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### Cartels Adv

#### The Seventh Circuit’s *Motorola* decision used an unclear and amorphous interpretation of comity to limit the scope of the Sherman Act extraterritorially – it created uncertainty that SCOTUS chose not to act on

Rogers ‘16 [Paul; 2016; Professor of Law and Former Dean, SMU Dedman School of Law; Of Counsel, Locke Lord, Dallas, Texas; Competition Law Chronicle; “A Current Look at Foreign Cartels and the United States Foreign Trade Antitrust Improvements Act,” vol. 2, https://scholar.smu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1791&context=law\_faculty]

The United States‘ Foreign Trade Antitrust Improvement Act (FTAIA), enacted in 1982, is designed to set the framework for determining if and when U.S. antitrust laws have jurisdiction over anticompetitive conduct involving commerce foreign to the United States.1 While excluding U.S. import commerce from its reach, it seeks to both clarify and limit the extraterritorial application of U.S. antitrust laws, perhaps in partial deference to foreign concerns about the reach of those laws to competitive conduct abroad. It is far, however, from an example of clarity in drafting.2 The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit has described it as a ―web of words‖3 while the Third Circuit noted that it was ―inelegantly phrased.‖4

The U.S. Supreme Court has considered the applicability of the FTAIA only in its 2004 F. Hoffman-LaRoche Ltd. v. Empagran S.A. decision.5 The case involved a world-wide vitamin price fixing scheme which, it was alleged, caused higher vitamin prices in the U.S. as well as other countries such as Ecuador. The Court ruled that U.S. purchasers could bring a Sherman Act claim under the FTAIA but that buyers in other countries could not since their harm was foreign to the United States. In interpreting the statute, the Court held that the act sets forth a general rule placing all non-import activity involving foreign commerce outside of the reach of the Sherman Act. But, the Court noted, the act ―brings such conduct back within the Sherman Act‘s reach if the restraint at issue has a ―direct, substantial, and reasonably foreseeable‖ anticompetitive impact on U.S. commerce.6

Litigation involving the FTAIA has spiked in the last decade or so as the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) has increasingly prosecuted foreign-based cartels, spurring many coattail civil lawsuits in addition. In a number of investigations, the DOJ has targeted foreign suppliers of component parts that were incorporated by other companies into finished products assembled overseas but later imported for sale to U.S. customers. Leading examples include TFT-LCD panels for finished products such as televisions, notebook computers, and cell phones and various parts assemblies used to make automobiles.

Often at issue is whether the foreign component cartel had the required ―direct, substantial, and reasonably foreseeable effect‖ on US commerce.7 The DOJ‘s position in those cases is typically that U.S. consumers were harmed because inflated cartel prices for the components paid for abroad were incorporated into higher prices for the finished products that were sold in the United States.8 It is concerned, however, that interpretations of the FTAIA that preclude the Sherman Act from reaching foreign component part cartels unduly limit its ability to protect U.S. consumers from competitive harm.9

Although lower courts have been mindful of the Supreme Court‘s admonition that Congress intended that the FTAIA ―clarify, perhaps to limit, but not to expand in any significant way, the Sherman Act‘s scope as applied to foreign commerce,‖10 they have applied the statute inconsistently. For example, the Ninth Circuit has held that ―direct‖ under the statute means ―as an immediate consequence‖ with no ―intervening developments.‖11 In contrast, the Second and Seventh Circuits have rejected the Ninth Circuit‘s test, instead defining direct as having a ―reasonable proximate cause nexus.‖12

The nexus test has proven difficult to apply and one group of commentators has argued that in practice it often devolves ―into subjective metaphysical analysis.‖13 But with respect to component part cartels, there is always the argument that effects on U.S. Commerce are not direct where a price fixed component is incorporated overseas into a finished product that is eventually imported into the United States. Thus, under either test, a U.S. plaintiff suing a foreign component part cartel cannot be assured that it can meet FTAIA requirements.

The FTAIA‘s seemingly intractability is perhaps best illustrated by the recent Motorola litigation before the Seventh Circuit. It involved claims based on foreign sales of price-fixed LCD panels incorporated into cellphones that were then imported into the United States. In earlier litigation the DOJ had alleged that the overcharges on those panels entering the U.S. exceeded $500 million.14

In Motorola I the court first held that the targeted conduct did not have a direct effect on U.S. commerce, but subsequently vacated the opinion.15 Then in Motorola II the same panel reversed itself on the direct effect test, holding that if prices of the components were fixed, the effect on U.S. commerce would meet the test for purposes of the FTAIA.16 But it focused additionally on the second domestic effects question under the statute – whether, assuming a direct effect on U.S. commerce, those effects give rise ―to an antitrust cause of action under the Sherman Act.‖17 In doing so, it held that the FTAIA precluded plaintiff ‘s claims because the domestic effect of a conspiracy to fix component part prices did not ―give rise‖ to a Sherman Act claim. The court reasoned that although the domestic effect of the conspiracy was increased cell phone prices in the U.S., that is not what harmed the plaintiff, which was a wholly owned foreign subsidiary of the American parent company.18 It had purchased the price fixed components directly from the conspirators abroad. According to the court, its harm was suffered abroad when it purchased the price-fixed panels abroad, but that harm was not dependent on the domestic effect of increased cell phone prices.19

In support of its holding, the Motorola II court referenced the Supreme Court‘s concern expressed in Empagran about the risk of excessive extraterritorial application of U.S. law interfering ―with a foreign nation‘s ability independently to regulate its own affairs.‖20 Of course, that concern for international comity is a prime motivation for the FTAIA itself.21 The proof is in the pudding, however. That is, it is the American courts which are left with the task of interpreting and applying an admittedly poorly drafted and confusing statute. As such, it seems that they are the ultimate purveyors of comity.

Part of the judicial function of course is to provide guidance and predictability. But with the circuit split after Motorola II, there is currently little of either for cases involving component part price-fixing abroad. Motorola II certainly restricts the reach of U.S. antitrust laws to those conspiracies and adds additional hurdles for the DOJ and private plaintiffs seeking relief for domestic harms. In addition to the direct and substantial effects requirement, plaintiffs must be prepared to meet a narrow, restrictive ―domestic effects‖ test to satisfy the FTAIA.22

But before one asserts that Motorola II has effectively swept away all U.S. antitrust claims against foreign component part price-fixers, it is important to remember the Supreme Court‘s admonition in Empagran that it matters who the plaintiff is.23 For example, if Motorola had made its purchase decisions and executed purchase orders in the U.S. rather than abroad through a foreign subsidiary, the result might have been different.24 Further, the DOJ, while is concerned about the effect of cases like Motorola II on its ability to criminally prosecute foreign based component part cartels, has typically asserted jurisdiction through the FTAIA‘s import commerce exception.25

Nonetheless Motorola II has limited the reach of Sherman Act claims to foreign component part cartels. But that case may have created a circuit split and it is far from clear how other circuits might handle the same type of claim. On June 15, 2015, the Supreme Court denied certiorari in both Motorola II and the Ninth Circuit‘s Hsiung case, so we are not going to get a definitive answer anytime soon.

Motorola II may have shifted the focus to the domestic effects analysis and away from the direct effects requirement, which could perhaps soften the supposed circuit spit since the FTAIA requires both. As a result, it may be that in declining to hear the case, the Supreme Court did not see a circuit split.26

In any event, judicial application of the FTAIA seems to have produced more questions than answers. While ideally the law should create certainty, the combination of an unartfully drafted statute, differing judicial interpretations of that statute, and the somewhat amorphous concept of comity all combine to produce a great deal of uncertainty about the application of the FTAIA to foreign component part cartels.

#### International cartels wreck US economic growth – the aff ensures growth and innovation across industries

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]

Anticompetitive activity of cartels and the globalization of commerce have exponentially accelerated the gap between buyers and sellers.374 Collectively, increasing poverty, the decline in median income, and the collusion of companies to sell products at a certain price put buyers at the mercy of these cartels.375 Sometimes, because the products are inelastic, consumers have no choice but to accept the inflated purchase price.376 As global supply chains continue to expand, business transactions become a source of potential victims by perpetrators of consumer fraud.377 This raises the need for stricter rules to protect the consumers who are more likely in a worse financial position than that of companies taking advantage of these consumers. Expanding the reach of the FTAIA to include transactions made outside of the United States but nonetheless have an impact to U.S. commerce, as held by the Ninth Circuit, will reduce this prevalent issue.378 This Part discusses the effects of this proposal to the protection of U.S. consumers and the international business community.

In today’s global economy, it is difficult to distinguish and separate foreign from domestic effects.379 Global supply chains have made it easier for products to move rapidly and with ease. The United States, holding twenty-one percent of the worldwide Gross Domestic Product (GDP), is most susceptible to cartel targeting.380 With twenty-nine percent market share, it is the largest consumer in the world.381 Any impact of collusion in the international market is intertwined with a harm to customers in the United States.382 Measures must be taken to ensure that markets remain open and competitive; no company should able to dominate and restrict the supply of products sold. With a rigid rule in place, formation of domestic and international cartels would decline, further strengthening competition.383 After all, the protection of consumers through the preservation of deterrence is one of the main focuses of antitrust laws.384

Courts, as well as scholars, have commented that cartel deterrence should be the primary concern over international comity issues in analyzing the FTAIA.385 In United States v. Nippon Paper Indus. Co., 386 the First Circuit concluded that principles of comity should not “shield” a defendant from any intentional wrongdoings, especially if a substantial effect occurred in U.S. markets.387 Otherwise, because cartel members are more likely to engage in anticompetitive conduct, a decision that is based more heavily on the international comity principle would make company transactions, domestic and abroad, confusing and ultimately increase the burden on consumers.388

Cartels, more often than not, operate in secrecy. Members can coordinate and collude to fix prices outside of U.S. jurisdiction, making it much more difficult for the U.S. government to detect and prosecute them.389 To achieve deterrence, a rule that will dissuade companies from engaging in anticompetitive conduct from the very beginning will allow antitrust enforcement to be more manageable.390 A cartel will most likely weigh the potential damages engaging in anticompetitive activities with the potential benefits of those anticompetitive activities.391 A study conducted in the United Kingdom showed that labor productivity declined when industries are characterized by collusion or when competition is low.392 The study showed, however, that once a strict antitrust law was enforced, the gap declined, if not disappeared.393

The presence of competition drives productivity by incentivizing companies to be more efficient.394 Studies have revealed that competition boosts product innovation and creativity, all while firms strive to reduce their costs, by encouraging them to produce higher-quality and more diverse goods and services at more competitive prices.395 Consumers will gain more access to markets they had not previously been exposed to as a result of commercial competition.396

Cartels limit the presence of competition in the economy.397 Once producers work together to protect their own interests, to the detriment of consumers, competition is eliminated.398 Cartel members either agree on a fixed price at which to sell certain products or restrict the quantity of output of the product released into the market.399 By deliberately restricting the output released into the market, without a natural shift in the consumers’ demand, the supply decreases, thereby increasing the price of the product.400 When most of the producers in an industry are part of a cartel, consumers will have no means to find a substitute, and they will have no choice but to accept the inflated price.401 For example, when AU Optronics and other defendants colluded to artificially set the price of the LCD panels, Motorola and other plaintiffs had no choice but to subsequently increase the price of their own products that used these LCD panels.402 Without the cartelpriced LCD panels, Motorola’s foreign subsidiaries would have been able to buy them at the market price and charge U.S. consumers less than they ultimately did.403

Extending the reach of the FTAIA to foreign conduct with an impact on U.S. commerce makes economic sense.404 Judge Higginbotham’s dissent in Den Norske was correct: Emphasizing the role of deterrence protects market efficiency.405 He argued that a broad interpretation of the FTAIA would aid the DOJ’s efforts in curtailing international cartels.406 A cartel’s overall profitability is favorably impacted by anticompetitive conduct, and this may lead cartel members to either further restrict the output or increase the price of the product.407 A decrease in competition could potentially move market share away from these efficient producers.408 Thus, a consistent application of the Ninth Circuit ruling across all U.S. jurisdictions will limit both this unacceptable behavior and the foreign companies’ incentive to form cartels. Foreign companies will be deterred from price-fixing knowing that they could be liable for anticompetitive conspiracies, even for transactions that occurred outside of the United States.409 Studies have already shown that antitrust enforcement increases productivity growth.410 In fact, a study has concluded that the price of products tends to drop approximately twenty to forty percent after cartels are broken up.411 The price-fixing issue is not only prevalent in the manufacturing industry, but also in the industries at issue in Hui Hsiung and Motorola. 412 Studies show that increased competition also benefits the agricultural, telecommunications, transport, and professional services industries.413 Moreover, even though competition usually starts at a domestic level, a ruling against cartel formation will positively affect the competitiveness of the domestic products as they compete in the international community.414 Companies typically acquire their production inputs from local markets and industries.415 If these industries lack competition, product prices in these markets may not be priced competitively, which affects the finished products’ competitiveness with foreign rivals.416

#### That leads to nuclear war

Mann 14 (Eric Mann is a special agent with a United States federal agency, with significant domestic and international counterintelligence and counter-terrorism experience. Worked as a special assistant for a U.S. Senator and served as a presidential appointee for the U.S. Congress. He is currently responsible for an internal security and vulnerability assessment program. Bachelors @ University of South Carolina, Graduate degree in Homeland Security @ Georgetown. “AUSTERITY, ECONOMIC DECLINE, AND FINANCIAL WEAPONS OF WAR: A NEW PARADIGM FOR GLOBAL SECURITY,” May 2014, <https://jscholarship.library.jhu.edu/bitstream/handle/1774.2/37262/MANN-THESIS-2014.pdf>)

The conclusions reached in this thesis demonstrate how economic considerations within states can figure prominently into the calculus for future conflicts. The findings also suggest that security issues with economic or financial underpinnings will transcend classical determinants of war and conflict, and change the manner by which rival states engage in hostile acts toward one another. The research shows that security concerns emanating from economic uncertainty and the inherent vulnerabilities within global financial markets will present new challenges for national security, and provide developing states new asymmetric options for balancing against stronger states.¶ The security areas, identified in the proceeding chapters, are likely to mature into global security threats in the immediate future. As the case study on South Korea suggest, the overlapping security issues associated with economic decline and reduced military spending by the United States will affect allied confidence in America’s security guarantees. The study shows that this outcome could cause regional instability or realignments of strategic partnerships in the Asia-pacific region with ramifications for U.S. national security. Rival states and non-state groups may also become emboldened to challenge America’s status in the unipolar international system.¶ The potential risks associated with stolen or loose WMD, resulting from poor security, can also pose a threat to U.S. national security. The case study on Pakistan, Syria and North Korea show how financial constraints affect weapons security making weapons vulnerable to theft, and how financial factors can influence WMD proliferation by contributing to the motivating factors behind a trusted insider’s decision to sell weapons technology. The inherent vulnerabilities within the global financial markets will provide terrorists’ organizations and other non-state groups, who object to the current international system or distribution of power, with opportunities to disrupt global finance and perhaps weaken America’s status. A more ominous threat originates from states intent on increasing diversification of foreign currency holdings, establishing alternatives to the dollar for international trade, or engaging financial warfare against the United States.

#### 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.

#### Advanced batteries are key tolasers – they’re key to missile defense and prevent a NoKo first strike

Daniels ‘17 [Jeff Daniels is a reporter for CNBC.com. Previously, he was a coordinating producer for CNBC, based at the network's Los Angeles Bureau. He joined the network in 1999. "Laser weapons developers ‘riding the wave’ created by Tesla, other battery innovators." https://www.cnbc.com/2017/11/17/laser-weapons-riding-the-wave-created-by-tesla-battery-innovators.html]

Advances made in automotive battery technology by Tesla and others are now being borrowed to help the Pentagon get high-power laser weapons that can kill everything from enemy drones to missiles.

The work on laser weapons underway includes an Air Force Research Laboratory contract awarded to Lockheed Martin last week to develop high-power fiber lasers that will be tested on a tactical fighter jet by 2021. The fighter jet demonstration project is part of the Air Force lab’s so-called SHiELD or Self-protect High Energy Laser Demonstrator program.

“You can power the laser like you can power the car off a battery system,” said Rob Afzal, senior fellow of laser weapon systems at Lockheed, the nation’s largest defense company. “We would use the same type of battery technology ... and the reason is you need to be able to deliver a lot of energy in a short period of time.”

Indeed, efficient lithium-ion battery technology commonly found in electric cars is now getting leveraged to drive power generation and storage solutions for military laser applications. It allows lasers to achieve significant bursts of energy very quickly for incinerating enemy targets, just as a Tesla Model S driver could accelerate from 0 to 60 miles per hour in a matter of a few seconds.

“As the batteries get smaller, cheaper, have more power density, more reliable, we’re just going to just have better power systems for the laser,” said Afzal. “The battery technology is ahead of the laser weapon technology.”

Some experts credit Tesla for helping bring a revolution in electric cars and lithium-ion battery technology, while also driving down battery costs and expanding the power storage market beyond cars. Even so, the Tesla brand competes with other lithium-ion battery suppliers, and research firm Technavio last year predicted the Chinese would surpass the U.S. in research and development spending on laser systems by 2022.

“It’s funny how a lot of things that happened in the auto industry can filter over into new capabilities on most other technologies, and lasers is one of them,” said Air Force lab’s SHiELD’s program manager Richard Bagnell.

Dan Goure, a former Pentagon official and now senior vice president of Virginia think-tank Lexington Institute, said the Lockheed contract to develop a laser for a fighter jet shows how far the research has come in terms of making laser weapons smaller.

In a release, Lockheed said this month its team will be “focused on developing a compact, high efficiency laser within challenging size, weight and power constraints.” It also said the laser system would be “pod mounted on the tactical fighter jet.”

‘Elon Musk in camouflage’

Yet the challenge comes from the fact that directed-energy weapons — lasers — tend to draw significantly more power than an automotive battery would require. The airborne laser weapons are designed to store power to fire off dozens of shots but can also include a power recharge system much like a hybrid electric car.

“You may literally not have to be generating power per se on the airplane [for laser weapons],” said Goure. “You can have battery storage, kind of like Elon Musk in camouflage. ”

It’s unclear if Musk’s Tesla or its suppliers are providing battery storage systems to the defense contractors for laser weapons. Tesla declined comment for this story.

For its part, Lockheed says it doesn’t use its own specialized battery technology for the lasers but one that’s being developed for automobiles, aircraft and other applications.

‘Riding the wave’

“We’re riding the wave,” said Afzal. “The battery advances are remarkable. We’re going to utilize that.”

Regardless, the military has been researching lethal lasers since the 1960s but in the past decade development has intensified with the focus on technologies that have more power, accuracy and reliability.

“One of the things we find in a lot of our systems — land, sea and air — is that we run out of shots particularly on the defense,” said Goure. “You just run out of bullets or missiles. And if you have laser, it avoids having to reload.”

For the Navy, a drone-killing laser weapon system was deployed a few years ago aboard the amphibious transport ship USS Ponce in the Persian Gulf, although the laser was removed from the ship last summer. In 2018, the Navy is expected to test a 150-kilowatt electric laser weapon. The high-energy laser weapon is being developed by Northrop Grumman to protect ships from drones, boats and enemy missiles.

The Army recently took delivery of a 60-kilowatt laser system from Lockheed that will be put on combat vehicles. Also, in August Lockheed did tests for the Army on a 30-kilowatt Advanced Test High Energy Asset (ATHENA) laser weapon system that shot down five drones. ATHENA is so powerful it can burn a hole in truck from a mile away.

Experts point out that a decade ago, the solid-state laser technology was bigger than many of the combat vehicles. “What’s happened is a new type of electrically-driven laser technology has evolved in the last 10 years where we can build very high power lasers that are very electrically efficient,” said Afzal. “The more efficient the laser you have, the less power you need to drive it.”

Killing missiles

At the same time, automotive industry innovation means laser weapons today are lighter and more portable than legacy chemical iodine lasers that were once tested aboard Boeing’s 747-400 jets for the Air Force.

Chemical lasers can pack a big punch in terms of firepower and shoot down ballistic missiles but are considered impractical and rely on large chemical tanks that can be hazardous in accidents.

Back in 2002, Boeing began testing chemical laser weapons on 747s in a program known as the YAL-1 Airborne Laser Testbed. The flying laser system was designed to shoot down enemy missiles but had mixed success, and the Pentagon pulled the plug on the $5 billion program in 2011. “One of the problems with the chemical laser is that first of all they’re too big and too heavy — and you have to carry the chemicals with you,” said Afzal. “With an electric laser, your platform which is driving, sailing, flying around, usually has a power system that can recharge your battery back. But in a chemical laser, once the chemicals are gone you have to go back to the depot.”

More recently, the U.S. Missile Defense Agency has indicated it wants to take another look at airborne laser weapons to kill enemy missiles but rather than use chemical lasers it plans to focus on electric solid-state laser technology.

In June, the agency put out a request for information with defense contractors for a drone equipped with a high-energy laser weapon system would be compact and designed to intercept missiles in the boost phase. That means the technology could one day possibly be used to bring down ballistic missiles fired by North Korea that are a threat to the U.S. or its allies.

#### NoKo first strike causes extinction

Dempsey ‘18 [Michael; 2/21/18; National intelligence fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, a fellowship sponsored by the U.S. government. He is the former acting director of national intelligence; War on the Rocks; “What If Kim Jong Un Decides to Bloody America’s Nose First?" https://warontherocks.com/2018/02/kim-decides-bloody-americas-nose-first/]

For the past several decades, North Korea has weathered periodic spikes in U.S. diplomatic and economic pressure while continuing to make steady progress with its weapons programs. North Korean leaders correctly calculated for years that U.S. policymakers would find the cost of an actual conflict on the Peninsula too high for serious consideration, and that China would be a safety valve if economic sanctions became too painful.

From Kim’s vantage point, however, there are reasons to question whether those assumptions are still valid. Over the past year, the public rhetoric from U.S. leaders threatening his regime has reached an unprecedented level, with some statements indicating that the United States is “locked and loaded” for a conflict, and others even hinting at the idea of a nuclear strike against North Korea. At the same time, the United States has quietly increased its military footprint in the region, including more regular B-1 bomber flights over the Korean Peninsula and — for the first time in a decade — the deployment late last year of three U.S. aircraft carriers off the Peninsula. This stepped-up military activity has undoubtedly not been lost on Kim or his generals and has likely sparked internal discussion about potential U.S. offensive military operations.

On the economic front, meanwhile, China has become intensely frustrated by both Kim’s behavior and constant U.S. demands to get tougher on the North, and has gradually imposed increasingly punishing sanctions, agreeing to limit oil supplies and stop importing steel and various food products. This is particularly worrisome to Kim because China accounts for about 90 percent of North Korea’s foreign trade. Taken in combination these actions might convince Kim that the established playbook has fundamentally changed, and that he is now in real danger.

So, how might this realization alter North Korea’s actions? It’s plausible that, contrary to the logic that maximum pressure will force concessions, the North’s new constraints could persuade Kim that he needs to demonstrate his own resolve and preemptively remind the United States and its allies just how costly an attempt at forced denuclearization or regime change would be. Indeed, Pyongyang’s track record suggests a willingness to raise the stakes during periods of tension and to take lethal action — from the seizure of the USS Pueblo in 1968 to the artillery bombardment of Yeonpyeong Island in 2010 — when it believes it necessary.

If Kim reaches this conclusion, there are a few options that his regime could consider which U.S. policymakers should prepare now to counter. First, there is the strong possibility of additional missile testing, potentially involving more sophisticated delivery systems and warheads — a standard tactic Kim has employed in recent months to demonstrate his resolve and showcase the North’s newfound technical prowess. I believe the regime is also likely to engage in proportional actions: Recall that when North Korea objected to the release of a Sony film in 2014 that portrayed an assassination attempt on Kim, it responded with a cyberattack on that specific studio. Today, Pyongyang could calculate that it needs to similarly target business interests in South Korea and the U.S. to force an easing of economic sanctions. This would likely be done through a series of cyberattacks against vulnerable commercial targets in both the United States and South Korea, especially banks and key economic infrastructure, but could also involve physical sabotage operations.

Second, if Kim believes that military pressure against the North is reaching an unacceptable level, he could try to intimidate Seoul and undermine its cooperation with Washington. This option could involve using North Korean special forces to trigger a series of isolated explosions in major cities in the South (North Korean special forces have operated in the South in the past) or even another incident similar to the sinking of a South Korean corvette in 2010 (the Cheonan), which the North has repeatedly denied despite overwhelming evidence to the contrary. Along these lines, Kim could also enlist a “sympathizer group” rather than his own special forces to attack a U.S. or South Korean military installation, calculating this would send the intended message while maintaining some degree of deniability.

And third, if confronted with the threat of a major U.S. military buildup on the Peninsula later this year, Kim may well decide in desperation that his best option is to preemptively target (including with mines) the ports and airfields that the U.S. military would rely on to transport troops into South Korea. If he pursues this option, Kim would almost certainly expect a strong U.S. retaliation, but might calculate that delaying America’s ability to deploy significant ground forces onto the Peninsula is his only remaining option to buy time and is therefore his best military play. Kim has undoubtedly learned the lesson of Desert Storm, and is unlikely to allow the U.S. military to mass hundreds of thousands of troops in the South for an offensive at the time and place of its choosing.

Understanding North Korea’s internal decision-making process and the various influences on Kim’s calculations is perhaps the hardest intelligence challenge on the planet. As is well documented, North Korea is among the most isolated countries in the world, with a young leader with almost no international expertise and only a few years of actual leadership experience. Therefore, it’s quite plausible that Kim himself has yet to decide on a course of action for the current standoff with Washington, and that his decisions will be shaped almost entirely by his superficial perception of U.S. intentions and the perceived threat. Sadly, my experience working on this issue while in government also causes me to believe that Kim is surrounded by advisers who, based on the last quarter-century of U.S.-North Korea relations, may be overconfident that the United States will shy away from conflict in the face of aggressive actions by North Korea. These advisers are unlikely to tell Kim anything he doesn’t want to hear for fear of their own personal safety. In other words, it’s a situation ripe for miscalculation by both sides.

Given the stakes — a potential conflict involving nuclear weapons — a miscalculation leading to a broader conflict simply cannot be allowed to occur. So in the coming months U.S. policymakers will want to exercise prudence in and carefully weigh their public statements, think deeply about how Kim and other critical actors might misperceive and overreact to U.S. actions and rhetoric, work in the closest possible consultation with key regional allies (especially South Korea), and prepare U.S. military, intelligence, and diplomatic responses to the full range of potential North Korean preemptive actions and counter-actions. It would be nice if the current showdown with North Korea could be resolved through diplomacy and follow a logical, predictable script of American design, but the two countries’ painful shared history suggests that we shouldn’t bank on that occurring.

#### The aff protects international supply chains and allows for rapid economic growth – US antitrust policy is key to ensure private plaintiffs can seek treble damages – any alternative penalty is insufficient because the benefits of price-fixing outweigh the risks

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 Seventh Circuit ruling also addressed policy arguments that are pertinent in today’s global economy. It held that foreign subsidiaries could bring suit to seek remedies under the laws of the country where they operated, and in light of this, the United States must not overextend its reach. Rather, it should allow foreign countries to govern conduct that occurs exclusively within their borders.343 However, the court failed to consider that allowing a private company to pursue claims under U.S. antitrust law would detect and deter the formation of cartels.344 Treble damages are available under U.S. antitrust law.345 The adversaries of this proposition argue that this would presume the inadequacy of the antitrust laws of foreign countries.346 They argue that foreign countries, with the help of the United States, set up their own antitrust laws and continue to improve these laws throughout the years; thus, these foreign laws must prevail in dealing with foreign anticompetitive conduct.347 While it is true that the United States has taken on a role to help foreign countries develop their own antitrust laws, the Seventh Circuit’s ruling presumes that fines and criminal prosecutions, both here and abroad, are sufficient to deter global cartels.348

The truth is, collective laws across the nations are still inadequate to protect U.S. companies and consumers, primarily because many nations still do not have laws against international price-fixing cartels.349 In fact, only a limited number of countries allow private companies to bring private antitrust claims for damages.350 On the other hand, existing antitrust laws in many other countries are insufficient because the penalties are significantly lower than those in the United States; therefore, this discrepancy fails to deter foreign companies from forming international price-fixing cartels.351 The financial gains from a conspiracy far outweigh the maximum criminal and civil fines imposed by other countries’ antitrust laws.352

The presence of price-fixing conspiracies for products such as LCDs, automotive parts, vitamins, and DRAM illustrate these ineffective antitrust laws.353 Companies engaged in these conspiracies know how the system works and will repeatedly participate in cartels without more rigid rules in place, such as that of the Ninth Circuit’s.354 The Seventh Circuit’s logic seems misplaced when focused on the availability (or the lack thereof) of the laws in foreign countries where the conduct occurred. The antitrust laws of the United States have nothing to do with the adequacy or inadequacy of other countries’ antitrust laws. Rather, they have everything to do with the fact that U.S. consumers were injured.

In Empagran, the U.S. Supreme Court held that extraterritorial application of U.S. antitrust law should be limited to balance the “legitimate sovereign interests of other nations.”355 One of the fears is that foreign plaintiffs with no relation to domestic commerce would flock to the United States to recover damages, which would be too costly given the already scarce judicial resources.356 The Seventh Circuit emphasized the principle of international comity and brought up the same concern in its Motorola opinion.357 However, the enactment of the FTAIA, particularly the “gives rise to” requirement, already accounts for this concern.358 This second requirement of the FTAIA ensures that all causes of action that have domestic effects to the United States are the proximate causes to those effects.359 Congress, therefore, made sure that unnecessary suits are not filed in U.S. jurisdictions, while not overstepping into another country’s interests.360 In Motorola, it is undisputed that the defendants’ conduct had domestic effects, as the inflated prices paid by the foreign purchases were ultimately passed on to U.S consumers.361 Motorola purchased over $5 billion worth of panels, over fifty percent of which eventually entered U.S. commerce.362 What seems to be a small increase in the price of the panels nonetheless would have a substantial effect on the market.363 Furthermore, the defendants were business executives engaged in global supply chains.364 If they did not already, they should have known that the artificially inflated price of these LCD panels targeted to reach the United States (as alleged by Motorola) would have an impact on the U.S. market.365

Moreover, it does not appear that these cases have raised serious comity concerns; despite the DOJ’s prosecution of the foreign companies and their employees, no foreign government has stepped forward expressing deep concerns about the overreaching enforcement of antitrust law.366 This is not to say that courts must forget about the importance of international comity when analyzing antitrust cases. International comity ensures that the United States does not overstep into foreign countries’ authority when extending the reach of U.S. antitrust laws.367 In fact, the United States has proactively assisted foreign countries in their efforts to capture more anticompetitive conduct.368 However, despite the need to “tread softly” in this arena, the United States must put down its foot and continue to litigate claims of anticompetitive conduct by foreign companies, so long as the foreign anticompetitive conduct satisfies the requirements of the FTAIA.369

Limiting the extent of the FTAIA, as the defendants contended and the Seventh Circuit ruled, would significantly destabilize the enforcement of antitrust law—“a central safeguard for the Nation’s free market structures,” which “is ‘as important to the preservation of economic freedom and our free-enterprise system as the Bill of Rights is to the protection of our fundamental personal freedoms.’”370 The Seventh Circuit, in ruling that a “component” is not “direct” enough to provide sufficient basis for liability under the statute, precluded any claim that involved components of finished goods imported into the United States from being brought under the Sherman Act.371 In effect, the court has made a per se rule that claims based on foreign conduct regarding a component of finished goods that eventually reach the United States have no place in the United States’ jurisdiction.372 This sweeping decision has negative ramifications in the detection of cartels, the protection of U.S. consumers, and the development of the international business community.373

The Ninth Circuit’s logic and reasoning should prevail in subsequent cases. It allows for a more rigid, yet necessary, rule in the rapid growth of the economy. By the Ninth Circuit’s logic, foreign cartels that harm U.S. commerce will be reached by U.S. antitrust laws. Treble damages will disincentivize these foreign companies from pursuing anticompetitive conduct; products will not be overpriced as a result of cartels’ price-fixing; transactions among domestic and/or foreign producers will be much smoother because both parties are at ease. U.S. Supreme Court involvement, interpreting how the FTAIA applies to non-import trade, would provide answers to questions that federal courts have been struggling to answer for many years, and it would reverberate the United States’ firm position against conspiracies that adversely impact U.S. consumers and the U.S. economy.

#### The aff solves by clarifying the language of the Sherman Act and giving courts guidance on interpreting the FTAIA’s language

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]

Resolving these conflicting ideas will be a difficult task because import commerce encompasses a complex web of transactions and implicates multiple aspects of economic policy-making.166 Therefore, Congress, which has not made major amendments to the Sherman Act or the FTAIA since their enactments,167 should clarify the statutes' scopes. As the above mentioned trade data suggest, the world economy is much more interconnected, and other countries have already begun to flex their antitrust muscles outside their borders in the context of price-fixed components.168 Moreover, because many corporations are multinational and thus subject to the corresponding jurisdictions' competitions laws, competition laws are starting to converge, mostly to resemble those of the United States.169 Congress, through its committees, research commissions, and hearings that will elicit expert testimonies, is in the best position to examine in detail which form of antitrust law would best serve the needs of American consumers and businesses.

In doing so, Congress should consider combining the Sherman Act and the FTAIA to clarify the interaction between the two statutes. 1 7 0 Because the FTAIA modifies the Sherman Act, instead of having a distinct section, the FTAIA's language can simply be added to the Sherman Act to make the Sherman Act more self-contained and easily understandable. In revising the statutes, Congress should define the contours of import commerce to provide courts with clearer guidance. Furthermore, considering that one of the major concerns involving a broad reading of the FTAIA is international comity, 172 it is more appropriate for Congress to consider complex foreign relation concerns than for the judiciary. Congress could update U.S. antitrust law in the face of increasing cross-border antitrust collaborations and other countries' practices of expanding extraterritorial applications of antitrust law. 17 3

#### Plan: The United States federal government should increase its prohibitions on anticompetitive business practices by expanding the extraterritorial scope of its antitrust laws.

### Harmonization Adv

#### Strengthening cartel responses mitigates the risks of regulatory harmonization – that offsets the costs of globalization and shields consumers

Leonardo ’16 [Lizl Leonardo, J.D. Candidate, DePaul University College of Law, 2018; B.S., 2011, De La Salle University-Manila, Philippines. "A Proposal t oposal to the Se o the Seventh and Ninth Cir enth and Ninth Circuit Split: Expand the cuit Split: Expand the Reach of the U.S. Antitrust Laws to Extraterritorial Conduct that Impacts U.S. Commerce." https://via.library.depaul.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=4008&context=law-review]

A U.S. Supreme Court ruling in favor of the Seventh Circuit will also prevent companies from potentially leaving the United States to avoid compliance with antitrust laws.417 Domestic companies with foreign subsidiaries that seek to increase their market share by colluding to fix the prices of products will be deterred from engaging in illegal conduct, but they will also be incentivized to keep their businesses in the country.418 Mere knowledge that companies can be liable in the United States for engaging in illegal, extraterritorial conduct that indirectly affects U.S. consumers could in itself discourage the companies from pursuing such conduct.419 Likewise, without the benefit of being exculpated from any extraterritorial conduct, companies will rather stay in the United States than incur expensive costs of moving overseas. This is a win-win situation; prices of products remain controlled by the natural forces of supply and demand, and small and local companies are able to compete with the bigger and international companies. On the contrary, a ruling that limits the extraterritorial reach of the FTAIA to non-import commerce, similar to what the Seventh Circuit held, will encourage companies to move their operations overseas and strategically only deal with the United States in instances they are certain will not subject them to either the Sherman Act or FTAIA.420

Arguably, ruling in favor of the Ninth Circuit could hurt companies that trade with the United States indirectly. These companies have legitimate reasons for incorporating as “foreign subsidiaries,” and subjecting them to U.S. jurisdiction would in effect deplete some of these purposes.421 Although domestic legal remedies are available in some foreign countries, as mentioned above, they are unlikely to deter price-fixing by international cartels.422

Moreover, having a more consistent approach in cases like this will strengthen and harmonize the partnership across nations. Needless to say, the cooperation between these countries can play a significant role in attaining this objective. Bilateral agreements between the countries have proven that, though challenging, implementing this stricter rule is not impossible.423 International trade rules, such as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), World Trade Organization (WTO), Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), and agreements between countries, imply the general acceptance of this proposal.424 The rapid growth in globalization has forced governments to institute and enforce policies that both protect domestic products from multinational firms and encourage the domestic firms to compete internationally, in furtherance of international trade.425

One of the partnerships the European Union (EU) and the U.S. governments are currently working on is called the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (T-TIP).426 Its aim is to further develop the strong relationship nations have and leverage that relationship to boost economic growth and international competitiveness.427 The agreement purports to provide greater transparency around trade and investment regulation while ensuring the quality of the products.428 As part of the agreement, the governments seek to eliminate all tariffs, other duties, and charges on trade in various products between the United States and the European Union.429

The proponents of T-TIP point out that the elimination of tariffs and quotas will, among other things, entail lower costs of import to each of the regions, put products from one area “on equal footing” with the products from another, create more jobs, lower the unemployment rate, increase competitiveness, and improve the overall growth of members of the agreement.430 Although the agreement seems ambitious at this time, it intends to link two of the world’s larg est economies to generate a third of the world’s GDP.431 Critics argue, however, that the deregulation of several national laws—possibly resulting in lower consumer standards, as well as compromised laws covering intellectual property, food safety, privacy and data collection, and democratic legitimacy—are all steps in the wrong direction.432

Having an established rule that foreign companies’ non-import trade conduct can be subjected to U.S. antitrust laws, as long as the conduct had an “immediate consequence” on U.S. commerce, could mitigate the risks associated with the opening of U.S. and EU markets. Foreign companies that will be encouraged to invest in the United States as a result of T-TIP will have an understanding of the laws and the possible repercussions of any business transaction in which they take part. These companies do not need to determine if and how any of their strategic decisions can be subjected to either the Seventh or Ninth Circuit rulings before securing deals or signing agreements. The certainty will provide companies with notice and understanding of how the law affects their decisions, thereby making their investments less risky. In return, investments could become safer, eventually having a favorable impact on the continued development of the world economy.

V. CONCLUSION

International commerce has expanded over time. Accordingly, the U.S. courts’ interpretation of antitrust laws must keep up with this rapid growth. It is time to apply a consistent rule that will solve the convoluted body of law and conflicting application of that body of law by the courts. U.S. courts must be able to reach foreign companies’ extraterritorial conduct that have wrongfully affected the U.S. economy. Though international comity may have been a concern in years past, deterrence should bear a greater weight in determining whether a foreign company is subject to the United States’ jurisdiction. After all, antitrust laws are geared towards protecting consumers. Ex panding the reach of the FTAIA to include transactions that occurred outside of the United States, but still have direct and significant effects in the United States, will allow for a more rigid yet necessary rule in the age of increasing international commerce. Consistency across all federal courts will provide foreign companies greater transparency with regard to the laws that govern both their import and non-import trade transactions; formation of cartels will be minimized; price-fixing of products will be easily detected and stopped; innovation and creativity will be encouraged; competition will increase; and prices of goods will likely decrease. Consequently, the United States and the global economy will be favorably impacted.

#### Now is key – regulatory harmonization is around the corner

Moens & Scott 9/9/21 [Barbara Moens, Reporter @POLITICOEurope covering trade and Belgian politics. Mark Scott, Chief Technology Correspondent at POLITICO. "Transatlantic trade deal rises from the grave to fight China." https://www.politico.eu/article/ttip-rises-from-the-grave-to-fight-china/]

Activists may have thought the politically explosive Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) negotiations between Europe and America were dead and buried.

But one of the most important elements of those talks, which collapsed in 2016, is back from the grave: regulatory alignment between Washington and Brussels.

The first meeting of the Trade and Tech Council (TTC) in Pittsburgh on September 29 is intended to build a diplomatic platform for the European Union and the United States to work together on industrial and tech standards to counter China's rise in sectors ranging from microchips and robots to artificial intelligence and the alleged antitrust abuses of Google and Amazon.

The attempt to build a common U.S.-EU front could hardly come at a more sensitive moment politically, as the American retreat from Afghanistan has blown a hole in European faith in the administration of U.S. President Joe Biden. Many in Brussels feel let down by Washington's retreat from that country, while many in the U.S. capital believe EU countries did not pull their weight during the 20-year war.

“You can not discuss the Trade and Tech Council, and transatlantic trade relations overall, without Afghanistan in the back of your mind,” said one EU trade diplomat who spoke on the condition of anonymity because the ongoing talks are private. “The trust is gone, and that has to be rebuilt one step at a time.”

The two sides may not find themselves perfectly aligned against the common Chinese foe, however.

Brussels had originally hoped to pressure the Americans into following Brussels’ regulatory line on tech and trade, building on more than a decade of digital policymaking that spanned competition enforcement to global privacy rules. But now, the big fear among European officials is that the EU could well come off second best in this process and cede power to the U.S. after Washington flexed its muscles in early-stage talks around the upcoming trade and tech summit to focus on priorities for Biden's administration.

TTIP through the back door?

The TTIP negotiations are mostly remembered for protests about hormone-treated beef and chemically-rinsed poultry but the major benefits of TTIP lay precisely in bringing together conflicting EU-U.S. regulations. At the time, Brussels described this part of TTIP as a "regulatory cooperation body" and said that it could look at sectors such as data and cybersecurity.

Washington and Brussels now want to target those regulatory benefits again. “That sounds extremely boring and technical, but there’s a lot of money in having different standards. So this has the support from business from both sides,” former EU trade chief Cecilia Malmström told POLITICO earlier this year. Ten working groups — on everything from global trade standards to how to deal with online platforms — are expected to hammer out how such joint transatlantic policymaking could work in practice.

This time around, it’s not just car seatbelts or pharmaceuticals. The discussions focus on critical emerging technologies like artificial intelligence, semiconductors and data governance.

#### Unchecked globalization causes right-wing populism – that causes slow growth, polarization, and war

Flaherty & Rogowski 21 [Thomas M. Flaherty is a PhD candidate and NSF Graduate Fellow at the University of California, San Diego. He can be reached at t1flaher@ucsd.edu. Ronald Rogowski is Distinguished Professor of Political Science at the University of California, Los Angeles, and Weatherhead Scholar at Harvard University (2019–2021). "Rising Inequality As a Threat to the Liberal International Order." https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/international-organization/article/rising-inequality-as-a-threat-to-the-liberal-international-order/4CDE05DEB3AB076CE338E1AA4A9C8087]

The openness to trade in goods, services, and factors of production the LIO has so effectively advanced over decades has concentrated real income growth in a very thin layer of workers. While this rise in top-heavy inequality doubtless has other causes, chief among them skill-biased technological innovation, trade openness has contributed mightily, particularly since the “China shock” of 2001;96 and certainly the populist movements that reject the LIO cast openness to trade and migration as the chief villain.

The ways in which rising inequality has threatened the LIO expose lacunae in international political economy's intellectual apparatus—“blind spots” that require remediation. Most importantly, our basic economics are, if not wrong, at least outdated. The field's adherence to classical trade models blinds us to the distributional effects revealed by top-heavy inequality: far more people lost from globalization, and fewer gained, than traditional theories (factor proportions and specific factors) suggested. While economists rapidly updated their trade models to account for the emerging reality of extreme inequality, political science largely stayed the course—and ran the danger, now realized, of misapprehending the domestic politics of globalization.

The trade literature offers three explanations for top-heavy inequality. The “enriched” Heckscher-Ohlin model of Haskel and colleagues shows how only a thin layer of extraordinarily talented individuals within the larger set of high-skill workers unambiguously benefits from a rise in the relative price of a skill-intensive product; the wages of both the less talented high-skill and the low-skill workers stagnate or fall.97 New new trade theory shows how a similarly narrow subset of very large and productive firms, and their employees, absorb the bulk of trade's gains at the expense of all other firms. Finally, economic geography suggests that trade concentrates economic growth in a few large metropolitan regions while inflicting stagnation and decline elsewhere. Each offers a pessimistic view of the politics of globalization in which variously defined superstars gain a far larger share than the society at large.

We validate these theories of top-heavy inequality with data on local election outcomes from as many as twenty-eight countries over twenty-six years. We find that public support for right-populist parties rises dramatically with exposure to imports and immigration, but only in those countries with high top-heavy inequality. The fact that the huge gains from trade and technology have flowed to such a small elite, while earnings in other categories have stagnated, may go far to explain why the antiglobalization movements blame not only crucial elements of the LIO, but increasingly a small and nefarious global elite, for what one politician luridly portrayed as the “carnage” among many regions and sectors of the advanced economies.

That these movements, with rare exceptions, seek relief in restrictions on trade and migration from populist movements of the Right, rather than in redistribution or training, probably owes much to the failure of the political Left to redistribute sufficiently.98 That so much of these parties’ electoral support, both in Europe and in the US, comes from manual workers and former supporters of the political Left lends credence to this conjecture.

The ill effects of rising inequality, however, extend well beyond the rising tide of antiglobalization movements and politicians. They extend to slower economic growth (bound to exacerbate existing resentments), increased political polarization, and even a heightened risk of international conflict.

#### Polarization causes extinction

Lugar and Hamilton 20 [Former Indiana Sen. Richard Lugar (1977–2013) and former Indiana Rep. Lee Hamilton (1965–1999) are distinguished professors of practice at the Hamilton Lugar School of Global & International Studies at Indiana University, A national security imperative: Bipartisan cooperation, https://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/foreign-policy/410146-a-national-security-imperative-bipartisan-cooperation]

Today, while a single existential threat may be gone, the challenges we face now are just as grave and complicated. China and Russia are revisionist powers, looking to overtake the U.S. and set the rules of the road. North Korea has developed a nuclear weapon and missiles to deliver it. Iran may soon decide it needs to restart its nuclear program and continues to sponsor terror throughout the region. The Middle East is a hodgepodge of civil wars and proxy fights between regional and world powers. The European alliance is fraying and democratic freedoms in formerly “safe” democracies are being rolled back. Countries like Venezuela are on the verge of collapse, and allies like Turkey and Hungary are sliding toward dictatorship.

Yet the bipartisan approach to national security has evaporated, boiled away by the same raging political fires that have consumed so many of our domestic issues. The world needs America to present a united front, where our political factions understand we’re better off working together than undercutting each other.

Historically, bipartisan cooperation has improved national security. Returning to that cooperative spirit would make America safer. Sen. Lugar, for instance, worked with his Democratic colleague Sen. Sam Nunn (Ga.) to secure and dismantle the recently-collapsed Soviet Union’s weapons of mass destruction, thereby leaving far fewer of these powerful weapons available to despots and terrorists. Similarly, Rep. Hamilton served with Republican Thomas Keane as Vice Chair and Chair, respectively of the 9/11 Commission, whose findings have helped prevent any other mass terrorist events in the U.S. since that horrible September morning 17 years ago.

#### U.S. populism prevents effective liberal internationalism -- that makes the entire system more prone to erupt and escalates every major hotspot.

Lavin 17 [Frank Lavin is the Chairman of Export Now. He served in the White House, National Security Council, State Department, and Commerce Department during the Reagan, Bush (41) and Bush (43) Administrations. Things Fall Apart: Populism and Foreign Policy. Georgetown Journal of International Affairs. October 20, 2017. https://www.georgetownjournalofinternationalaffairs.org/online-edition/2017/10/20/things-fall-apart-populism-and-foreign-policy]

Trump does indeed have guiding principles, but they are process principles and not the substantive principles that we are used to seeing in a president. What shapes his foreign policy is that which shaped his singular triumph in public life: his campaign. Indeed, Trump abjured several of the policies that have guided Republican campaigns of the modern era: entitlement reform, trade agreements, and international leadership. A long-time supporter of both Bill and Hillary Clinton, President Trump’s political success was drawn not from conservatism nor an intellectual architecture—though he has some conservative impulses—but from political populism. His worldview in many ways is an extension of that belief.

What is Populism?

This populism has four characteristics. First, it is grievance-based. It focuses on problems rather than solutions. This has the extraordinary advantage of giving the message potency because negative statements can motivate more effectively than positive ones, but it makes it difficult to form a governing coalition, since constituencies that have a problem with a particular policy might have even greater differences among its alternatives. Indeed, as a candidate, Trump avoided articulating a positive vision regarding even central pillars of his campaign such as health care. Notably, Trump’s main foreign policy pronouncements in the campaign were grievance-based: terrorism, trade and immigration. Equally noteworthy, they were all essentially domestic issues with a foreign genesis. The traditional foreign policy questions were largely absent from his discussions: What is America’s role in the world? What is the value of an alliance? To what extent should we promote democracy and human rights, or should the U.S. focus on national interest calculations?

Second, the populist must establish emotional connectivity with the audience. Trump tends to evaluate people largely based on how they connect with him. The rally format suits him well; he loves the audience and the audience loves him. There are no questions and answers, nor any discussion, nor does there have to be new information, but there is plenty of emotional connectivity. Importantly, this emotional connectivity has little to do with economic class, a point that can befuddle Trump’s domestic political opponents, who underestimate his working-class appeal on the basis that he personally has little in common with them or that his policies supposedly would not help them. To a populist, the first point is broadly irrelevant and the second point is highly debatable. Might many a construction worker welcome a construction boom, and many a restaurant worker welcome an expansion of the business, if it meant job security and a larger paycheck, even if it would create disproportionate returns to the construction company and restaurant owner? For many working men and women, a growth in inequality is not inherently troubling. Thomas Piketty might be right, but it might not matter to most Americans if returns to capital outpace returns to labor. In addition, when establishment elites mock Trump, from his grammar to his boorishness, a portion of non-elites see this as condescension.

Third, populism is exculpatory: Every problem the United States faces was caused by others and the target audience is blameless. So if a company wanted to relocate some activity to Mexico, it must have been to exploit wage differences. No discussion as to whether wage increases at the U.S. facility have outpaced productivity increases. No discussion as to whether union rules impede flexibility and productivity. No discussion of the fact that Mexico might be a better production platform because it has more free trade agreements. Management is to blame, with Mexico in connivance. This is frequently expressed in themes of anti-establishment or alienation, which can have a corrosive effect when anchored in grievances.

Fourth, policy choices are cost-free and without trade-offs. Cost-benefit analysis, transition costs, the challenges in administering a government agency, underperforming programs, secondary effects and unintended consequences – these are all incidental to the victory of the policy choice itself. As such, populists might as well berate NATO leadership into burden-sharing, ignoring the downside to publicly hectoring leaders of sovereign nations. They, too, might as well call for a physical wall on the U.S. border with Mexico since it will be, by self-declaration, cost free.

To be fair, others in public life exhibit some of these elements. President Obama’s healthcare plan was historically grandiose in scope, cost and complexity, yet it was ballyhooed to save money. Similarly, Obama’s eight-year effort to reduce U.S. commitments to NATO was to have no costs in terms of force projection, alliance cohesion, or deterrence. And, Obama was the only President in the modern era to have run against trade as a candidate, an approach Trump followed. What Went Wrong? How could the bipartisan consensus on U.S. international leadership fade so quickly, particularly at a moment when the combination of market economics and alliances of democracies had resulted in perhaps the most prosperous and most liberal moment in human history? There are four contributors to the rise of populism: societal transformation, grievance economics, international leadership, and elite limitations. First, societal transformation – meaning both globalization and automation— has two profound socio-political effects. It produces an extraordinary degree of prosperity; and it carries with it a distribution effect. The bell curve of income distribution does not shift as much as it elongates. Few people are worse off, but many people are not better off. There is not necessarily the creation of a large number of winners and losers, but there is certainly the perception people getting left behind. Trump understands the message: The globalization club is having a party, and you are not invited. Silicon Valley is drinking champagne and your role is to pick the grapes. These trends also feed into the narrative of alienation because it decreases people’s control over their lives even as their overall prosperity increases. Globalization and automation have created economic anxiety in electorates around the world, and not just among steelworkers and coal miners. Realtors, bank tellers, school teachers, and cab drivers are all seeing competitive pressure and the prospect of job elimination. To many Americans, comparative advantage and creative destruction create a more prosperous society, but accompanying it is job insecurity. David Ricardo and Joseph Schumpeter might be right, but so what? Second, over several decades we have seen a shift from growth economics to grievance economics. This represents a break with the recovery policies that guided the leading economies through the 1950s and 1960s (and that economic rationalists such as Macron tilt toward today). In the current view, the primary purpose of economic policy is not to foment prosperity, but to redress grievances. Indeed, regardless of absolute improvements in well-being, reducing economic inequality is deemed to be a basis for policy. The premise of growth economics is that a system is fundamentally fair, so the main challenge is how fast we can go. The premise of grievance economics is that the system is fundamentally unfair, so going faster merely exacerbates the unfairness. This cult of inequality incentivizes interest-group politics and rent-seeking, leading to slower growth. If you focus on growth policies, you get growth. If you focus on grievance policies, you get grievances. A third cause is the shift in the U.S. international posture. We have seen a growing fatigue in the United States over the cost of international leadership. The U.S. entered the post-Cold War era with the institutions and the cohesion of the Cold War era largely intact, even though the end of the Soviet Union removed what political scientists term a “negative integrator.” Now we are deep into the post-post-Cold War era, with faded cohesion and institutions. For the first time since Harding and Coolidge we have two presidents in a row who have no international military or policy pedigree. Beyond the direct costs of international leadership in defense budgets and personnel, Americans seem more sensitive to the indirect costs of public opinion and anti-Americanism. Relationships can be expensive. Friendships can be complicated. If there is no immediate threat, and if no one likes us anyhow, then what is the point of foreign policy?

To sum up this point, imagine international Presidential leadership as a decision between whether to be a minute early or a minute late. Do you deter or do you react? Being a minute early requires leadership, because it carries with it the possibility of error and the cost of action without a consensus. “Left of Boom,” the British call it. Being a minute late and waiting until the problem has metastasized has the considerable benefit of allowing public consensus to build, and it is the less politically expensive approach. President Obama’s instinct is that foreign policy is better managed by being a minute late, such as responding after-the-fact to the Chinese build-out in the South China Sea, not confronting Russia on its intervention in U.S. elections, and perhaps in the cases of Aleppo or ISIS, Obama was more than a minute late. President Bush’s instinct was to be a minute early, foolishly so to his critics. Presidents have spent some 75 years since Pearl Harbor trying to be a minute early, with all the costs and mistakes that entailed, yet now we have two presidents in a row who believe we are better off being a minute late.

Finally, the appeal of populism has been driven by their perception of the limitations of the U.S. leadership class: insular, rigid, and sometimes simply mediocre. Additionally, over-engineered solutions and the appearance of being self-serving, if not corrupt, help the appeal of populism. Sometimes it comes from the declining marginal effectiveness of government programs as society becomes more affluent and complicated. Indeed, the Obama administration seemed to regularly play into the hands of populists, sometimes passively so, as with the refusal to challenge even the more exotic of the sanctuary city movement. Sometimes, it was by design as with the painstaking construction not to label Islamic terrorism as such. If responsible leaders appear to be playing favorites or not accurately describing a phenomenon, they abandon the issue to their opponents — a phenomenon Trump witnessed through his hesitation in characterizing the Charlottesville protests. If populists rely too heavily on emotional connectivity, which establishment politicians have any emotional connectivity? Does there exist an aspirant for President, other than Donald Trump, who can have a friendly discussion with a Walmart cashier? How many of the possible 2020 presidential candidates have worked in the “real” economy, working for an institution that needed to turn a profit? Sam Rayburn’s wish to Lyndon Johnson, after LBJ had related how bright was his brain trust, was that he wished one of them had run for county sheriff. Can we today wish that one of the 2020 presidential candidates will have run a diner, which would have required them to hire teenagers, train high school dropouts, deal with single parents, lay-off workers from failed projects and negotiate wages, all while paying taxes and dealing with various government agencies? Maybe this is why a restaurant worker might respect an owner, or even a New York real estate developer, but not a career politician. If the elites cannot maintain that connectivity, they give an opening to populists. Attaining political maturity contemporaneous with the Bush 43 invasion of Iraq, Obama was wary of American over-reach and committed to a foreign policy pullback. He embedded that withdrawal in a denial of American exceptionalism, a pillar of U.S foreign policy since Pearl Harbor. If you stop believing in yourself, it is difficult to ask others to believe in you. The rejection of America’s special role in the world helped set the stage for “Make America Great Again.” Was Barack Obama the ultimate Donald Trump enabler? There other contributing factors beyond the above four. The rise of identity politics probably played into Trump’s hands, as did the digital communications revolution. News clutter rewards pugnacity and sensationalism and allows for cocoons and even tribalism. It is also worth noting that Trump is a man of unusual presentation strengths, and he can effectively project personality. Simply put, Trump was an exemplary grievance candidate in a grievance year. Trump articulated a vision; Hillary Clinton did not. We are in a communications era. For Secretary Clinton, communications is a means to an end. For Trump it is an end. She believes in her in-box; He, in his out-box. Hillary campaigned as the functionary; Donald as the visionary. Is internationalism doomed? America is now in the middle of a twelve and possibly sixteen year reign of two presidents who challenge the Cold War view that America is better off with a leading international presence, with being a minute early. It is too expensive, argued President Obama, and it leads us into unwinnable conflicts, draining our reputation and our purse. It is too expensive, echoes President Trump, and foreigners abuse and cheat us. Obama argues for minimalism because the United States is a problem for the world, and Trump argues for minimalism because the world is a problem for the United States. Even as President, Trump is easy to underestimate. Appealingly so. Many critics derive amusement, even a sense of superiority, from his foibles. His factual errors and even spelling mistakes provide an opportunity for mockery, but the lazy epiphany of error-spotting is a poor substitute for a substantive rebuttal. And a significant portion of the criticism is either ad hominem or an over-reach, either of which helps Trump. Those who are serious about policy should look at the direction in which he is taking the country, rather than fixate on these errors. To be even-handed, if President Trump’s distinctive success in the public space was his astonishing 2016 victory, in 2008 the distinctive success of Senator Obama was his astonishing election. Obama wisely chose not to run on his government record but marshaled his formidable stage skills and personal charisma to direct criticism toward Hillary Clinton and John McCain. So if Trump’s foreign policy approach stems from his success as “Ranter-in-Chief,” does Obama’s approach stem from his success as “Charmer-in-Chief?” Radically different styles, but with policy similarities.

The deterioration in U.S. foreign policy will likely continue for the near term. On any given day, the Obama/Trump approach may make sense. We should be a minute late. It makes sense to skimp, to cut defense expenditures, to reduce international good-will and connectivity, to save money all around. Relationships can be expensive and even harmful – this is the seduction of the minimalist school. But there is a countervailing argument.

The main argument against this minimalist approach will be events themselves. The minimalist approach might work in a static environment, but that stasis in itself incentivizes a destabilizer. At some point, history presents the bill. Only then will we be reminded, perhaps cruelly, that although on any given day it might be less expensive to be a minute late, as a matter of national policy we need to be a minute early. If we are not willing to pay the price to be left of boom, then we must pay the price for the boom itself. Worse than the expense and bother of having friends would be the expense and bother of not having friends.

#### Trade that doesn’t account for distributional effects drives populism – perceived unfairness outweighs alt causes

Rodrik 17 [Dani Rodrik, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University. "Populism and the Economics of Globalization." The National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper No. 23559. July 2017. http://www.nber.org/papers/w23559.pdf]

Globalization had a big upside. It greatly expanded opportunities for exporters, multinational companies, investors, and international banks, as well the managerial and professional classes who could take advantage of larger markets. It helped some poor countries – China in particular – rapidly transform farmers into workers in manufacturing operations for export markets, thereby spurring growth and reducing poverty. But the decline in global inequality was accompanied by an increase in domestic inequality and cleavages. Globalization drove multiple, partially overlapping wedges in society: between capital and labor, skilled and unskilled workers, employers and employees, globally mobile professionals and local producers, industries/regions with comparative advantage and those without, cities and the countryside, cosmopolitans versus communitarians, elites and ordinary people. It left many countries ravaged by financial crises and their aftermath of austerity.

Globalization was hardly the only shock which gutted established social contracts. By all accounts, automation and new digital technologies played a quantitatively greater role in de-industrialization and in spatial and income inequalities. But globalization became tainted with a stigma of unfairness that technology evaded. People thought they were losing ground not because they had taken an unkind draw from the lottery of market competition, but because the rules were unfair and others – financiers, large corporations, foreigners – were taking advantage of a rigged playing field.

Many of these consequences were predictable and are not a surprise. The same can be said about the political backlash as well. A number of empirical papers have linked the rise of populist movements – Trump and the right-wing Republicans in the U.S., Brexit in Britain, far-right groups in Europe – to forces associated with globalization, such as the China trade shock, rising import penetration levels, de-industrialization, and immigration.

Analyzing electoral results across U.S. congressional districts, Autor et al. (2016) have shown that the China trade shock aggravated political polarization: districts affected by the shock moved further to the right or the left, depending which way they were leaning in the first place. Elected Republicans became more conservative, while elected Democrats became more liberal. For Britain, Becker et al. (2016) find that austerity and immigration impacts both played a role in increasing the Brexit vote, in addition to demographic variables and industrial composition. Also analyzing Brexit, Colantone and Stanig (2016) find a much more direct role for globalization. Using an Autor et al. (2013)- type China trade shock variable, they show regions with larger import penetration from China had a higher Leave vote share. They also corroborate this finding with individuallevel data from the British Election Survey that shows individuals in regions more affected by the import shock were more likely to vote for Leave, conditional on education and other characteristics.

A second paper by Colantone and Stanig (2017) undertakes a similar analysis for fifteen European countries over the 1988-2007 period. It finds that the China trade shock played a statistically (and quantitatively) significant role across regions and at the individual level. A larger import shock is associated with support for nationalist parties and a shift towards radical right-wing

parties. Finally Guiso et al. (2017) look at European survey data on individual voting behavior and find an important role for economic insecurity – including exposure to competition from imports and immigrants – in driving populist parties’ growth. The same variables also affect voter turnout: individuals who experience greater economic insecurity are also less likely to show up at the polls. As Guiso et al. (2017) indicate, the latter result suggests that studies that focus on vote shares alone underestimate the importance of these economic drivers, including globalization shocks.

A question that has attracted little interest to date is why the backlash has taken the particular form it has in different countries. Most (but not all) populist movements in the current wave are of the right-wing variety. These emphasize a cultural cleavage, the national, ethnic, religious, or cultural identity of the “people” against outside groups who allegedly pose a threat to the popular will. In the U.S., Donald Trump has demonized at various times the Mexicans, Chinese and Muslims. In Europe, right-wing populists portray Muslim immigrants, minority groups (gypsies or Jews), and the faceless bureaucrats of Brussels as the “other.” An alternative variety of populism revolves around a largely economic cleavage, the wealthy groups who control the economy and define its rules versus the lower income groups without access to power. The original American populism of the late 19th century was of this variety, focusing its opposition on the railroad barons and the Northeastern financial elite. Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign in 2016 took a similar form. In Europe, there are a few left-wing populist movements, of which Greece’s Syriza and Spain’s Podemos are the best known. In Latin America, by contrast, populism has long taken mostly a left-wing form. In Figure 5 I provide some systematic evidence on the dynamics of support for populist parties around the world since the 1960s. The figure shows the aggregate vote shares of populist parties in countries with at least one populist party. I distinguish between leftwing and right-wing populists and between Europe and Latin America. (The U.S. presidential election of 2016 is not included.) The appendix discusses data sources and parties/countries covered. What jumps out of Figure 5 is the sharp contrast between the patterns of populism in Europe and Latin America. In Europe, the rise of populism is very recent and swift – from below 5 percent of the vote in the late 1980s to more than 20 percent by 2011-2015. Moreover, this increase is driven exclusively by right-wing parties. The left-wing populist vote share remains throughout well below 5 percent of the aggregate electorate in the countries included. By contrast, left-wing populism has always been strong in Latin America, with vote totals between 15-30 percent. It also has experienced a recent, if less marked, rise. Right-wing populism has remained at very low levels in Latin America. What explains the predominance of right-wing populism in Europe today, compared to the predominance of its left-wing variant in Latin America? To shed some light on this question, it helps to think of the rise of populism as the product of both demand- and supply-side factors at work. On the demand side, the distributional and other economic fault lines created or deepened by globalization generate potential public support for movements that position themselves outside the political mainstream and oppose established rules of the game. But the economic anxiety, discontent, loss of legitimacy, fairness concerns that are generated as a by-product of globalization rarely come with obvious solutions or policy perspectives. They tend to be inchoate and need to be channeled in a particular programmatic direction through narratives that provide meaning and explanation to the groups in question. That is where the supply-side of politics comes in. Populist movements supply the narratives required for political mobilization around common concerns. They present a story that is meant to resonate with their base, the demand side: here is what is happening, this is why, and these are the people who are doing it to you. In Mukand and Rodrik (2017) we provide a model where political conflict can revolve around different axes. There are three different groups in society: the elite, the majority, and the minority. The elite are separated from the rest of society by their wealth. The minority is separated by particular identity markers (ethnicity, religion, immigrant status). Hence there are two cleavages: an ethno-national/cultural cleavage and an income/social class cleavage. These cleavages can be orthogonal or overlapping, producing different patterns of alliances and political outcomes. With some simplification, we can say that populist politicians mobilize support by exploiting one or the other of these two cleavages. The “enemies of the people” are different in each case. Populist who emphasize the identity cleavage target foreigners or minorities, and this produces right-wing populism. Those who emphasize the income cleavage target the wealthy and large corporations, producing left-wing populism. It is reasonable to suppose that the relative ease with which one or the other of these cleavages can be targeted depends on their salience in the everyday experience of voters. In particular, it may be easier to mobilize along the ethno-national/cultural cleavage when society is experiencing an influx of immigrants and refugees with dissimilar cultural and religious identities. Then economic anxiety can be channeled into opposition to these groups. Immigrants and refugees can be presented as competing for jobs, making demands on public services, and reducing public resources available for natives. Indeed, a major source of support for far-right parties in Europe has been the fear that immigration will erode welfare state benefits, a fear that is heightened in countries experiencing austerity and recession (see for example Hatton 2016). Cavaille and Ferwerda (2017) find that support for right-wing populist parties is very responsive to perceived competition with immigrants for in-kind benefits, in their case public housing.

An important implication of this reasoning is that even when the underlying shock is fundamentally economic the political manifestations can be cultural and nativist. What may look like a racist or xenophobic backlash may have its roots in economic anxieties and dislocations.20 The supply-side of politics – the narrative on offer -- matters a great deal. This is a point that is often overlooked in current diagnoses. For example, it is not easy to know whether Trump’s victory represents an economic or cultural phenomenon without disentangling the demand and supply sides – the underlying grievances, on the one hand, and his narrative, on the other.

What about Latin America? The reason that populism took a divergent path in Latin America may be related to the fact that the salient shocks associated with globalization took different forms there. Latin Americans who were affected negatively by globalization experienced it not as immigration or rule by Brussels/Frankfurt, but as rapid trade opening, financial crises, IMF programs, and entry by foreign corporations in sensitive domestic sectors such as mining or public utilities. The anger to be mobilized was against these forces and the domestic groups that supported them. This lent itself to left-wing (economic) populism rather than right-wing (cultural) populism.21 The European exceptions to right-wing populism provide further support to this argument. The two European countries that grew substantial left-wing populist movements – Greece and Spain – bear a certain similarity to Latin America. They were major recipients of capital inflows under the European model of financial globalization, the euro. Once the sudden stop took place, their economies went into a tailspin and unemployment skyrocketed. The shock was then intensified by the presence of a common currency and austerity policies imposed from the outside – a troika made up of the IMF, the European Central Bank, and the European Commission. Although all countries in Europe were affected by the euro crisis, Greece and Spain were among the most adversely hit. Greece has yet to recover, and unemployment remains very high in both countries. All this is reminiscent of Latin American boom-and-bust cycles, going back at least to the 1970s. So it is not surprising that the financial crisis and its aftermath in Spain and Greece provided fertile ground for left-wing populists, for similar reasons. The relative weakness of cultural/religious cleavages to be exploited may also play a part in favoring left-wing over right-wing populist movements. In Latin America, the bulk of immigration has been from other Latin American countries or from culturally similar European countries. Within Europe, Spain and Greece once again provide instructive counter-examples. Compare the immigration experience of Spain with that of France, for example (Table 2). Even though Spain has a somewhat larger migrant stock in relation to its population, the majority of Spain’s immigrants come from either Latin America or from advanced European countries.22 In France, by contrast, the largest share (more than 40 percent) of migrants are from Moslem countries (Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia, Turkey) and an additional 10 percent come from Sub-Saharan Africa. A rightwing populist party (i.e., the National Front) has much more fertile ground in France than in Spain. The U.S. presents a mixed case, combining characteristics of both of these paths. Unlike Europe which had opened up to trade and reached a political settlement supporting it long ago – extensive safety nets in exchange for trade openness – the U.S. experienced increased exposure to imports comparatively recently. And it did so without systematic compensation. So imports (especially from China) and trade agreements (with Mexico, Asian countries) were politically salient issues, around which large number of voters could be mobilized. The financial crisis and the differing fates of large banks versus lowincome homeowners – one bailed out, the other not – engendered anger at the financial elites. At the same time, immigration from Mexico, the threat of radical Muslim terrorism, and lingering racial divides were ripe for political manipulation. In other words, the U.S. presented ample ground for both types of cleavage. Correspondingly, the 2016 presidential elections were contested by major populist movements on both the left and the right, led by Bernie Sanders and Donald Turmp, respectively.

8. Concluding remarks

One conclusion from the preceding discussion is that the simple economics of globalization is not particularly auspicious with respect its political sustainability. This is especially true of the advanced phases of globalization – what I have called elsewhere “hyperglobalization” (Rodrik 2011) – in which the ratio of political/distributive costs to net economic gains is particularly unfavorable. Historically, the unification of national markets has required an unequivocal political project led by a strong central executive. Nothing comparable exists globally, and the European experience provides ample reason to be skeptical that something like that can be achieved even regionally. In a world divided politically, markets face strong centrifugal forces as well.

The global economic arrangements of the immediate post-war era were built around John Maynard Keynes’ insight that sustaining a world economy reasonably hospitable to international trade and investment would require carving up space for domestic macroeconomic management. For Keynes, this meant capital controls in particular, which he viewed not as a temporary expedient but as a permanent feature of the international economic order. The same principle was followed in other domains as well. The GATT regime entailed a thin model of trade integration, not reaching beyond direct border barriers or manufactured imports in advanced economies. It left plenty of room for countries to design their own regulations and industrial policies – and indeed protect “sensitive” sectors (such as agriculture or garments).

The resulting system -- variably called the Bretton Woods compromise or embedded liberalism23 – was a great success. It fostered a large increase in global trade and investment and saw rapid economic development in both the advanced and developing economies. Perhaps it was too successful for its own good. By the late 1980s, policy makers and economists thought they could make it work even better by pushing for deeper economic integration. Trade agreements became more ambitious and reached beyond the border into domestic regulations. The removal of restrictions on capital mobility became the norm rather than the exception. In the process, the “embedding “ or “compromise” that had made the earlier regime such a success was overlooked.

The rise of populism forces a necessary reality check. Today the big challenge facing policy makers is to rebalance globalization so to maintain a reasonably open world economy while curbing its excesses.

## 2ac

### 2AC – Expand the Scope

#### We meet – the FTAIA limits the scope of the Sherman Act by exempting most extraterritorial action – the aff would reduce the exemption by adopting a more-encompassing definition of “directness” – that expands the Sherman Act to apply to more conduct

Gerber ‘17 [David J. Gerber; Sept. 2017; University Distinguished Professor, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago-Kent College of Law. Journal of Antitrust Enforcement; “Competitive harm in global supply chains: assessing current responses and identifying potential future responses,” vol. 6, p. 5–24, https://academic.oup.com/antitrust/article-pdf/6/1/5/24149036/jnx015.pdf]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### We meet – the aff adds a clarified version of the FTAIA’s language to the body of the Sherman Act – that’s 1AC Ryu

#### We meet – zero civil suits in cases where a “direct effect” on US commerce happens along the supply chain outside of the US can happen now – the aff greenlights them

#### In ‘expand the scope,’ ‘expand’ means to increase and ‘the scope’ defines permissible behavior.

Collins ’21 [Collins English Dictionary; copyright updated 2021; Collins Cobuild, “Expand the Scope,” https://www.collinsdictionary.com/us/dictionary/english/expand-the-scope]

expand the scope

These examples have been automatically selected and may contain sensitive content that does not reflect the opinions or policies of Collins, or its parent company HarperCollins.

I wanted to work internationally and expand the scope of my possibilities.

Times, Sunday Times

Labour has called for the government to expand the scope of the test to include consideration of the impact of any merger on research and development and science.

Times, Sunday Times

Most opponents are small-government conservatives who are outraged at any attempt to expand the scope of government, particularly when it involves their personal healthcare decisions.

Times, Sunday Times

The move was cited by the developer to be to expand the scope of indie videogames, and not as a market strategy.

Retrieved from Wikipedia CC BY-SA 3.0 https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/. Source URL: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Afterfall: InSanity

Such results expand the scope of asymmetric hydroboration to more sterically demanding alkenes.

Retrieved from Wikipedia CC BY-SA 3.0 https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/. Source URL: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Metal-catalysed hydroboration

Definition of 'expand'

expand

(ɪkspænd)

Explore 'expand' in the dictionary

VERB

If something expands or is expanded, it becomes larger. [...]

See full entry

COBUILD Advanced English Dictionary. Copyright © HarperCollins Publishers

Definition of 'scope'

scope

(skoʊp)

Explore 'scope' in the dictionary

UNCOUNTABLE NOUN [NOUN to-infinitive]

If there is scope for a particular kind of behaviour or activity, people have the opportunity to behave in this way or do that activity. [...]

#### Prefer our interp – any interp that excludes narrowing exemptions wrecks the topic by eliminating affs that have answers to core generics

#### No ground offense – their interp creates less predictable affs that link to less

#### Aff ground---ony one aff can change consumer welfare standards---means the neg wins every round and hurts aff in noovaton

#### Reasonability – substance crowd out outweighs norm-setting.

### T---prohibit

#### We meet---we pan international price fixing

#### We meet---plan text in a vacuum

#### We meet---we ban international price fixing and allow companies to sue which price fixing

#### Ci---prhibition includes subsets

Hadley ’9 [John Vestal; December 16, 1909; Justice on the Supreme Court of Indiana; Westlaw, “McPherson v. State,” 174 Ind. 60]

Furthermore, the word “prohibition” is close akin to “regulate, restrict, and control.” Its use in the body of the act is of little significance. To forbid the sale of liquor by those who have no license; to deny the licensee the right to sell on certain days, between certain hours, in certain places, in certain quantities—is, to some extent at least, qualified prohibition. It is prevention, interdiction. Such laws, however, are unquestionably regulations and restrictions of the liquor traffic. They operate as a check, as a restraint, upon the sale, not in absolute inhibition, and are in the strictest sense regulations. They regulate by prohibiting the sale at certain times, and to certain persons, and \*613 in certain places. Besides, to say the law prohibits the citizen from selling without a license, or that the law prohibits the licensed seller from selling on Sunday, is etymologically correct. In fact, the word was employed in this sense by the Legislature in framing section 4 of the Nicholson law (section 8327, Burns' Ann. St. 1908), which provides that obstructions to the street view shall not be set up in the selling room “during such days and hours when the sale of such liquors is prohibited by law.” So it is not so much the primary meaning of the word as sense in which it is popularly understood as applied to the manufacture and sale of spirituous liquors that must control.

Following are a few definitions of “prohibition” as specifically applied:

“Interdiction of the liberty of making and of selling, or giving away, intoxicating liquors for other than medicinal, scientific and religious purposes.” Anderson's L. Dict.; Bouvier, L. Dict. (Rawle's Rev.).

“The forbidding by law of the manufacturing and sale of alcoholic liquors.” English's L. Dict.

“The forbidding by law of the sale of alcoholic liquors as a beverage.” Webster's Int. Dict.

“The forbidding by legislative enactment of the sale of alcoholic liquors for use as a beverage.” Standard Dict.

The term has even a wider sweep than this. A prohibitory law, to be classed as such, must, at the same instant, in the same way, become effective to interdict the sale of liquors throughout all parts of the jurisdiction of the lawmaking power. Welsh v. State, 126 Ind. 71, 77, 25 N. E. 883, 9 L. R. A. 664; Shea v. City of Muncie, 148 Ind. 14, 46 N. E. 138; Paul v. Gloucester County, 50 N. J. Law, 585, 15 Atl. 272, 1 L. R. A. 86.

It seems absurd, because rationally inconceivable, that under the operation of a general prohibitory statute enacted by the General Assembly sales as a beverage may indefinitely continue to be lawfully made in many counties of the state. It is also equally incomprehensible how a law may be absolutely prohibitory and in itself provide the means and terms under which sales may be continued or resumed in any or all counties of the state. We are unable to perceive any distinction between the prohibition which results from remonstrance under former laws, which has uniformly been held to be regulation, and the prohibition arising under the act in question, with the sole exception as to the duration of the term of restriction, depending upon petition and election at the expiration of each biannual period. We therefore conclude that the object and purpose of the act before us is regulation, and not prohibition, of the liquor traffic, and that the subject is fairly deducible from the title, and not in conflict with section 19, art. 4, of the Constitution. Isenhour v. State, 157 Ind. 524, 62 N. E. 40, 87 Am. St. Rep. 228; Gustavel v. State, 153 Ind. 613, 54 N. E. 123; Burget v. Merritt, 155 Ind. 143, 57 N. E. 714; Clarke v. Darr, 156 Ind. 692, 60 N. E. 688; Republic Iron, etc., Co. v. State, 160 Ind. 379, 66 N. E. 1005, 62 L. R. A. 136; Maule Coal Co. v. Partenheimer, 155 Ind. 100, 55 N. E. 751, 57 N. E. 710.

### 2ac---cap

#### Prefer util---it’s the only non-arbitrary form of risk calculus---life is a prerequisite to solving all of their impacts.

#### Framework---weigh the plan against the status quo or a competitive alternative---it’s the only interp with a resolutional basis---any other one justifies asserting infinite arbitrary frameworks which unfairly shifts the debate from 1AC offense and wrecks clash.

#### Perm do both---either the alt overcomes the links or it can’t overcome resistance in the squo.

#### Growth is sustainable, physical limits aren’t absolute, AND resource use is declining now---degrowth unleashes global disaster

Bailey 18 [Ronald; February 16; B.A. in Economics from the University of Virginia, member of the Society of Environmental Journalists and the American Society for Bioethics and Humanities, citing a compilation of interdisciplinary research; Reason, “Is Degrowth the Only Way to Save the World?” https://reason.com/2018/02/16/is-degrowth-the-only-way-to-save-the-wor; RP]

Unless us folks in rich countries drastically reduce our material living standards and distribute most of what we have to people living in poor countries, the world will come to an end. Or at least that's the stark conclusion of a study published earlier this month in the journal Nature Sustainability. The researchers who wrote it, led by the Leeds University ecological economist Dan O'Neill, think the way to prevent the apocalypse is "degrowth."

Vice, pestilence, war, and "gigantic inevitable famine" were the planetary boundaries set on human population by the 18th-century economist Robert Thomas Malthus. The new study gussies up old-fashioned Malthusianism by devising a set of seven biophysical indicators of national environmental pressure, which they then link to 11 indicators of social outcomes. The aim of the exercise is to concoct a "safe and just space" for humanity.

Using data from 2011, the researchers calculate that the annual per capita boundaries for the world's 7 billion people consist of the emission of 1.6 tons of carbon dioxide per year and the annual consumption of 0.9 kilograms of phosphorus, 8.9 kilograms of nitrogen, 574 cubic meters of water, 2.6 tons of biomass (crops and wood), plus the ecological services of 1.7 hectares of land and 7.2 tons of material per person.

On the social side, meanwhile, the researchers say that life satisfaction in each country should exceed 6.5 on the 10-point Cantril scale, that healthy life expectancy should average at least 65 years, and that nutrition should be over 2,700 calories per day. At least 95 percent of each country's citizens must have access to good sanitation, earn more than $1.90 per day, and pass through secondary school. Ninety percent of citizens must have friends and family they can depend on. The threshold for democratic quality must exceed 0.8 on an index scale stretching from -1 to +1, while the threshold for equality is set at no higher than 70 on a Gini Index where 0 represents perfect equality and 100 implies perfect inequality. They set the threshold for percent of labor force employed at 94 percent.

So how does the U.S. do with regard to their biophysical boundaries and social outcomes measures? We Americans transgress all seven of the biophysical boundaries. Carbon dioxide emissions stand at 21.2 tons per person; we each use an average of 7 kilograms of phosphorus, 59.1 kilograms of nitrogen, 611 cubic meters of water, and 3.7 tons of biomass; we rely on the ecological services of 6.8 hectares of land and 27.2 tons of material. Although the researchers urge us to move "beyond the pursuit of GDP growth to embrace new measures of progress," it is worth noting that U.S. GDP is $59,609 per capita.

On the other hand, those transgressions have provided a pretty good life for Americans. For example, life satisfaction is 7.1; healthy life expectancy is 69.7 years; and democratic quality stands at 0.8 points. The only two social indicators we just missed on were employment (91 percent) and secondary education (94.7 percent).

On the other hand, our hemisphere is home to one paragon of sustainability—Haiti. Haitians breach none of the researchers' biophysical boundaries. But the Caribbean country performs abysmally on all 11 social indicators. Life satisfaction scores at 4.8; healthy life expectancy is 52.3 years; and Haitians average 2,105 calories per day. The country tallies -0.9 on the democratic quality index. Haiti's GDP is $719 per capita.

Other near-sustainability champions include Malawi, Nepal, Myanmar, and Nicaragua. All of them score dismally on the social indicators, and their GDPs per capita are $322, $799, $1,375, and $2,208, respectively.

The country that currently comes closest to the researchers' ideal of remaining within its biophysical boundaries while sufficient social indicators is…Vietnam. For the record, Vietnam's per capita GDP is $2,306.

"Countries with higher levels of life satisfaction and healthy life expectancy also tend to transgress more biophysical boundaries," the researchers note. A better way to put this relationship is that more wealth and technology tend to make people happier, healthier, and freer.

O'Neill and his unhappy team fail drastically to understand how human ingenuity unleashed in markets is already well on the way toward making their supposed planetary boundaries irrelevant. Take carbon dioxide emissions: Supporters of renewable energy technologies say that their costs are already or will soon be lower than those of fossil fuels. Boosters of advanced nuclear reactors similarly argue that they can supply all of the carbon-free energy the world will need. There's a good chance that fleets of battery-powered self-driving vehicles will largely replace private cars and mass transit later in this century.

Are we about to run out of phosphorous to fertilize our crops? Peak phosphorus is not at hand. The U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) reports that at current rates of mining, the world's known reserves will last 266 years. The estimated total resources of phosphate rock would last over 1,140 years. "There are no imminent shortages of phosphate rock," notes the USGS. With respect to the deleterious effects that using phosphorus to fertilize crops might have outside of farm fields, researchers are working on ways to endow crops with traits that enable them to use less while maintaining yields.

O'Neill and his colleagues are also concerned that farmers are using too much nitrogen fertilizer, which runs off fields into the natural environment and contributes to deoxygenated dead zones in the oceans, among other ill effects. This is a problem, but one that plant breeders are already working to solve. For example, researchers at Arcadia Biosciences have used biotechnology to create nitrogen-efficient varieties of staples like rice and wheat that enable farmers to increase yields while significantly reducing fertilizer use. Meanwhile, other researchers are moving on projects to engineer the nitrogen fixation trait from legumes into cereal crops. In other words, the crops would make their own fertilizer from air.

Water? Most water is devoted to the irrigation of crops; the ongoing development of drought-resistant and saline-tolerant crops will help with that. Hectares per capita? Humanity has probably already reached peak farmland, and nearly 400 million hectares will be restored to nature by 2060—an area almost double the size of the United States east of the Mississippi River. In fact, it is entirely possible that most animal farming will be replaced by resource-sparing lab-grown steaks, chops, and milk. Such developments in food production undermine the researchers' worries about overconsumption of biomass.

And humanity's material footprint is likely to get smaller too as trends toward further dematerialization take hold. The price system is a superb mechanism for encouraging innovators to find ways to wring ever more value out less and less stuff. Rockefeller University researcher Jesse Ausubel has shown that this process of absolute dematerialization has already taken off for many commodities.

After cranking their way through their models of doom, O'Neill and his colleagues lugubriously conclude: "If all people are to lead a good life within planetary boundaries, then the level of resource use associated with meeting basic needs must be dramatically reduced." They are right, but they are entirely backward with regard to how to achieve those goals. Economic growth provides the wealth and technologies needed to lift people from poverty while simultaneously lightening humanity's footprint on the natural world. Rather than degrowth, the planet—and especially its poor people—need more and faster economic growth.

#### No transition---other states will inevitably attempt economic growth.

#### No mindset shift

Heinberg 15—Senior Fellow-in-Residence of the Post Carbon Institute (Richard, “The Anthropocene: It’s Not All About Us”, <http://www.postcarbon.org/the-anthropocene-its-not-all-about-us/>, dml)

It’s hard to convince people to voluntarily reduce consumption and curb reproduction. That’s not because humans are unusually pushy, greedy creatures; all living organisms tend to maximize their population size and rate of collective energy use. Inject a colony of bacteria into a suitable growth medium in a petri dish and watch what happens. Hummingbirds, mice, leopards, oarfish, redwood trees, or giraffes: in each instance the principle remains inviolate—every species maximizes population and energy consumption within nature’s limits. Systems ecologist Howard T. Odum called this rule the Maximum Power Principle: throughout nature, “system designs develop and prevail that maximize power intake, energy transformation, and those uses that reinforce production and efficiency.”

In addition to our innate propensity to maximize population and consumption, we humans also have difficulty making sacrifices in the present in order to reduce future costs. We’re genetically hardwired to respond to immediate threats with fight-or-flight responses, while distant hazards matter much less to us. It’s not that we don’t think about the future at all; rather, we unconsciously apply a discount rate based on the amount of time likely to elapse before a menace has to be faced.

True, there is some variation in future-anticipating behavior among individual humans. A small percentage of the population may change behavior now to reduce risks to forthcoming generations, while the great majority is less likely to do so. If that small percentage could oversee our collective future planning, we might have much less to worry about. But that’s tough to arrange in democracies, where people, politicians, corporations, and even nonprofit organizations get ahead by promising immediate rewards, usually in the form of more economic growth. If none of these can organize a proactive response to long-range threats like climate change, the actions of a few individuals and communities may not be so effective at mitigating the hazard.

This pessimistic expectation is borne out by experience. The general outlines of the 21st century ecological crisis have been apparent since the 1970s. Yet not much has actually been accomplished through efforts to avert that crisis. It is possible to point to hundreds, thousands, perhaps even millions of imaginative, courageous programs to reduce, recycle, and reuse—yet the overall trajectory of industrial civilization remains relatively unchanged.

#### Warming doesn’t cause extinction

Nordhaus 20 Ted Nordhaus, an American author, environmental policy expert, and the director of research at The Breakthrough Institute, citing new climate change forecasts. [Ignore the Fake Climate Debate, 1-23-2020, https://www.wsj.com/articles/ignore-the-fake-climate-debate-11579795816]//BPS

Beyond the headlines and social media, where Greta Thunberg, Donald Trump and the online armies of climate “alarmists” and “deniers” do battle, there is a real climate debate bubbling along in scientific journals, conferences and, occasionally, even in the halls of Congress. It gets a lot less attention than the boisterous and fake debate that dominates our public discourse, but it is much more relevant to how the world might actually address the problem. In the real climate debate, no one denies the relationship between human emissions of greenhouse gases and a warming climate. Instead, the disagreement comes down to different views of climate risk in the face of multiple, cascading uncertainties. On one side of the debate are optimists, who believe that, with improving technology and greater affluence, our societies will prove quite adaptable to a changing climate. On the other side are pessimists, who are more concerned about the risks associated with rapid, large-scale and poorly understood transformations of the climate system. But most pessimists do not believe that runaway climate change or a hothouse earth are plausible scenarios, much less that human extinction is imminent. And most optimists recognize a need for policies to address climate change, even if they don’t support the radical measures that Ms. Thunberg and others have demanded. In the fake climate debate, both sides agree that economic growth and reduced emissions vary inversely; it’s a zero-sum game. In the real debate, the relationship is much more complicated. Long-term economic growth is associated with both rising per capita energy consumption and slower population growth. For this reason, as the world continues to get richer, higher per capita energy consumption is likely to be offset by a lower population. A richer world will also likely be more technologically advanced, which means that energy consumption should be less carbon-intensive than it would be in a poorer, less technologically advanced future. In fact, a number of the high-emissions scenarios produced by the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change involve futures in which the world is relatively poor and populous and less technologically advanced. Affluent, developed societies are also much better equipped to respond to climate extremes and natural disasters. That’s why natural disasters kill and displace many more people in poor societies than in rich ones. It’s not just seawalls and flood channels that make us resilient; it’s air conditioning and refrigeration, modern transportation and communications networks, early warning systems, first responders and public health bureaucracies. New research published in the journal Global Environmental Change finds that global economic growth over the last decade has reduced climate mortality by a factor of five, with the greatest benefits documented in the poorest nations. In low-lying Bangladesh, 300,000 people died in Cyclone Bhola in 1970, when 80% of the population lived in extreme poverty. In 2019, with less than 20% of the population living in extreme poverty, Cyclone Fani killed just five people. “Poor nations are most vulnerable to a changing climate. The fastest way to reduce that vulnerability is through economic development.” So while it is true that poor nations are most vulnerable to a changing climate, it is also true that the fastest way to reduce that vulnerability is through economic development, which requires infrastructure and industrialization. Those activities, in turn, require cement, steel, process heat and chemical inputs, all of which are impossible to produce today without fossil fuels. For this and other reasons, the world is unlikely to cut emissions fast enough to stabilize global temperatures at less than 2 degrees above pre-industrial levels, the long-standing international target, much less 1.5 degrees, as many activists now demand. But recent forecasts also suggest that many of the worst-case climate scenarios produced in the last decade, which assumed unbounded economic growth and fossil-fuel development, are also very unlikely. There is still substantial uncertainty about how sensitive global temperatures will be to higher emissions over the long-term. But the best estimates now suggest that the world is on track for 3 degrees of warming by the end of this century, not 4 or 5 degrees as was once feared. That is due in part to slower economic growth in the wake of the global financial crisis, but also to decades of technology policy and energy-modernization efforts. “We have better and cleaner technologies available today because policy-makers in the U.S. and elsewhere set out to develop those technologies.” The energy intensity of the global economy continues to fall. Lower-carbon natural gas has displaced coal as the primary source of new fossil energy. The falling cost of wind and solar energy has begun to have an effect on the growth of fossil fuels. Even nuclear energy has made a modest comeback in Asia.

#### Extinction’s inevitable---only growth can sustain colonization and solve extinction

**Skran 16** [Dale Skran is Executive Vice President of the National Space Society and a member of the Board of Directors of the Alliance for Space Development. “Settling space is the only sustainable reason for humans to be in space,” <http://www.thespacereview.com/article/2915/1>]

As robotic and artificial intelligence technologies improve and enable increasingly robust exploration without a human presence, eventually there will be only one sustainable reason for humans to be in space: settlement. Research into the recycling technology required for long-term off-Earth settlements will directly benefit terrestrial sustainability. Actively working toward developing and settling space will make available mineral and energy resources for use on Earth on a vast scale. Finally, space settlement offers the hope of long-term species survival that remaining on Earth does not. There are more than seven billion people on the Earth today. No rational space settlement advocate suggests that any significant portion of that population, or even of those who are rich, will be moving to Mars or anywhere else in space. However, a recent essay by Astro Teller, head of Google X Labs, and his wife Danielle, a physician and researcher takes the bold position that “It’s completely ridiculous to think that humans could live on Mars.” This essay, published by Quartz, repeats with little examination some of the hoariest arguments against space settlement. To support this view, the Tellers quote their 12-year-old daughter: “I can’t stand that people think we’re all going to live on Mars after we destroy our own planet.” This quote contains two mischaracterizations that demand refutation: that “we are all” going to live in space and that we are going to live in space after we destroy Earth. Another canard that has long floated about was given form by the recent film Elysium starring Matt Damon: the rich will leave the poor on the Earth and escape to space settlements. Upon examination, all three of these ideas are strawmen. There are more than seven billion people on the Earth today. No rational space settlement advocate suggests that any significant portion of that population, or even of those who are rich, will be moving to Mars or anywhere else in space. Instead, we expect that relatively small numbers of highly qualified individuals, or those who are deeply dedicated to living in space, would form the first settlements. Over a significant period of time, thousands more from the Earth would join those settlements as they become increasingly self-sufficient. Over more time, various possible niches for settlement (Moon, Mars, asteroids, free space, etc.) will be occupied, and eventually the population in space will total many millions, most of whom will have been born in space. So why then do Elon Musk, Stephen Hawking, and many others, including organizations like the National Space Society (NSS) and Alliance for Space Development, believe strongly that space settlement is essential to human survival? Although this may seem surprising, the Earth is not a “safe space.” The destiny of virtually all species on Earth is extinction in a relatively short span of geologic time. The Tellers claim that “we live on a planet that is perfect for us.” This statement is both completely true and total nonsense. We fit well on the Earth because we have evolved over millions of years to become creatures that are both adapted to live here and to like living here. It is truer to say that we are perfect for the Earth than the reverse. In fact, the Earth is not such a commodious place. It is subject to periodic calamities of various sorts, ranging from massive asteroid and comet impacts to titanic volcanic eruptions, and from periodic ice ages to disastrous solar flares. In the short run, the Earth seems balmy and comfortable. Viewed from the perspective of deep time, it starts to look more like a death trap, bedeviled by regular mass extinctions. However, things are actually quite a bit worse. Although there are many potentially bad things that might happen to the human race on the Earth from natural sources, there are many more from unnatural sources. We have been dancing with nuclear disaster for a long time. An apocalyptic atomic war is not inevitable, but it is possible. Add to this scenario the genetically engineered killer virus, “gray goo,” a robot revolt, and other horrors as yet undreamt, and the odds against human survival get longer. Hence, the need to abandon the fiction of Earth as our eternal and unchanging perfect home and to appreciate both the need for, and promise of, space settlement. Not so the rich can escape to an Elysium in the sky, or so we can all leave behind a polluted and overheated Earth, but simply so that the human species and human culture has a chance at surviving and flourishing in the long term. The Tellers believe that sustainability on the Earth has no relationship to what we do in space, but the same technologies that enable deep space settlement will have a profound impact on terrestrial sustainability. The Tellers write, “We haven’t even colonized the Sahara desert, the bottom of the oceans… because it makes no economic sense.” This may be true, but it also makes no sense to settle the Sahara desert, the bottom of the oceans, or Antarctica since these locations are on the Earth, and humans living there will not increase the probability of species survival. Near-Earth free space settlements and lunar bases are just stepping stones to ones much further out that are quarantined from Earth by millions of kilometers of vacuum. Once the motivation of species survival is put front and center, it becomes clear that a settlement in low Earth orbit, on the Moon, at L5, or on the Martian surface is not nearly sufficient. What is needed is a large set of thriving communities distributed throughout the solar system, and even ultimately in the Oort Cloud surrounding the solar system proper. This vision is not a small thing. It will be the work of many generations, just as was the settling of the New World or, even earlier in history, the human diaspora out of Africa along the Asian coast to Australia and beyond. The Tellers believe that sustainability on the Earth has no relationship to what we do in space, but the same technologies that enable deep space settlement will have a profound impact on terrestrial sustainability. Space settlements, of necessity, push the limits of food production per square meter and per liter of water. Space settlement agricultural methods can also be applied to growing food in parched California or in vertical farms in crowded urban areas. Space settlements require humans and technology to co-exist in close proximity. This implies an absolute minimization of pollution and sustained recycling of all waste. Such technologies seem highly applicable to sustainability on Earth as well. We will need to provide the best possible medical care for remote space settlements, which will be far from hospitals on Earth. The technologies that make such medicine effective—“tricorders”, telemedicine, and so on—can also bring medical care to underdeveloped and underserved areas of the Earth. The Tellers raise the specter of “winter-over syndrome” in the Antarctic, writing that “living on Mars would be way, way more miserable than living in Antarctica,” and concluding, “Nobody wants to live there.” Although it is clear that the Tellers will not be going, the large numbers who signed up for Mars One’s sketchy settlement plans suggest that a lot of people do want to live on Mars. There are real challenges to constructing space settlements, but current Antarctic bases are not true settlements. Nobody lives there with their families, with the exception of the coastal Esperanza Base, where about ten families routinely winter over. No real effort is made to create any kind of human environment that is comfortable over a long period of time. Conditions in Antarctica might be better compared to living in a campground than a self-sustaining settlement. Additionally, the current Antarctic Treaty essentially prevents any extraction or use of the natural resources found there, thus making economically independent settlements infeasible. The Tellers think that, from an economic perspective, “Mars has nothing to offer in return.” Here, at least in the short run, they have a point. Let us not shy from the truth. Conditions in the early settlements in the New World were difficult at best, and the casualty rate was high. We should expect the same to hold true for early space settlements. However, Jamestown and Plymouth gave rise to vast cities and a tamed landscape on a scale of hundreds of years. We now bring to the table technological means that would seem magical to the Jamestown settlers. Even as difficult an environment as the Moon can be developed and settled using technology that either exists currently or is an engineering project, as one book suggests. The Tellers think that, from an economic perspective, “Mars has nothing to offer in return.” Here, at least in the short run, they have a point. Although Mars may have more of the natural resources a settlement will need than, say, the Moon, it is at the bottom of a fairly steep gravity well and, for the time being, it is not likely that there will be many Mars-to-Earth exports. However, this is like looking at the resources of the New World via a keyhole, seeing a swamp, and reporting back that there is no point in going there. It is worth keeping in mind the example of “Seward’s Folly.” The purchase of Alaska from Russia was mocked as “Seward’s icebox” and a “polar bear garden.” At the time, the oil and mineral riches of Alaska were undiscovered and undreamt of. Space itself teems with valuable resources, including continuous and abundant solar energy and mineral wealth on a scale beyond imagination just in the near Earth asteroids. Just as the Tellers were dismissing space resources as irrelevant, the US Congress was laying the legal groundwork for asteroid and lunar mining with the passage of the Commercial Space Launch Competitiveness Act, signed by President Obama on November 23, 2015. The Tellers also seem unaware that their leadership at Google, Larry Page and Eric Schmidt, are investors in the asteroid mining firm Planetary Resources. The Tellers say that “we won’t survive [on Earth] unless we learn to live in a resource neutral way.” This statement assumes that that Earth is a closed system, which it is not. The Earth is flooded daily with vast amounts of solar energy that, if exploited, could power just about any civilization we wish to maintain. There is no technical limitation to providing continuous, carbon-free power from space solar power satellites beaming power back to the surface of the Earth anywhere it might be needed. The main opposition to this idea derives from an unwillingness to consider centralized power systems on ideological grounds, combined with the unexpected reality of very cheap natural gas today. Even the most conservative consideration of near-Earth asteroid resources suggests that there is no reason to view the Earth as a closed system to which nothing can be added. The time for the settlement of Mars will come, but first we need to build on our success in developing the resources of Earth orbit, in the form of navigation, Earth observation, communication, and weather satellites, by fully developing the economic potential of the Earth-Moon system. Space settlements must flow out of the development of the economic resources of space if they are to be sustainable in the long term. The NSS has developed a complete description of milestones toward the development of space settlements. In view of the above, Astro Teller was probably right to turn down the “space cadet” who wanted Google X to spend money on Mars settlement. But wait—Google is doing exactly that. A key first step toward space settlement is ensuring a gapless transition from the existing International Space Station to commercially owned and operated LEO space stations as described in the NSS position paper “Next Generation Space Stations.” Next will come the development of the resources of the Moon and neaby asteroids leading to the creation of a self-sustaining Earth-Moon economy. Once we have established an asteroid-Earth-Moon economy that makes the resources found in this region fully available for projects ranging from the construction of solar power satellites to fueling future Mars missions, trips to Mars will be far less of a reach than they are today. In view of the above, Astro Teller was probably right to turn down the “space cadet” who wanted Google X to spend money on Mars settlement. Currently Google’s money would be better spent in low Earth orbit, among the asteroids, and on the Moon, joining forces with the growing number of entrepreneurs seeking their fortunes in space. But wait—Google is doing exactly that by sponsoring the Google Lunar X PRIZE to encourage private groups to send landers to the Moon, and investing $900 million in Elon Musk’s SpaceX. Given that corporate Google (now Alphabet) has just made a massive investment in a company founded to settle Mars, the Tellers’ essay sounds a bit like sour grapes. In any case, the Tellers are completely wrong in their disregard of the potential economic benefits of space development and the underlying motivation for space settlement.

#### Alt can’t solve---

#### The case---all of our internal links are based off of changing the extraterritorial application of antitrust laws

#### Their links---all of their links are to the status quo which means they have to win they create structural change in order to solve them.

#### Perf con takes out reps links – they use the same rhetoric in their 1nc

#### Alts that fiat substantial private actors are a voting issue---not assumed in the literature, disincentivizes good research, and overdetermines the debate

### 2ac---infrastructure

#### Infrastructure won't pass.

Elliott '9/16 [Philip; 9/16/21; Washington Correspondent for TIME; "Democrats Face a Grueling Two Weeks as Infighting Erupts Over Infrastructure," https://time.com/6098810/house-democrats-reconciliation/]

Put another way? Brace for some nasty politics over the next two weeks as House Speaker Nancy Pelosi tries to get this bill to a vote before the budget year ends on Sept. 30. And those 2,600 pages had better be recyclable.

Democrats can only afford three defectors if they want to usher this bill into law, and they’re perilously close to failure. So far, five centrist Democrats in the House have said they prefer a scaled-back version of the Medicare component. But if Pelosi gives the five centrists that win, she risks losing the support of progressives who are already sour that things like a punitive wealth tax and the end to tax loopholes aren’t present in the current version of the bill.

As it stands now, letting Medicare negotiate drug prices would save the government about $500 billion over the next decade. The scaled-back version doesn’t have an official cost, but a very similar version got its score in the Senate last year: roughly $100 billion in savings. Because Democrats are using a budgeting loophole to help them avoid a filibuster and pass this with bare majorities, that $400 billion gap matters a lot more than on most bills. Scaling back the Medicare savings means they would also have to scale back their overall spending on the bill—a big line in the sand for progressives who say they’ve already compromised too much.

All of this, of course, comes as President Joe Biden and his top aides in the White House have been trying to get Senate centrists onboard. Just yesterday, he met separately with Sens. Kyrsten Sinema and Joe Manchin, fellow Democrats who have expressed worries about the $3.5 trillion price tag but have been vague about what exactly they want to cut back on. With the Senate evenly divided at 50-50, and Vice President Kamala Harris in position to break the ties to Democrats’ victories, any shenanigans from those two independent thinkers scrambles the whole package.

Oh, and that other bipartisan infrastructure plan that carries $550 billion in new spending? It’s still sitting on the shelf in the House. Pelosi said she’d bring it to the floor only when the bigger—and entirely partisan—bill was ready. And there’s plenty of grumbling about that package, too.

If this is all beginning to sound like a scratched record that keeps repeating, it’s because this has become something of a pattern here in Washington. Things look pretty grim for legislation in town these days, despite Democrats controlling the House, the Senate and the White House. Their margin for error is literally zero, and so hiccups from a half-dozen centrists can forewarn a doomed agenda.

So far, Pelosi has been a master of holding the line on crucial votes and has managed to maneuver her team to victories, including on an earlier pandemic relief package that passed with only Democratic votes. Now she’s trying again, but the clock is ticking, and $3.5 trillion is an eye-popping sum of money that rivals the spending the United States unleashed to close out World War II.

Oh, and one more thing: the nation’s credit card is within weeks of becoming maxed out. And Republicans say they’re not going to up the limit, leaving Democrats to figure out how to do that at the same time. Even though a boost to the debt ceiling will cover money already spent—much of it during the Trump era—the GOP is going to leave Democrats holding this vote alone and won’t “facilitate” any change to D.C.’s borrowing power. Which adds another item to the tricky list of tasks facing Democrats on the Hill over the next two weeks.

#### Biden's antitrust executive order thumps.

NYT '21 [New York Times; 7/24/21; "Biden’s Antitrust Team Signals a Big Swing at Corporate Titans," https://www.nytimes.com/2021/07/24/business/biden-antitrust-amazon-google.html/]

The appointments show both the Democratic Party’s renewed antitrust activism and the Biden administration’s growing concern that the concentration of power in technology, as well as other industries like pharmaceuticals, agriculture, health care and finance, has hurt consumers and workers and stunted economic growth.

They also underscore that Mr. Biden is willing to use the power of his office and not wait for the tougher grind of congressional action, an approach that is both faster and potentially riskier. This month, he issued an executive order stuffed with 72 initiatives meant to stoke competition in a variety of industries, increase scrutiny of mergers and restrict the widespread practice of forcing workers to sign noncompete agreements.

#### Vote no---the plan has already been introduced---it costs capital to reject it.

#### Antitrust is bipartisan.

Baer ’20 [Bill; October 1; Visiting Fellow in Governance Studies, former Assistant Attorney General for Antitrust at the U.S. Department of Justice and Director of the Bureau of Competition at the Federal Trade Commission, J.D. from Stanford University; Testimony Before the United States House of Representatives, “Proposals to Strengthen the Antitrust Laws and Restore Competition Online,” <https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/Bill-Baer-10.1.20-Testimony-to-House-Antitrust-Subcommittee.pdf>]

What resulted was more rigor in antitrust analysis, enforcement, and judicial decision-making. Enforcers and the courts disciplined themselves to make sure that each enforcement action told a credible story of economic harm from the behavior being challenged. The antitrust agencies developed enforcement guidelines for mergers, intellectual property licensing, defense industry consolation, competitor collaborations, innovation, among others, that explained when certain behaviors and mergers caused or risked injury to competition and consumers. 4 And over time, the courts welcomed at least the merger guidelines as providing helpful explanations of how our antitrust laws should be applied in a late 20th and early 21st century economy.

The executive and legislative branches, whether led by Republicans or Democrats, were mostly on the same page. As a result, for the last 30 years or so, antitrust enforcement has been largely nonpartisan, driven by the widely shared view that harm to consumers and competition should be the predicate for challenging conduct. And that is a good thing. Analytically sound and fact-based antitrust enforcement, as I testified at my nomination hearing before the Senate Judiciary Committee in 2012, provides the public, the business community, the courts, and the legislative branch with some assurance that it is the merits that count—not political ideology, whim, or the desire to pick winners and losers in the economy.5 And it helps explain why there have been only modest pendulum swings in competition enforcement over the last few decades. Consistency and predictability enhance the credibility of antitrust enforcement.

#### Nobody cares about the plan---extraterritorial antitrust law isn’t contenious at all and increases competition which the republicans love

#### No reason why biden pushes the plan – it can be introduced by any number of senators who could push it

#### Fiat solves the link

#### Political capital doesn’t solve OR deplete.

Waldman 20 -- Paul Waldman, Communication PhD at the University of Pennsylvania, Politics Columnist at the Washington Post. [Joe Biden has to move fast, 12-2-20, https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2020/12/02/joe-biden-has-move-fast/]

As David Roberts of Vox observes: In 2009, Obama and his aides made the mistake of thinking that their major initiatives had to be rolled out one at a time in sequence, because he had a finite store of “political capital” that had to be spent carefully. But political capital is not something that exists apart from any particular issue; it isn’t a special sauce that has to be poured on a policy in order to make it palatable.

And with the parties as polarized and unified as they are, political capital has become all but meaningless. There may have been a time when a popular president possessed so much capital that a senator from the opposition party would feel compelled to support him on part of that president’s agenda, but that time is long gone. There is no account Biden can draw on to turn Republican “no” votes into “yes.”

So setting up a series of high-profile policy battles may be the opposite of what Biden should do. The unfortunate fact is that he may not have the opportunity to do much in the way of big legislation on health care or climate change or anything else, and if he has only executive power to work with, it makes it all the more urgent to move quickly.

Which means getting staff in place immediately and then unleashing them. The Revolving Door Project argues that Biden should give as much authority as possible to the agencies to let them dismantle their particular corners of the Trump legacy on their own, because the task “simply will not happen if approached sequentially or micromanaged” by a White House staff with limited bandwidth.

That means moving on every policy area all at once. There’s nothing to be gained by putting off any part of Biden’s agenda. Whatever he can do given the limits of his power, he should do as soon as possible, in a flood of policymaking.

Even if Democrats win both Georgia races and control the Senate, Biden should acknowledge that he likely has two years until the 2022 midterm elections to pass whatever legislation he can. Not only will Democrats probably lose one or both houses in the inevitable backlash (as happens to most presidents in their first midterm), the only possible chance at forestalling that result is to get results, as many as possible, that he can show the voters.

Republicans will complain that Biden is being partisan, uncompromising, taking a “my way or the highway” approach. It will be a strategy to convince everyone of the lie that Biden and Democrats might be able to find some way of winning them over, when in fact they’ll be implementing a strategy of total opposition.

If Biden follows them on that fruitless quest, he’ll be running in circles while crucial time passes and nothing gets done. The only option for him is to decide not to care about Republican whining and do what he got elected to do with all haste. The alternative is failure.

#### Reject non-intrinsic DAs – logical policy maker could pass the plan and the infrastructure bill

#### No internal link---no way the infrastructure package will be big enough to combat all of warming

#### Warming doesn’t cause extinction

Nordhaus 20 Ted Nordhaus, an American author, environmental policy expert, and the director of research at The Breakthrough Institute, citing new climate change forecasts. [Ignore the Fake Climate Debate, 1-23-2020, https://www.wsj.com/articles/ignore-the-fake-climate-debate-11579795816]//BPS

Beyond the headlines and social media, where Greta Thunberg, Donald Trump and the online armies of climate “alarmists” and “deniers” do battle, there is a real climate debate bubbling along in scientific journals, conferences and, occasionally, even in the halls of Congress. It gets a lot less attention than the boisterous and fake debate that dominates our public discourse, but it is much more relevant to how the world might actually address the problem. In the real climate debate, no one denies the relationship between human emissions of greenhouse gases and a warming climate. Instead, the disagreement comes down to different views of climate risk in the face of multiple, cascading uncertainties. On one side of the debate are optimists, who believe that, with improving technology and greater affluence, our societies will prove quite adaptable to a changing climate. On the other side are pessimists, who are more concerned about the risks associated with rapid, large-scale and poorly understood transformations of the climate system. But most pessimists do not believe that runaway climate change or a hothouse earth are plausible scenarios, much less that human extinction is imminent. And most optimists recognize a need for policies to address climate change, even if they don’t support the radical measures that Ms. Thunberg and others have demanded. In the fake climate debate, both sides agree that economic growth and reduced emissions vary inversely; it’s a zero-sum game. In the real debate, the relationship is much more complicated. Long-term economic growth is associated with both rising per capita energy consumption and slower population growth. For this reason, as the world continues to get richer, higher per capita energy consumption is likely to be offset by a lower population. A richer world will also likely be more technologically advanced, which means that energy consumption should be less carbon-intensive than it would be in a poorer, less technologically advanced future. In fact, a number of the high-emissions scenarios produced by the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change involve futures in which the world is relatively poor and populous and less technologically advanced. Affluent, developed societies are also much better equipped to respond to climate extremes and natural disasters. That’s why natural disasters kill and displace many more people in poor societies than in rich ones. It’s not just seawalls and flood channels that make us resilient; it’s air conditioning and refrigeration, modern transportation and communications networks, early warning systems, first responders and public health bureaucracies. New research published in the journal Global Environmental Change finds that global economic growth over the last decade has reduced climate mortality by a factor of five, with the greatest benefits documented in the poorest nations. In low-lying Bangladesh, 300,000 people died in Cyclone Bhola in 1970, when 80% of the population lived in extreme poverty. In 2019, with less than 20% of the population living in extreme poverty, Cyclone Fani killed just five people. “Poor nations are most vulnerable to a changing climate. The fastest way to reduce that vulnerability is through economic development.” So while it is true that poor nations are most vulnerable to a changing climate, it is also true that the fastest way to reduce that vulnerability is through economic development, which requires infrastructure and industrialization. Those activities, in turn, require cement, steel, process heat and chemical inputs, all of which are impossible to produce today without fossil fuels. For this and other reasons, the world is unlikely to cut emissions fast enough to stabilize global temperatures at less than 2 degrees above pre-industrial levels, the long-standing international target, much less 1.5 degrees, as many activists now demand. But recent forecasts also suggest that many of the worst-case climate scenarios produced in the last decade, which assumed unbounded economic growth and fossil-fuel development, are also very unlikely. There is still substantial uncertainty about how sensitive global temperatures will be to higher emissions over the long-term. But the best estimates now suggest that the world is on track for 3 degrees of warming by the end of this century, not 4 or 5 degrees as was once feared. That is due in part to slower economic growth in the wake of the global financial crisis, but also to decades of technology policy and energy-modernization efforts. “We have better and cleaner technologies available today because policy-makers in the U.S. and elsewhere set out to develop those technologies.” The energy intensity of the global economy continues to fall. Lower-carbon natural gas has displaced coal as the primary source of new fossil energy. The falling cost of wind and solar energy has begun to have an effect on the growth of fossil fuels. Even nuclear energy has made a modest comeback in Asia.

### Ftc cred

#### Alt causes to lack of cred

Goolsbee ’20 [Austan; September 30; Professor of economics at the University of Chicago’s Booth School of Business, has been a Department of Justice antitrust consultant, and was an adviser to President Barack Obama; *New York Times,* “Big Companies Are Starting to Swallow the World,” <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/09/30/business/big-companies-are-starting-to-swallow-the-world.html>; KS]

First, the enforcement budget for antitrust actions was already stretched way too thin even before the current crisis began. That budget has been falling for years and is lower now than it was two decades ago. The entire antitrust division of the Justice Department and the F.T.C. are being forced to operate on less than a single company like Facebook brings in over a few days. In the last 10 years, the number of merger filings (which notify the authorities of an intended merger) has almost doubled, but the number of enforcement actions taken by the government has actually fallen.

#### No link---the affis in the context of private suits able to sovle

#### The aff solves any tradeoff link – private litigation takes cases off the government’s docket

Harrington ‘15 [Joseph; 1/29/15; Patrick T. Harker Professor, Department of Business Economics & Public Policy, at The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania; CPI Antitrust Chronicle; “The Comity-Deterrence Tradeoff and the FTAIA: Motorola Mobility Revisited,” https://www.competitionpolicyinternational.com/the-comity-deterrence-trade-off-and-the-ftaia-motorola-mobility-revisited/]

Of greater relevance is the second reason for the lack of public enforcement, which is that the government suspects unlawful collusion but chooses not to litigate. The Antitrust Division of the U.S. Department of Justice (“DOJ”) has limited resources, which means all possible cases cannot be pursued. Furthermore, the presence of a resource constraint impacts the type of cases that are pursued. These days, the DOJ’s caseload is heavily oriented to cases involving the leniency program but not all forms of collusion lend themselves to a firm receiving amnesty. A member of a hard-core cartel engaged in a per se offense can expect to receive leniency if it is the first to come forward but there are many cases of collusion that do not involve behavior that is per se unlawful. Given the lower threshold for a conviction in a civil case, private litigation has been, and will continue to be, essential in prosecuting these less flagrant, but no less harmful, forms of collusion.  
While it is difficult to document case selection by the DOJ, there is certainly evidence consistent with it being a substantive factor. In noting that the DOJ obtained convictions in 92 percent of 699 cases filed over 1992 to 2008, Professors Robert Lande and Joshua Davis comment:17

The DOJ appears much more willing to tolerate a false negative (a failure to prosecute a violation of the antitrust laws) than a false positive (litigating a case when in fact there was no violation). In other words, it appears the DOJ chooses not to pursue litigation in many meritorious cases, perhaps at least in part because it lacks the necessary resources. This may well create a need for private litigation as a complement to government enforcement of the antitrust laws.

#### Aff solves internal link—CBR allows missles which solves

#### No Chance of loose nukes impact

**Press**, Associate Professor of Government at Dartmouth College, **13** (Daryl, “Why States Won’t Give Nuclear Weapons to Terrorists,” International Security 38.1 p. muse)

Counterarguments

Critics of our analysis might offer several counterarguments. First, the problem of “loose nukes” might give state sponsors of nuclear terrorism an opportunity for avoiding responsibility for their actions. Second, one might discount empirical evidence about the attribution rate of conventional terror attacks because attributing a nuclear attack would be different—and harder—than attributing an act of conventional terrorism. Third, one might argue that some states will still be tempted to resort to nuclear attack by proxy because the threat of retaliation by the victim would lack credibility given the inherent uncertainty that would persist even in a case of so-called successful attribution.

Counterargument #1: Capitalizing On “Loose Nukes”

In the wake of a nuclear detonation, investigators would need to consider the possibility that the nuclear device or fissile materials were obtained without the consent of any state. The attack might not have resulted from a state’s attack-by-proxy strategy, but rather from the problem of “loose nukes”—poorly secured nuclear weapons or materials falling into the wrong hands through illicit means. Knowing that a victim would need to at least consider the possibility of nuclear theft, a state sponsor might hope to succeed with its nuclear handoff under one of two logics. First, a state might give nuclear weapons or materials to a terrorist organization with full awareness that it would be identified as the source, but then try to avoid responsibility by claiming that the weapons or materials had been stolen from its stockpiles. Second, a state might give nuclear weapons or materials to a terrorist organization and try to avoid responsibility by claiming that the weapons or materials were stolen from a different foreign stockpile.

The first strategy—giving nuclear weapons to terrorists and then pleading guilty to the lesser charge of maintaining inadequate stockpile security—is highly dubious. Any state rational enough to seek to avoid retaliation for a nuclear attack would recognize the incredible risk that this strategy entails. In the wake of an act of nuclear terrorism, facing an enraged and vindictive victim, would the state sponsor step forward to admit that its weapons or materials were used to attack a staunch enemy, with the hope that the victim would believe a story about theft and grant clemency on those grounds? If that logic does not appear implausible enough, recall that no state would be likely to give its nuclear weapons or materials to a terrorist organization with which it did not have a long record of cooperation and trust. Thus, a state sponsor acknowledging that it was the source of materials used in a nuclear attack would be doing so in light of its enemies’ knowledge that the terrorists who allegedly [End Page 96] stole the materials happened to have been its close collaborators in prior acts of terrorism. This strategy would be nearly as suicidal as launching a direct nuclear attack.37

The second strategy—giving nuclear weapons to terrorists and then hiding behind the possibility that they were stolen from some unspecified insecure foreign source—deserves greater scrutiny. The list of potential global sources of fissile material seems long. Nine countries possess nuclear weapons, and eleven more have enough fissile material to fashion a crude fission device.38 In 2011 the world’s stockpile of highly enriched uranium (HEU), the fissile material most likely to be sought by terrorists,39 was about 1.3 million kilograms, meaning that the material needed for a single crude weapon could be found within the rounding error of the rounding error of global stocks. Perhaps, therefore, nearly all twenty countries with sufficient stocks of fissile material would need to join the lineup of suspects after a terrorist nuclear attack, not as possible sponsors but as potential victims of theft. And if enough fissile material to make a nuclear weapon could be purloined from any of these countries, [End Page 97] then perhaps the victim would be unable to rule out all possible sources and thus be unable to punish the real culprit.

This gloomy picture overstates the difficulty of determining the source of stolen material after a nuclear terrorist attack. In the wake of a detonation, the possibility of stolen fissile material complicates the task of attribution—but only marginally. At the end of the Cold War, several countries—particularly in the former Soviet Union—confronted major nuclear security problems, but great progress has been made since then.40 Although no country has perfect nuclear security, today the greatest concerns surround just five countries: Belarus, Japan, Pakistan, Russia, and South Africa.41 In addition, not all of those states are equally worrisome as potential sources of nuclear theft. Substantial concerns exist about the security of fissile materials in Pakistan and Russia (the latter if simply because of the large size of its stockpile), but Belarus, Japan, and South Africa would likely be quickly and easily ruled out as the source of stolen fissile material. Belarus has a relatively small stockpile of fissile material—approximately 100 kilograms of HEU42 —so in the wake of a nuclear terrorist attack, it would be easy for Belarus to show that its stockpile remained intact.43 Similarly, Japan (one of the United States’ closest allies) and [End Page 98] South Africa would be keen to allow the United States to verify the integrity of their full stocks of materials. (In the wake of a nuclear terror attack, a lack of full cooperation in showing all materials accounted for would be highly revealing.) Iran is not believed to have any weapons-usable nuclear material to steal,44 although that could change. In short, a nuclear handoff strategy disguised as a loose nukes problem would be very precarious.45

Counterargument #2: Conventional Versus Nuclear Attribution

The evidence presented above shows that the perpetrators of terror attacks against the United States or its allies in which ten or more people are killed on home territory are almost always identified. But these data are based solely on conventional terror attacks. Might acts of nuclear terror be harder to attribute than their conventional cousins?

With no actual cases of nuclear terrorism to examine, it is impossible to know for sure how the challenges of attribution after a nuclear attack would compare to the difficult police and intelligence work that led to attribution in the thousands of cases of conventional terrorism. Logic suggests at least one reason why it might be harder to identify the perpetrators of nuclear terrorism, but many other factors suggest that nuclear attribution would be easier than solving conventional incidents of terrorism. Taken together, these arguments suggest that the data presented above may well understate the actual likelihood of nuclear attribution.

Identifying the perpetrators of a nuclear terror attack, as opposed to a conventional terror incident, would be harder because a nuclear detonation would destroy much of the evidence near the site of the attack. In the aftermath of a conventional bombing, investigators check nearby security cameras for images of the attackers, sift through the debris to recover physical evidence, and interview witnesses. This sort of evidence has proved useful in several terror investigations. For instance, investigators found the vehicle identification number (VIN) from the trucks used to bomb the World Trade Center in 1993 and to destroy the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City in 1995.46 A nuclear detonation, however, would leave little (if any) of such evidence. [End Page 99]

Although investigators always prefer to have physical evidence from the scene of a bombing, in high-profile investigations such evidence is used in conjunction with vast quantities of other data: for example, information about the activities of terror groups already under surveillance before the attack; intercepted cellphone and internet communications; reports from agents embedded with known terror groups; and similar types of information shared by friendly governments. In fact, while the VIN number was useful in solving the 1993 World Trade Center attack, it was far less important in the Oklahoma City bombing investigation, because the key suspect was in custody before the on-site evidence was gathered. Nevertheless, the loss of evidence from the attack site would complicate the attribution of a nuclear terror attack relative to a conventional terror incident.

There are at least five reasons, however, to expect that attributing a nuclear terrorist attack would be easier than attributing a conventional terrorist attack. First, no terrorism investigation in history has had the resources that would be deployed to investigating the source of a nuclear terror attack—particularly one against the United States or a U.S. ally. Rapidly attributing the attack would be critical, not merely as a first step toward satisfying the rage of the victims but, more importantly, to determine whether additional nuclear attacks were imminent. The victim would use every resource at its disposal—money, threats, and force—to rapidly identify the source of the attack.47 If necessary, any investigation would go on for a long time; it would never “blow over” from the victim’s standpoint.

The second reason why attributing a nuclear terror attack would be easier than attributing a conventional terrorist attack is the level of international assistance the victim would likely receive from allies, neutrals, and even adversaries. An attack on the United States, for example, would likely trigger unprecedented intelligence cooperation from its allies, if for no other reason than the fear that subsequent attacks might target them. Perhaps more important, even adversaries of the United States—particularly those with access to fissile materials—would have enormous incentives to quickly demonstrate their innocence. To avoid being accused of sponsoring or supporting the attack, and thus to avoid the wrath of the United States, these countries would likely go to great lengths to demonstrate that their weapons were accounted for, that their fissile materials had different isotopic properties than the type used in the attack, and that they were sharing any information they had on the [End Page 100] attack. The cooperation that the United States received from Iran and Pakistan in the wake of the September 11 attacks illustrates how potential adversaries may be motivated to help in the aftermath of an attack and stay off the target list for retaliation.48 The pressure to cooperate after an anonymous nuclear detonation on U.S. soil would be many times greater.49

Third, the strong positive relationship between the number of fatalities stemming from an attack and the rate of attribution (as depicted in figures 1 to 3 above) suggests that the probability of attribution after a nuclear attack—with its enormous casualties—should be even higher. The 97 percent attribution rate for attacks that killed ten or more people on U.S. soil or that of its allies is based on a set of attacks that were pinpricks compared to nuclear terrorism. The data in those figures suggest that our conclusions understate the actual likelihood of nuclear attribution.

Fourth, the challenge of attribution after a terrorist nuclear attack should be easier than after a conventional terrorist attack, because the investigation would begin with a highly restricted suspect list. In the case of a conventional terror attack against the United States or an ally, one might begin the investigation at the broadest level with the U.S. Department of State’s list of fifty-one foreign terrorist organizations. In the case of a nuclear terror attack, only fifteen of these FTOs have state sponsors—and only one sponsor (Pakistan) has either nuclear weapons or fissile materials. (If Iran acquires nuclear weapons, that number will grow to two, but there is no overlap between the terror groups that Pakistan supports and those that Iran assists.)

Finally, any operation to detonate a nuclear weapon would involve complex planning and coordination—securing the weapon, learning to use it, planning the time and location of detonation, moving the weapon to the target, and conducting the attack. Even if only a small cadre of operatives knew the nuclear nature of the attack, the planning of a spectacular operation would be hard to keep [End Page 101] secret.50 For example, six months prior to the September 11 attacks, Western intelligence detected numerous indications that al-Qaida was planning a major attack. The intelligence was not specific enough—or the agencies were not nimble enough—to prevent the operation, but the indicators were “blinking red” for months, directing U.S. attention to al-Qaida as soon as the attacks began.51

Counterargument #3: Uncertainty and Failed Deterrence

Skeptics of our confidence in the feasibility of post-nuclear attack attribution might emphasize the role of uncertainty in constraining the response of the victim. Attribution, after all, is not a binary outcome but a matter of probabilities. Each of the cases of “successful attribution” in the data we used reflects a consensus among GTD researchers that a particular group carried out an attack—but there are few cases in which the list of the guilty parties is certain. Without such certainty, a victim of nuclear terrorism would arguably be constrained in its response against a suspected sponsor. Believing this, a state comparing the option of a direct nuclear attack to sponsorship of a terrorist strike might prefer the latter, counting on residual attribution uncertainty to dampen the response.

There are two problems with this counterargument. First, while attribution uncertainty might restrain a state from responding to an act of nuclear terror with a major nuclear retaliatory strike, that option is not the only devastating response available to a country such as the United States or one of its allies. Indeed, regardless of the level of attribution certainty, a nuclear strike might not be the preferred response. For example, in the wake of a nuclear terror attack against the United States thought to be sponsored by Pakistan, Iran, or North Korea, U.S. leaders might not feel compelled to determine those countries’ guilt “beyond a reasonable doubt” or to narrow down the suspect list further; Washington might simply decide that the era in which “rogue states” possessed nuclear weapons must end, and threaten to conquer any country that refused to disarm or that was less than forthcoming about the terror attack.52

Second, this counterargument would be unlikely to carry much weight with a leader contemplating nuclear attack by proxy. A leader tempted to attack because of the prospect of residual attribution uncertainty and the hope that such uncertainty would restrain his victim from lashing out in retaliation would need enormous confidence in the humaneness of his enemy, even at a time [End Page 102] when that enemy would be boiling over with rage. For example, could one really imagine an Iranian aide convincing the supreme leader that if Iran gave a nuclear bomb to Hezbollah, knowing that Israel would strongly suspect Iran as the source, Israel’s leaders would be too restrained by their deep humanity and lingering doubts about sponsorship to retaliate harshly against Tehran?

In fact, the U.S. response to the September 11 attacks, including the invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq, indicates a willingness to retaliate strongly against those directly culpable (al-Qaida), their associates (the Taliban), and others simply deemed to be troublemakers in the neighborhood (Iraq). There was debate in the United States over the strategic wisdom of invading Iraq, but none of Saddam Hussein’s crimes—either known, suspected, or fabricated—were held to an evidentiary standard even close to certainty.53 States that consider giving nuclear weapons to terrorists cannot be certain how the victim will react, but basing one’s hope for survival on a victim’s reluctance to act on partial evidence of culpability would be a tremendous gamble.

A nuclear terror strike would have momentous consequences. In the case of an attack on the United States, such a strike would draw the full investigative, diplomatic, and military might of the world’s only superpower. In that environment, the incentives for allies, neutrals, and adversaries to cooperate would be immense. Therefore, the data offered in figures 1 to 3 (which show attribution rates after attacks that are, by comparison to a nuclear event, mere pinpricks) probably greatly underestimate the odds of attribution. Uncertainties about the full list of possible accomplices might endure, but the notion that a victim of a nuclear terrorist attack would be paralyzed by those uncertainties is far-fetched.

Conclusion

President Obama has identified nuclear terrorism as “the single biggest threat to U.S. security,” describing it as “something that could change the security landscape of this country and around the world for years to come.”54 The prospect of an adversary state covertly giving a nuclear weapon or nuclear materials to a terrorist organization has been the animating force in U.S. grand strategy for more than a decade. The scenario was used to justify the invasion of Iraq and toppling of the Iraqi regime in 2003; and in 2012 and 2013, proponents of a preventive military strike on Iran’s nuclear facilities frequently argued that such attacks are necessary to eliminate the possibility of Iran trying a [End Page 103] nuclear attack by proxy against Israel or the United States. We demonstrate here that such fears are overblown. The rationale for state sponsorship of nuclear terrorism lacks sound deductive logic and is empirically unsupported by the most relevant available evidence.

The United States and its allies should be able to deter nuclear-armed states from passing their weapons to terrorists, because a terrorist nuclear strike would not remain anonymous for long and would soon be traced back to the originating state. This conclusion is based on two empirical findings. First, among the relevant past cases of conventional terrorist attacks—those targeting the homelands of powerful states and causing significant casualties—almost all were successfully attributed to the perpetrating terrorist organization. Second, linking the attributed terrorist organization to a state sponsor would not be difficult. Few foreign terrorist organizations have state sponsors; those that do typically have only one; and only one suspected state sponsor of terrorism (Pakistan) has nuclear weapons or sufficient stockpiles of nuclear materials.

Furthermore, potential sponsors of nuclear terror face a wicked dilemma: to maintain distance by passing the weapon to a terrorist group they do not know well or trust, or to maintain control by giving it to a group they have cooperated with repeatedly. The former strategy is mind-bogglingly dangerous; the latter option makes attribution from terror group to sponsor simple.

Our findings have two important policy implications. First, the fear of nuclear attack by proxy by itself does not justify costly military steps to prevent nuclear proliferation. Nuclear proliferation may pose a variety of other risks, and the appropriate level of U.S. efforts to stop proliferation should depend on the cumulative effect of these risks, but the dangers of a nuclear handoff to terrorists have been overstated. For example, Iranian leaders would have to be crazy or suicidal to think that they could give a nuclear weapon to one of their terrorist collaborators and face no repercussions. If leaders were that irrational, the bigger problem would be direct nuclear attack without concern for the retaliatory consequences, not the alleged problem of a nuclear handoff.

### litigation

#### No internal link – their grant ev says its costly plaintiffs and enforcers which doesn’t link to the courts because the same amount of time in the courts

#### ‘Patent holdups’ are a lie. Antitrust policies are a greater threat.

Barnett ’18 [Jonathan, Ronald A. Cass, Richard A. Epstein, Douglas H. Ginsburg, Gus Hurwitz, David J. Kappos, Paul Michel, Adam Mossoff, Kristen Osenga, David J. Teece, and Joshua D. Wright; February 22; Professor at the USC Gould School of Law; Dean Emeritus of the Boston University School of Law; Law Professor at New York University; Senior Circuit Judge, United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, Law Professor at George Mason University; Law Professor at the University of Nebraska; Former Under Secretary of Commerce and Director of the United States Patent & Trademark Office; Retired Chief Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit; Law Professor at George Mason University; Professor at the University of Richmond School of Law; Thomas W. Tusher Professor in Global Business at the University of California at Berkeley; Former Commissioner of the Federal Trade Commissioner, Law Professor at George Mason University; IP Watchdog, “Apply Evidence-based Approach to Antitrust Law Equally to Innovators and Implementers,” https://www.ipwatchdog.com/2018/02/22/evidence-based-application-antitrust-law/id=93755/]

As judges, former judges and government officials, legal academics and economists who are experts in antitrust and intellectual property law, we write to express our support for your recent announcement that the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice will adopt an evidence-based approach in applying antitrust law equally to both innovators who develop and implementers who use technological standards in the innovation industries.

We disagree with the letter recently submitted to you on January 24, 2018 by other parties who expressed their misgivings with your announcement of your plan to return to this sound antitrust policy. Unfortunately, their January 24 letter perpetuates the long-standing misunderstanding held by some academics, policy activists, and companies, who baldly assert that one-sided “patent holdup” is a real-world problem in the high-tech industries. This claim rests entirely on questionable models that predict that opportunistic behavior in patent licensing transactions will result in higher consumer prices. These predictions are inconsistent with actual market data in any high-tech industry.

It bears emphasizing that no empirical study has demonstrated that a patent-owner’s request for injunctive relief after a finding of a defendant’s infringement of its property rights has ever resulted either in consumer harm or in slowing down the pace of technological innovation. Given the well understood role that innovation plays in facilitating economic growth and wellbeing, a heavy burden of proof rests on those who insist on the centrality of “patent holdup” to offer some tangible support for that view, which they have ultimately failed to supply in the decade or more since that theory was first propounded. Given the contrary conclusions in economic studies of the past decade, there is no sound empirical basis for claims of a systematic problem of opportunistic “patent holdup” by owners of patents on technological standards.

Several empirical studies demonstrate that the observed pattern in high-tech industries, especially in the smartphone industry, is one of constant lower quality-adjusted prices, increased entry and competition, and higher performance standards. These robust findings all contradict the testable implications of “patent holdup” theory. The best explanation for this disconnect between the flawed “patent holdup” theory and overwhelming weight of the evidence lies in the institutional features that surround industry licensing practices. These practices include bilateral licensing negotiations, and the reputation effects in long-term standards activities. Both support a feed-back mechanism that creates a system of natural checks and balances in the setting of royalty rates. The simplistic models of “patent holdup” ignore all these moderating effects.

Of even greater concern are the likely negative social welfare consequences of prior antitrust policies implemented based upon nothing more than the purely theoretical concern about opportunistic “patent holdup” behavior by owners of patented innovations incorporated 2 into technological standards. For example, those policies have resulted in demands to set royalty rates for technologies incorporated into standards in the smartphone industry according to particular components in a smartphone. This was a change to the longstanding industry practice of licensing at the end-user device level, which recognized that fundamental technologies incorporated into the cellular standards like 2G, 3G, etc., optimize the entire wireless system and network, and not just the specific chip or component of a chip inside a device.

#### Federal court clog now – it’s been a crisis for decades

Davis 2/25/21 (Kristina, staff @ San Diego Union-Tribune, "Overwhelmed federal courts ask Congress for more judges," https://www.sandiegouniontribune.com/news/courts/story/2021-02-25/federal-courts-congress-relief)

Overwhelming caseloads, substantial litigation delays and spiraling costs have prompted Congress to take a fresh look at expanding the number of judges sitting on lower federal courts.

In a hearing Wednesday held by the House Committee on the Judiciary, both congress members and witnesses, including those from San Diego, characterized the situation as a crisis that has been decades in the making.

“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.

#### Jan 6 prosecutions thump – causing court clog now

Gerstein and Cheney 3/10/21 (Josh and Kyle, Politico, "Capitol riot cases strain court system," https://www.politico.com/news/2021/03/10/capitol-riot-court-cases-475081)

The transcontinental hearing — with the prosecutor in Alaska, the defendant in Michigan and other participants in the D.C. area — underscored the extraordinary lengths to which the Justice Department and courts are going to prosecute and process hundreds of people accused of storming the Capitol on Jan. 6. With the D.C.-based team of federal prosecutors stretched thin, the Justice Department has called in a cavalry of far-flung reinforcements.

A POLITICO review of the more than 250 (and climbing) cases related to the Capitol breach shows that federal prosecutors from Fort Lauderdale to Wichita to San Francisco have heeded that call. So far, over 30 cases are assigned to attorneys who appear to be outside the staff of the U.S. Attorney’s Office in Washington as it tackles what may be the most sprawling prosecution in U.S. history related to a single event.

For context: the office’s 2021 criminal caseload includes fewer than 20 federal prosecutions that aren’t connected to the Capitol assault.

The ever-expanding probe, which President Joe Biden’s incoming attorney general Merrick Garland has called his top immediate priority, has increasingly strained the justice system and required extraordinary measures to churn through a growing roster of cases. Dozens are simple trespassing cases, but others allege brutal assaults on Capitol police officers while a mob loyal to former President Donald Trump overran Congress and forced a delay in the formal counting of electoral votes. Hundreds more cases are expected to land on the docket in the next few weeks and months.

#### Immigration thumps

TCR 3/16/21 (The Crime Report, "Immigration Cases Took 41% of Federal Caseload in 2020," https://thecrimereport.org/2021/03/16/1242803/)

Immigration offenses, followed by drug trafficking, were the most common crimes sentenced in federal courts last year, according to the U.S. Sentencing Commission (USSC). Reflecting the former administration’s crackdown on undocumented immigrants, immigration violations alone accounted for 41 percent of the caseload, a slight uptick from 38 percent the previous year, the USSC said in its annual report.

#### 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.

## 1ar

#### Disease won’t cause extinction—vaccines, immunity, and technology check

**Adalja 6/7 –**MD in medicine @ American University, fellow @ American College of Physicians, member of the Infectious Disease Society of America's Public Health Committee, Senior Associate @ University of Pittsburgh Medical Center, Clinical Assistant Professor in the Department of Critical Care Medicine, Clinical Assistant Professor in the Department of Emergency Medicine, Adjunct Instructor in the Department of Medicine’s Division of Infectious Diseases(Amesh, “Why Hasn't Disease Wiped out the Human Race?” The Atlantic,[http://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2016/06/infectious-diseases-extinction/487514/)//ghs-sr](http://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2016/06/infectious-diseases-extinction/487514/)/ghs-sr)

Any apocalyptic pathogen would need to possess a very special combination of two attributes. First, it would have to be so unfamiliar that no existing therapy or vaccine could be applied to it. Second, it would need to have a high and surreptitious transmissibility before symptoms occur.The first is essential because any microbe from a known class of pathogens would, by definition, have family members that could serve as models for containment and countermeasures. The second would allow the hypothetical disease to spread without being detected by even the most astute clinicians. The three infectious diseases most likely to be considered extinction-level threats in the world today—influenza, HIV, and Ebola—don’t meet these two requirements. Influenza, for instance, despite its well-established ability to kill on a large scale, its contagiousness, and its unrivaled ability to shift and drift away from our vaccines, is still what I would call a “known unknown.” While there are many mysteries about how new flu strains emerge, from at least the time of Hippocrates, humans have been attuned to its risk. And in the modern era, a full-fledged industry of influenza preparedness exists, with effective vaccine strategies and antiviral therapies. HIV, which has killed 39 million people over several decades, is similarly limited due to several factors. Most importantly, HIV’s dependency on blood and body fluid for transmission (similar to Ebola) requires intimate human-to-human contact, which limits contagion. Highly potent antiviral therapy allows most people to live normally with the disease, and a substantial group of the population has genetic mutations that render them impervious to infection in the first place. Lastly, simple prevention strategies such as needle exchange for injection drug users and barrier contraceptives—when available—can curtail transmission risk. Ebola, for many of the same reasons as HIV as well as several others, also falls short of the mark. This is especially due to the fact that it spreads almost exclusively through people with easily recognizable symptoms, plus the taming of its once unfathomable 90 percent mortality rate by simple supportive care. Beyond those three, every other known disease falls short of what seems required to wipe out humans—which is, of course, why we’re still here. And it’s not that diseases are ineffective. On the contrary, diseases’ failure to knock us out is a testament to just how resilient humans are. Part of our evolutionary heritage is our immune system, one of the most complex on the planet, even without the benefit of vaccines or the helping hand of antimicrobial drugs. This system, when viewed at a species level, can adapt to almost any enemy imaginable. Coupled to genetic variations amongst humans—which open up the possibility for a range of advantages, from imperviousness to infection to a tendency for mild symptoms—this adaptability ensures that almost any infectious disease onslaught **will leave a large proportion of the population alive** to rebuild, in contrast to the fictional Hollywood versions. While the immune system’s role can never be understated, an even more powerful protector is the faculty of consciousness. Humans are not the most prolific, quickly evolving, or strongest organisms on the planet, but as Aristotle identified, humans are the rational animals—and it is this fundamental distinguishing characteristic that allows humans to form abstractions, think in principles, and plan long-range. These capacities, in turn, allow **humans to modify, alter, and improve themselves** and their environments. Consciousness equips us, at an individual and a species level, to make nature safe for the species through such technological marvels as antibiotics, antivirals, vaccines, and sanitation.When humans began to focus their minds on the problems posed by infectious disease, human life ceased being nasty, brutish, and short. In many ways, human consciousness became infectious diseases’ worthiest adversary.