit have different and distinct meanings, whether understood in their ordinary and common signification, or as defined by the courts in construing statutes. Power granted to a municipal corporation to grant licenses to retailers of liquors, and to regulate them, does not confer power to prohibit, either directly or by a prohibitory charge for a license. Town of Marion v. Chandler, 6 Ala. 899; Ex parte Burnett, 30 Ala. 461; In Joseph v. Randolph, 71 Ala. 499, it is said: “A constitutional right, though subject to regulation, can not be impaired or destroyed, under the devise or guise of being regulated.” To regulate the sale of liquor implies, ex vi ter \*97 mini, that the business may be engaged in or carried on, subject to established rules or methods. Prohibition is to prevent the business being engaged in or carried on, entirely or partially. The two purposes are incongruous. A title which expresses a purpose to regulate, gives no indication of a purpose to absolutely prohibit. We are constrained to hold the act unconstitutional.

## AT: guidance docs

### 2ac

#### Perm do the CP – it’s a way the plan could be done

#### Perm do both—pass the plan and provide positive incentives for compliance—if the cp’s incentvies are enough to guarantee compliance then the perm shields the link

#### CP fails –

#### Guidance is the status quo – non-compliance proves regulation is key

#### Legally impossible – guidance docs are only allowed to clarify existing federal laws – they can’t suggest new policies

#### Non-binding – no enforcement mechanism or legal penalties – it won’t have the weight of law

Lankford and Alexander 15 – Lamar Alexander is the senior US senator from Tennessee and Senator James Lankford is a Republican of Oklahoma and member of the Senate intelligence committee, ("SEN. JAMES LANKFORD HOLDS A HEARING ON EXAMINING THE USE OF AGENCY REGULATORY GUIDANCE", 9/25/15, https://search-proquest-com.ezp1.lib.umn.edu/docview/1716716707/52BF935BD1694E6EPQ/2?accountid=14586) //S.He

These terms are often grouped together under the umbrella of guidance. Guidance is a helpful tool, one, for example, agencies merely wish to clarify, to find a point of ambiguity in existing regulation.

The APA acknowledges that agency guidance is useful by exempting it from its notice and comment requirements. Therefore, when an agency chooses to issue a guidance document in lieu of rulemaking, it may, for example, publish it on its Web site and do that immediately.

But the benefit of guidance -- but the guidance of guidance, that it bypasses notice and comment and therefore, can be readily issued comes with a catch. Guidance may not impose legal obligations on the agency or on the parties it regulates beyond those inherent in the rule that it clarifies.

Given these characteristics that guidance is not legally binding but merely re-articulates a regulation's existing legal requirements and regulated parties' obligations under those requirements, it can be very difficult even for experts to determine or discern when a document can be rightly called a guidance and when it should go through the rigor of APA notice and comment rulemaking. In fact, the Government Accountability Office, in its most recent report, found the legal scholars and federal courts grapple with these very determinations.

I do believe that agencies may issue guidance documents with the best of intentions to clear up confusion or to provide timely information. However, also -- I also understand the concerns and frustration of regulated entities that must sift through huge stacks of guidance with widely varying names to ensure that they are appropriately complying with standards.

For example, the Department of Labor has issued guidance documents under various headings such as advisory opinions, notices to interested persons, brochures, policy directives, bulletins, questions and answers, and circulars just to name a few. Likewise, the Department of Education issues guidance under the heading such as "dear colleague" letters, memoranda, best practices, frequently asked questions, program memos and manuals.

I hope the discussion we have today will be in service of ensuing that guidance is properly and selectively issued going forward. Today's concern lies with the process by which the decision to issue guidance is made.

Circumventing the rulemaking process robs the public of Congressionally mandated notice and comment and is wrong in and of itself, even if the substance of policy it articulates is sensible. In the past, for example, independent watchdog organizations and congressional committees have expressed concerns with particularly the Department of Education guidance.

In 2010, '11 and in '14, the department's Office of Civil Rights issued guidance dubbed as "dear colleague" letters on bullying, sexual assaults and school discipline in higher education. The letter served to significantly expand prohibited conduct in the way in which disciplinary procedures could be conducted, and the scope of school liability for failing to prevent prohibitive conduct.

#### Backlash and confusion – gets lost in the flurry

Heitkamp 15 – (Heidi, "SEN. JAMES LANKFORD HOLDS A HEARING ON EXAMINING THE USE OF AGENCY REGULATORY GUIDANCE", 9/25/15, https://search-proquest-com.ezp1.lib.umn.edu/docview/1716716707/52BF935BD1694E6EPQ/2?accountid=14586) //S.He

HEITKAMP: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thanks for calling this hearing. Agency use of guidance documents may not sound like the most riveting topic.

But it is one of incredible importance -- we're like the rules nerds. So, you know, we get very excited about all of these topics.

But obviously, this is one of incredible importance and one that affects so many of our businesses and so many of our schools, and pretty much the entire regulatory community. As I've said many times, regulations underpin almost everything our nation and our citizens do.

Regulations keep our products and food safe. Regulations work to prevent fraud and keep our economy and American -- Americans working.

However, sometimes the language agencies use creates confusing and seemingly conflicting standards. Guidance is the mean by -- means by which businesses can get the clarity and answers they're searching for.

It gives them certainty. Guidance removes ambiguity and helps clarify expectations. Guidance is the conduit for informational exchanges and a tool to streamline processes.

Guidance allows businesses to better understand their relationship with the regulator. Guidance is not nor should it be substantive rulemaking.

It's important to recognize that more often than not, guidance comes at the request of the regulated parties. Any work that we do here must not show (ph) that exchange for it's a valuable tool for both business and government.

There is more to guidance than simply clarifying views and expectations. The creation of guidance must take into account the effects these documents will have on the affected parties.

Although guidance cannot change laws, it has the power to influence markets. It is incredibly important that we ensure regulated entities are given an opportunity to voice their concerns, share data and submit comments.

In order for this to be a truly exceptional process, we must ensure that there are seats for all interested parties at the table. And that seat must be a real seat.

However, there is the difference between having a seat at the table and getting one's own way. Many times, agencies' hands are handcuffed.

And the Congress holds the key. Sometimes, agencies simply do not have the authority to alter regulation due to a statutory mandate.

In these instances, it is up to Congress to be vigilant. It is up to everyone on this dais to ensure that we listen to agencies and we listen to businesses, and we listen to those who are regulated.

It is up to us to be willing to work together to tweak and amend legislation when necessary. And it is up to us to ensure that good intentions do not overly burden our economy.

In reviewing the testimony and reports in preparation for this hearing, it seems that there is much we can do as a chamber to ensure that guidance published is of the highest quality. It's important that there is consistency across agencies.

And as the chairman noted, although we have two agencies represented here, we aren't looking just at two agencies. We are looking at -- and that's the role of this committee, to look more at a systemic view.

However, these illustrations can, in fact, help inform us on the types of reforms that we may -- we may be advancing out of this committee. Small businesses don't always have the staff or the time to sift through pages and pages.

In fact, I can guarantee you, they do not have the staff or the time to sift through pages of confusing and dissimilar fact sheets. Administrator interpretations, directives, information memorandums, and program instructions spread across multiple Web sites and multiple pages.

We need to work to make sure that guidance is accessible to the public. We need to ensure that one does not have not (ph) -- does not need to have intimate knowledge of the regulatory state to understand what is and what is not a guidance document.

We need to simplify terms and create consistencies. We need to ensure that it is an inclusive system where impacted parties have a real voice.

#### Links to the net benefit – reason

#### CP is a voter –

#### One-sided mandate – cp fiats the aff mandate – forces us to either impact turn the net-benefit or make solvency deficits that they fiat past – wrecks clash, makes us autolose

#### Interp – solvency advocate specific to our aff or reading the net-ben as a case argument or da solves

## AT: regneg cp

### 2ac

#### Perm do the cp—it’s a way of implementing the plan

#### Perm do both—use input from the affected parties on how implement the plan

#### Regulation can’t create a new private right of action

Scalia, 1– dead man who used to be a Supreme Court justice; writing the majority opinion for the Supreme Court (Alexander v. Sandoval, 532 U.S. 275 (2001), reprinted in Education Law: Equality, Fairness, and Reform, ed: Derek Black, 2013)

Both the Government and respondents argue that the regulations contain rights-creating language and so must be privately enforceable, but that argument skips an analytical step. Language in a regulation may invoke a private right of action that Congress through statutory text created, but it may not create a right that Congress has not. Thus, when a statute has provided a general authorization for private enforcement of regulations, it may perhaps be correct that the intent displayed in each regulation can determine whether or not it is privately enforceable. But it is most certainly incorrect to say that language in a regulation can conjure up a private cause of action that has not been authorized by Congress. Agencies may play the sorcerer's apprentice but not the sorcerer himself.

#### Counterplans which could result in the aff are a voter

#### Links to the NB—still creates a private right of action or else can’t solve

#### Links to ptx—aff is still seen as atrust action

## AT: BBB

### Won’t Pass---2AC

#### Spending bill doomed---requires restarting, downsizing, and isn’t top priority.

Pramuk ’12/31 [Jacob; 12/31/21; staff writer at CNBC; Thomas Franck; economic policy reporter for CNBC "Democrats look to salvage tattered legislative agenda as they face 2022 midterm elections," https://www.cnbc.com/2021/12/30/congress-news-democrats-to-take-up-build-back-better-fed-picks-in-2022.html]

Biden’s Build Back Better Act weighs the most heavily on Democratic minds. The $1.75 trillion investment in social and climate programs hit a wall this month when Sen. Joe Manchin, D-W.Va., said he would oppose it.

“It would be really, really sad as someone who worked really hard on this, if we were not successful,” Senate Budget Committee Chairman Bernie Sanders, I-Vt., told MSNBC after Manchin announced his stance this month. “But it would be even sadder if the American people said, ‘these people stand for nothing. Not only can’t they get anything done, they don’t believe in anything.’”

Though Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer has vowed to bring the bill up for a vote next month, it is all but doomed. Even so, Democrats hope to revive it in some form that could win support from every member of their Senate caucus.

Congress will have to pass a government funding bill by mid-February to prevent a government shutdown that could lead to furloughs of federal workers. In addition, the Senate and House will work to resolve disagreements on a bill that would pile a quarter of a trillion dollars into research and development to catch up with Chinese investments in technology.

Democrats’ legislative agenda also includes a bill that some in the party believe is the biggest priority of all: The party will try to pass voting rights legislation to counter restrictive bills introduced by state legislatures around the country. Elections proposals stalled repeatedly last year as all Republicans opposed them and at least two Democrats resisted efforts to bypass the filibuster.

Build Back Better

Democrats see the social spending and climate plan as their top domestic priority and a key to showing voters what they can accomplish before November. Manchin’s stance has stopped the bill in its tracks, and it has no clear path forward.

The Senate will return to Washington next week, followed by the House a week later.

Schumer aims to bring a version of the House-passed plan to the Senate floor this month. As Democrats look to approve the bill with a simple majority in the face of unified GOP opposition, a no vote from Manchin alone would sink it.

“We are going to vote on a revised version of the House-passed Build Back Better Act – and we will keep voting on it until we get something done,” Schumer wrote to Senate Democrats earlier this month.

Democrats will likely have to lop off pieces of the bill to win Manchin’s support. They could face hard choices in the coming weeks about whether to scrap some policy priorities to ensure others pass.

The House-passed bill includes a one-year extension of the enhanced child tax credit, child-care subsidies, four weeks of paid leave, an expansion of Medicare to cover hearing aids and more than $500 billion in green energy programs, among a slew of other measures. The strengthened child tax credit — which expires at the end of the year — and paid leave could fall first as Democrats try to appease Manchin.

The conservative West Virginia Democrat, who has a personal financial interest in the coal industry, pushed Democrats to cut a major climate program from the bill as they trimmed its price tag to $1.75 trillion from $3.5 trillion. The White House’s talks with Manchin and Sen. Kyrsten Sinema, D-Ariz., led to a framework agreement in the fall.

### Link---AT: Biden---2AC

#### Biden fails. Too many blunders thump.

Glasser ’12/30 [Susan; 12/30/21; staff writer at The New Yorker, former editor of Politico Magazine, Politico, and editor-in-chief of Foreign Policy; "Joe Biden’s Year of Hoping Dangerously," <https://www.newyorker.com/news/2021-in-review/joe-bidens-year-of-hoping-dangerously>]

The best thing you can say about 2021 is that it will soon be over. A year that started with an insurrection at the Capitol is ending with more than eight hundred thousand Americans dead in the covid pandemic, as a contagious new variant, Omicron, produces the biggest wave of cases yet. Inflation is the highest it has been in decades. The twenty-year U.S. war in Afghanistan concluded with an embarrassing and botched American retreat. The Republican Party, rather than rejecting the defeated ex-President, has redoubled its commitment to Trump and Trumpism, purged dissenters, and embraced outright denialism, whether of vaccines or election results. Who’d have thought that 2020 would ever look good by comparison?

Joe Biden, taking office amid multiple crises, was never going to have it easy. He campaigned on the promise of restoration—of sanity to our national politics, of competence to our governance, and of civility to our public life. He has lived up to his personal part of the bargain, at least, returning dignity to the White House, rejecting the inflammatory lies and demagoguery of his predecessor. The nation is no longer subject to early-morning and late-night tweetstorms of Presidential invective. The White House is neither a superspreader of misinformation nor, as it was under Trump, a platform for personal aggrandizement and self-enrichment.

Many of the national indicators have improved, too: more than seventy per cent of American adults are vaccinated; there are promising new treatments for covid; unemployment has fallen, wages have risen, the economy has rebounded, and the stock markets have hit record highs that would have had Trump beating his chest. Biden managed to pass a bipartisan infrastructure bill through Congress, with more than a trillion dollars in new spending, something that Trump never delivered. All of this, to some Biden backers, is an example of a President who “won big with a bad hand,” as David Frum put it the other day.

But the national mood is sour, and understandably so. Sanity, competence, and civility have not exactly returned to Washington; normalcy is not just around the corner. Biden, it is now clear, promised what he couldn’t deliver in a nation divided against itself. He trafficked in hope that was arguably as misleading in its own way as Trump’s lies. More than four hundred thousand Americans have died of covid since Trump left office—many of them because they refused to get a free, lifesaving vaccine. More than two-thirds of Republicans to this day refuse to accept that Biden is the legitimately elected President, preferring Trump’s Big Lie to the uncomfortable truth of his defeat. There is no restoration possible in such a country.

Republicans, having turned predictions of Biden’s failure into a self-fulfilling prophecy, already proclaim him the second coming of Jimmy Carter: a weak and doomed one-term President, besieged by inflation and a national malaise that defies the actual economic indicators. Democrats know it is early days. A year into an Administration is not the right time to judge its record. But with Biden’s ambitious Build Back Better social-spending bill stalled in the 50–50 Senate by West Virginia’s Democratic senator and a united wall of Republican resistance and with grim prospects for the Party in the upcoming midterm elections, few speak anymore of Biden as a transformative figure. The overheated declarations last spring that this President was the progressive reincarnation of F.D.R. or L.B.J. now seem as dated as the widespread expectation in both parties that Trump, defeated in November, 2020, and disgraced on January 6th, could never have a political future.

So forget the predictions. They’re garbage. Any time you are tempted to buy into them, think back to your January 7th self. Did you imagine a world where it was even possible that Liz Cheney, not Donald Trump, would be the Republican leader purged as a result of the insurrection at the Capitol? Or think back to the moment when you got the covid vaccine and perhaps cried, as the young woman in line in front of me did, at the thought of finally being liberated from the pandemic? Did you think you’d be spending New Year’s Eve at home alone again, wondering where to score a covid test, and watching helplessly as thousands of Americans continue to die each week of a disease for which many of them refused to be vaccinated?

This, as much as anything, must be why Biden, who started the year with nearly sixty per cent of Americans approving of his job performance, now has the lowest rating of any modern President at this point in their tenure—except Donald Trump. Back in the 2020 campaign, Biden effectively made the case that Trump had failed on the pandemic. But he did not reckon fully with the havoc that Trump’s supporters could deal to his own efforts to stop the virus. He did not foresee that so many Americans would risk even death itself for the cause of owning the libs.

For a few months, it seemed that perhaps Biden could deliver. In his Inaugural Address at the Capitol, a mere two weeks after the pro-Trump mob stormed it in an effort to block his victory, Biden spoke of history and hope, renewal and resolve. He claimed that democracy had prevailed and that his tenure would be a time to repair, restore, heal, and build—that he would dedicate his Presidency to reinvigorating a fractured nation. “Unity is the path forward,” he promised.

They were stirring words, bipartisan words, words that many—indeed, probably most—Americans wanted to hear. They were also impossible words.

On July Fourth, Biden still believed in the impossible. He held a party on the White House lawn to celebrate “Independence Day and Independence from covid-19,” as his address that day was tragically mistitled. “Today, all across this nation, we can say with confidence: America is coming back together,” Biden declared. But, of course, it was not. It is no coincidence that Biden’s approval numbers began sinking over the summer as the Delta surge made clear the enormous costs to the whole society of what had morphed by then into what Biden and his Administration have taken to calling the “pandemic of the unvaccinated.”

His Presidency has yet to recover. As of December, in fact, his positive rating stood at just forty-three per cent, according to Gallup. And not all of the political wounds can be pinned on recalcitrant Republicans and crazed anti-vaxxers. Biden and his Administration were at times slow to recognize unpleasant realities—whether the emergence of inflation, the likelihood of a swift Taliban takeover in Afghanistan, or the persistence of vaccine resistance—and equally slow to impose policies that might mitigate them. The oldest President ever elected, Biden at age seventy-nine is not the doddering caricature that Republicans have sought to make him. But he has not yet figured out how to make an effective case for himself and his Presidency. He is not the huckster that Trump was, nor is he the salesman. A year ago, Democrats would have been jubilant at the thought that they had managed to win back control of the Senate and pass bills amounting to trillions of dollars in urgently needed government programs. But the expectations for Biden’s Administration somehow became entirely out of line with what was possible—given the realities of covid and the U.S. Congress. As for the threat Trump poses, Biden continues to largely avoid even mentioning the former President by name, and the ongoing attack on democracy supported by him and his conspiracy-driven allies.

### Link---PC Fails---2AC

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### Link---No Spillover---2AC

#### Lawmakers forget and compartmentalize.

Everett and Schor 18 [Burgess Everett and Elana Schor, congressional reporter for POLITICO. He previously was a transportation reporter for POLITICO Pro, Web producer, helping run POLITICO’s Twitter and Facebook accounts, and a contributor to the On Media blog; congressional reporter for POLITICO; “Congress driven to distraction”, Politico, March 12 2018, <https://www.politico.com/story/2018/03/12/congress-republicans-attention-deficit-452221>]

Even in peak form, Congress struggles to focus on any one issue for more than a few days. But its short attention span has taken on new meaning in the era of Donald Trump. “We kind of have attention deficit disorder,” as Sen. John Kennedy (R-La.) put it. Every time it seems the president has zeroed in on an issue, and appears determined to see it through — guns and immigration are just the two latest examples — he moves on to something else. And Congress, which isn’t designed to respond swiftly to national events and the wishes of the White House even in the least distracted of circumstances, simply can’t keep up. The constant whiplash of priorities is getting on lawmakers’ nerves. “It’s unbelievable to me,” said Sen. Susan Collins (R-Maine). “The attention span just seems to be ... it’s a real problem.” The hyperactive mind-set of the Oval Office has had the effect, whether by design or not, of quickly diverting attention from topics big or small. After a bout of attention on gun control in the wake of the Florida school massacre last month, Congress has seemingly moved on already. Before that, it was the plight of Dreamers facing deportation. In the end, nothing gets done on the issue of the day. The president “is all over the place — 15 tweets in 19 hours,” said Senate Minority Whip Dick Durbin (D-Ill.), who invested months of his time in the immigration debate only to watch the effort fall apart. “Trying to keep up with where his mind lights from day to day is hard." Trump’s March 5 deadline to extend expiring protections for some young immigrants briefly trained the Senate on that topic, though the chamber failed to pass anything. Then the president flirted with Democrats on gun control after the Florida school massacre, seemingly building momentum for a rare breakthrough. But before anything happened on the Hill, Trump had moved on tariffs — causing a genuine GOP freak-out and a movement to rein in Trump. When the White House might try to refocus the Capitol’s attention back on gun violence or immigration is anyone’s guess.

### Turn---Winners Win---2AC

#### Winners win -- Biden refills his capital with policy wins.

Barrow, 1/17/2021 (Bill, “Joe Biden’s long political evolution leads to his biggest test; The president-elect will inherit stewardship of a nation wrenched by pandemic and seismic cultural fissures,” <https://www.denverpost.com/2021/01/17/joe-biden-political-evolution/>, accessed on 1/19/2021, JMP)

While Biden aides argue his shifts don’t involve changes in principle or fundamental values, some other observers say the point is moot. The question, said Maurice Mitchell, who leads the progressive Working Families Party, is simply whether Biden will continue to evolve and leverage his political capital into both post-Trump stability and big policy wins.

“We can’t control people’s convictions but we can shift the politics of the possible,” Mitchell said, noting that Johnson signed seminal civil rights laws less than a decade after quashing such measures as Senate majority leader.

Barber, the minister, pointed to other historical figures whom Biden sometimes mentioned while campaigning: Roosevelt and Abraham Lincoln. Both, Barber noted, were savvy, even ruthless politicians who reached for their biggest achievements only after winning the nation’s highest office — and they did so against vicious opposition and during times of existential national threats.

## AT: Clog

### Clog UQ

#### Courts perma clogged.

Solomon '21 [Aron; 6/4/21; head of digital strategy for Esquire Digital and an adjunct professor of business management at the Desautels Faculty of Management at McGill University; "The Viral Court Backlog and How to Dig Out Post-Pandemic," https://www.law.com/thelegalintelligencer/2021/06/04/the-viral-court-backlog-and-how-to-dig-out-post-pandemic//]

Just over a year ago, if you would have asked an experienced judge or lawyer to imagine the litigation and jury trial backlog if a global pandemic were to sweep through the nation, they first would have probably told you that your morbid scenario wasn’t funny and that the courts would never be able to dig out.

This is precisely where we find ourselves today. Throughout state and federal courts, for both civil and criminal cases, we are in an infinitely worse position than we were when the pandemic began. The threshold issue today is how we dig ourselves out before the system implodes.

In New Jersey, the court system has a massive backlog that isn’t going to be cleared anytime soon. Michael J. Epstein, founder of New Jersey-based The Epstein Law Firm, has seen the dramatic effect the pandemic has had on the New Jersey court system.

“Earlier this year, the backlog in New Jersey courts was twice what it was before the pandemic. There is a better chance that the backlog will double once again before it improves, yet there is really no easy answer to get our courts out of the current situation. It’s not just civil cases— there is also a backlog in New Jersey for criminal cases as well.”

Part of the problem is that jurisdictions such as New Jersey that have already relaxed restrictions on court appearances are now dealing with an aggressive third wave of the virus, with a fourth wave has begun to take hold in some parts of the world. When its effects are felt in the court system, it could again grind things to a complete halt and make the backlog exponential.

There are ways technology can play an expanded role this time around, compared to the slow start we had in 2020. But, especially in criminal matters, technology is limited by what it can’t replicate—the guarantees afforded people to appear in person at a trial. Many jurisdictions (including parts of Texas and California) are neither technologically equipped to handle remote jury trials nor can make them happen without the consent of defendants.

While courts and judicial systems have improved over the past year at planning, training their staff, and even investing in the right technologies to keep things moving when and where possible, no courts are equipped with functional crystal balls. Yet the power of accurate foresight is what is needed most to get things back on track in our national system of functional and fair trials.

Perhaps there is no better national example of how the gears powering the court systems have ground to a halt than in the city of New York. The New York Times reported in December that there have been only nine criminal trials in nine months. If that seems like a very small number, it is—the norm would be around 800 trials.

The direct cost of this is obviously much more severe in criminal proceedings. As highlighted in the New York Times piece, there is a profound human cost to these delays:

“Is it fair for people to be languishing in pretrial detention and presumed innocent with no prospect of a trial in the future for them?” said New York’s chief administrative judge, Lawrence K. Marks. “A criminal justice system cannot be, in any sense of the word, fully functioning, if it is not conducting jury trials.”

The logistical nightmares aren’t going away soon and they are going to take the daily hard yards that attorney Epstein describes. “I know that New Jersey lawyers are able and willing to help in any way that we can and I would expect my colleagues in other states to feel exactly the same way. Our clients can’t afford further delays, as this deeply impacts justice.”

This is the case throughout the nation, as the same factors that have created the backlog persist. In both civil and criminal trials, the absence of critically important participants in the case because of lockdown and illness may get worse before it gets better.

#### Courts clogged now---judicial vacancies, backlogs, and pandemic delays.

Davis '21 [Kristina; 2/25/21; writer for the San Diego Tribune; "Overwhelmed federal courts ask Congress for more judges," https://www.sandiegouniontribune.com/news/courts/story/2021-02-25/federal-courts-congress-relief/]

“For 20 years-plus we’ve been in a judicial emergency,” Chief District Judge Kimberly Mueller of the Eastern District of California testified to the Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet.

The Judicial Conference of the United States — the policymaking body of the federal courts — has proposed that Congress create 65 new permanent judgeships across certain district courts to provide relief to 663 existing positions, as well as convert eight temporary seats to permanent. California should get 23, the conference said, including four in the Southern District of California, which encompasses San Diego and Imperial counties.

The proposal, backed by progressive legal organizations, is not as controversial as the idea of expanding the U.S. Supreme Court and appears to have some bipartisan support — including from subcommittee member Rep. Darrell Issa, R-Vista, who sponsored a similar bill in 2018 that would have added 52 new judgeships.

However, he and other Republicans stressed that backing such a measure would likely come with a compromise that would perhaps spread the appointments over current and future presidential election cycles so as not to flood the courts with President Joe Biden appointees.

The last major boost to the federal bench came with legislation in 1990. Since then, the number of case filings has swelled while the number of district judges assigned to hear them has remained relatively stagnant.

The situation is no different in San Diego, which has authorization for 13 active judges, bolstered by 14 magistrate judges, nine senior judges and the occasional visiting judge.

Since 2003, the last time Congress added judgeships locally, case filings have risen by 17 percent, testified District Judge Larry Burns, who recently stepped down as chief to assume senior status in the district.

When considering weighted caseloads — an assessment that determines the amount of time each case type takes to complete — the Southern District in 2019 handled well above the national average, 634 cases per judge versus 535. The goal is around 430.

The crushing caseloads have been exacerbated by vacancies on the bench — Biden currently has five to fill locally — and a considerable backlog of civil cases stalled by the COVID-19 pandemic.

“Our criminal caseload is absolutely staggering here,” Burns explained to the subcommittee, noting the district’s nexus to the U.S.-Mexico border. From 2017 to 2019, criminal filings rose 30 percent, much of it stemming from the Trump administration’s push to prosecute misdemeanor illegal entries into the U.S.

“The effects of the increase in our caseload have been profound and have inexorably led to delay in the handling of cases — particularly civil cases,” Burns said.

#### Antitrust litigation in federal courts increasing now – Epic v Apple ruling

Robertson 9/12/21 (Adi, staff @ The Verge, "A COMPREHENSIVE BREAKDOWN OF THE EPIC V. APPLE RULING," https://www.theverge.com/2021/9/12/22667694/epic-v-apple-trial-fortnite-judge-yvonne-gonzalez-rogers-final-ruling-injunction-breakdown)

Mobile games are a huge part of Apple’s App Store revenue — approximately 70 percent, according to the ruling — and Apple has outsized power in mobile gaming. Gonzalez Rogers concludes iOS and Android hold a near-duopoly, although she considers the Nintendo Switch and cloud gaming services potential near-future competitors. The ruling estimates that Apple has a share of around 55 percent in the mobile game transactions market, alongside “extraordinarily high profit margins,” which can be a sign of monopoly power.

But despite Apple’s “considerable” power and profit margins, “these factors alone do not show antitrust conduct. Success is not illegal,” Gonzalez Rogers concludes. While Epic argued that iMessage and other factors deliberately lock users into iOS, Gonzalez Rogers wasn’t convinced by this line of reasoning.

The ruling leaves the door open for future antitrust complaints. “The evidence does suggest that Apple is near the precipice of substantial market power, or monopoly power, with its considerable market share,” Gonzalez Rogers writes. “Apple is only saved by the fact that its share is not higher, that competitors from related submarkets are making inroads into the mobile gaming submarket, and, perhaps, because [Epic] did not focus on this topic.”

#### Big antitrust rulings now – Epic v Apple

Keenan and Howley 9/10/21 (Alexis and Daniel, staff @ Yahoo Finance, "Epic v. Apple ruling: Judge finds Apple has to let developers offer third-party payments," https://finance.yahoo.com/news/epic-apple-antitrust-ruling-160722962.html)

“Fortnite” developer Epic Game’s antitrust lawsuit against Apple (AAPL) has upended the mobile device maker’s tightly protected and booming App Store. In a decision issued Friday, a federal California judge largely sided with Epic by issuing a permanent injunction against Apple’s App Store policies, and opening the door for developers to offer customers third-party payment options in apps.

The company's stock was down more than 2% following the ruling.

“Epic Games failed in its burden to demonstrate Apple is an illegal monopolist,” Judge Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers wrote in an order. “Nonetheless, the trial did show that Apple is engaging in anticompetitive conduct under California’s competition laws.”

Apple’s so-called anti-steering policy limits the ability of Apps to inform customers of payment options outside of the App Store. This is problematic for apps, Epic argued, because Apple’s App Store charges a 30% commission. “A remedy to eliminate those provisions is appropriate,” Judge Gonzalez Rogers ruled.

The judge issued a permanent injunction prohibiting Apple from stopping developers from directing customers to in-app purchasing methods. It also forbids Apple from barring apps from communicating directly with customers who have voluntarily given the app their contact information.

According to Sensor Tower estimates, consumers spent an estimated $72.3 billion via the App Store in 2020. A blow to the amount the store is able to pull in would be a major issue for Apple.

In response to the ruling, Apple issued a statement saying, "Today the court has affirmed what we’ve known all along: the App Store is not in violation of antitrust law. As the court recognized ‘success is not illegal.’ We remain committed to ensuring the App Store is a safe and trusted marketplace that supports a thriving developer community and more than 2.1 million U.S. jobs, and where the rules apply equally to everyone."

Epic Games CEO Tim Sweeney issued his own response:

This content is not available due to your privacy preferences.

Update your settings here to see it.

For its part, Epic Games was ordered to pay Apple's 30% fee on the roughly $12 million in revenue it earned from "Fortnite" between August 2020 and October 2020 when the game maker circumvented Apple's anti-steering policy. The damages stem from the judge's ruling in favor of Apple on its counterclaim that Epic had breached its contract with Apple by offering payment outside of the App Store.

The ruling doesn’t end the fight between the two companies, as Apple is expected to appeal the decision. However, the case moves forward a hotly contentious issue over how much control dominant mobile device makers can exert over third party developers that design software to sell on their platforms.

### AT: wave of litigation

#### Wave of litigation theory is wrong for antitrust – existing procedural devices solve

O'Daniel 78 (David, JD Candidate @ Vanderbilt, "Denial of Standing to Private,Noncommercial Consumers Under Section 4 of the Clayton Act," https://scholarship.law.vanderbilt.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3090&context=vlr)

Private consumers alleging injury to their pocketbooks because of artificially higher prices generated by antitrust violations are injured in their property and should be granted standing under section 4. Denial of standing to private consumers frustrates the goals of the antitrust laws and in many instances will allow antitrust violations to go unchecked. Fear of a tidal wave of litigation probably is unfounded, but even if existent, such a threat could be controlled by existing procedural devices such as interpleader, joinder, and consolidation. Decisions like those by the Eighth Circuit in Reiter and the Northern District of California in Weinberg ignore these safeguards at the expense of viable antitrust enforcement. In the future, courts addressing the issue of private consumer standing should emulate the position of the district court in Theophil and allow private consumers standing under section 4.

#### Impossible to predict that a court decision produces X number of future cases

Levy 13 (Marin, Assoc Prof of Law @ Duke, "Judging the Flood of Litigation," https://uchicagolawjournalsmshaytiubv.devcloud.acquia-sites.com/sites/lawreview.uchicago.edu/files/02\_Levy\_0.pdf)

Beginning with the purely empirical component, the preceding discussion reveals that the justices often invoke floodgates arguments without much support for why they believe a large number of cases will come. In Bivens, Justice Blackmun suggested that the Court’s decision would “open[ ] the door for another avalanche of new federal cases” on the theory that “[w]henever a suspect imagines, or chooses to assert, that a Fourth Amendment right has been violated, he will now immediately sue the federal officer in federal court”331 and nothing more. In Solem, Chief Justice Burger claimed that the Court’s decision to hold the petitioner’s sentence unconstitutional would lead to a “flood” of new cases with no additional support.332 Of course, it can be easy to hide one’s claims behind this kind of hyperbole—and there is reason to suspect that parties and justices have invoked this language at times precisely because, in the words of Justice Powell, a “‘floodgates’ argument can be easy to make and difficult to rebut.”333 But if a particular decision is made to avoid an influx of cases that could harm a coordinate branch of government or state court, then it should be based on something more than the suggestion that an “avalanche” or “flood” is imminent. Forecasting the number of cases that will follow a decision is no easy task and may be near impossible in some cases. For example, if one of the justices had been willing to accept the basic principle of President Clinton’s argument in Jones, that justice then would have needed to show why a decision by the Court not to stay civil litigation against the President would “spawn” a host of new litigation334—a particularly difficult undertaking given the sui generis nature of the case. But outside of a unique case such as Jones, we should expect the justices to have some extended discussion about why they think a flood is likely to come. This reasoning could be based on past experience with the same kind of claims, as in Michigan Academy of Family Physicians335 and Skinner,336 or experience with comparable claims, as in Bivens.337 Now to be clear, the point of this prescription is not to encourage the justices to become empiricists (an important caveat given that there will certainly be skepticism about the ability of the Court to make these kinds of forecasts even outside the most challenging cases338). Rather, the point is that if claims about increases in litigation are to influence at least some decisions, the justices need to provide support for those claims—both for each other and for the public.

### Econ UQ

#### Recovery is crushed.

Cerullo ’12-21 [Megan and Irina Ivanova; December 21; Reporters; CBS News, “Omicron variant puts a "winter chill" on U.S. economic recovery,” <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/omicron-variant-economic-recovery-winter-chill/>]

A new coronavirus variant is casting a pall over the holiday season, as a steep uptick of cases is driving restaurant closures, large-event cancellations and causing Americans to pull back on travel plans.

The hyper-infectious strain of coronavirus known as the [Omicron](https://www.cbsnews.com/news/covid-omicron-variant-what-we-know-united-states-world/) variant has already been detected in 38 states, and comes on top of a wave of Delta variant that pushed up case counts and strained health systems in many parts of the country.

The newest wave [closed college campuses](https://www.cbsnews.com/news/covid-19-omicron-variant-college-nyu-activities/) and prompted the cancellation of high-profile [events](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2021-12-16/biden-warns-on-omicron-nyc-covid-surge-alarming-virus-update) including Broadway shows and the UCLA men's basketball game scheduled for Saturday. Meanwhile, fears of illness are pushing travelers to hold off on post-holiday plans and [derailing many well-laid return-to-office plans](https://www.cbsnews.com/news/covid-19-omicron-variant-january-return-to-office-rethink/) by companies large and small. And stock markets ended the week down, with the Dow dropping more than 500 points Friday and some of its slump attributed to Wall Street worries about Omicron.

Coming after a strong summer and fall, the pullback is certain to dampen the economic recovery, some economists say. The question is — by how much?

"It's inevitable that this new variant will lead to a slowdown in consumer spending activity over the next few weeks and in 2022. How severe that will be is a big question mark at this point," Gregory Daco, chief U.S. economist at Oxford Economics, told CBS MoneyWatch.

"I think there are increasing concerns about the new strain, and I think that will be reflected in somewhat of a winter chill in economic activity," Daco said. "The more this variant spreads, the more rapidly it spreads, the more people will hesitate to go out to movies, major events."

He noted that the severity of the economic hit will likely depend on the degree of illness the new strain causes — something that is not yet well understood. If it turns out Omicron cases are relatively milder than other variants and masses of infected individuals don't overwhelm health care systems, economic activity is likely to pick up again in the spring of next year, he predicted.

But there's a worrying example from across the pond: the United Kingdom, where Omicron is already widespread.

"The current experience of the U.K. suggests that the U.S. services sector is about to take a severe hammering," Ian Shepherdson, chief economist at Pantheon Macroeconomics, wrote Thursday in a note to investors. "The ensuing re-emergence of Covid fear will drive down spending in hotels, restaurants, bars, and other leisure venues, and we expect air travel to be hit too."

All in all, Shepherdson expects the virus wave to reduce first-quarter U.S. GDP growth to 3% from 5%, he wrote.