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#### Advantage One is Energy:

#### The filed-rate doctrine is a ‘zombie energy law,’ shielding undead companies from liability for anticompetitive behavior.

Macey ’20 [Joshua; 2020; Law Professor at Cornell; Vanderbilt Law Review, “Zombie Energy Laws,” vol. 73, no. 4]

Today, these “zombie energy laws” entrench incumbent market power and prevent the deployment of renewables.15 The filed rate doctrine, for example, continues to shield energy companies from civil antitrust suits even though most energy companies no longer formally file rates with regulators.16 The requirement that regulators assess the financial viability of transmission projects before issuing a certificate of public convenience and necessity to site new transmission lines is a vestigial remnant of a rule that was once needed to prevent new entry into a utility’s exclusive service territory.17 In these ways, courts and regulators have clung to many of the rules that were created to protect customers in the public utility era but have since outlived their useful purpose.18

Footnote 16:

16. See Rossi, supra note 11, at 1646 (noting how courts have “allow[ed] the filed tariff doctrine to become an independent, firm-specific antitrust defense”). In twin cases decided in 1956, the Supreme Court instructed the Federal Power Commission (the regulatory predecessor to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“FERC”)) to presume that any freely negotiated wholesale transaction was “just and reasonable” for purposes of the Federal Power Act and the Natural Gas Act. See Fed. Power Comm’n v. Sierra Pac. Power Co., 350 U.S. 348, 372 (1956) (holding that contract rates freely negotiated between sophisticated parties meet the just-andreasonable standard required by the Federal Power Act, even if they are unprofitable to the public utility); United Gas Pipe Line Co. v. Mobile Gas Serv. Corp., 350 U.S. 332, 344–45, 347 (1956) (same, but for the purposes of the Natural Gas Act). The presumption that freely negotiated energy contracts are “just and reasonable” applies even if FERC did not have an initial opportunity to review the contract. See NRG Power Mktg., LLC v. Me. Pub. Utils. Comm’n, 558 U.S. 165, 167 (2010) (“Under this Court’s Mobile–Sierra doctrine, FERC must presume that a rate set by ‘a freely negotiated wholesale-energy contract’ meets the statutory ‘just and reasonable’ requirement.”); Morgan Stanley Capital Grp. Inc. v. Pub. Util. Dist. No. 1, 554 U.S. 527, 530 (2008) (“The presumption may be overcome only if FERC concludes that the contract seriously harms the public interest.”).

Article continues:

These zombie energy laws are now seriously degrading energy markets. They allow incumbents to raise prices and, worse, prevent clean energy companies from competing with incumbent fossil fuel generators. For example, Arkansas regulators recently blocked a multibillion dollar transmission line that would have enabled more than $7 billion of investment in renewable energy facilities after finding that only incumbent utilities are eligible to receive a certificate of public convenience and necessity in the state of Arkansas.19 Although the project would have reduced electricity prices in the southeast and provided enough clean energy to power over a million homes a year, it has been repeatedly delayed in part because state energy regulators have determined that only incumbent utilities were legally authorized to construct new transmission lines.20 The certificate of public convenience and necessity was originally designed to ensure that rate regulated utilities were able to honor their service obligations. Today, the requirement that regulators assess market demand before granting a certificate of public convenience and necessity entrenches incumbent market power and impedes the development of renewable suppliers.

Numerous scholars and policymakers have questioned the usefulness of these doctrines.21 This Article’s contribution is therefore not to provide a novel critique of these zombie energy laws. It is instead to point out that many of the seemingly diffuse problems that pervade modern electric power markets can be attributed to the historical origins of electricity regulation. All of these laws emerged to mitigate market power abuses under a regulatory system that has largely been abandoned. Their continued application is now facilitating market power abuses and blocking the development of cleaner and cheaper energy sources.

#### The doctrine serves no purpose in energy markets. Studies suggest FERC regulation can’t fix the market without restructuring the exception.

Macey ’20 [Joshua; 2020; Law Professor at Cornell; Vanderbilt Law Review, “Zombie Energy Laws,” vol. 73, no. 4]

The filed rate doctrine might have been a sensible rule when generators were regulated as public utilities. It is difficult to imagine how a plaintiff could have brought an antitrust case in court when utilities had a legal right to a monopoly and when regulators determined what prices were reasonable. The problem with the filed rate doctrine today is that many generators no longer actually file rates with public service commissioners.173

Footnote 173:

173. See Fed. Energy Regulatory Comm’n v. Elec. Power Supply Ass’n, 136 S. Ct. 760, 768 (2016):

Decades ago, state or local utilities controlled their own power plants, transmission lines, and delivery systems, operating as vertically integrated monopolies in confined geographic areas. That is no longer so. Independent power plants now abound, and almost all electricity flows not through “the local power networks of the past,” but instead through an interconnected “grid” of near-nationwide scope.

(quoting New York v. Fed. Energy Regulatory Comm’n, 535 U.S. 1, 7 (2002)).

The article continues:

Energy markets look radically different than they did a century ago. Much of the country’s generation is now compensated through competitive procurements, and, as of 2018, thirty-six percent of all generation is produced by independent power producers that are unaffiliated with investor-owned utilities.174 In the mid-1950s, the Supreme Court announced that it would assume that rates that had been negotiated at arm’s length were just and reasonable.175 Thus, in most of the country, private ordering—not formal ratemaking proceedings—now determines the profits generators make when they sell electricity.176

There is therefore no need for regulators to worry that antitrust suits will prevent the public service commissions from realizing their mandate to prevent discriminatory rates, because regulators in these parts of the country no longer rely on ratemaking proceedings to ensure that rates are just and reasonable. In fact, FERC now presumes that freely negotiated contracts are just and reasonable.177 When FERC and state energy regulators presume, without reviewing contracts in a ratemaking proceeding, that all freely negotiated contracts are just and reasonable, they do not have an opportunity to assess whether a contract has anticompetitive effects.

Yet the application of the filed rate doctrine to competitive energy markets means that market participants are largely shielded from the laws that mitigate anticompetitive behavior in ordinary markets. In 1986, the Supreme Court affirmed the filed rated doctrine on stare decisis grounds, and it did so despite recognizing that the doctrine no longer served its original purpose.178 Without authority to enforce antitrust laws, consumers have to trust that regulators will prevent collusive behavior and monopolistic pricing.

And regulators have failed to prevent market power abuses in electricity markets. Consider the 2000–2001 California energy crisis. At the turn of the twenty-first century, large generators began to strategically refuse to sell electricity until prices rose to astronomical levels.179 Companies such as Enron would purposefully export electricity that was needed in the state to neighboring states such as Nevada in order to drive up California electricity prices.180 Pacific Gas and Electric (“PG&E”), one of the two California companies that purchased electricity from generators to sell to consumers, was forced into bankruptcy when it found itself unable to afford electricity it was required to supply to Californians.181 This type of behavior contributed to market inefficiencies worth an estimated $12 billion.182 Suppliers’ anticompetitive behavior was one of the reasons wholesale prices increased so dramatically and was thus one of the reasons California had to implement rolling blackouts.183

Other states have experienced similar abuses. Texas found itself in the same position in 2005, when market manipulation cost Texans more than $70 million.184 In the summer of 2006, New York market manipulation cost New Yorkers approximately $150 million.185 Studies of energy prices have demonstrated that market manipulation is an ongoing problem and that the tools FERC uses to deter manipulation are ill-equipped to prevent the types of abuses that pervade energy markets.186

It arguably made sense to funnel antitrust suits against regulated monopolies through the federal regulator charged with overseeing those monopolies. That is because judicial enforcement may undermine a market’s entire rate structure and lead to discriminatory rates. On top of that, a company that enjoys a legal right to a monopoly is by definition permitted to engage in some conduct that would otherwise constitute an antitrust violation. In such cases, it arguably made sense to have the regulator responsible for ensuring that a company charge just and reasonable rates also make sure that the company is complying with service obligations imposed by state tort, contract, and antitrust laws.

Yet courts continue to apply the filed rate doctrine in restructured energy markets. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, for example, has held that “utility filings with the regulatory agency prevail over . . . other claims seeking different rates or terms than those reflected in the filings with the agency.”187 According to the Ninth Circuit, the doctrine is “a form of deference and preemption, which precludes interference with the rate setting authority of an administrative agency, like FERC.”188

As explained in Section III.C, the filed rate doctrine was a judicially created doctrine intended to make sure that the judiciary did not undermine rates filed in cost-of-service ratemaking proceedings. Today, however, FERC has replaced monopoly cost-of-service ratemaking with a market-based approach to setting wholesale rates in most of the country. The Commission now seeks to ensure “just and reasonable” rates “by enhancing competition” among multiple wholesale providers of electricity.189 FERC has done so because it has concluded that competition is the most effective way “to bring more efficient, lower cost power to the Nation’s electricity consumers.”190 To achieve that purpose, FERC has endeavored “to break down regulatory and economic barriers that hinder a free market in wholesale electricity”191 and it has chosen to rely on market forces in competitive auctions to fulfill its statutory charge of ensuring “just and reasonable” wholesale rates.192 Courts thus seem to reflexively apply the filed rate doctrine in restructured markets without recognizing that the doctrine has become obsolete in markets where energy regulators do not review every energy contract before determining that the contract is just and reasonable.193

Restructured energy markets are intended to create the same incentives as ordinary markets. To that end, exempting energy companies from judicial enforcement of ordinary tort, contract, and antitrust claims gives energy companies an exceptional privilege. In the cases described in this Section, the filed rate doctrine prevented civil plaintiffs from enforcing antitrust laws.194 In this way, a doctrine that was originally meant to protect consumers by ensuring utilities treat all customers fairly has become a weapon that generators yield to exploit their market power.

#### Energy prices are rising.

Smith 11-8 [Talmon; November 8; Economics reporter for The New York Times based in New York. Before joining the Business desk, he was a staff editor in Opinion, covering public policy, economics and culture; *The New York Times,* “Winter Heating Bills Loom as the Next Inflation Threat,” <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/11/08/business/economy/home-heating-prices-winter.html>; KS]

With consumers already dealing with the fastest price increases in decades, another unwelcome uptick is on the horizon: a widely expected increase in winter heating bills.

After plunging during the pandemic as the global economy slowed, energy prices have roared upward. Natural gas, used to heat almost half of U.S. households, has almost doubled in price since this time last year. The price of crude oil — which deeply affects the 10 percent of households that rely on heating oil and propane during the winter — has soared by similarly eye-popping levels.

And those costs are being quickly passed through to consumers, who have become accustomed to cheaper energy prices in recent years and now find themselves with growing concerns about inflation this year.

In the United States, the winter months account for about 50 to 80 percent of residential fuel consumption. And there is “a significant chance” consumers could face a “marked increase” in prices for heating, said Nina Fahy, an analyst for Energy Aspects, a research consultancy.

Last winter was warmer than average, which led to residential energy bills that were comparatively low. This season, heating costs could rise to levels not seen a decade, even if there isn’t a severe winter. Several factors — lower global fuel inventories, incentives for producers to let prices rise and a mismatch between supply and demand as economies emerge from the pandemic — may combine to push bills higher regardless.

Mark Wolfe, executive director of the National Energy Assistance Directors’ Association, a group of state officials administering aid to low-income households, says those living paycheck to paycheck, or just trying to save, aren’t going to be soothed by complex explanations about inventory levels, supply chains or global demand. When the bills start coming in December or January, he said, “the public’s going to get angry.”

Expert forecasts suggest that the southern half of the country, which has milder winters and relies on relatively cheap electricity for home heating, may enter spring largely unscathed. But the Northeast and the Northern Plains, as well as rural areas nationwide, are far more dependent on heating oil and propane, which are highly exposed to price spikes in commodity markets.

#### Private utilities are creating artificial shortages – limits supply and raises prices.

Vaheesan ’19 [Sandeep; October 25; Legal director at the Open Markets Institute. Vaheesan previously served as a regulations counsel at the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, where he helped develop and draft the first comprehensive federal rule on payday, vehicle title, and high-cost installment loans; “MOTION OF OPEN MARKETS INSTITUTE FOR LEAVE TO FILE AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT,” <https://static1-squarespacecom.proxy.lib.umich.edu/static/5e449c8c3ef68d752f3e70dc/t/5eaa1d9d2790182e187cc171/1588207017816/19-1678_Documents-as-filed.pdf>; KS]

Plaintiff-appellant accuses Eversource Energy and Avangrid (two vertically integrated utilities that distribute gas and electricity to end-use customers and own power generation assets) of misusing their market power at the natural gas resale level and engineering a chain of events that inflicted substantial harm on New England residents. The defendants-appellees abused their gas pipeline use rights to create an artificial shortage of resale gas, a key input for generating electricity in New England. By limiting the supply of gas in New England and raising the price of natural gas, the defendants-appellees increased the costs of generating electricity. And by raising the costs of generating electricity, they increased wholesale electricity prices and ultimately retail electricity costs for New Englanders by more than $3 billion.

#### Market power abuses drive up prices and grid vulnerabilities.

Gorodetsky ‘9 [Julia; Winter; Corporate securities lawyer for Andrews Kurth LLC; *Tulane Environmental Law Journal,* “Analogy By Necessity: The Filed Rate Doctrine and Judicial Review of Agency Inaction,” <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/43294073.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3A40dc35292abcd134d36ab5a0d941bbc6>; KS]

B. The Unique Nature of the Electricity Market and the Greater Potential for Market Abuse

The electricity market is different from any other competitive market in a way that makes it hard to control. This makes the electricity industry particularly prone to market power abuse by individual utilities.45 The wholesale electricity market is currently under FERC's jurisdiction.46 That means that private utilities are required to file their tariffs with FERC for its review and approval.47 During the approval process, FERC reviews the market share of the utility in order to determine whether the utility possesses the market power necessary to manipulate the market.48 Market power means the power of a single firm to drive prices upwards without losing its consumers.49 In its extreme form, market power leads to monopoly.50 Monopolies hurt consumers because they produce too little and charge too much.51

Currently, FERC employs the Federal Guidelines developed by the DOJ and the FTC for nonelectricity markets as a benchmark for the critical market share under which the utility is incapable of exercising market power.52 This market set by DOJ and FTC stood at twenty percent.53 What FERC does not account for is that the unique characteristics of the electricity market "directly translate into enhanced market power for generators and traders holding much smaller market shares than 20%."54 The nature of the electricity market is such that when the right conditions are met, even a utility with as little as one percent of the market share can exercise significant market power by withholding capacity and driving the prices upwards.55

The electricity market is unique in several ways. First, the demand for electricity is highly inconsistent over time.56 Second, electricity cannot be stored.57 That means that "[e]ach unit consumed must be produced at exactly the nanosecond it is consumed."58 Thus, unless consumers are responsive in their demand for electricity, the only way to stabilize prices is to add more generators because the future capacity cannot balance out the present capacity.59 The demand for electricity is fairly inelastic due to the lack of price information among consumers.60 Price elasticity of demand describes "the extent to which quantity demanded decreases in response to an increase in the price of a good or service."61 Therefore, consumer demand does not act as a constraint upon market power because consumption will continue at the same rate regardless of the price charged.62 Further, the number of generating facilities is relatively fixed due to the substantial entry barriers for production of electricity.63

Thus, varying demand for electricity and the inability to store electricity may result in tremendous price volatility in the electricity market.64 Further, these characteristics open the door to potential market power abuse by making it possible for one firm to artificially inflate prices by withholding its electricity generation capacity or raising its prices with impunity.65 The fact that the exercise of market power in the electricity market does not demand collusion makes the electricity market particularly vulnerable to abuse.66 In case of collusion, however, the price of electricity can soar even higher.67

Third, electricity is transmitted through an integrated transmission grid which may include several regions in the United States and Canada.68 Consequently, individual states can impact the market significantly yet have very little power to control it.69 Further, because electricity cannot be stored, the only way to operate the grid without causing blackouts is to balance generation and demand carefully in order to avoid surplus in the wires.70

#### Rising prices guarantee demand outpaces supply – ensures grid failure.

Kocieniewski & Malik 11-5 [David and Naureen; November 5; Reporters at Bloomberg; *Bloomberg;* “The Power Grid Is Just Another Casino for Energy Traders,” <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/features/2021-11-05/why-is-my-electric-bill-so-high-energy-traders-bets-could-be-the-culprit>; KS]

Anyone who pays a utility bill in the U.S. is familiar with the symptoms of an aging power grid perpetually in need of upgrades. Less visible are the entities that bet on, and make multimillion-dollar profits from, the grid’s shortcomings. GreenHat’s story shows that not only do American power customers have to contend with high electric bills, rolling blackouts, and increasingly common outages—they’re also underwriting a trading system that allows speculators to pocket the winnings and sticks ratepayers with some of the biggest losses.

Andrew Kittell grew up in the shadow of Wall Street. His father, Donald Kittell, was an executive with Morgan Stanley Dean Witter and later served as the chief financial officer for Sifma, the Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association. Andrew liked excitement—he skied and surfed—but told friends he’d learned from summer jobs on Wall Street that he didn’t care for financial risk. At Columbia Business School, he wrote in-depth research on the odds of winning at a casino, reaching conclusions that soured him on gambling, close associates say.

Kittell was hired out of school by Bear Stearns, for a unit that aimed to wring profit from the investment bank’s portfolio of power plants. After Bear’s 2008 bankruptcy, he wound up in Houston at JPMorgan Ventures Energy Corp. (JPMVEC), where he worked alongside fellow trader John Bartholomew. Bartholomew had spent years as a power purchaser at a Southern California utility; he boasted on his résumé that the experience had taught him how to take advantage of flaws in the state’s payment formulas for power generators.

In the broadest terms, power traders try to anticipate when demand will rise and supply will falter. JPMVEC did all that—and also focused on finding rules it could exploit. One example: During times of heightened demand, California officials would pay plant owners hefty ramp-up fees to bring more generators online. So JPMVEC wouldn’t switch on the handful of plants under its control until it could charge as much as 83 times the normal price of power. The plants would run for a bit, then shut down to await the next demand peak. In all, the firm employed 12 different strategies that federal officials determined went beyond typical behavior and were designed to game the system.

According to internal emails, senior JPMorgan executives expected the power unit to reap hundreds of millions of dollars, but by 2013 regulators had intervened. JPMorgan agreed that year to the second-largest settlement in FERC’s history: It paid a $285 million fine for what the settlement called “manipulative bidding strategies” and returned $125 million more in “unjust profits.”

The next year, Kittell, Bartholomew, and a third JPMVEC alumnus, Kevin Ziegenhorn, formed GreenHat. Through their lawyers, Bartholomew and Ziegenhorn declined to comment for this story.

FERC is the main enforcement authority for U.S. electricity markets. The Securities and Exchange Commission has also led major investigations into energy trading firms, including Enron, whose market manipulation and accounting fraud led to bankruptcy in 2001 and landed top executives in prison. But consumers’ first line of defense consists of four regional transmission organizations, or RTOs, and three single-state independent system operators, or ISOs (New York, California, and Texas have their own grids). These private companies grapple with a system that is part Escher, part Rube Goldberg. Day to day, the essential task is balancing supply and demand—and the power flow has to be precise, at a frequency of 60 hertz, or the grid can become unstable. It’s a daunting task considering that the grid is a sprawling patchwork cobbled together from lines running along paths built a century ago and vulnerable to challenges as unpredictable as extreme weather, mechanical breakdowns, falling tree limbs, cyberattacks, and solar flares. The grid operators also run the markets for financial instruments based on the cost of those disruptions.

GreenHat traded in a market operated by the largest of the grid keepers, the RTO known as PJM Interconnection LLC. PJM (the name originally stood for Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Maryland) directs power from 1,400 generators through 85,100 miles of high-voltage cables in 13 Eastern states and the District of Columbia. Its 65 million electricity consumers have been spared the widespread blackouts that have affected tens of millions of people in Texas and California lately, but they’ve paid for that stability.

PJM is supposed to balance the interests of power companies, consumers, and communities, but for years it’s allowed major suppliers such as Exelon, Duke Energy, and American Electric Power to bill ratepayers for high-priced upgrades to sections of the grid where they predominate, according to an assortment of studies. Ari Peskoe, director of the Electricity Law Initiative at the Harvard Law School Environmental and Energy Law Program, says PJM’s reliable checkoff on new projects allows suppliers to preserve their market dominance and freeze out competition. It’s effectively “a protection racket” for the biggest providers, Peskoe says.

PJM has also allowed power providers owned by Wall Street firms such as Blackstone Inc. and KKR & Co. to tap into the billions of dollars a year PJM pays for what’s called reserve generation—the maintenance of clunker plants that are used only in emergencies, typically a few days a year. That limited role has been a lifeline for aging plants like the 52-year-old Homer City Generating Station in western Pennsylvania, once owned by General Electric Co. It’s a coal-burning plant made all but obsolete by the shale gas boom in the surrounding area. PJM pays it to stay online to help meet peak demand. Federal regulators, academics, consumer advocates, and market participants all say PJM pays for far too much capacity. PJM disagrees.

GreenHat found a similarly accommodating environment in PJM’s market for congestion contracts. Grid operators dole out rights to the excess congestion revenue they collect to utilities and other power suppliers. At regular auctions, the recipients can resell such rights as futures contracts. Winning bidders, including speculators like GreenHat, acquire their positions on credit; no money changes hands until the contracts’ terms end. That can be years in the future.

Similar markets operate around the country, but GreenHat found PJM’s especially attractive. In comments to close associates, Kittell cited one particular aspect: PJM allowed traders to buy large numbers of congestion contracts while posting very little collateral. To secure the positions that ultimately lost $180 million, PJM required GreenHat to pledge less than $600,000, FERC records show.

PJM declined to comment on the GreenHat case, citing FERC’s ongoing investigation. In emailed statements, PJM has said that since GreenHat’s default it has implemented “a comprehensive overhaul of credit reform, mitigation policies and procedures” that include stricter collateral requirements and the appointment of a chief risk officer in 2019. The new policies give PJM officials “authority to limit, rescind or terminate participants.”

PJM has also closed another regulatory gap. When GreenHat set up shop, PJM had no screening process in place for new traders or trading firms. It does now. The applications of the GreenHat executives were approved without so much as a Google search.

Anyone who’s paid surge pricing for an Uber has a general idea of what creates congestion revenue: Prices and surcharges climb steeply whenever demand exceeds suppliers’ capacity. In the electricity market, there are additional wrinkles. Overloading a power line causes wires to retain heat and stretch, putting them at risk of failure, so grid operators like PJM have to balance the limited capacity of the lines against the ceaseless ebb and flow of demand. When needed, they bring on additional power providers, at higher prices. Say the price on a given day is $30 per megawatt-hour. When there’s a little pressure on supply, that might rise a few dollars. As the pressure increases it might double, then increase tenfold, then twentyfold. PJM finally caps prices at $1,000 per MWh—but in the most extreme conditions they could surge to $3,750. Next year those prices can rise to more than $12,000.

When prices jump, grid operators charge every ratepayer the new, higher price—even though the initial providers continue to receive the previous, lower price. Imagine you’re riding in an Uber economy car when demand leaps so high that the only option available for new riders is limousines. And then imagine that the price you have to pay automatically increases to the limousine rate—even though your driver will collect only the economy rate.

The money that grid operators collect from consumers but don’t pay to power providers is congestion revenue. During the first six months of this year, consumers in PJM’s service area kicked in $354 million in such revenue, a 97% increase from a year earlier.

#### Grid failure is existential.

Weiss and Weiss ’19 [Matthew and Martin; May 29; National Sales Director at United Medical Instruments, UMI and Research assistant at the American Jewish University; Neurosurgeon at UCLA-Olive View Medical Center; Energy, Sustainability, and Society, “An assessment of threats to the American power grid,” vol. 9]

Consequences of a sustained power outage

The EMP Commission states “Should significant parts of the electrical power infrastructure be lost for any substantial period of time, the Commission believes that the consequences are likely to be catastrophic, and many people will die for the lack of the basic elements necessary to sustain life in dense urban and suburban communities.” [67].

Space constraints preclude discussion on how the loss of the grid would render synthesis and distribution of oil and gas inoperative. Telecommunications would collapse, as would finance and banking. Virtually all technology, infrastructure, and services require electricity.

An EMP attack that collapses the electric power grid will collapse the water infrastructure—the delivery and purification of water and the removal and treatment of wastewater and sewage. Outbreaks that would result from the failure of these systems include cholera. It is problematic if fuel will be available to boil water. Lack of water will cause death in 3 to 4 days [68].

Food production would also collapse. Crops and livestock require water delivered by electronically powered pumps. Tractors, harvesters, and other farm equipment run on petroleum products supplied by an infrastructure (pumps, pipelines) that require electricity. The plants that make fertilizer, insecticides, and feed also require electricity. Gas pumps that fuel the trucks that distribute food require electricity. Food processing requires electricity.

In 1900, nearly 40% of the population lived on farms. That percentage is now less than 2% [69]. It is through technology that 2% of the population can feed the other 98% [68]. The acreage under cultivation today is only 6% more than in 1900, yet productivity has increased 50 fold [69].

As stated by Dr. Lowell L Wood in Congressional testimony:

“If we were no longer able to fuel our agricultural machine in the country, the food production of the country would simply stop, because we do not have the horses and mules that used to tow agricultural gear around in the 1880s and 1890s”. “So the situation would be exceedingly adverse if both electricity and the fuel that electricity moves around the country……… stayed away for a substantial period of time, we would miss the harvest, and we would starve the following winter” [70].

People can live for 1–2 months without food, but after 5 days, they have difficulty thinking and at 2 weeks they are incapacitated [68]. There is typically a 30-day perishable food supply at regional warehouses but most would be destroyed with the loss of refrigeration [69]. The EMP Commission has suggested food be stockpiled for a possible EMP event.

A prescription for failure

Even if all the recommendations of the Congressional EMP Commission were implemented, there is no guarantee that the grid will not sustain a prolonged collapse. There should therefore be contingency plans for such a failure.

There is also another consideration. The foundational pillars of prior American nuclear defense policy, in today’s climate, are of uncertain validity. Mutual assured destruction is the Maginot line of the 21st century. Nonproliferation will prove difficult to resurrect.

The consequences of a widespread nuclear attack have been positioned to the public as massive deaths from blast effects, and then further lingering deaths from the effects of radiation. We suspect there will be no electricity, and there will be no electricity for a very long time.

There should be an actionable plan in anticipation of a possible prolonged collapse of the grid—a retro-structure and a skill set to provide a framework for survival. Our sense is there is no plan.

#### The filed rate doctrine insulates price manipulation from private suits.

Vaheesan ’19 [Sandeep; October 25; Legal director at the Open Markets Institute. Vaheesan previously served as a regulations counsel at the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, where he helped develop and draft the first comprehensive federal rule on payday, vehicle title, and high-cost installment loans; “MOTION OF OPEN MARKETS INSTITUTE FOR LEAVE TO FILE AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT,” <https://static1-squarespacecom.proxy.lib.umich.edu/static/5e449c8c3ef68d752f3e70dc/t/5eaa1d9d2790182e187cc171/1588207017816/19-1678_Documents-as-filed.pdf>; KS]

Legislative and regulatory action have transformed the governance of gas and electricity industries since the 1970s. For much of the twentieth century, comprehensive public utility regulation governed the production and sale of gas and electricity. Federal and state regulators treated both industries as generally monopolistic and subjected firms to price regulation. Under this cost-of-service regulation, federal and state regulators established rates that allowed sellers of gas and electricity to recover their costs and earn a reasonable rate of return on their capital investments. Over the past 40 years, Congress and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) have curtailed the public regulation of prices in natural gas and electricity and introduced market competition in both industries. These legislative and regulatory actions have replaced regulator-approved rates with market-based prices in one or more levels of the gas and electric supply chains. Richard J. Pierce, Jr., The Evolution of Natural Gas Regulatory Policy, 10 Nat. Res. & Env. 53 (1995); Paul L. Joskow, Restructuring, Competition and Regulatory Reform in the U.S. Electricity Sector, 11 J. Econ. Persps. 119 (1997).

Under a system of market-based pricing, full and robust antitrust enforcement is vital to protect the public from the collusive, exclusionary, and unfair practices of producers and traders of electricity and natural gas. See Alfred E. Kahn, Deregulatory Schizophrenia, 75 Calif. L. Rev. 1059, 1059 (1987) (“While prepared to defend enthusiastically the deregulations with which I have been involved, I feel equally strongly that they have greatly accentuated the importance of antitrust enforcement.”). In this case, however, the Court expanded the filed rate doctrine, which was created to protect the integrity of regulatorapproved rates, to immunize Eversource Energy and Avangrid’s manipulation of market prices for electricity and gas from a private antitrust lawsuit. In broadening the filed rate doctrine to dismiss the plaintiff-appellant’s lawsuit, the district court granted a de facto license for sellers of gas and electricity to use their market power to transfer millions or even billions of dollars from the public into their own coffers.

Traditionally, the filed doctrine protected the integrity of rates that federal regulators had approved. Under the filed rate doctrine, the Supreme Court and this Court have declined to retrospectively alter rates that a regulator had approved in advance of taking effect. Square D Co. v. Niagara Tariff Bureau, Inc., 476 U.S. 409 (1986); Town of Norwood v. New England Power Co., 202 F.3d 408 (1st Cir. 2000). With market-based pricing, however, regulators do not require the prospective filing of rates and approve any rates in advance of their effectiveness.

The district court’s expansion of the filed rate doctrine to insulate marketbased prices from private antitrust lawsuits is both bad law and bad policy. First, the decision, in addressing the relationship between the Natural Gas and Federal Power Acts and the antitrust laws, repealed the Clayton Act’s private right of action. The Supreme Court has established a strong presumption against such implied repeals of federal statutes, including the antitrust laws. United States v. Borden Co., 308 U.S. 188 (1939). The Supreme Court has held that “[r]epeals of the antitrust laws by implication from a regulatory statute are strongly disfavored and have only been found in cases of plain repugnancy between the antitrust and regulatory provisions.” United States v. Philadelphia National Bank, 374 U.S. 321, 350–51 (1963). Second, the decision undermines effective antitrust enforcement and the public benefits of market-based pricing regimes. With market-based pricing in gas and electricity, private antitrust lawsuits complement federal regulatory oversight and public antitrust enforcement, provide essential deterrence against collusive, exclusionary, and other unfair practices, and compensate the victims of antitrust violations in gas and electricity markets.

DESIRABILITY OF PARTICIPATION

The district court’s opinion improperly expanded the scope of the filed rate doctrine. The district court disregarded both the strong presumption against implied repeals of the antitrust laws and the importance of antitrust enforcement for competitive market-based pricing in gas and electricity. Amicus curiae will explain the legal authorities and policy considerations that support denying filed rate protection to the market-based prices at issue in this case. Amicus curiae’s brief will not duplicate arguments made by the parties. It will instead provide the amicus curiae’s distinct perspectives on the issues facing the Court.

CONCLUSION

For these reasons, the motion for leave to file an amicus curiae brief in support of the plaintiff-appellant should be granted.

#### Private right of action is key – it’s empirically more effectively than the DOJ and FTC.

Vaheesan ’19 [Sandeep; October 25; Legal director at the Open Markets Institute. Vaheesan previously served as a regulations counsel at the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, where he helped develop and draft the first comprehensive federal rule on payday, vehicle title, and high-cost installment loans; “MOTION OF OPEN MARKETS INSTITUTE FOR LEAVE TO FILE AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT,” <https://static1-squarespacecom.proxy.lib.umich.edu/static/5e449c8c3ef68d752f3e70dc/t/5eaa1d9d2790182e187cc171/1588207017816/19-1678_Documents-as-filed.pdf>; KS]

Although it did not even consider whether a clear repugnancy exists between the implicated statutes, the district court nonetheless repealed the Clayton Act’s private right of action. 15 U.S.C. § 15. The court ignored the strong presumption against implied repeals and improperly broadened the filed rate doctrine. In natural gas resale and wholesale electricity markets, market-determined pricing is the norm. See supra Part I. The plaintiff-appellant’s complaint “challenge[s] the background marketplace conditions” and not “the reasonableness of any rates expressly approved by FERC.” Oneok, 135 S. Ct. at 1602. See also Otter Tail, 410 U.S. at 374 (“When [commercial] relationships are governed in the first instance by business judgment and not regulatory coercion, courts must be hesitant to conclude that Congress intended to override the fundamental national policies embodied in the antitrust laws.”).

No “clear repugnancy” exists between the Clayton Act and the Federal Power and Natural Gas Acts. The plaintiff-appellant’s complaint does not ask or threaten to unsettle any prices individually filed with FERC before they took effect. In contrast to the individual rates that were prospectively filed in Town of Norwood and Square D, the defendants-appellees here did not file rates with FERC in advance of their effectiveness. Instead of charging regulator-approved or - validated rates, the defendants-appellees’ discretionary conduct4 helped set prices in the market. Indeed, as discussed infra in Part III.B, private antitrust enforcement and federal regulatory oversight complement each other in industries with marketbased prices – and together constrain the discretion of market actors and ensure that they cannot profit through collusive, exclusionary, and other unfair practices.

B. The Full Application of the Antitrust Laws Is Essential for Competitive Market-Based Prices

Since Congress and FERC have committed to market-based pricing in wellhead gas, resales of gas, and wholesale electricity, the full application of the antitrust laws is critical for ensuring the success of this legislative and regulatory market creation. Even as FERC maintains oversight of the electricity and natural gas markets, this regulatory supervision has important limitations and cannot be expected to root out all anticompetitive conduct. Antitrust enforcement complements FERC oversight and provides vital deterrence against anticompetitive practices in gas and electricity markets. Specifically, antitrust suits brought by injured consumers and businesses provide strong deterrence of anticompetitive conduct as well as compensation. In dismissing the plaintiffappellant’s suit, the district court severely weakened the effectiveness of the antitrust laws and empowered sellers of gas and electricity to profit through anticompetitive market conduct.

FERC oversight is not adequate to prevent anticompetitive conduct and ensure that markets in natural gas and electricity are free from collusive, exclusionary, and other unfair market conduct. Although FERC has an obligation to maintain “just and reasonable rates” under the Natural Gas and Federal Power Acts, 15 U.S.C. § 717c, it has only very limited tools to police specific anticompetitive conduct in the gas and electricity markets and to provide any remedy for anticompetitive market conduct it discovers after the fact.

Even assuming FERC acts against anticompetitive and other unfair conduct,5 its remedies provide inadequate deterrence and cannot be counted on to compensate injured parties. FERC can impose monetary penalties of up to a fixed maximum amount per day on parties over whom it has jurisdiction and who have violated FERC rules in gas or electricity markets. 15 U.S.C. 717t-1; 16 U.S.C. 825o-1(b). All such penalties, however, go to the United States Treasury, not to the injured customers, absent agreement by the defendant. FERC can also order disgorgement of ill-gotten profits as a result of market manipulation. Revised Policy Statement on Enforcement, 123 FERC ¶ 61,156 (2008). Both remedies are, at best, an imperfect approximation of market-wide injury to purchasers and, at worst, a small fraction of market harm and woefully inadequate to deter market misconduct. And they offer no guarantee of full compensation for injured parties.

Given FERC’s limited market oversight powers, antitrust enforcement plays an important role in gas and electricity markets. Antitrust lawsuits help identify and stop anticompetitive practices and ensure that market-based pricing serves the public. When sellers engage in collusion, exclusion and mergers, they can enhance and maintain their market power and profit at the expense of purchasers and rivals. See, e.g., Keyspan, 763 F.Supp. at 636 (describing alleged effects of anticompetitive swap agreement involving rival generators in New York City). As federal regulators have renounced or been deprived by Congress of direct pricesetting authorities, the full effectiveness of the antitrust laws is essential. Jim Rossi, Lowering the Filed Tariff Shield: Judicial Enforcement for a Deregulatory Era, 56 Vand. L. Rev. 1591, 1648 (2003). See also Alfred E. Kahn, Deregulatory Schizophrenia, 75 Calif. L. Rev. 1059, 1059 (1987) (“While prepared to defend enthusiastically the deregulations with which I have been involved, I feel equally strongly that they have greatly accentuated the importance of antitrust enforcement.”).

The filed rate doctrine’s limitation on private antitrust enforcement subverts the effectiveness of the antitrust laws. The ability of injured consumers and businesses to bring antitrust suits is a pillar of the American antitrust enforcement regime. Under the Clayton Act, “[a]ny person who shall be injured in his business or property by reason of anything forbidden in the antitrust laws may sue . . ., and shall recover threefold the damages by him sustained, and the cost of suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee.” 15 U.S.C. § 15. See, e.g., Blue Shield of Va. v. McCready, 457 U.S. 465, 472 (1982) (quoting Mandeville Island Farms, Inc. v. Am. Crystal Sugar Co., 334 U.S. 219, 236 (1948)) (“Congress sought to create a private enforcement mechanism that would deter violators and deprive them of the fruits of their illegal actions, and would provide ample compensation to the victims of antitrust violations. . . . As we have recognized, ‘[t]he statute does not confine its protection to consumers, or to purchasers, or to competitors, or to sellers. . . . The Act is comprehensive in its terms and coverage, protecting all who are made victims of the forbidden practices by whomever they may be perpetrated.’”).

Empirical research shows the public importance of “private attorneys general” and the value of having more enforcers on the beat against corporate collusion, consolidation, and monopolization. A study of 60 private antitrust lawsuits between 1990 and 2011 found that these actions generated more deterrence than the federal government’s entire criminal antitrust enforcement activity over the same period. Joshua P. Davis & Robert H. Lande, Defying Conventional Wisdom: The Case for Private Antitrust Enforcement, 48 Ga. L. Rev. 1, 26 (2013). And these lawsuits compensated injured parties, whereas public enforcement generally did not.

Under the district court’s neutering of private antitrust enforcement, market participants have expansive power to control markets through collusive and exclusionary conduct and extract billions in overcharges from the public. Their discretion and power are subject only to the limited oversight of FERC, supra, and resource-constrained public antitrust enforcement agencies. Kadhim Shubber, Staffing at Antitrust Regulator Declines under Donald Trump, Fin. Times, Feb. 7, 2019. Federal antitrust enforcers themselves have recognized the central role of suits brought by consumers and businesses injured by antitrust violations. See, e.g., Study of Monopoly Power: Hearing Before the H. Comm. on the Judiciary, 82 Cong. Rec. 15 (1951) (Statement of H. Graham Morison, Assistant Attorney General in charge of Antitrust Div., Dep't of Justice) (“[I]f you did away with the triple damages suit entirely and still wanted substantial enforcement in order to have economic freedom you would have to quadruple the size of the Antitrust Division.”).

The district court’s expansion of the filed rate doctrine establishes for gas and electricity a regime of “radical deregulation—markets absent common law and antitrust protections.” Rossi, supra, at 1596. By barring purchasers of power and potentially other market participants from bringing antitrust suits for damages, the court’s ruling blocks arguably the most effective antitrust enforcers—individuals and businesses—from vindicating their rights and protecting the public.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, this Court should limit the filed rate doctrine to its scope as articulated by the Supreme Court in Square D and this Court in Town of Norwood. The district court improperly expanded the filed rate doctrine to cover market-based prices that are not filed with a federal regulator before they take effect. Accordingly, this Court should reverse the district court’s granting of the defendants-appellees’ motion to dismiss and remand the case for discovery.

#### The plan solves by ensuring arbitrarily approved rates are subject to antitrust.

Gorodetsky ‘9 [Julia; Winter; Corporate securities lawyer for Andrews Kurth LLC; *Tulane Environmental Law Journal,* “Analogy By Necessity: The Filed Rate Doctrine and Judicial Review of Agency Inaction,” <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/43294073.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3A40dc35292abcd134d36ab5a0d941bbc6>; KS]

This Article argues that judicial review of private party antitrust claims, predicated upon market-based tariffs and filed with a regulatory agency, is not precluded by the filed rate doctrine. Th study is limited to the electricity market. In order to argue in favor of judicial reviewability of private conduct under antitrust law, this Article analogizes the filed rate doctrine with agency inaction in law, which is governed by the doctrine of nonreviewability. In Heckler v. Cheney, the United States Supreme Court gave policy reasons for its conclusion that agency inaction was unreviewable.1 I will apply the reasoning offered by the Court in Heckler to the specifics of a case study and conclude that agency market-based tariff-approval decisions should be reviewable. The case study is California's electricity crisis of 2000-2001. In particular, the examination will concentrate Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (FERC) poor handling of the crisis, its aftermath, and the antitrust claims that followed.

The presumption of reviewability shifts the burden to show that its approval of a marked-based rate was not arbitrary. Courts should subject an agency's decision to the arbitrary and capricious standard of review. This standard would require agencies to give explanations and standards. If the agency fails to show that the decision was not arbitrary, courts should refuse to apply the filed rate doctrine and should subject the claim to the operation of antitrust laws. Courts should not, however, determine which tariff would best serve the interests of the properly functioning deregulated electricity markets. Such determinations are best left to the legislature or the agency because antitrust law and agency regulation are complementary to each other.

#### That shields against market abuse by promoting accountability and preventing arbitrariness.

Gorodetsky ‘9 [Julia; Winter; Corporate securities lawyer for Andrews Kurth LLC; *Tulane Environmental Law Journal,* “Analogy By Necessity: The Filed Rate Doctrine and Judicial Review of Agency Inaction,” <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/43294073.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3A40dc35292abcd134d36ab5a0d941bbc6>; KS]

VI. Judicial Review and the Filed Rate Doctrine

There is little reason to continue to disallow judicial review of antitrust claims against utilities on account of the filed rate doctrine. As argued in the preceding section, such claims are likely to be found reviewable if subjected to the Heckler standard in lieu of FERC 's limited expertise with the competitive markets, and its subsequent lack of capacity to monitor and effectively deter market abuse by private utilities.237 Such claims should be subjected to the same principles courts utilize in reviewing claims arising from agency action under the arbitrary and capricious standard of review, namely, the requirement for explanation-giving and standard-setting.

Judicial scrutiny should be limited to the determination of whether the agency's decision was arbitrary, and if it was, courts should then subject the claim to antitrust laws. The determination as to whether rates approved by the agency were indeed sufficient for the proper functioning of a competitive market should be left to the legislature. The courts are poorly suited for the determination of proper rates prices.238

There are several other alternatives to judicial review of agency decision-making process for tariff approval, such as the expansion of the filed rate doctrine or judicial deference to the most politically accountable figure.239 However, judicial review seems to be the most workable solution in light of "the founding principles of the administrative state [which] are dedicated not only to promoting political accountability, but also to preventing administrative arbitrariness."240

The danger of arbitrariness undermines the legitimacy of an agency's decisions by generating "conclusions that do not follow logically from the evidence, rules that give no notice of their application, or distinctions that violate basic principles of equal treatment."241 Such arbitrary results are evident in the continuing application of the filed rate doctrine, which shields private utilities from antitrust claims and prevents remedy even when such rates were approved as a result of an inadequate agency review process and lack of agency expertise.242

Further, the filed rate doctrine, as it exists in its current form and application, poses a serious problem as an impediment to the effective operation of properly functioning deregulated electricity markets.243 The doctrine has to be either abolished or revised. The latter solution would result in keeping the doctrine while expanding an agency's enforcement authority. This solution is simply not workable, because expanding agency authority will not be an effective substitute for agency expertise and experience with competitive markets. Abolishing the doctrine entirely is a more viable answer to the problem at hand. Abolition, however, must be accompanied by judicial review of agency decision- making processes related to tariff approval.

Keeping the filed rate doctrine in its current state is an unwise policy decision. As elaborated earlier, the filed rate doctrine was developed by the courts as a rule of statutory construction out of "deference to a 'congressional scheme of uniform . . . regulation'" delegated to the agency.244 The construed congressional intent behind the filed rate doctrine was to protect consumers from price discrimination by public utilities.245 This intent, however, was later perverted when courts started employing the doctrine to shield regulated utilities from antitrust claims. The mere act of filing with an agency, such as FERC, effectively insulates the utility from antitrust claims, even when the agency's market- based rate-approval process is nothing more than rubber stamping the submitted rates.246 Thus, the doctrine opens the door to market power abuse which poses a serious danger to the proper functioning of deregulated electricity markets.

### 1AC – Plan

#### By expanding the scope of its core antitrust laws, the United States federal government should substantially increase prohibitions on nearly all anticompetitive business practices by the private sector that are currently exempted by the filed rate doctrine.

### 1AC – Econ

#### Advantage Two is Econ:

#### Business confidence is low – numerous indicators.

Marcos 9-28 [Coral; September 28; Business Reporter; *New York Times*, “Stocks Tumble in Worst Day Since May, as Tech Shares Slide and Bond Yields Climb,” <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/09/28/business/stock-market-today.html>; KS]

The prospect of the Federal Reserve not reaching as deep into its bottomless pockets is starting to hit home for investors.

The S&P 500 tumbled 2 percent on Tuesday — the worst one-day slide for the benchmark U.S. index since May — as investors faced the expected wind-down of the enormous bond purchases the central bank has made since the start of the pandemic.

“The deep sell-off highlights the extent of the nerves in the markets surrounding the moves of the Fed,” said Fiona Cincotta, senior financial markets analyst at Forex.com.

The coming slowdown of bond purchases is a sign of the Fed’s confidence that the economy is recovering from the upheaval of the pandemic. But, Ms. Cincotta noted, other factors are still making Wall Street wary.

“There’s also a combination of rising energy prices, concerns that inflation could be more entrenched in these elevated levels and the fact that consumer confidence is slowing,” she said.

The tumble extended into the Asian trading day on Wednesday, though investors signaled that confidence might be returning.

Stocks in Japan were down more than 2.6 percent midday. But losses in other Asian markets, like Hong Kong and mainland China, were more moderate. Futures markets were signaling that Wall Street would open modestly higher.

The trigger for Tuesday’s tumble, which cut across sectors, was a rise in the yield on the benchmark 10-year Treasury note. With the Fed preparing to slow its purchases as soon as November, investors have been selling off bonds before demand ebbs. On Tuesday, that pushed the 10-year’s yield up to 1.54 percent, its highest level since June.

Even though the Fed has said it doesn’t plan to increase interest rates for months or years, government bond yields are the basis for borrowing costs across the economy. When bond prices fall, yields rise — a move that can hinder the stock market’s performance because it makes owning bonds more attractive and can discourage riskier investments.

Higher rates would make borrowing more expensive for smaller companies, and the jump in yields was a blow to shares of several high-flying stocks. Etsy, the online craft marketplace, dropped 6 percent, and Shopify fell more than 5 percent. Both companies have soared during the pandemic.

“With tech stocks, you’re betting for a company to have a breakthrough years from now,” said Beth Ann Bovino, the chief U.S. economist at S&P Global. “If interest rates go up today, that value that you receive years from now is discounted.”

The biggest technology stocks — particularly Amazon, Apple, Microsoft, Google and Facebook — have a vast pull on the broader market and helped drag down the S&P 500. Apple fell 2.4 percent and was the best performer of the tech giants. Amazon dropped 2.6 percent while Microsoft, Facebook and Google were down by more than 3.5 percent.

But the declines cut across many sectors. Energy stocks were the exception, rallying after oil prices climbed early in the day. Schlumberger, ConocoPhillips, Halliburton and Exxon Mobil were among the best-performing shares in the S&P 500, though some of their gains faded as oil futures turned lower in the afternoon.

The Delta variant of the virus remains a concern for investors, while persistent supply-chain bottlenecks have affected everything from auto production to school lunches. In Washington, lawmakers remain deeply divided over spending on infrastructure and expanding social programs.

And another pressing fight is brewing over raising the nation’s debt limit — a dispute that could trigger a government shutdown. Treasury Secretary Janet L. Yellen warned lawmakers on Tuesday of “catastrophic” consequences if Congress does not deal with the debt limit before Oct. 18.

The unease is apparent in stock performance the past four weeks. The S&P 500 is approaching a 4 percent drop for September, ending seven straight months of gains. The winning streak had lifted stocks more than 20 percent, as investors seemed to largely shrug off any bad news.

Bumpy moments have usually involved the Fed. Tuesday’s trading echoed the volatility of earlier this year, when a jump in rates roiled financial markets. That rise happened as traders worried that higher inflation might cause the Fed to increase rates sooner than officials had forecast.

“There’s no doubt that the equity market does not like higher rates — there’s just no debate about it,” Ralph Axel, director of U.S. Rates Strategy at Bank of America.

Lauren Goodwin, an economist at New York Life Investments, wrote in a note to clients that investors have begun seeking out safer investments while weighing concerns including the debt-ceiling fight and regulatory actions in China.

#### **Energy prices drive inflationary pressures.**

Eberhart 9-21 [Dan; September 21; CEO of Canary, LLC.; *Forbes,* “Rising Energy Poses Big Inflationary Threat To U.S. Economy,” <https://www.forbes.com/sites/daneberhart/2021/09/21/rising-energy-poses-big-inflationary-threat-to-us-economy/?sh=7ada2d4377b2>; KS]

Fears about inflation are rampant in Europe where natural gas and power shortages are colliding with the onset of winter to drive energy prices to record-breaking levels. Mix in the effects of supply chain bottlenecks caused by the global pandemic and you have a dangerous cocktail of rising prices and falling purchasing power of must-have energy products.

And while the situation in the United States is not as bad, consumers and investors can’t afford to be complacent. Wall Street traders are watching what’s happening in Europe and anticipating inflation will continue to rise on these shores, too.

Concerns about the most recent Consumer Price Index (CPI) report put the jitters in traders that knocked the wind out of the sails of the stocks market. The year-over-year CPI rose 5.3 percent over its level last August and the core CPI is up 4 percent over the same period. That’s a slight decrease from where they were in July, but it’s still double the 2 percent inflation rate targeted by the Federal Reserve.

U.S. consumer prices increased at their slowest pace in six months in August, however those figures ignore the volatile food and energy components of the market. Consumers don’t have the luxury of ignoring rising prices for energy commodities like crude oil, natural gas, gasoline, and diesel. The cost of energy impacts prices throughout the supply chain – from production to transportation – and those extra costs ultimately filter down to the consumer at the end of the line.

Benchmark Brent crude oil now trades above $75 a barrel, or more than 45 percent above where it started the year, and analysts warn that a tightening oil market could prompt further gains.

Average U.S. retail gasoline prices are some 50 percent higher than a year ago at $3.19 a gallon, and with crude feedstock costs rising and some refineries still constrained after Hurricane Ida, they could also move higher.

The situation is most alarming in natural gas, which many consumers rely on to power and heat their homes. At over $5 per million Btu, benchmark Henry Hub natural gas prices are more than twice as high as a year ago, at an annualized rate equal to a $109 billion increase to consumers. The Energy Information Administration (EIA) reports that working natural gas stocks are 17 percent lower than a year ago and 7 percent below the five-year average.

Gas shortages in Europe and Asia are drawing more U.S. gas abroad as exports of liquefied natural gas (LNG), exacerbating market tightness here despite America’s vast gas reserves. The EIA says that natural gas exports are up 41 percent from a year ago.

The consultancy S&P Global Platts calculates that Henry Hub prices would have to increase to $10 per million Btu to provide incentive to U.S. producers to fulfill domestic natural gas demand rather supply the export market. At those price levels, which the United States experienced in 2008, would cause demand destruction in the manufacturing sector. Many manufacturers that consume large quantities of natural gas can no longer compete in the market at those prices, which results in a loss of jobs.

Low gas inventories and rising prices are a concern because the United States should now be building stocks for the winter when the heating season creates peak demand. The market is now in what’s known as a “shoulder season” when demand is structurally lower because the market is in between robust summer cooling demand and peak winter heating demand.

Instead, American consumers could be facing an uncomfortable winter if natural gas prices spike at the same time as crude oil and refined products push higher while the economy continues to recover from the pandemic.

It’s a dangerous prospect, particularly for lower income families who are hurt most by rising energy prices. A 50-cent-a-gallon increase in retail gasoline prices may not dent the wallet of wealthier consumers, but it can be incredibly painful for those with lower or fixed incomes.

And there’s another side to inflation in energy that can squeeze consumers. Investors use commodity markets to hedge their inflation risk, meaning they buy oil and gas futures contracts to hedge against the risk of consumer prices rising across the board. This speculative buying can drive up the price of the underlying commodity for consumers.

The Biden administration is understandably worried about rising energy prices but its attempts to blame the oil and gas industry are off base and show a lack of understanding of energy markets.

#### Inflation raises costs and decreases discretionary spending.

Troise 10-28 [Damian; October 28; Journalist at Associated Press; *Associated Press,* “Energy Prices Lift Oil and Gas Stocks, Weigh on the Economy,” <https://apnews.com/article/business-economy-prices-a906dbc90bf85a3caa11882e1eb861ec>; KS]

Energy prices are soaring in 2021 and oil and gas stocks are the clear winners, but the losers might just turn out to be businesses and consumers.

The energy sector has far outpaced the broader market in 2021. The S&P 500’s energy stocks are up more than 50%, compared with a roughly 20% gain for the overall index. Devon Energy, Marathon Oil and Occidental Petroleum have all more than doubled in value this year.

While energy stocks are reaping the benefits from high demand and lagging supplies, other areas of the economy are having a tougher time coping.

Surging oil and gas prices are adding to broader inflation pressures that are squeezing businesses and driving up costs. A wide range of manufacturers are finding it more costly to ramp up operations as energy costs rise. Airlines are getting hurt by higher jet fuel costs as they try to rebuild profits. Consumers in the U.S. and around the world are facing a tighter squeeze on their wallets from rising energy costs.

Fertilizer maker CF Industries briefly halted operations at two facilities in the U.K. in September because of high natural gas prices. Delta Air Lines CEO Ed Bastian warned investors earlier in October that fuel prices will hurt its ability to remain profitable through the end of the year. It expects a “modest” loss in the fourth quarter.

Consumers are already paying more for goods as companies pass through higher fuel costs, raw materials costs and supply chain disruptions. More worrisome to some analysts is what happens if people have to cut back on spending in order to pay for higher gas and home heating costs. The economic recovery depends on continued consumer spending, but higher energy costs could mean less discretionary spending on services, travel and goods.

#### The economic effects ripple through every industry and sector.

Salzman 11-9 [Avi; November 9; Senior writer at Barron's, covering stocks, the economy, and the impact of new technology on financial markets; *Barron’s,* “High Energy Prices Are Rippling Through the Economy,” <https://www.barrons.com/articles/high-energy-prices-are-rippling-through-the-economy-51636477167>; KS]

The latest government inflation figures show that prices are rising fast, and much of the momentum is coming from energy. The trends are already hitting businesses in several industries and will continue rippling through the economy. Investors should keep an eye out for shrinking margins—and possibly pressure on valuation—in the months ahead.

On Tuesday, the Bureau of Labor Statistics released the monthly producer price index, which measures prices of goods and services as they make their way through the supply chain. The report showed that the PPI rose 0.6% in October on a month-over-month basis, and 8.6% on a year over year basis, in line with economists’ expectations.

The consumer price index, which measures prices at the retail level, is scheduled to be released on Wednesday. That report is likely to show that escalating energy prices are forcing consumers to pay up for heating oil, propane, gasoline, and other fuels.

“I think more pain is going to come to the consumer, certainly, for this winter,” said Marcus McGregor, an energy analyst at asset manager Conning. “I think if you look at the latest reports, costs for propane, natural gas and any sources that are leading into the consumer’s home—if we have a really cold winter—are expected to increase significantly this winter. So I see more pain before relief when it comes to the U.S. consumer.”

Businesses are already having to adjust. The PPI shows how the escalating energy costs are affecting corporations—and how they may end up flowing through to consumers in several industries. The price of goods that were at the final stage of production (as opposed to component parts) rose 1.2% in the month, with three quarters of that jump having to do with a rise in the price of energy, according to the report. In October, oil prices rose 13%. Natural gas prices were flat in October, after jumping 34% in September, the largest one-month gain in 12 years.

That has been a boon for energy companies, which have led the market higher this year after trailing for much of the previous decade. Exxon Mobil (ticker: XOM) stock has soared 58% this year, and BP (BP) is up 34%.

But escalating energy prices are a draw on several other industries. Consumer goods get more expensive because it costs more to truck them to warehouses and stores.

“Higher commodity and freight cost impacts combined were a 400 basis point hit to gross margins,” said Procter & Gamble (PG) CFO Andre Schulten on the company’s earnings call last month.

Airlines get pinched, too, because fuel can account for about one-fifth of their expenses. Delta Air Lines (DAL), for instance, said on its latest earnings call that high fuel prices “will pressure our ability to remain profitable in the December quarter.”

“At present time, we’re expecting a modest loss in the fourth quarter with crude prices driving that up nearly 60% year-to-date and more than 15% just over the last month,” said CEO Ed Bastian.

Companies that make or process fuels and chemicals often run on natural gas. Refinery operator Valero Energy (VLO) said that its refinery operating expenses rose 6% in the third quarter largely because of higher natural gas prices. And any other business—including office work—that uses substantial amounts of electricity can be hurt when energy prices rise. Natural gas now accounts for the largest share of U.S. electricity generation.

Industrial companies can be hit too, as their operating expenses rise. Processed fuels used in manufacturing—things like oils, greases, natural gas, and diesel—are on average 34% more expensive than they were a year ago, according to the PPI. That, along with supply-chain problems around the world, are causing some industrial companies to warn investors that their margins could be hurt.

German chemicals company BASF (BASFY) said that high natural gas prices cost it 600 million euros in the first nine months of the year, but that October prices increases would make its operations even more expensive.

“Throughout basically all value chains, our suppliers, our customers and we ourselves continue to be confronted with increasing raw material, energy and transportation costs, supply chain constraints and the related and largely unforeseeable issues with material availability,” said CEO Martin Brudermüller on the company’s latest earnings call.

It’s a global problem that won’t be going away soon, and one that consumers are starting to feel too.

#### **Slows the U.S. economic recovery and guarantees recession.**

Mitchell 10-10 [Josh; October 10; Covers the U.S. economy from the Journal's Washington, D.C. bureau. He previously covered transportation policy and the bailouts of General Motors and Chrysler. Prior to the Journal, he worked as a reporter for the Baltimore Sun and the Palm Beach Post; *Wall Street Journal,* “Soaring Energy Prices Raise Concerns About U.S. Inflation, Economy,” <https://www.wsj.com/articles/soaring-energy-prices-raise-concerns-about-u-s-inflation-economy-11633870800>; KS]

The U.S. economy is facing a new threat: rising energy prices.

Crude oil has risen 64% this year to a seven-year high. Natural-gas prices have roughly doubled over the past six months to a seven-year high. Heating oil has risen 68% this year. Prices at the pump are up nearly a dollar over the past 12 months to a national average just over $3 a gallon. Coal prices are at records.

Higher energy prices could push up inflation in coming months, damp consumer spending on other products and services, and ultimately slow the U.S. recovery, economists say.

“For consumers it’s like a tax,” economist Kathy Bostjancic of Oxford Economics said of the price increase. While consumers will likely be squeezed, the energy-price rise “would have to be extreme and prolonged” to halt the economic recovery, she added. More likely, “we would just see growth decelerate more or a longer pause before growth resumes, and that we just get a bit stickier inflation in the meantime.”

Andreas Steno Larsen, an analyst at Helsinki-based Nordea Bank ABP, is more pessimistic. He said this year’s rise in energy prices has caused him to cut his estimate for U.S. growth next year to 1.5% from 3.5%. While he believes oil and gas prices will remain flat in coming months, he also sees a worst-case scenario in which they rise by another 40% some time next year, enough to push the U.S. and global economy into a brief recession in mid-2022.

The higher prices are being driven by rising demand and tight supplies. As the pandemic fades and consumers around the world step up spending, factories and service providers are ramping up production, which requires energy. Oil supplies are tight because oil-exporting countries have decided to increase production in measured steps instead of opening the taps more widely.

#### Economic decline causes interstate war.

Brands ’21 [Hal and Michael Beckley; September 24; Global Affairs Professor at Johns Hopkins University; Political Science Professor at Tufts University; Foreign Policy, “China Is a Declining Power—and That’s the Problem,” <https://foreignpolicy.com/2021/09/24/china-great-power-united-states/>]

Slowing growth makes it harder for leaders to keep the public happy. Economic underperformance weakens the country against its rivals. Fearing upheaval, leaders crack down on dissent. They maneuver desperately to keep geopolitical enemies at bay. Expansion seems like a solution—a way of grabbing economic resources and markets, making nationalism a crutch for a wounded regime, and beating back foreign threats.

Many countries have followed this path. When the United States’ long post-Civil War economic surge ended, Washington violently suppressed strikes and unrest at home, built a powerful blue-water Navy, and engaged in a fit of belligerence and imperial expansion during the 1890s. After a fast-rising imperial Russia fell into a deep slump at the turn of the 20th century, the tsarist government cracked down hard while also enlarging its military, seeking colonial gains in East Asia and sending around 170,000 soldiers to occupy Manchuria. These moves backfired spectacularly: They antagonized Japan, which beat Russia in the first great-power war of the 20th century.

A century later, Russia became aggressive under similar circumstances. Facing a severe, post-2008 economic slowdown, Russian President Vladimir Putin invaded two neighboring countries, sought to create a new Eurasian economic bloc, staked Moscow’s claim to a resource-rich Arctic, and steered Russia deeper into dictatorship. Even democratic France engaged in anxious aggrandizement after the end of its postwar economic expansion in the 1970s. It tried to rebuild its old sphere of influence in Africa, deploying 14,000 troops to its former colonies and undertaking a dozen military interventions over the next two decades.

#### Economic decline ensures leadership turnover.

Brückner ’19 [Markus and Hans Grüner; October 31; Economics PhD and Professor at Australian National University, External Consultant to IMF and World Bank; Economics PhD and Professor at the University of Mannheim, External Consultant to European Central Bank; Public Choice, “Economic growth and political extremism,” no. 185]

Abstract

We argue that the growth rate, but not the level of aggregate income, affects the support for extreme political parties. In our model, extreme parties offer short-run benefits to part of the population at the expense of a minority. Growth effects on the support for such parties arise when uncertainty exists over whether the same subset of individuals will receive the same benefits in the future. More people are willing to take political risks if economic growth is slow. Based on a panel of 16 European countries, our empirical analysis shows that slower growth rates are associated with a significant increase in right-wing extremism. We find no significant effect of economic growth on the support for extreme left-wing parties.

1 Introduction

Distributional consequences are associated with political extremism, both in the short run and in the long run. Extreme political parties often propose to redistribute resources away from specific subgroups of society, such as the rich, ethnic minorities, or citizens living in specific regions. This paper analyzes the impact of economic growth on the support for extreme political parties in western democracies. We argue that the growth rate, but not the level of aggregate income, affects the support for extremism.

In the first part of our paper, we discuss three alternative explanations for why an increase in the economic growth rate reduces the support for extreme political parties. Two well-known explanations are related to retrospective voting and behavioral effects, the latter meaning that voters may react more strongly to changes in than to levels of economic well-being. The third, novel explanation is that parties with extreme political platforms are perceived to create considerable uncertainty about the future distribution of income.

We develop a simple game-theoretic model that analyzes that uncertainty effect. In our model, extreme political parties offer short-run gains from redistribution to a group of individuals. However, the same individuals also face long-run losses owing to the higher income risk that is associated with an extreme regime.1 The model permits a comparative static analysis with respect to several key variables of interest. The growth rate is associated with larger future income risk. Such risk reduces the number of voters favoring extreme parties. The level of aggregate income has no effect on the support for extremism. Income inequality raises support for redistribution and affects the impact that a change in the growth rate has on the support for extremism.

An important feature of our model is that the effect of economic growth on the support for extremism depends on uncertainty of future income redistribution. If redistributive policies are perceived as predictable—in the sense that the same group will have income taken away from it in the future—then the political support for an extremist party is unaffected by growth.

In the empirical part of our paper, we estimate the relationship between economic growth and the support for extreme political parties using a panel dataset comprising 16 European countries. Our dependent variable is a survey-based measure, compiled by Euro-barometer, of respondents' support for extreme right-wing parties and extreme left-wing parties. We use that data, which spans more than three decades and contains entries on a semi-annual frequency, to estimate the effects of economic growth on the support for extremism. Our empirical analysis shows a significant negative effect of real per capita GDP growth on the support for extreme right-wing parties: controlling for country and time fixed effects, a one percentage point decline in real per capita GDP growth increases the vote share of extreme right-wing parties by up to one percentage point. We document that the negative effect of economic growth on the support for right-wing extremism is robust across estimation techniques and model specifications. We do not find a systematic effect of growth on the support for left-wing extremism.

A possible explanation for the differential effects between left-wing and right-wing extremism that relates closely to our theoretical model is that right-wing extremism might be associated with more uncertainty over what groups will be subject to income expropriation in the future. Left-wing extremism is associated with income redistribution, but little uncertainty exists over its target. Communist doctrine (see, for example, the Communist Manifesto by Marx and Engels 1848), envisions a classless society; i.e., a society wherein incomes are distributed equally. Over the past century, extreme left-wing parties have followed closely that doctrine by proposing to redistribute incomes from rich to poor; as opposition parties they have voted against laissez faire policies and, when in power, they have implemented programs that reduced the wealth and income prospects of the rich (see, e.g., Brown 2010).

Right-wing extremism, in contrast to left-wing extremism, does not advocate a classless society. Instead, it often is associated with discrimination against specific groups of society for racial, religios, political or other reasons.2 An extreme case of a murderous and discriminatory regime was the German fascist rule during the first half of the 20th century. One can see it as a direct consequence of the Nazi party's "Fuhrerprinzip"—"the principle of unconditional authority of the leader" (Bernholz 2017, p.9)—which created considerable uncertainty over who might be stigmatized, imprisoned or killed in the future.3 Indeed, from the Nazi period we know that various groups were stigmatized for different reasons4 and that stigmatization also was particularly erratic.5,6

The empirical analysis of our paper is related to Stevenson (2001), who examines the determinants of aggregate policy preferences in a panel of 14 European countries. One of Stevenson's main findings is that declines in economic growth cause policy preferences to shift to the right, while increases in economic growth cause policy preferences to shift to the left.7 Our paper differs from Stevenson in at least three important aspects. First, in contrast to Stevenson, we show that our empirical results are robust to controlling for country fixed effects, meaning that our results also hold at the within-country level, and not just in cross-section. Relatedly, Acemoglu et al. (2008, 2009) showed that the cross-country relation between income and democracy turns insignificant when country fixed effects are entered into the econometric model. Second, we provide evidence that our empirical findings reflect a causal effect of economic growth on political extremism. We show that our main findings are robust to estimating dynamic models that enable to test for Granger causality; and we also show that the main findings hold with an instrumental variables approach. Third, we distinguish in our empirical analysis between extreme right-wing and extreme left-wing parties. That distinction matters: a robust negative effect of economic growth is found on the support for extreme right-wing parties, whereas no systematic effect exists for the support of extreme left-wing parties. Our finding of a significant negative effect of economic growth on the support for right-wing extremism is in line with the finding of Bromhead et al. (2012), who show that the vote share of right-wing extremists during the Great Depression was significantly larger in those countries that experienced a more severe economic crisis. Using subnational data for 218 European regions during 1990-2016, Rao et al. (2018) find a significant negative effect of regional output on the vote share of extreme right-wing parties, but no signicant effect on extreme left-wing parties.

**Leadership turnover causes nuclear war.**

Bertoli ’18 [Andrew, Allan Dafoe, and Robert F. Trager; May 9; PhD and International Relations Professor at IE University, Spain; PhD and International Relations Professor at UCLA; Political Science Professor at UCLA; Journal of Conflict Resolution, “Is There a War Party? Party Change, the Left–Right Divide, and International Conflict,” vol. 63, no. 4]

Is the likelihood that a democracy will take military action against other countries largely influenced by which party controls the presidency? Many believe so (Palmer, London, and Regan 2004; Arena and Palmer 2009; Clare 2010). In modern American politics, one party is consistently identified as more hawkish than the other. Surveys have revealed that Republican voters consistently prefer more aggressive policies (Eundak 2006; Trager and Vavreck 2011; Gries 2014). Moreover, many believe that Al Gore, had he been elected, would not have invaded Iraq like President George W. Bush did (Jervis 2003; Lieberfeld 2005), and that the foreign policies of Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump would be similarly opposed (Paletta 2016).

Nevertheless, it is very difficult to determine whether the party in control of the presidency really has an important impact on foreign policy due to the selection of parties into particular domestic and international contexts. Put simply, which party controls the presidency is not random. For example, the victory of George W. Bush in 2004 can be attributed to a number of domestic and international factors at the time, including the American public's heightened concerns over national security following September 11. Similarly, Barack Obama's success in 2008 was influenced by problems at home and a decrease in public willingness to engage in military adventurism. Therefore, an observational analysis would likely be biased by such selection processes. Thus, even if countries behave differently when certain parties control the presidency, it would be very difficult to know if that difference is explained by the parties or by the environments into which the parties are selected.

In principle, we could overcome this problem by running an experiment in which we randomly assigned countries to be ruled by leaders from different parties. Such an ideal research design would avoid the confounding problem, making it possible to test whether countries tend to be more or less aggressive when certain parties control the presidency. Experiments are unmatched in their ability to identify causal effects, so this type of study could greatly improve our understanding of how electing candidates from different parties influences foreign policy.

We approximate this ideal experiment by using a regression discontinuity (RD) design. Specifically, we look at close presidential elections where a candidate from one party barely defeated a candidate from a different party. Such a design works if it is close to random which party won in these cases, a premise which is plausible given the inherent randomness in large national elections. Thus, we use close elections to get data that are similar to what would result from a real experiment. Such natural experimental designs are extremely rare in the study of war and thus warrant attention in the exceptional instances when they do occur.

We run two main analyses. First, we look at whether countries tend to be more (or less) aggressive when presidential candidates from right-wing parties barely defeat candidates from left-wing parties. This quasi-experimental comparison involves a small sample size (n = 29), but we still find noteworthy evidence that electing right-wing candidates increases the likelihood that countries will initiate high-level military disputes against other states. Second, to increase our statistical power, we examine cases where candidates from incumbent parties barely won or barely lost to candidates from challenger parties (n = 36). Specifically, we test whether countries experienced a larger change in their propensity to engage in military disputes when the candidate from the challenger party barely won. Thus, our key outcome of interest here is how much countries deviated from their prior levels of dispute involvement. We find statistically significant evidence that electing candidates from challenger parties causes countries to experience a larger change in their propensity to engage in military conflict with other states.

Upon further examination of the data, we find that the results from our second test are largely explained by a tendency for candidates from challenger parties to initiate military disputes in their first year in office. Thus, these findings support the theory that major leadership transitions tend to increase the chances of state aggression, either because new leaders lack the experience to manage international crises effectively or because they need to prove their resolve by acting tough.

This article makes several important contributions to the study of international relations. First, there is a long-standing debate in political science over whether leaders have an important independent impact on interstate conflict or whether their influence is largely constrained by strategic realities (Byman and Pollack 2001; Mearsheimer and Walt 2003; Jones and Olken 2009; Chiozza and Goemans 2011; Saunders 2011; Horowitz, Stam, and Ellis 2015; Croco 2015). This study provides quasi-experimental evidence that leaders do have a meaningful impact on foreign policy. Second, the results presented here suggest that domestic political ideology can spill over into the international realm. One of the main explanations for the democratic peace is that democracies act in accordance with their domestic norms when it comes to foreign policy (Morgan and Campbell 1991). The findings presented here support that hypothesis by showing that left-wing leaders do tend to behave more dovishly in international affairs. Third, these results suggest that we should be alert to the potential for interstate conflict when right-wing leaders are in office, as well as after elections where party control of the presidency changes hands.

This study is also notable because it is one of the first in the international relations literature to use a preanalysis plan. Prior to looking at any of the results, we pre-registered the main tests that we planned to conduct in this article. Our motivation here was to tie our hands, so that there could be no question of sifting through the data to find the statistical tests that produced the most interesting or significant results. The temptation for scholars to run many tests and then report the ones that are most "interesting" can lead to misleading findings. This danger has attracted a great deal of attention across scientific fields over the last decade, and it is seen by many as a major problem for quantitative research (Nosek et al. 2015). The purpose of preanalysis plans is to help ensure that research remains credible.

The article proceeds as follows. We first discuss the theoretical bases for the claim that party control of the presidency influences conflict decisions and review the existing empirical work on this subject. We then outline the research design in more detail. Next, we conduct design checks to verify that the research design is appropriate. We then present the results for party ideology. After that, we test whether party turnover leads to changes in the likelihood of state aggression. We then discuss the findings and conclude.

Leaders, Parties, and International Conflict

In recent years, much debate has arisen over whether leaders influence the chances of interstate conflict, and if so, how. A major question in this research program is whether leaders from certain parties are more likely to behave aggressively in foreign affairs or whether the ideology of the leader is largely unrelated to state behavior.

The theory that party control of the presidency influences the chances of interstate conflict can be derived from three premises. The first is that conservatives and liberals hold different views about the legitimacy or efficacy of military force. This assumption is backed by cross-national survey data showing that liberals tend to be more concerned with fairness, duties of care, and preventing harm, while conservatives tend to favor the preservation of social orders, the purity of sanctified objects, and loyalty to in-groups (Graham, Haidt, and Nosek 2009; Boer and Fischer 2013). Several studies have also found that these differences in moral foundations influence foreign policy attitudes (Schwartz 1992; Kertzer et al. 2014; Kertzer and Rathbun 2015). In particular, liberals are more "prosocial" and seek compromise internationally, in contrast to conservatives, who are more "proself” and therefore bargain more aggressively (Schwartz, Caprara, and Vecchione 2010).

The second assumption is that general differences in party attitudes appear at the elite level. There are two ways that these differences could affect the behavior of political elites. First, the political leaders could sincerely hold beliefs and preferences similar to those of their constituents, leading them to have different foreign policy strategies and goals. Alternatively, the leaders could have different beliefs and attitudes than their constituents, but nonetheless recognize that they must carry out their supporters' agenda if they hope to stay in office.

Although it is difficult to know the extent to which leaders true foreign policy preferences reflect those of their constituents, several observational studies show that changes in a leader's base correlate with changes in their approach to international affairs. First, Mattes, Leeds, and Carroll (2015) find that changes in the supporting coalitions of leaders predict foreign policy change, measured by the policy positions taken by nations in the United Nations General Assembly. Rathbun (2004) and Haas (2005) come to a similar conclusion looking at support for peace-enforcement missions, and Solingen (2009) finds that economic interests and the ideologies of partisan coalitions influence nuclear weapons policy. Therefore, even when a leader has different foreign policy beliefs and goals than the rest of the party, there may still be pressure to toe the party line.

The third assumption is that leaders from different parties can act on their divergent preferences. This means that international and domestic constraints on leaders cannot be so powerful that they largely limit leaders to a single course of action. For example, some realists argue that there is little room for leaders to have an independent impact on foreign policy because they all need to defend and advance the national interest (Mearsheimer 2001; Mearsheimer and Walt 2003). Regarding domestic constraints, Trager and Vavreck (2011) find that right-wing and left-wing leaders can have incentives to hide their "types." Liberal leaders may be forced to adopt more hawkish foreign policies because they fear that their moderation will sometimes be interpreted as weakness (Schultz 2005), whereas conservative leaders may have incentives to adopt more moderate policies because the public would likely judge them unduly aggressive if they acted hawkishly. Thus, leader preferences and political incentives could actually push in opposite directions.

Several previous studies have examined whether right-wing leaders tend to behave more aggressively in foreign policy than left-wing leaders. Using logistic regression on panel data covering eighteen parliamentary democracies from 1949 to 1992, Palmer, London and Regan (2004) find that right-wing governments are more likely to be involved in military disputes, while left-wing governments are more likely to see the disputes in which they are involved in escalate. Their explanation is that right-wing parties favor using force more often, so their leaders will engage in military conflict more often. However, when left-wing leaders engage in conflict, they will need to emerge victorious to justify their involvement, so they will be more likely to bargain tough and escalate if necessary. These researchers find that a shift from left to right government increases the chances of dispute initiation by about 50 percent and that left-wing governments are about twice as likely to escalate conditional on being in a dispute. Second, Arena and Palmer (2009) apply a probit model to panel data covering twenty stable democracies from 1960 to 1996 and find that right-wing governments are more likely to initiate disputes. Their theory is based on the finding that right-wing leaders are less likely to be removed from office for using force unwisely than left-wing leaders. This makes right-wing leaders more likely to start international conflicts in the hopes of increasing their domestic support. Third, Clare (2010) applies logistic regression to twenty parliamentary democracies from 1950 to 1998 and finds that parliamentary democracies are about twice as likely to initiate disputes when they are controlled by right-wing parties.

The central limitation of these studies is that their conclusions rest on the results of regression analysis on cross-national panel data. Such an approach is not guaranteed to eliminate bias from omitted variables. In fact, the results from this type of analysis can be badly biased, even when researchers control for a wide range of important covariates (Clarke 2005). In some cases, controlling for potential con-founders can even amplify bias (Pearl 2013). Thus, the results from these past studies should be interpreted as a tentative first cut at answering this question rather than the final word on the subject.

The design-based approach that we employ in this article gets around the omitted variable bias problem because the as-if random assignment of leaders to office should create balance across observable and unobservable pretreatment characteristics. In many other scientific fields, the results of conventional observational analyses have been overturned by design-based studies. For example, the validity of hormone replacement therapy and a variety of theories in development economics, psychology, and elsewhere have been overturned when experimental and quasi-experimental approaches were brought to bear (Women's Health Initiative 2002; Freedman 2009; Dunning 2012). Therefore, the tests that we present in this article provide an important step forward in our understanding of the empirical relationship between party control of the presidency and interstate conflict.

Before moving on to our research design, though, we should first lay out the hypotheses that we want to test. As we detail in our preanalysis plan, we started this project with the belief that leaders do matter and that electing leaders from different parties does affect the likelihood of state aggression. Given this prior, we formulated two main hypotheses. The first is the party ideology hypothesis, which predicts that electing leaders from right-wing parties will increase the likelihood of state aggression. The second hypothesis is highly general and speaks directly to the question of whether leaders matter in international relations. It posits that electing a leader from the incumbent party will lead to less change in international dispute behavior than electing a leader from a challenger party. We refer to this as the incumbent/challenger hypothesis.

Party Ideology Hypothesis: Electing presidential candidates from right-wing parties will make countries more aggressive than electing candidates from left-wing parties.

Incumbent/Challenger Hypothesis: Electing candidates from challenger parties will lead to a greater change in state aggression than electing candidates from incumbent parties (the absolute difference in aggression between presidential terms will be greater when there is party turnover).

One issue that is related to the incumbent/challenger hypothesis is that new leaders may be particularly likely to act aggressively early in their terms. There are several reasons why this might be the case. First, new leaders may lack the experience to manage international crises effectively, making it more likely that disagreements with other states will turn into military conflicts (Potter 2007). Second, new leaders may be more likely to want to show the international community that they are willing to use force abroad, which could strengthen their bargaining leverage in future international negotiations (Wolford 2007; Dafoe 2012). Third, new leaders may want to send a signal to their domestic audiences that they are tough when it comes to foreign affairs, which could increase their popularity at home. This idea that leaders are more likely to get involved in military disputes when they first arrive in office has received support from cross-national logistic regression analysis on panel data (Gelpi and Grieco 2001) and a mixed-methods analysis that looks at American presidents (Potter 2007).

While most of the existing theory and research on leadership transitions has focused on cases where new leaders come to office, a similar logic might be applied to party control of the presidency, particularly when it comes to the reputational mechanisms. New leaders who are from the same party as the old one should be able to associate themselves with the previous leader's reputation, giving them less of a need to signal their resolve. On the other hand, when leaders from challenger parties come to power, there should be less certainty that the new leader will have an approach to foreign policy that is similar to the old one's. In short, when party control of the presidency changes hands, it marks a more significant leadership transition (Mattes, Leeds, and Matsumura 2016). Thus, even if parties tend to behave pretty similarly across ideologies, we might still find that leaders from challenger parties might be much more aggressive early in their tenures.

Challenger Aggression Hypothesis: Electing candidates from challenger parties will lead to an increase in state aggression when the new leader takes office.

We did not preregister the challenger aggression hypothesis prior to looking at the results, but this was the only hypothesis we tested outside of those we preregis-tered. Thus, the findings do not reflect data mining. Nevertheless, some readers may wish to interpret the test of this particular hypothesis as exploratory.

Research Design

There are several different design-based approaches that could be used to investigate how leaders affect state behavior. One would be to look at all cases of leadership turnover and compare how countries behaved before and after the leadership change. This research design rests on the idea that countries are comparable before and after leadership transitions. This assumption may be plausible in some cases, but in others, it is clearly invalid. For example, the periods before and after normal electoral leader transitions are usually not comparable. Many countries elect the leader and members of the legislature at the same time, making it difficult to determine the effect of leadership change by itself. Similarly, looking at cases when leaders were forcibly removed from office also has its limitations, since leaders are usually removed at times of extreme political tension. Likewise, leadership changes that are caused by assassinations are not likely to provide valid comparisons. The new leader will probably have to deal with a more complicated political situation in the aftermath of the assassination, making the beginning of their term much different from the end of the previous leader's term.

Another potentially promising approach would be to focus on changes in leadership that resulted from the natural deaths of leaders. The timing of natural leader deaths should be fairly unrelated to the domestic and international environments. Moreover, the legislature will typically not change following the natural death of a leader, making it much easier to isolate the independent effect of leaders on foreign policy. However, the natural death approach is not well-suited for this particular study. The reason is that the new leader almost always comes from the same party as the old leader. Thus, this exogenous change in leadership does not provide much leverage in determining how party control of the presidency affects interstate conflict. This research design could be useful in looking at other types of variation in leaders, such as age, military experience, and occupational background. However, it is not a promising design for this study.

The approach that we take instead is to use an RD design. RD involves comparing units that barely surpassed and barely fell short of an important cut point that influenced treatment assignment. For example, if there was a test where everyone who scored a fifty or higher got a scholarship, researchers could assess the effects of getting the scholarship by comparing the students who scored fifty and fifty-one to the students who scored forty-eight and forty-nine. So long as there is no sorting at the cut point, as could happen if the graders had opportunity and motive to nudge some test takers above the cut point, it should be close to random which of these students won the scholarship, since they were all on the verge of getting it (Lee 2008).

Close elections provide an excellent opportunity to use RD analysis. Given the inherent randomness in the electoral process, whether candidates barely win or barely lose in close elections is plausibly as-if random (Eggers et al. 2015).1 Political scientists have used RD to study questions like how winning an election influences a party's likelihood of winning the next election (Lee 2008) and how winning an election affects a candidate's wealth later in life (Eggers and Hainmueller 2009). Scholars have also used RD to test how economic and political outcomes differ when Republican candidates for mayor barely defeat or barely lose to Democratic candidates (Pettersson-Lidbom 2008; Gerber and Hopkins 2011; Beland 2015; de Benedictis-Kessner and Warshaw 2016).

In this article, we look at close presidential elections. To our knowledge, this study is the first to apply RD specifically to presidential elections. For our analysis, we followed the procedures that were outlined in our preanalysis plan (which is available at the end of the Online Appendix). We will briefly summarize these procedures in the remainder of this section.

Our Statistical Approach

There are two general ways to analyze an RD. The first, known as the continuity approach, involves plotting two smoothing functions on either side of the cut point and estimating the difference at the cut point (Voeten 2014). This method should be used when the score, or "forcing variable," is continuous. The second method is the local-randomization approach, appropriate when the forcing variable is discrete (Lee and Card 2008; Cattaneo, Frandsen, and Titiunik 2015; Bertoli 2017). It involves drawing a window around the cut point and treating the units within that window like they were in a randomized experiment.

Since the forcing variable in this study is vote share in a presidential election, which is essentially continuous, we would normally use the continuity approach. However, we discovered in our preanalysis plan that the continuity approach had a type 1 error rate (false-positive rate) of 12 percent for this study, which we believe is due to our small sample size. Since the type 1 error rate should be 5 percent by design, we chose not to use this method, since it was overly likely to give us significant results. Instead, we used the local-randomization approach, which we found had a type 1 error rate of about 4 percent.

Defining Close Elections

We considered elections to be close if the top two candidates were within 2 percent of the cut point (48 percent to 52 percent range). Data on close races were available in the data set constructed by Bertoli, Dafoe, and Trager (2018). This data set includes every democratic election between 1815 and 2010, where democracies are defined as countries with Polity IV Institutionalized Democracy scores above five. The data set provides information on the top two candidates including their names, parties, and vote shares in the election. If there were more than two candidates running in an election, we focused only on the votes for the top two candidates, rescaling their vote shares accordingly. In cases where there were runoffs, we used their vote shares from the runoff rather than the initial election. We also excluded close elections in nondemocracies because we were concerned about fraud in these cases. Given the possibility of fraud, we did not feel confident in assuming that the outcomes of these elections were as-if random.

One complication that arose is that the United States elects presidents through the electoral college. This system makes it possible for candidates to lose the popular vote but still win the election if they defeat their rival in the electoral college. To deal with this issue, we counted the electoral college vote rather than the popular vote when looking at the United States. This decision is consistent with other similar studies (Bertoli, Dafoe, and Trager 2018). For every other country, we used the popular vote.

Measuring Party Ideology

To identify parties as left or right-wing, we evaluated the parties against each other according to their positions at the time of the election on social questions associated with liberalism and conservatism. Parties were judged further to the right when they expressed support for "traditional values," national, religious, racial, or ethnic in-groups, or the benefits of authority and traditional sources of authority such as a monarchy. Parties were judged further to the left when they expressed inclusive sentiments, a duty of care for vulnerable groups, and support for democratic principles. Secondarily, we evaluated parties as left or right on economic policy preferences. Advocacy for wealthier interests placed a candidate further to the right, and advocacy for the less well-off is associated with the left. These two social and economic dimensions are highly correlated, with the principal exceptions coming from communist and postcommunist countries. In these cases, the primary social dimension determined the left-right coding. When parties could not be easily classified as left or right according to these metrics, we excluded the election from the ideology test.

Main Analyses

We looked at two different types of close elections. The first were close elections between right-wing and left-wing parties, where it was essentially random whether the presidency was controlled by a leader with a right-wing or left-wing ideology. In total, we have twenty-nine close elections between right-wing and left-wing parties. The second set of close elections that we analyzed was narrow races between an incumbent and challenger party. In these cases, it was as-if random whether the country experienced party continuity or change in the executive branch. We have thirty-six of these close elections in our data set. For this group of cases, we were particularly interested in testing whether a change in party control of the presidency increased the likelihood of a change in state aggression.

Although our sample sizes are not large, the power tests that we ran at the beginning of this project indicated that we had a good chance of picking up a medium-sized or large effect. For the test of left- versus right-wing parties, we determined we would correctly detect (at a = .05) a medium-sized effect (0.5 standard deviation [SD]) 30 percent of the time, a large effect (0.8 SD) 54 percent of the time, and a very large effect (1.2 SD) 82 percent of the time. In the incumbency power analysis, we found that we would detect a medium-sized effect 55 percent of the time, a large effect 93 percent of the time, and a very large effect over 99 percent of the time. Also, if the effects were small or nonexistent, the power tests indicated that we would be able to establish confidence intervals that were precise enough to rule out very large (+1.2 SD) positive and negative effects.2

Moreover, although the results turn out to be significant at conventional levels, we encourage readers to avoid interpreting p values as either significant (p < .05) or not while reading this article and to bear the bias-variance trade-off in research design in mind. Almost all quantitative research in international relations lacks any claim to strong causal identification, being based on observational data and linear adjustment of largely ad hoc covariate sets. By contrast, the design presented here has a strong claim to causal identification and unbiasedness, providing a crucial complement to the vast majority of the literature which does not. Thus, since p values provide a continuous measure of how inconsistent the evidence is with the null hypothesis, a higher p value in an unbiased design may actually reflect more evidence against the null than a lower p value in a biased one. Small p values (e.g., p < .2), even if not significant at conventional standards, also provide important evidence in these contexts.

In addition to our two main tests, we examined whether candidates from challenger parties are more likely to initiate military disputes at the beginning of their terms than candidates from incumbent parties, which would be consistent with the theory that major leadership transitions make state aggression more likely. Our motivation for running this test came from reading Wolford (2007), Dafoe (2012), and Wu and Wolford (2016). These articles advance a compelling theory and intriguing empirical evidence that new leaders have reputational incentives to act tough when they first come to office. We find strong evidence consistent with this hypothesis.

Outcomes

We measured aggression using the number of militarized interstate disputes (MIDs) that a country initiates. These disputes are cases where countries explicitly threatened, displayed, or used force against other states (Ghosn, Palmer, and Bremer 2004). Specifically, we look at the number of these disputes that a state initiated starting from when the leader took office and ending at the date that the winner of the next election was scheduled to start. In cases where leaders were replaced part of the way through their term, we used the day that they left office instead. Since the length of time that candidates held office varied, we divided the total number of disputes by the duration of the time period. Thus, the unit of measurement is military disputes initiated per year in office.

We use slightly different versions of the outcome variables for our different tests. For the ideology test, we use military disputes initiated per year, as described in the previous paragraph. For the main incumbency test, we use the absolute change in military disputes initiated per year from the previous term. We use this variable because we are interested in evaluating whether there was a larger absolute change in military aggression when the challenger party barely won. Thus, the measure is:

Absolute change in military aggression =|MIDs/year during winner's term

—MIDs/year during previous term|

In other words, we are testing whether challenger parties gaining control of the presidency makes countries with high levels of prior aggression more likely to experience a decrease in dispute initiation and countries with low levels of prior aggression more likely to experience an increase in dispute initiation. We conduct a one-sided test for this analysis, since we expect that the absolute change will be larger for countries where the challenger party barely wins. Lastly, for the exploratory test about whether challenger candidates tend to be more aggressive when they first take office, we look at the number of disputes that each country initiated in the first year of the new presidential term.

Across these tests, our main outcomes are (1) military disputes initiated and (2) high-level military disputes initiated. High-level disputes are cases where countries used force against other states or entered into international wars.3 Following the preanalysis plan, we examine high-level disputes, which constitute actual uses of force, separately because the factors that drive posturing may be different from those that drive actual violence. As secondary outcomes, we look at (3) all disputes that countries engaged in and (4) all high-level disputes that countries engaged in. These cases include disputes that countries did not start but participated in nonetheless.

Estimation

We employ two estimation strategies. Our primary statistical analysis involves t tests. This is a simple approach, recommended for its parsimony and robustness, which is appropriate given the assumption that close elections were as-if random (Dunning 2012). As a secondary test, we plot the outcome as a function of the electoral result and estimate how the expected value of the outcome changes at the cut point using local linear regression, as is often done for RD designs. An advantage with using this approach is that it makes it possible to visualize how outcomes change at the cut point.

Design Checks

Our research design rests on one main assumption, necessary for internally valid estimates: the outcomes of the close elections considered in this study are as-if random. For example, the design would be invalid if any candidates could precisely manipulate their vote shares around the cut point, such as by counting the votes and adding just enough to win. This assumption should be valid for democracies provided that elections are fair (Eggers et al. 2015).

A second "representativeness" assumption facilitates generalizing from our results, and this is that the democracy years experiencing close elections are not dissimilar to democracy years in which elections are not close. If this assumption is reasonable, then we can generalize from our results to all democracy years. However, if the countries that had close elections are not representative of other democracies, then the causal estimates that we find may not reflect broader patterns in international relations.

We can test the as-if randomness assumption in two ways. First, we can check that the samples are balanced on important pretreatment characteristics. Figure 1 plots the balance using two-sided t tests. The graph on the left shows that countries where right-wing parties barely won were very similar to countries where left-wing parties barely won, and the graph on the right shows that countries where incumbent parties barely won were similar to countries where challenger parties barely won. In Figure 1, we look at twenty-four covariates, and not a single one is significantly imbalanced. Thus, the data are consistent with the assumption that who won these close elections was as-if random.

[[FIGURE ONE OMITTED]]

[[FIGURE TWO OMITTED]]

Second, we can test whether there is balance in the number of cases on either side of the cut point. Figure 2 shows how close right-wing and incumbent parties were to winning the presidency. For the twenty-nine close elections between right-wing and left-wing parties, there were sixteen cases where the right-wing party won and thirteen cases where the left-wing party won (p = .71). Similarly, for the thirty-six close elections between incumbent and challenger parties, there were seventeen cases where the incumbent party won and nineteen cases where the challenger party won (p = .87). Thus, there is no evidence of sorting in either sample.

[[FIGURE THREE OMITTED]]

We can also evaluate the external validity assumption by comparing the two samples to the broader population of all democracies since 1815. Figure 3 uses box-plots to compare our samples to the broader population with respect to covariates related to military power. The comparisons show that our samples are very similar to the broader population of democracies from 1815 to 2010. Thus, at least with respect to these covariates, there is little reason to believe that either of our samples consist of an idiosyncratic group of countries that would behave differently than most other democracies. Rather, the representativeness of our samples indicates that our results should be indicative of broader trends in international relations.

In sum, the outcomes of the close elections appear to be random, and the countries where the close elections happened are fairly representative of all other democracies. Therefore, the design appears to have worked very well. In the next two sections, we will look at how electing presidential candidates from different parties affects state aggression using this new empirical approach.

Results for Party Ideology

Our results indicate that right-wing parties tend to be more aggressive than left-wing parties. Table 1 shows the aggression levels of the countries that had close elections between right-wing and left-wing candidates. On average, the countries where right-wing parties barely won started .06 more disputes per year than countries where left-wing parties barely won. Similarly, they engaged in .10 more high-level disputes per year than countries where left-wing parties barely won. Given that the average duration of a presidential term for these countries is 4 years and 169 days, this adds up to .32 more disputes initiated and .43 more high-level disputes initiated over an average presidential term.

Figure 4 plots the estimates for the two main outcome variables along with the two other indicators of aggression. The confidence intervals are based on two-tailed t tests. They suggest that electing right-wing parties does increase state aggression, particularly when it comes to high-level disputes. Of course, all of these confidence intervals cover zero, so we cannot rule out zero effect with 95 percent confidence based on this analysis alone. The estimate most different from zero is of high-level disputes initiated (p = .25). For disputes initiated, the results appear to be more consistent with no effect (p = .64), as do the results for the supplemental tests of all disputes and all high-level disputes.

[[TABLE ONE OMITTED]]

[[FIGURE FOUR OMITTED]]

However, if we look at the specific disputes in more detail, the evidence that electing right-wing leaders increases state aggression grows stronger. While all the high-level disputes that the right-wing leaders engaged in involved unequivocal uses of force, the only high-level dispute that any of the left-wing leaders initiated is questionable and should probably be excluded. This dispute was between Costa Rica and Nicaragua in 1995, and it did not involve any military action by either country. Costa Rican police crossed the Nicaraguan border in pursuit of suspects and were arrested. Two days later, the Costa Rican police force retaliated by arresting two Nicaraguan police officers who had crossed the border "to get a drink of water." The two sides made a prisoner swap on the following day. If this case is dropped, then electing right-wing parties appears to lead countries to initiate . 12 more high-level disputes per year (p = .162).4

Moreover, the only reason that these results are not significant is because the United States (2001) is an outlier, which inflates the standard errors. We can address this issue by modifying the outcome to a simple indicator variable for whether countries initiated any high-level disputes (no = 0, yes = 1), which makes our test insensitive to outliers. The estimates then suggest that electing right-wing parties increases the chances that countries will initiate high-level military disputes by 25 percent (p = .041). Therefore, even though the initial tests were not statistically significant, they become more conclusive after we address some minor issues with the data.

Given the number of democracies in the world today, there may be enough close elections to get much more precise estimates a decade or two from now or maybe even after the next expansion of the MID data set. This design is definitely worth returning to in the near future. However, for the present, we will turn to a second test in the next section on more data that yields increased statistical power. This test provides further evidence that which party controls the presidency does affect the likelihood of state aggression.

Results for Incumbent versus Challenger Parties

The second test that we run compares cases where challenger parties barely defeated incumbent parties to cases where they barely lost to incumbent parties. In these cases, it was as-if random whether the incumbent or challenger party won. Thus, we can test how much military aggression changes when the party that controls the executive branch changes. The outcomes that we use for this test are the absolute changes in the military indicators between the term when the incumbent or challenger party barely won and the previous term. For this analysis, we use one-sided tests that assume that there will tend to be a larger change in military aggression when the challenger party barely wins.

Table 2 shows the absolute change in aggression levels for the countries that had close elections between candidates from incumbent and challenger parties. When the candidates from challenger parties barely won, the absolute change in disputes initiated per year was .031 greater than when candidates from incumbent parties barely won (p = .30; 26 percent increase from baseline). For high-level disputes, the difference is even more notable. The absolute change in high-level disputes initiated per year was .074 greater than when candidates from incumbent parties barely won (p = .046, 133 percent increase from baseline). The average length of the presidential terms for these data was 4.42 years, so this adds up to a difference of .33 high-level disputes initiated per presidential term. Figure 5 plots the confidence intervals for the aggression indicators.

This estimated effect is substantively large relative to other determinants of conflict that international relations scholars have analyzed. For example, past studies have found that revolutions increase the likelihood that countries will initiate military disputes by about 74 percent (Colgan 2010), arms transfers by about 60 percent (Krause 2004), and neutrality pacts with potential conflict joiners by about 57 percent (Leeds 2003). The effect of challenger parties winning appears to be in the ballpark of these estimates, although it is hard to nail down this effect very precisely because of the relatively small sample size.

Figure 6 illustrates the effect for high-level disputes across a greater range of margins of victory. As countries move from incumbent party victories (the points on the left) to challenger party victories (the points on the right), there is a large shift in the absolute change in high-level disputes initiated. Countries where the challenger party barely won experienced a much larger change than countries where the incumbent party barely won. Although this method of estimating the treatment effect was not the primary method that we discussed in our preanalysis plan, the results for this approach are fairly conclusive.

### 1AC – Federalism

#### Circuit splits over the filed rate doctrine makes enforcement incoherent.

First ’12 [Harry and Christopher Sagers; November 28; Law Professor at NYU; Law Professor at Cleveland-Marshall; Brief of Antitrust and Economics Professors, “McCray v. Fidelity National Title Insurance Company,” http://sblog.s3.amazonaws.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/McCray-Final-File-Copy-as-Filed.pdf]

Some courts, though not all, have found that this complex of theoretical considerations has no relevance as soon as a state adopts the simple expedient of a rate-filing system, even if it is identical to the unreviewed, file-and-use system that Ticor found so lacking. They do this on their view that the filed rate doctrine should apply in such cases, and in their view the filed rate rule precludes private remedies even where the agency engages in no actual review of rates filed.3 Amici are eager to undo this extraordinary elevation of form over theoretical substance, and to bring consistency to all cases in which states attempt to limit federal antitrust.

Footnote 3.

3 Not all courts so hold, and the Circuits are accordingly split. Compare Brown v. Ticor Title Ins. Co., 982 F.2d 386, 394 (9th Cir. 1992) (rejecting filed rate protection for state-filed rates), with Wegoland Ltd. v. NYNEX Corp., 27 F.3d 17, 20 (2d Cir.1994) (finding filed-rate protection for state-filed rates), H.J. Inc. v. Nw. Bell Tel. Co., 954 F.2d 485, 494 (8th Cir.1992) (same), and Taffet v. S. Co., 967 F.2d 1483, 1494 (11th Cir. 1992) (same).

Footnote 3 ends.

To be clear, Amici stress as the justification for certiorari not the lack of “active supervision” in and of itself, but the expansion of the heavily disfavored filed rate doctrine to state-filed rates, an expansion that creates serious theoretical tension. If “a doctrine [so] indefensible . . . should be narrowly construed,” as one leading antitrust authority has said, HERBERT HOVENKAMP, FEDERAL ANTITRUST POLICY: THE LAW OF COMPETITION AND ITS PRACTICE § 19.6 (4th ed. 2011) (emphasis added), then there can be no call for expanding it in this way, beyond any traditional basis in the intent of the federal Congress, and in a way so far at odds with this Court’s theory of antitrust federalism. Accordingly, while there may be support for the view that federally filed rates can enjoy filed rate protection without actual review, and while some such support was cited below,4 it is inapt to this case.

Amici will explain three related reasons that the theoretical conflict renders certiorari appropriate. First, only this Court is likely to restore consistency across factual contexts that some lower courts have taken to be distinct and unrelated. Failure to find that consistency causes there to be inexplicably and undesirably different antitrust treatment of state regulatory regimes that do not differ in any respect relevant to any value of federalism or federal antitrust. Second, this Court will consider another matter this Term raising importantly similar issues, Federal Trade Commission v. Phoebe Putney Health Sys., Inc., 663 F.3d 1369 (11th Cir.), cert. granted 2012 WL 985316 (2012) (No. 11-1160). Consideration of both matters would complement one another, as they raise the same fundamental concern: what precisely should be required of state governments before they excuse private persons from federal antitrust liability. And finally, confusion of this central theoretical point caused the court below explicitly to break with a decision of the Ninth Circuit on essentially identical facts, Brown v. Ticor Title Ins. Co., 982 F.2d 386 (9th Cir. 1992). Amici submit that Brown properly applied this Court’s larger framework for balancing state regulation and federal antitrust.

III. REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

This case is not, as the court below took it to be, about minor points of detail within the widely disparaged “filed rate” doctrine, commonly associated with Keogh v. Chicago & Nw. Ry. Co., 260 U.S. 156 (1922). It has little to do with the since-repealed federal statute at issue in that case, or with any similar federal statute, or with Justice Brandeis’s views of the largely defunct Progressive-era rate and-entry regulatory regimes of which those statutes were a part.

Instead, this case is about federalism. Specifically, it is about what should be required before a state government excuses private persons from the federal antitrust laws. The court below forgot that “a state”—unlike the federal Congress— “does not give immunity to those who violate the Sherman Act by authorizing them to violate it, or by declaring that their action is lawful . . . .” Parker v. Brown, 317 U.S. 341, 351 (1943).

The opinion below crystallized the central problem in the following, nearly hidden observation: while not denying that some of this Court’s state action cases seem hard to square with its decision, the court simply found “no apparent requirement to reconcile the filed rate and state action doctrines . . . .” McCray v. Fidelity Nat’l Title Ins. Co., 682 F.3d 229, 238 n.6 (3d Cir. 2012). The court gave no explanation for that view, cited two circuit opinions for it that are logically irrelevant,5 and was evidently unaware of judicial6 and academic7 authority for the seemingly self-evident point that antitrust scope doctrines should be consistent with one another. In fact there is a need for theoretical consistency, and certiorari is made appropriate by the court’s failure to seek it.

A. Serious and Unexplained Theoretical Conflict in the Scope of Antitrust

The decision below, when taken together with this Court’s Ticor decision, gives rise to the following puzzle. If State X and State Y both had title insurance regimes like those at issue in Ticor, then title insurers in both states would be fully subject to government antitrust remedies. Ticor so held. But the effect of a ruling like that below is to bar private damages remedies. So if State X did not have a ratefiling requirement, then private plaintiffs could challenge price-fixing by State X title insurers, but a rate-filing requirement in State Y would bar private challenges there, even though in every other respect the regulatory regimes remained identical. Nothing seemed relevant to filed rate protection below except for the tariff filing itself. In its absence, the filed rate doctrine would not apply, and Ticor would preclude state action immunity, making private damages actions possible.

The same result would hold even if both states’ regulators had the same power to enforce the same reasonable rate and non-discrimination rules, and even if both states explicitly authorized price-fixing by statute. Filed rate protection would still be unavailable, and Ticor would still deny state action immunity from private remedies. And it would be so even though the State Y filing system were exactly like the one found inadequate in Ticor—a file-anduse system in which the regulator never actually uses its power of post-filing review. The Third Circuit would preclude the federal remedies of Clayton Act § 4 in State Y but not State X, even though the only difference between them is State Y’s requirement to file a piece of paper that no one ever looks at.

This result is at odds with seventy years of this Court’s elaborate balancing of state and federal interests in antitrust cases, a framework that began in Parker in 1943. Where the Court has permitted states to deviate from the federal competition mandate, it has been solely to respect their sovereign interests in regulating trade within their borders. The states have no such interest in cases in which they do not in fact regulate. Accordingly, antitrust is relaxed in light of state policy only where the state itself has actively used its regulatory power. Ticor, 504 U.S. at 639-40; Midcal, 445 U.S. at 105-06.

Ticor, this Court’s last statement on the issue, remains its fullest theoretical elaboration. As Ticor explained, on a thorough canvass of the Court’s prior decisions, the Court’s purpose has never been “to determine whether the State has met some normative standard, such as efficiency, in its regulatory practices.” The Court asks only “whether the State has exercised sufficient independent judgment and control so that the details of the rates or prices have been established as a product of deliberate state intervention, [and] not simply by agreement among private parties.” Ticor, 504 U.S. at 634-35; see also id. at 633 (“Immunity is conferred out of respect for ongoing regulation by the State, not out of respect for the economics of price restraint.”). And the Court judges the degree of the state’s “independent judgment and control” by measuring precisely the variable that the court below said was irrelevant: the Court requires evidence of “[a]ctual state involvement, not deference to private price-fixing arrangements under the general auspices of state law . . . .” Ticor, 504 U.S. at 633. Critically, the Court added that:

state officials [must] have and exercise power to review particular anticompetitive acts of private parties and disapprove those that fail to accord with state policy. Absent such a program of supervision, there is no realistic assurance that a private party’s anticompetitive conduct promotes state policy, rather than merely the party’s individual interests.

504 U.S. at 634 (quoting Patrick v. Burget, 486 U.S. 94, 100-01 (1988)).

Therefore, the result in this case should not stand unless there is some difference between the filed rate doctrine, applied below, and the state action doctrine explained in Ticor, and the difference serves some relevant policy goal important enough to justify radically different exposure to liability in otherwise similar contexts. But the only difference in consequence between the two doctrines is that the state action immunity precludes all antitrust and the filed rate rule ordinarily precludes only some private remedies. No policy goal of either antitrust or federalism is served by precluding private federal remedies in only one of two markets identical except that one observes a pro forma state-law filing requirement.

First, the policy values on which Keogh and other filed rate cases are justified have no force where rates are filed with a state agency.8 The goal of preventing price discrimination among customers—the filed rate doctrine’s “paramount purpose,” Square D Co. v. Niagara Frontier Tariff Bur., 476 U.S. 409, 417 (1986) (quoting Keogh, 260 U.S. at 163)—has no relevance here. First of all, as petitioners observe, Delaware’s regulatory regime explicitly permits varying prices and contemplates that they may be set competitively. Compl. ¶ 34 (quoting Del. Code Ann., Tit. 18, § 2501). But even if Delaware did prohibit discrimination, a state non-discrimination rule should be no basis for disregard of federal antitrust laws. A mere state government desire to prevent price discrimination—which is an ordinary feature of many healthy, competitive markets— should receive no more federal deference than any other state intrusion into normal competition. It would be no different than when a state “simply authorizes price setting and enforces the prices established by private parties.” 324 Liquor Corp. v. Duffy, 479 U.S. 335, 344-45 (1987) (quoting Midcal, 445 U.S. at 106). Especially where the state engages in no actual oversight of the rates set, it would do no more than “cast[ ] . . . a gauzy cloak of state involvement over what is essentially a price-fixing arrangement.” Id.

Likewise, mandating deference to regulatory authority, the other major policy goal commonly associated with filed rate protection, would make little sense here, for that is precisely the value precluded by Ticor. A state government cannot by mere fiat declare that antitrust does not apply. No policy goal of antitrust or federalism would make that more true simply because a state has adopted a pro forma rate-filing requirement.

Second, it is no reply that filed rate protection leaves open federal enforcement. Ticor stressed the danger, in terms of the lost values of healthy competition, were states allowed to displace antitrust by fiat. See 504 U.S. at 632 (“The preservation of the free market and of a system of free enterprise without price fixing or cartels is essential to economic freedom. . . . A national policy of such a pervasive and fundamental character is an essential part of the economic and legal system within which the separate States administer their own laws for the protection and advancement of their people.”). It follows that if private remedies are needed for the actual preservation of those values, then private remedies too cannot be dispensed with by state fiat.

#### Filed rate has become a judicial bypass for enforcement.

Rossi ’3 [Jim Rossi; 2003; Law Professor at Florida State University; Vanderbilt Law School, “Lowering the Filed Tariff Shield: Judicial Enforcement for a Deregulatory Era,” vol. 56]

B. Antitrust Defenses and Immunities

Modern antitrust defenses and immunities provide courts an opportunity to safeguard the public interest in deterrence - largely ignored by the filed tariff shield - in the context of federal antitrust litigation. To be sure, per se defenses provide an important set of protections against judicial overreaching on the basis of antitrust law into competitive markets. 236 However, allowing the filed tariff doctrine to become an independent, firm-specific antitrust defense - as courts have - is unnecessary and harmful, given other doctrines that protect agency discretion and state jurisdiction while also providing courts the flexibility to evaluate dual enforcement issues. Courts should independently assess whether tariffs qualify for immunity from antitrust enforcement, using traditional antitrust law doctrines, rather than using filed tariffs as a shorthand way of bypassing the antitrust laws. In contexts in which in the filed rate bar has been raised, antitrust defenses arise in two distinct scenarios: 1) horizontally, in instances where federal regulators, rather than federal courts, might assert jurisdiction over allegedly anticompetitive conduct; and 2) vertically, in instances where federal regulators approve one tariff and state regulators approve another tariff, and hence a jurisdictional conflict arises because the allegedly [\*1647] anticompetitive conduct is arguably within the realm of state regulators or falls into a jurisdictional gap. In both scenarios, antitrust law already provides ways to respect the agency regulatory process, making the filed tariff doctrine redundant.

1. Horizontal Jurisdictional Conflicts: Regulatory Compliance and Primary Jurisdiction

In the horizontal scenario, courts since Keogh have invoked the filed tariff shield to bar most antitrust claims, but do recognize certain exceptions. 237 Nearly twenty years ago, Judge Friendly called the doctrine into question in this context. 238 Although in Square D the Supreme Court refused Judge Friendly's invitation to overturn Keogh, Justice Stevens and a majority of the Court were notably sympathetic to his critique. 239 Given the more prevalent emergence of market norms, Judge Friendly's critiques resound even more clearly today. Although recent Ninth Circuit cases refuse to allow deregulation to threaten the application of the filed tariff doctrine, these cases are solidly preemption cases rather than cases applying the basic principles of Keogh. 240 Federal courts have yet to fully assess Keogh's fate against the backdrop of electric power and telecommunications deregulation.

Where federal regulators have approved all tariffs related to allegedly anticompetitive conduct, the continued rationale for allowing the filed rate doctrine to bar antitrust liability is questionable. The strongest rationale for invoking the filed rate doctrine in this context is out of respect for the expertise of agency regulators, reflected in the deference strand of the filed tariff doctrine. In Town of Norwood, the First Circuit characterized the legal foundations of the filed rate doctrine as "extremely creaky," 241 but when invoked as a bar to antitrust enforcement, the filed rate doctrine is also incoherent. To begin, as with state contract and tort law claims, if misconduct requires modification of tariff terms, regulators could easily accommodate this need in future rate cases. 242 But also, as the court [\*1648] itself noted in Norwood, in the context of the tariff approval action, FERC had waived requirements that filed rates or tariffs be accompanied and justified by cost-of-service data. 243 Such data would be necessary for the agency itself to evaluate the price squeeze claim.

Notwithstanding the fact that the agency lacked sufficient data to evaluate a claim of price squeeze, the court in Norwood concluded that "it is the filing of the tariffs, and not any affirmative approval or scrutiny by the agency, that triggers the filed rate doctrine." 244 This is dangerously broad language. By focusing on the filing of tariffs by regulated firms, the court privileges private behavior rather than the actual or anticipated actions by regulators that traditional deference concepts evaluate. It is difficult to reconcile invocation of the filed rate doctrine in the context of price squeeze claims - as the court struggled with in Norwood - with other antitrust claims, in which the filed rate doctrine has not been successfully invoked as a bar to litigation. For example, mergers and sales of assets by utilities have been subject to antitrust challenge even though the resulting rates were subject to federal regulation and the merger or sale had been approved by regulators. 245 Since Otter Tail, which allowed antitrust claims when an agency had some jurisdiction, the simple filing of tariffs has not precluded antitrust claims, even where regulators have partial jurisdiction over conduct. 246 In a deregulated market, courts have a particular responsibility to carefully assess tariffs in order to help ensure that anticompetitive and otherwise illegal private conduct does not "escape scrutiny" of applicable legal standards. 247 Otherwise, as Judge Boudin (who penned Town of Norwood) warned in an earlier-published article, through the repeated use of the filed tariff doctrine the "metaphor is likely to exhaust itself," 248 undermining the very competitive process it is designed to protect.

#### Causes jurisdiction hunting. State action immunity makes it coherent.

Rossi ’3 [Jim Rossi; 2003; Law Professor at Florida State University; Vanderbilt Law School, “Lowering the Filed Tariff Shield: Judicial Enforcement for a Deregulatory Era,” vol. 56]

2. Vertical Jurisdictional Conflicts: State Action Immunity

Modern antitrust jurisprudence also potentially extends the filed tariff doctrine's reach to a second context, vertical, in which both federal and state regulators have approved tariffs relating to allegedly anticompetitive conduct. In this context, it is conceivably the state-approved tariff that makes antitrust enforcement unnecessary. Some states do not explicitly endorse the filed tariff doctrine, as a matter of state law, 261 but, regardless of whether a state independently does so, state action immunity serves functions similar to those the filed tariff doctrine purports to serve, again making it unnecessary.

State action immunity is designed to accommodate the federal antitrust interest in promoting competition with state interests in regulation. When state regulation works to restrict competition, these two interests may collide. In Parker v. Brown, the United States Supreme Court addressed this conflict in reviewing the potential antitrust liability of state officials enforcing a program that fixed raisin prices and restricted competition between growers. 262 The Court held that the Sherman Act was not intended to restrain "state action," effectively creating absolute immunity for pure state actors, but the Court did not address the potential liability of private parties operating under the auspices of state law. 263

Later cases extended state action immunity to private parties whose allegedly anticompetitive acts were the product of, or approved by, state action. As the Supreme Court stated in California Retail Liquor Dealers Ass'n v. Midcal Aluminum, Inc., immunity for private actors exists only if the challenged restraint is taken pursuant to a ""clearly articulated and affirmatively expressed … state policy'" 264 and is subject to active state [\*1653] supervision. 265 The clear articulation requirement does not require a defendant to show that state law compelled the challenged actions, 266 but instead only that the state affirmatively contemplated the type of activity challenged. 267 Given this low threshold, the active supervision requirement does most, if not all, of the heavy lifting in determining whether state action immunity applies to private actors. 268 Courts have held that this requirement is not automatically met when the state "simply authorizes price setting and enforces the prices established by private parties" because such a broad authorization would merely "cast[] … a gauzy cloak of state involvement over what is essentially a price-fixing arrangement." 269

In the context of dual rate regulation schemes, state action immunity can have the same effect as the filed rate doctrine at the state level, while also providing courts flexibility to evaluate the deterrence implications of declining jurisdiction. In Town of Concord v. Boston Edison Co., then-Judge Breyer assessed a price squeeze claim brought under these circumstances. 270 FERC regulated Boston Edison's wholesale electric power rates, while its retail rates were regulated by state authorities. 271 Municipal utilities, such as the Town of Concord, challenged Boston Edison's wholesale prices as anticompetitive, on the grounds that the utility's wholesale price increases, approved by FERC, had not been matched by corresponding retail price increases at the state level. 272 The municipality claimed that the disparity between the two rates put the towns in a price squeeze, making retail customers more likely to purchase directly from Boston Edison and thus placing the municipal customer base at risk. 273 Properly declining to apply the filed rate shield - because this basis for refusing jurisdiction is particularly problematic in the context of price squeeze claims, where sometimes neither the federal [\*1654] nor state regulator has authority to rectify an antitrust violation 274 - Judge Breyer reasoned that Boston Edison enjoyed no express immunity from the application of the antitrust laws, but recognized that careful analysis of the price squeeze claim is necessary in the context of regulated industries. 275 Regulators continue to monitor the reasonableness of rates, as well as the relationship between utilities and their competitors. 276 In addition, Judge Breyer noted that regulation makes it less likely that a price squeeze would drive independent distributors from the marketplace, since the permission of regulators is required to take on new customers. 277 He further observed that supporting a price squeeze claim in such circumstances is at odds with the goals of price competition to the extent that it would encourage greater retail rates, and that there were potential institutional concerns with courts telling regulators what rate to apply under the circumstances. 278 Judge Breyer concluded that "a price squeeze in a fully regulated industry such as electricity will not normally constitute "exclusionary conduct' under [the] Sherman Act … ." 279

Judge Breyer's analysis addressed the price squeeze claim on its merits. This is understandable given that, in the context of this specific price squeeze claim, it was unclear whether the anticompetitive conduct was the wholesale rate, the retail rate, or both. 280 However, on similar facts - where the state regulates retail rates and the allegedly anticompetitive conduct is at the retail level [\*1655] only - state action immunity might allow a more complete analysis of the deterrence benefits of allowing an antitrust claim to go forward. 281 If a state actively supervises the regulation of retail rates, for example, this could implicate state action immunity in price squeeze and other antitrust claims. 282 Thus, if courts are satisfied with the monitoring provided by state regulators (including their ability to deter wrongdoing by regulated firms), there may be no need to address the merits of antitrust claims, creating the same effect as the filed tariff shield - even in instances where a state lacks its own state-law version of the doctrine.

Such an approach has significant advantages over the filed rate doctrine, as it focuses on the degree and effectiveness of overlapping state supervision, rather than on the simple act of filing or approving a tariff. Courts have yet to fully determine how state action immunity will apply in a full or partially deregulated environment. It is fair to predict, though, that as market norms emerge in formerly regulated industries, state action immunity will likely be available less often than was previously the case. 283 For example, in a recent case involving a utility's offer of a discounted rate to a customer that was conditioned on the customer's agreement to forego development of its own generation plant, a United States District Court agreed with the Department of Justice's Antitrust Division that such conduct was not protected from antitrust attack by state action immunity. 284 Although the New York state legislature had authorized reduced rates to "prevent loss of … customers," and the New York Public Service Commission had approved the reduced rate contract, the court held that the state legislature did not foresee or intend the anticompetitive [\*1656] features of this arrangement, particularly to the extent it resulted in the removal of a competitor. 285

None of these doctrines - robust federal preemption, primary jurisdiction, or state action immunity from antitrust enforcement - was available early in the twentieth century, when federal courts first developed the filed tariff doctrine to help protect customers against discrimination in rates. 286 The filed tariff doctrine was questionable even before these doctrines developed, but today it is even more unnecessary. Further, by encouraging perverse behavior by private actors that is largely beyond the reach of the judiciary - thus widening the jurisdictional gap in enforcement of market norms - the doctrine is harmful. Using the filed tariff doctrine as an independent legal reason to preempt state law claims, or refuse jurisdiction over antitrust and other federal claims, gives short shrift to the public interest in the context of dual regulatory enforcement. In a dual enforcement regime, the jurisdictional inquiry must focus on the relationship between the agency and the courts, or the agency and state law, rather than on the deceptively simple act of filing a tariff with a regulatory body. These alternative doctrines provide federal courts the flexibility necessary to do this. Similarly, in states that recognize the doctrine, an analysis of primary jurisdiction would suffice to protect agency discretion.

#### Chills telemedicine which would solve the aging crisis.

Sklar ’20 [Tara and Christopher Robertson; 2020; Health Law Professor at the University of Arizona; Law Professor at the University of Arizona; American Journal of Law and Medicine, “Telehealth for an Aging Population: How Can Law Influence Adoption Among Providers, Payors, and Patients?” vol. 47]

Notwithstanding these avenues of reform, many states continue to restrict healthcare providers from practicing telemedicine by requiring a full license in the state of service.102 These states often define “the practice of medicine broadly to include phone calls, e-mails, and on-line discussions, circumscribe[ing] the use of the new technology.”103 To the extent that these state licensing laws are designed to favor local providers, they may arguably be subject to challenge under the dormant commerce clause of the U.S. Constitution,104 or under federal antitrust laws.105 Regardless, Congress should consider affirmatively preempting them as hindrances to interstate commerce and federal spending, such as Medicare. Likewise, Congress preempted state doctrines around corporate practice of medicine, to the extent that they interfere with the work of Health Maintenance Organizations (“HMOs”).106

Similar to when and how a healthcare relationship should be established, states may claim that strict licensure laws improve standardization and quality of care,107 but if the benefit is slim, then it may not offset the chilling effect of the on cross-border practice, and hence, provider participation and patient access. In fact, state licensure laws do not vary substantially, and a more ambitious alignment seems to be a promising path forward.108

C. REIMBURSEMENT OF COSTS

\*322 In this section, we describe current approaches by insurers, including Medicare, Medicaid, and private carriers, to reimburse for telehealth services. We discuss related state laws, and suggest how to optimize reimbursement for greater telehealth adoption.

On the private payor front, 40 states and the District of Columbia have laws governing reimbursement for telehealth.109 These laws either require coverage parity, which ensures that a service is reimbursed if provided through telehealth, or payment parity, which ensures that reimbursement is at the same rate as when care is delivered in-person.110 If the policy goal is to increase use of telehealth, then payment parity can reassure doctors that telehealth will not undercut their revenues. However, payment parity laws can defeat the policy advantage of telehealth to reduce costs.111

Because the majority of states have private-payer reimbursement laws of some sort, the current practice is to amend a law to expand its applicability to additional specialties.Minnesota, for example, did this when it expanded its private-payer law to cover dental coverage, while Utah's expansion singles out telepsychiatry services,112 and Washington allows telemedicine to be offered from “any location determined by the individual receiving the service.”113 It is important to question whether these private-payer laws are necessary to expand reimbursement efforts given increasing market demand. A Milbank report documented interviews in six states that did not have parity in payment laws, yet found that almost all private health insurers covered telehealth services and paid the same rate as in-person services.114

The aforementioned expansion of MA plans to cover telehealth could be an excellent natural experiment to compare before and after 2020. The clear implementation date could determine whether and how much reimbursement changes are improving overall utilization, access to care, better health outcomes, and lower costs when compared to the traditional Medicare population, in essence the control group. Comparisons between states may also be striking as most MA enrollees, forty percent, reside in six states (Florida, Hawaii, Minnesota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin) and Puerto Rico, and, by contrast, rural states have lower rates of MA enrollees.115

MA's expansion into the telehealth may create additional market pressure for private insurers (who often also administer MA plans) to voluntarily reimburse for telehealth services. Traditional Medicare may follow the pathway that MA is starting with a bipartisan bill that was reintroduced on October 30, 2019 entitled Creating Opportunities Now for Necessary and Effective Care Technologies “CONNECT” for Health Act, which is currently pending in the Senate Finance Committee.116 This bill would reduce geographic and site-specific requirements for traditional Medicare so \*323 that these beneficiaries would also receive telehealth delivered care directly in their homes.117 This pending legislation could make an enormous impact on telehealth utilization nationwide where the pool of patients would surge to nearly 60 million people.

The MA move may also influence Medicaid, especially as the largest payor for long-term care in America. There are over six million older adults on Medicaid who have both Medicare and Medicaid coverage (aka “dual-eligibility”), and this is largely attributable to them going through their savings paying for some form of long-term care.118 In an effort to extend personal finances, a phenomenon of “aging in place” is gaining primacy as the preferred long-term care model, rather than a nursing home or institutional setting.119

Telehealth coverage and reimbursement in state Medicaid programs vary considerably. Almost all states (49) and the District of Columbia have some coverage for telehealth, and nearly all reimburse for live video telehealth.120 Some state Medicaid programs impose restrictions such as limits on the sort of facilities where telehealth care can be received, by what type of healthcare provider, and geographic restrictions.121 As of 2016, eight state Medicaid programs reimbursed for telehealth under their home health services, but this number more than doubled to 19 states by 2019.122 Patients are eligible for these Medicaid services if they have two or more chronic conditions, one chronic condition and are at risk for a second, or have one serious and persistent mental health condition.123 Given the prevalence for chronic conditions and mental health among older adults, as previously discussed, many will be able to meet the eligibility requirement.124

States are removing some of these restrictions, for instance, the majority of state Medicaid programs no longer have rural requirements that must be met for telehealth reimbursement.125 Additionally, a number of states are demonstrating innovative efforts with funding support from the federal government, namely through grants and waivers for home health programs.126 With the consent of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Alabama, Iowa, Maine, New York, Ohio, and West Virginia have all used state plan amendments that include telehealth coverage in their home health proposals.127 Similarly, Kansas, Pennsylvania, and South Carolina have used waivers to cover remote patient monitoring for long-term care services.128

Across all these domains of insurance, the quick expansion of telehealth coverage may be worrisome if it forces patients who would otherwise prefer an in-person visit to only have access to care via telehealth. One option to help curtail this \*324 issue is for insurance regulators to require that insurers maintain an in-person option for members. Nonetheless, such insurance mandates may wreak inefficiency, if they do not reflect consumer preferences.

CONCLUSION

Telehealth is increasingly important to the future practice of medicine, but poses a unique set of challenges for state lawmakers as they attempt to navigate interstate practice. Additionally, state and federal lawmakers are being confronted with how to provide high-quality, affordable care for an aging population that will live for an average of two decades with multiple chronic conditions.129

It is clear that law plays a substantial role in how quickly telehealth operators can achieve the scale necessary to provide care for an older population in their homes. Fortunately, state licensure laws are actively reducing some of the administrative burdens that had limited cross-border practice with support for an interstate compact.130 But much more can be done on this front; the fragmentation of state-based licensure likely does not promote quality or efficiency compared to a unified or seamless system. Furthermore, the CMS rule to allow MA plans to reimburse for care received in the home is an essential move for telehealth to suddenly reach a much broader and older population where utilization has been disproportionately low compared to other age groups.131 This federal-private insurer effort combined with the work already underway via state Medicaid programs should continue nationwide growth for telehealth adoption.

An area that continues to remain variable across states is the establishment of a healthcare relationship. The position of the AMA and the states that follow it reflect a presumption that in-person interactions should remain the baseline for healthcare standards. Also discussed, to require an in-person visit for patients who cannot leave their homes without substantial difficulty, and for conditions where the standard of care would not require a physical exam, seems unnecessarily onerous and costly for all parties. A more flexible, forward-looking approach would be for lawmakers to allow alternatives or exceptions that recognize telehealth's unique capabilities and the patients that would most benefit from this form of care.

#### The aging crisis causes extinction.

Vladev ’20 [Ivaylo and Rositsa Vladeva; July 1; Konstantin Preslavsky University of Shumen, Faculty of Natural Sciences; Sciendo, “The Demographic Problem – One of the Main Problems of Contemporary,” vol. 7, no. 2]

The aim of the present study is to analyze the essential features of the global problems of the contemporary stage in the development of human society and to highlight the place of the demographic problem as an objective factor for the existence of modern civilization.

To realize the goal it clarifies the criteria for determining a problem as a global one and makes classification of the global problems from a geographic point of view. It identifies the causes for the demographic problem, analyses and specifies its different dimensions at the global, regional and national levels.

Materials and Methods

In order to study the processes of globalization and the specific features of the demographic problem, comparative analysis, content analysis and quantitative methods are applied. In order to clarify the criteria for determining a given problem as a global one, methods of systematization and classification from a geographic point of view are applied.

Results and Discussion

One of the essential characteristics of the modern development of the society is its globalization. It is known as international integration on a large scale in all areas of economics, culture and society. The processes of globalization should be explored in the context of the relationship of the planetary problems with some aspects of economic and social life on a global, regional and national level [2].

Globalization is a complex process that provokes many controversies, but also determines the overarching changes in our times. According to U. Bek, „globalization is certainly the most commonly used - the wrongly used - and the most rarely defined, probably the most vague, the most fuzzy and the most politically influential word in the last but also in the coming years“ [1, p. 42]. Most researchers regard globalization as an inevitable process of forming common principles of current civilization development and common criteria for the qualitative assessment of the development.

We can therefore accept globalization as a complex integrative process, characterized by the following main features:

- universality - a tendency towards integration of all economic, social, political, cultural, environmental and demographic processes in their entirety and interdependence;

- democracy - engaging and actively participating in the process of globalization of all social strata;

- spontaneity - absence of an external source as a special moderator;

- chaoticity - inconsistency of the ongoing integration processes and presence of random fluctuations.

Globalization is a phenomenon, but it is not an ideal process as well as its results and it affects differently individuals, social communities, countries, regions, and the planet as a whole. It has its positive and negative consequences, encompassing socio-economic, demographic, natural-geographic processes, transforming human relationships into a state of globality.

Globality as a problem is also associated with the global problems of civilization. During its development the human society frequently encounters complex problems originating from its local nature and cover significant parts of the globe. According to P. Lakov, „the global problems are provoked by the chronological unity and the rapid rate of destruction of the balance between nature and society and should therefore be considered as an undivided system of dynamically changing interdependent phenomena in the space“ [3, p. 24].

The global problems of the contemporary stage of the development of the world civilization are already fully manifested in the second half of the 20th century, but from the end of the 1990s to the present day as a result of the introduction of the new information and communication technologies and the enhanced processes of economic and political integration a kind of „globalization boom“is observed. Therefore, the studying of the global problems is necessary to take into account both the general patterns and trends in the development of the world economy, as well as the action of the social factors of development, including the rapid growth of the population of the planet, the strengthening of interaction and interdependence between states.

According to their origin, the global problems are the result of the processes of globalization that are taking place in today's world and play the role of drivers for the development of the world system. Because they arise from the functioning of the global systems and their interaction, they can not be considered in isolation, but their unity and interrelation must be taken into account.

The global problems are wide ranging and continually create hazards for the existence and development of human society. The world of the 21st century inherited from the 20th century poverty, economic problems, resource shortages, mass diseases and nationalism and religious fanaticism, dozens of „hot spots“ and international terrorism. The old dangers in the form of weapons of mass destruction are complemented by new ones.

Though diverse in nature, the global problems have a common specificity that separates them from the other processes and phenomena in world development and they are distinguished by certain features:

- they endanger the future of all human civilization;

- they are an objective factor for the world development;

- targeted and coordinated actions of much of humanity are needed to overcome them;

- failure to resolve them can lead to serious and irreversible consequences for the whole of humanity. Some authors believe that the global problems are the result of the following inconsistencies:

- between the unlimited production factors entering the system „technically“ and the limited reproduction capabilities of the system of nature;

- between the „industrial“ system widely used in the technics and the other „small craft“ and „,partly craft“ system under the name „human“;

- between the unique products of the „classical culture“ and the unrestricted circulation of „mass culture“ products;

- between the global balances according to which the stability of processes in nature and society depends on the degree of their balance [4, p. 280-281].

The territorial character of the global problems could be pointed out as their specific feature. Geographically they cover the whole of the world, but at the same time they are manifested at the regional level as well, with local indications in different countries. This proves the relationship between the categories: „common“(global) – „special“(regional) – „individual“(local).

In order not to identify the public, regional and local problems with global ones, it is necessary to specify criteria that can define a given problem as a global one (Figure 1).
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It should be noted that these criteria together can only establish the global nature of a given problem, because each of them can not be a decisive factor. At the same time, we must emphasize the high dynamism of every global problem caused by the combination of many different factors and their state in specific historical conditions and geographic regions.

There is a wide variety of views regarding the classification of global problems: depending on their severity, the time of their emergence, their nature, the actual real dependencies between them, the sequence of decision-making to overcome them, etc. Their grouping according to certain attributes helps to identify the existing links, to specify the priorities, to determine the degree of exacerbation of objectively existing global problems and to rank the sequence of the actions for their solution.

In order to realize the purpose of the study and to clarify the essence of the global problems, an attempt was made to create a geographical classification. Without claiming to be exhaustive, we formulate fourteen global problems on the basis of their relevance, severity and importance. They are grouped into three large groups depending on the spheres in which they appear and prove the trinity of nature – man – society. Accordingly, the groups are geodemographic, population-related; natural-geographic, arising from the components of the natural environment and socio-economic, related to the economy, the social sphere, the culture, the social development (Figure 2).

Based on the classification, the following conclusions can be made:

- Global problems increase their number and sphere of manifestation;

- The greatest number of global problems (1/2 of all classified) occurs in the contact areas of interaction;

- Regardless of the conditional and relative nature of the proposed classification, the occurrence of the global problems is in close interdependence and interrelation;

- Most of the global problems has a complex nature because they occur under the influence of two (3, 4, 6, 8) or three main groups (2, 5, 7);

- Due to their complex nature the global problems require a system of comprehensive measures to resolve them.

From these examples it can be summarized that the assignment of one or another problem to a given group is conditional and depends on the criteria of partitioning, the degree of relevance of the individual problems and the regional view of the authors on them. Therefore, the proposed classification should be seen not as a definitive solution to the issue but as a possible way of reconstructing the complex system, helping to better understand the essence of the interrelations between the global problems.
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1. Demographic

2. Food-related

3. Healthcare problems

4. Educational problems

5. Preservation of world peace

6. Problems of international security

7. Ecological

8. Depletion of natural resources

9. Global warming

10. Water-related

11. Global catastrophes and natural disasters

12. Socio-economic conflict between poor and rich countries

13. Social inequality

14. Spiritual and moral crisis of humanity

Every global problem should be seen from three main points: what is the present situation, where, how and why the situation has become dangerous and how we can try to change it for the better by applying different strategies. The choice and the decision depend to a great extent on the social-ethical and moralhumanistic norms created in society, which is also the goal of its development [5, p. 12].

It is known that the problem is a scientific or public issue that has to be investigated and solved. It is caused by a certain inconsistency in the course of a natural, social or demographic process, the carrying out of some human activity and the lack of the expected result.

The demographic problem is a leading among the global problems of our time, because its emergence and solving influence the solution of food problems, the environmental problem, the preservation of the world peace, the problems of the international security, the health care and the education.

Demographic problems arise in the reproduction of the population and the level of compliance of resources for the development of humanity and of individual peoples and societies. The main criterion for assessing the course of demographic processes is the ability to carry out normal and appropriate reproduction of the population according to the conditions and resources. Demographic development is not limited only to the process of increasing the number of inhabitants of the planet, but also includes the problems of increasing population in relation to the natural resource potential of the territory, the condition and quality of the environment, hindering the food supply of the population, urbanization, inter-ethnic relations, refugees, lack of employment. All this proves that the interrelations between demography, economy and politics are complex and multilayered.

Therefore, the demographic problem is the mismatch between the level of socio-economic development, the resource availability for the economy, food and commodity production and population growth. Generally speaking, the demographic problem is that the population is rapidly growing due to the high fertility rate and life expectancy, the shortage of natural resources and production capacities for food and consumer goods.

Today, the effects of relative and absolute population growth become so topical that they are becoming a global problem. The dynamics of population growth in the world, presented in Table 1, is very distinctive.

The point of 1 billion is exceeded at the beginning of the 19 century. While the first doubling after 1810 required 110 years, the second one was in 40 years (1920 – 1960), the third one in 14 years (1960 – 1974) and the last one in 12 years (1999 – 2011). For the last 18 years, the population has increased by more than 1.5 billion and 94.5% of the growth is in the developing countries and only 5.5% of the developed ones. At the end of 2017, the world population reached 7.5 billion.
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The rate of population growth is the rate at which demographic indicators change. The highest rates of population growth in the world occurred in the 1970s and 1980s – about 2% average annual growths. Then they began to decline and in the first decades of the 21st century they were set at 1.2%. It is expected that in the middle of the 21st century they will increase again to 2.8%.

According to estimates of UN experts, the world population by 2025 will reach 8.2 billion, by 2040 – 9.2 billion, by 2050 – 9.7 billion and by 2055 – almost 10 billion. Population growth, according to the expected trends for this period, will be formed by developing countries in a ratio of 97: 3.

Much or little is the present world population of 7.5 billion people? The world population itself, however significant, can not be considered as large or little, isolated from the natural and human resources and the established political and socio-economic conditions.

Scientists maintain two different opinions and carry on intensive discussions. Some of them believe that the Earth is still far from absolute overpopulation and unlikely to reach it. Another part of them believe that the Earth is already overpopulated. Reason for this opinion is the misery, malnutrition and hunger, avalanche escalation of environmental problems in overpopulated areas.

Very often, population growth is seen as one of the factors not only hindering the fulfilment of life needs, but also threatening the viability of human civilization. Together with the increased consumption of natural resources, technical and energy equipment, the amount of waste resulting from human life and production activity is constantly increasing. Moreover, the socio-demographic situation in developed and developing countries is diametrically opposed, denoted by the term „demographic division of the world“.

In different countries and regions, the demographic problem has different dimensions. In developed countries, the demographic problem is mainly reflected in the aging of the population and the reduction of human resources for the economic development of the countries. In developing countries, the demographic problem is reflected in a predominant increase of the population to the basic necessities of life and the occurrence of significant difficulties in feeding the population, its health care and the development of education. The extent and the nature of the demographic problem in individual countries depend to a large extent on their socio-economic development and the stage of the demographic transition they are on. At a regional and national level, demographic problems, depending on the type of reproduction of the population, have different dimensions – demographic explosion, demographic stagnation and demographic crisis. Human development across individual regions and countries is assessed through the two problems – a demographic explosion and a demographic crisis.

The rapid increase in population in the world, in a particular geographic region or in a particular country is defined as a demographic explosion. It is characterized by a high birth rate, a sharp drop in mortality, and especially child mortality and increased life expectancy. This is an unfavourable demographic situation because it reduces the opportunities for most people to feed, the opportunities for health care, education, jobs, etc.

The accelerated growth of the world population is now predominantly determined by the developing countries. Due to the high relative share of the population at sub-working age (1/4 of the population up to 16 years old) these countries will preserve the high growth rate of their population. Demographic explosion has a restraining effect on the country and region's development prospects. It is characteristic for the most countries in Africa, some countries in Asia and Latin America. At present the epicentre of the demographic explosion is in Africa.

High birth rate is the main prerequisite for triggering the demographic explosion. It, under the conditions of decreasing mortality, ensures the large population growth. The most significant birth rates occur in the continent of Africa and mostly in the West, Central, East and partially in South Africa.

In 2017, 43 African countries had birth rates above 30‰. The highest figures are in Niger (50‰), Chad (48‰), Angola (46‰), Democratic Republic of Congo (46‰), Central African Republic (45‰), Mozambique (45‰), Mali (44‰), Somalia (44‰), Burkina Faso (44‰), Burundi (43‰), Zambia (43‰) and others. The countries in Asia are with high birth rates too. 5 of them have a birth rate above 30‰: the Democratic Republic of Timor – Leste (36‰), Afghanistan (34‰), Yemen (33‰), Tajikistan (33‰), Iraq (31‰); and in 34 of them the birth rate is between 20 and 30‰. Haiti, Bolivia, Guyana and Guatemala in Latin America have a birth rate of between 25 and 30‰.

The decreasing overall mortality is the second most important prerequisite for the demographic explosion. It is mainly due to the development of healthcare and medicine and to the raising living standards of the population. Under this influence is the mortality rate in most European countries, East Asia, North America, the Gulf region (Oman, UAE, Qatar, Bahrain, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia). Decreasing mortality rate in these countries leads to an increased average life expectancy and aging of the population. The lower mortality rate in a number of countries is due to the age structure of the population with a strong predominance of younger generations (25-30% of the population up to 16 years old) and is denoted by the term „demographic spring“. This applies to most African countries.

The mortality rate is in close relation with the average life expectancy. The latter grows almost continuously. This is due to the increased living standards, the way of life and the improvement of health care.

According to UN data in 2017, the expected average life expectancy in the world is 69 years, for men 67 years and for women 71 years [6]. The highest average life expectancy is in the developed countries: Monaco (89.4 years), Japan (85.5 years), Singapore (85.5 years), Iceland (83.1 years), Israel (82.7), Switzerland (82.7), Malta (82.7 years), the Republic of Korea (82.5 years), the Australian Union (82.4 years), Italy (82.4 years), Luxembourg (82.4 years) and others.

Geographical regions with the highest average life expectancy are Western Europe and North America. For men, life expectancy is the highest in Monaco (85.5 years), Singapore (82.8 years), Japan (82.2 years) and Iceland (80.9 years). Women have the highest life expectancy in Monaco (93.4 years), Japan (89 years), Singapore (88.3 years) and Republic of Korea (85.8 years). The lowest life expectancy is in the poor African and Asian developing countries, such as Mozambique (54.1 years), the Central African Republic (53.3 years), Somalia (53.2 years), Zambia (53 years), Lesotho (53 years) and Afghanistan (52.1 years). Decreasing child mortality in developing countries and the high birth rates have an impact on the population growth and hence on the demographic explosion. At the end of the 20th century, child mortality in the world was about 54‰ and in 2017 it declined to 32.9‰. Thus, while in 2000 the continent with the highest child mortality rate in the world, Africa, it ranged from 87‰ (West Africa) to 140‰ (Central and Eastern Africa), in 2017 there was no African country with child mortality over 100‰.

Today, it varies in a wide range from 20 to 93‰ and decreases as a result of measures to combat diseases, hunger and malnutrition and to improve healthcare. Over the last decades, the child mortality rates in Arab countries rapidly decrease, especially in the Persian Gulf region (below 8‰), where it has reached the level of the most developed countries.

Analyzing the demographic situation in the world in the context of the demographic explosion, we should note that the larger population has a stronger impact on the environment and increases the „demographic burden“ on the territory.

It is simultaneously influenced by several factors: the absolute population growth, the extent of consumption (lifestyle, income, and infrastructure development), the social inequality of the population, and the level of technology used. The development of the modern economy requires the use of an increasing amount of natural resources. The acuteness of the problem is related not only to the depletion of the limited resources, but also with the nature of their impact on the environment during use. The increase of the population in the world and its migration intensify this impact by preventing the stabilization of the unemployment problem; make it difficult to solve the problems of education, healthcare and social welfare. Consequently, any socio-economic problem includes a demographic problem as well.

Decreasing the population in a particular geographic region or country forms the situation of a demographic crisis. It is due to low birth rates, average mortality rates, aging of the population, negative or zero natural growth and shortage of labour resources.

As a global problem it is still considered the demographic explosion, not paying due attention to the upcoming demographic problems as depopulation, narrowed reproduction of the population and its aging, which will cause irreversible negative social and economical problems and demographic crises, especially among the small nations.

The aging of the population forms an unfavourable demographic situation, consisting in increasing the number and relative share of people in over-working age, reducing the number of people in sub-working age and limiting the labour resources. It is especially distinctive for most countries in Europe, Japan and others.

The aging of the population is characterized by the average age of the population (a characteristic of the age structure of the population, which is calculated as a weighted average value of the population in all age groups). It reveals the level reached in the process of population aging in the world and countries.

In 2017, the average age of the population in the world is 30.6 years. It ranges from a low age of 15.5 to 16 years in the African countries of Niger, Mali, Chad, Uganda and Angola up to 43 years or more in some European countries and Japan. The countries with high living standards and high life expectancy have the highest average age like Monaco (53.8 years), Japan (47.7 years), Germany (47.4 years) and Italy (45.8 years). The high average age is a feature of countries with a very high level of emigration of young people, such as Slovenia (44.2 years), Lithuania (44), Latvia (43.9 years), Croatia (43.3 years), Bulgaria (43 years), Estonia (43 years) and others [6].

Thus, the relative share of the population in over-working age in 2025 in these countries will account for over 1/4 of the total population, which will cause significant losses for health care and social security. At the same time, the birth rate in most economically developed countries can no longer provide for simple reproduction of the population. This process is called „demographic winter“.

The phenomenon of the demographic crisis is primarily centred on the countries of Eastern Europe and is not yet typical for the developed countries. It becomes topical to the researchers of the population from the mid-1990s when the most unfavourable parameters of the demographic situation are reached – very low birth rates, high total mortality and high mortality in the individual age groups, old age structure, emigration, high unemployment, etc. About 80% of the natural population growth of the EU member states since 1994 is due to emigrants. According to demographic projections, almost all countries in Europe are expected to be covered by a demographic crisis in 2025.

The demographic crisis has its strongest manifestations in countries like Bulgaria, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Hungary, Romania, Croatia and others. It is due to the negative natural growth and mass emigration of young population to Western Europe and North America. The term „demographic crisis“ can be interpreted as a profound violation of reproduction of the population. In 2017, Lithuania (14.8‰), Bulgaria (14.5‰) and Latvia (14.5‰) are at the top of the world's highest mortality rates, followed by Ukraine (14.3‰), Serbia (13.6‰), Belarus (13.2‰) and others. The lowest birth rates are in Japan (7.5‰), Puerto Rico (8‰), Portugal (8.2‰), Greece (8.3‰), Bulgaria (8.5‰) 5‰), Germany (8.6‰).

Since the beginning of the 21st century, the continent of Europe has a negative natural growth, with the highest negative figures being in Bulgaria (-6‰), Lithuania (-5‰), Latvia (-4.9‰), Serbia (-4, 7‰), Ukraine (-4.2‰), Hungary (-3.9‰), Croatia (-3.6‰). Thus, due to the low birth rates and high mortality, there is a disruption of the normal reproduction of human generations. The demographic crisis naturally reduces the population of a given country or region to a different extent, with a severe disruption of the basic demographic structures.

The demographic crisis is characterized by the fact that the real growth (the total value of the natural and mechanical growth) of the population in these countries is negative and forms a reduction of the population. In 2017, the reduction of the population is most pronounced in Lithuania (-11.1‰), Latvia (- 11‰), Moldova (-10.8‰), Bulgaria (-6.3‰), Estonia (-6‰), Croatia (-5.3‰), Serbia (-4.7‰), Ukraine (- 4.2‰), Romania (-3.5‰), Montenegro (-3.4‰), Hungary (-2.6‰), Belarus (-2.5‰) and others. The reduction of the population in each of these countries is not only related to higher mortality rates and lower birth rates but also to the significant emigration rates. The demographic crisis exists in Puerto Rico (-16‰) and Lebanon (-11.3‰) and the European countries Germany, Poland, Italy, Portugal, Greece are entering the crisis as well as Japan in Asia.

Many countries in the world are characterized by demographic stagnation. Its typical feature is maintaining the constant population. The actual growth is zero or around zero. This demographic situation is formed at and is characteristic for countries on different stages of demographic transition and different levels of socio-economic development. This group includes mainly developed countries with almost zero natural growth and a positive mechanical population growth, such as Austria, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Slovenia, Finland, Spain and others.

The indicated negative trends in population development cover all developed and highly developed countries. The consequences for the society and the demographic systems in the developed countries are similar, but they vary in intensity over time. As the demographic crisis in these countries is largely blunted by immigration and increasing the average life expectancy.

Conclusions

Based on the report we can formulate the following results:

- The processes in the globalizing world are generating the global problems of today. They act as driving forces in the development of the world system.

- On the basis of their relevance and significance, in order to prove the trinity of nature – man – society, fourteen global problems are formulated in three large groups, depending on the spheres in which they manifest.

- Problems related to the dynamics of the human population affect the whole world and in some parts of the planet there is overpopulation, which can lead to depletion of natural resources as well as poverty and malnutrition.

- Global efforts to resolve the global demographic problem are contrary to the interest of countries that have unfavourable demographics including Bulgaria.

- There are countries with decreasing birth rates and increasing life expectancy everywhere in the world. The aging population leads to higher healthcare and pensions costs, and the number of workers and tax payers is steadily decreasing. As a result, these countries are at risk to become „demographic bombs“ which means a crisis due to too few people working.

- The demographic picture of the world is highly contrasting and moves between the two extremes - a demographic explosion and a demographic crisis. The factors that determine it affect the socio-economic development, income distribution, employment, unemployment, social security, health care, education, housing and the sources of water, food, energy, raw materials as well as environmental conditions and climate change.

- Stabilizing the population of our planet and resolving the demographic problem in the future is not an end in itself but a means of improving the lives of the present and future generations.

#### Antitrust executive action now.

Tankersly ’12-25 [Jim and Alan Rappeport; 2021; reporters; the New York Times, “As Prices Rise, Biden Turns to Antitrust Enforcers,” https://www.nytimes.com/2021/12/25/business/biden-inflation.html]

WASHINGTON — As rising inflation threatens his presidency, President Biden is turning to the federal government’s antitrust authorities to try to tame red-hot price increases that his administration believes are partly driven by a lack of corporate competition.

Mr. Biden has prodded the Agriculture Department to investigate large meatpackers that control a significant share of poultry and pork markets, accusing them of raising prices, underpaying farmers — and tripling their profit margins during the pandemic. As gas prices surged, he publicly encouraged the Federal Trade Commission to investigate accusations that large oil companies had artificially inflated prices, behavior that the administration says continued even after global oil prices began to fall in recent weeks.

The push has extended to little-known agencies, like the Federal Maritime Commission, which the president has urged to search for price gouging by large shipping companies at the heart of the supply chain.

The turn to antitrust levers stems from Mr. Biden’s belief that rising levels of corporate concentration in the U.S. economy have empowered a few large players in each industry to raise prices higher than a more competitive market would allow.

**The FTC is taking strong antitrust steps in oil and gas now**

**Dillickrath ‘21** [Thomas Dillickrath; John D. Carroll; Katie Daw; 12/16/21; Partner in the Antitrust and Competition Practice Group at Sheppard Mullin; Partner in the Antitrust and Competition Practice Group at Sheppard Mullin; Associate at Sheppard Mullin; “Antitrust Scrutiny Heating Up in Oil and Gas Industries,” <https://www.natlawreview.com/article/antitrust-scrutiny-heating-oil-and-gas-industries>]

President Biden recently **wrote a letter** to FTC Chair Lina **Khan** urging the Commission to immediately investigatepotential **anticompetitive behavior** in the **oil and gas sector**. The President noted that **gas prices** have been **rising**, while the **costs** faced by **oil** and **gas** companies themselves have decreased. Concerned that the two largest oil and gas companies in the country are set to double their net income over 2019 while the gap between the price of unfinished gasoline and the price at the pump is increasing, he called on the FTC to “**bring all of the Commission’s tools** to bear if you uncover any wrongdoing.”

Steps Already Taken

The Biden administration has made a **previous attempt** to **direct** the **FTC’s** focus towards the **oil and gas**industries. At President Biden’s behest, the Director of the National Economic Council, Brian Deese, wrote to Chair Khan on August 11, citing “divergences between oil prices and the cost of gasoline at the pump” and urging the FTC to investigate. Chair **Khan** responded with a letter of her own, outlining a **three point plan** to address the administration’s concerns about the **cost of gas**. First, the FTC would identify additional legal theories to **challenge fuel station mergers** that involve dominant players in the market acquiring family-run businesses. Second, the FTC “would tak[e] steps to **deter unlawful mergers** in the **oil and gas industry**.” The Chair specifically referred to the imposition of prior approval requirements to deter illegal mergers in sectors including retail gas markets. Third, Chair Khan indicated that she would **direct staff** to **investigate** **abuses** in the **franchise market**, noting that the **sale of gasoline** at **high prices** may benefit chains at the expense of franchisee store operations.

President Biden expressed in his November 17th letter that he appreciated the plans to “strengthen oversight of mergers in the oil and gas sector” but that further inquiry is required.

Potential Avenues for Enforcement and Investigation

Given the **President’s explicit requests** to **investigate**, participants in the **oil and gas industry** can expectthe FTC to **increase scrutiny** and **enforcement**. The FTC may pursue several avenues to execute the President’s agenda.

Investigative Powers: Subpoenas and 6(b) Studies

In the wake of Hurricane Katrina, the FTC expended significant resources under its statutory authority to investigate accusations of price gouging in the gasoline market. The Commission issued subpoenas, also known as “Civil Investigative Demands” (CIDs) to petroleum industry firms and issued requests to retailers under Section 6(b) of the FTC Act. The FTC ultimately concluded in May of 2006 that the pricing was explained by normal market trends.

The FTC may employ similar methods to **investigate** **oil** and **gas industries** now by issuing **CIDs** and **6(b) orders.**Orders issued under 6(b) of the FTC Act function similarly to CIDs and require the recipient to **provide information** to the FTC in writing, subject to court-ordered compliance. Both can require an organization to turn over company information. 6(b) authority also enables the Commission to conduct wide-ranging studies that do not have specific law enforcement purposes. For example, utilizing its 6(b) power and without an underlying specific law enforcement purpose, the FTC recently launched an inquiry into supply chain disruptions and its impacts on consumers.

Wholesalers, refiners, single-location retailers, pipeline owners and operators, terminal owners, and petroleum marketers could all be issued CIDs or 6(b) requests for information if the FTC seeks to gain a deeper understanding of the gasoline cost problem. This possibility seems more likely given the FTC’s recent willingness to utilize Section 6(b) in other industries, including the investigation into the supply chain shortage. However, 6(b) studies are incredibly exhaustive and time consuming to deploy. The costliness of a 6(b) study could be a barrier.

Increased Merger Scrutiny

The FTC may also **increase scrutiny** on **oil and gas companies** by ramping up its **focus on mergers** within the industry, as Chair Khan indicated it would in her letter to Director Brian Deese. This methodology of increasing merger scrutiny also fits within the FTC’s larger trend of increased merger enforcement across a variety of industries under Chair Khan’s leadership.

There is evidence that increased attention on mergers in the gas and oil sector is **already taking place**—regulators**extended** the **approval** process for at least **five oil and gas mergers** and acquisitions in the third quarter of **2021alone**. This sort of scrutiny has been rare in the oil and gas sector, in which mergers have, up until recently, largely sailed through the regulatory process. The FTC has not blocked a major oil merger in two decades. It brought only four energy related actions in all of 2020, while the DOJ did not file any merger enforcement actions in the energy sector last year. If the FTC’s enforcements behaviors as of late 2021 continues, we may very well see not only more extended approval processes and issuances of second requests, but perhaps more merger challenges, as well.

Takeaways

Participants in the oil and gas market have enjoyed several decades of flying relatively beneath the notice the antitrust regulatory bodies. **Increased antitrust scrutiny** of the industry from both the **DOJ** and **FTC** has **been occurring** and **likely will increase**, with President Biden’s request being just a recent example. As clients consider potential transactions, they would be well-served by seeking advice from experienced antitrust counsel.

#### Antitrust is good for business confidence---it’s a substitute for regulation

Edlin ‘8 [Aaron; Summer 2008; Richard Jennings Chair, Professor of Economics and Law at the University of California at Berkeley; Antitrust, “Perspectives on the Future Direction of Antitrust,” vol. 22]

My grandfather preached “moderation in all things.” Were he alive today, he would despair to see the state of U.S. antitrust.

At the crudest level, moderation would demand that sometimes the plaintiff wins, other times the defendant. Yet, if there be any consistency in today’s antitrust it is that “the defendant always wins,” criminal price-fixing aside. We have come a long ways from the days of Potter Stewart’s famous quip.

More fundamentally, strong antitrust enforcement has always been thought a good substitute for regulation and government ownership. Simply put, if antitrust ensures competition, then regulation is unnecessary. Yet, in the last three decades we deregulated and privatized substantial portions of the economy and have simultaneously pared back the antitrust laws.

Airlines, trucking, electricity, telephones, and the Internet, have all moved from full regulation or government ownership to a softer regulated competition. Banking too has been substantially deregulated and the walls between banking and insurance have come down.

With so much deregulation, my grandfather would have expected the antitrust courts and enforcement authorities to be extending their reach. Not so.

Sylvania, Business Electronics, Khan, and now Leegin, have made vertical agreements all but per se legal. In theory, tying cases remain per se illegal, but expect that to end soon enough. Section 2 seems vestigial, with no DOJ cases started this century. Predatory pricing cases seem almost unwinnable. And, the intellectually bankrupt reliance on profit sacrifice and price-cost comparisons in predatory pricing has drifted toward becoming the rule for all exclusionary cases.

And, while the substantive antitrust abuses have been cabined, pleading hurdles have been heightened. After Twombly, Nynex, and Trinko, plaintiffs are scrambling even to state a claim, let alone to meet the burden of proving one.

Ironically, because many of the deregulated industries maintain some level of regulation. Trinko and Credit Suisse provide increased immunity from antitrust violations, even when the (de)regulatory statute seems to disclaim such immunity.

So my grandfather would not be happy.

Sometimes though, the times may call for immoderateness. Could something have changed that justified less regulation and less antitrust? Many point to a rationalization with economics and a realization that the U.S. had become far too interventionist by the early 1970s. Indeed, economics does preach the virtues of laissez faire. Economists, however, also recognize that market failures from information or natural monopoly justify intervention. And, ironically, the same three decades that have seen this pullback have seen economists increasingly recognizing the myriad failures of markets.

Perhaps globalization obviates the need for antitrust? Maybe in some markets. But globalization can be easily fit in the framework of traditional antitrust analysis if it means broader geographic markets and more actual or potential competitors. No changes in law are required.

Viewed in isolation many of the changes to antitrust seem to me to be improvements. Together, though, they represent a massive shift whose justification I question. Could antitrust be losing its way?

#### Removing market manipulation increases market confidence.

FERC ’18 [Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; September; “Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Strategic Plan Fy 2018-2022;” <https://www.ferc.gov/sites/default/files/2020-04/FY-2018-FY-2022-strat-plan.pdf>; KS]

Objective 3.2: Facilitate public trust and understanding of Commission activities by promoting transparency, open communication, and a high standard of ethics.

Facilitating understanding of how the Commission carries out its responsibilities and maintaining public trust in the Commission are important components of the Commission’s commitment to organizational excellence. Trust and understanding increase acceptance of FERC decisions and reduce the potential for the public to dispute FERC rules and regulations, thus enabling the creation and enforcement of policy.

The Commission achieves this objective by maintaining processes and public information services that promote transparency and open communication with respect to the conduct of the Commission’s business. FERC’s proactive communication, along with an online document repository and timely responses to inquiries, foster awareness and understanding of the Commission’s activities.

The Commission also advances this objective by maintaining internal processes and services that ensure adherence to statutes, regulations, and self-imposed standards. In addition, FERC provides training and guidance to promote an ethically informed workforce. These activities further encourage public confidence in the Commission’s activities and ability to fulfill its responsibilities.

Confidence reelevent

Growth will decrease – 1ac ev says interacts with every article

#### Climate doesn’t cause extinction.

Kerr et al. 19 – Dr. Amber Kerr, Energy and Resources PhD at the University of California-Berkeley, known agroecologist, former coordinator of the USDA California Climate Hub. Dr. Daniel Swain, Climate Science PhD at UCLA, climate scientist, a research fellow at the National Center for Atmospheric Research. Dr. Andrew King, Earth Sciences PhD, Climate Extremes Research Fellow at the University of Melbourne. Dr. Peter Kalmus, Physics PhD at the University of Colombia, climate scientist at NASA’s Jet Propulsion Lab. Professor Richard Betts, Chair in Climate Impacts at the University of Exeter, a lead author on the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) in Working Group 1. Dr. William Huiskamp, Paleoclimatology PhD at the Climate Change Research Center, climate scientist at the Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research. [Claim that human civilization could end in 30 years is speculative, not supported with evidence, 6-4-2019, https://climatefeedback.org/evaluation/iflscience-story-on-speculative-report-provides-little-scientific-context-james-felton/]

There is no scientific basis to suggest that climate breakdown will “annihilate intelligent life” (by which I assume the report authors mean human extinction) by 2050.

However, climate breakdown does pose a grave threat to civilization as we know it, and the potential for mass suffering on a scale perhaps never before encountered by humankind. This should be enough reason for action without any need for exaggeration or misrepresentation!

A “Hothouse Earth” scenario plays out that sees Earth’s temperatures doomed to rise by a further 1°C (1.8°F) even if we stopped emissions immediately.

Peter Kalmus, Data Scientist, Jet Propulsion Laboratory:

This word choice perhaps reveals a bias on the part of the author of the article. A temperature can’t be doomed. And while I certainly do not encourage false optimism, assuming that humanity is doomed is lazy and counterproductive.

Fifty-five percent of the global population are subject to more than 20 days a year of lethal heat conditions beyond that which humans can survive

Richard Betts, Professor, Met Office Hadley Centre & University of Exeter:

This is clearly from Mora et al (2017) although the report does not include a citation of the paper as the source of that statement. The way it is written here (and in the report) is misleading because it gives the impression that everyone dies in those conditions. That is not actually how Mora et al define “deadly heat” – they merely looked for heatwaves when somebody died (not everybody) and then used that as the definition of a “deadly” heatwave.

North America suffers extreme weather events including wildfires, drought, and heatwaves. Monsoons in China fail, the great rivers of Asia virtually dry up, and rainfall in central America falls by half.

Andrew King, Research fellow, University of Melbourne:

Projections of extreme events such as these are very difficult to make and vary greatly between different climate models.

Deadly heat conditions across West Africa persist for over 100 days a year

Peter Kalmus, Data Scientist, Jet Propulsion Laboratory:

The deadly heat projections (this, and the one from the previous paragraph) come from Mora et al (2017)1.

It should be clarified that “deadly heat” here means heat and humidity beyond a two-dimension threshold where at least one person in the region subject to that heat and humidity dies (i.e., not everyone instantly dies). That said, in my opinion, the projections in Mora et al are conservative and the methods of Mora et al are sound. I did not check the claims in this report against Mora et al but I have no reason to think they are in error.

1- Mora et al (2017) Global risk of deadly heat, Nature Climate Change

The knock-on consequences affect national security, as the scale of the challenges involved, such as pandemic disease outbreaks, are overwhelming. Armed conflicts over resources may become a reality, and have the potential to escalate into nuclear war. In the worst case scenario, a scale of destruction the authors say is beyond their capacity to model, there is a ‘high likelihood of human civilization coming to an end’.

Willem Huiskamp, Postdoctoral research fellow, Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research:

This is a highly questionable conclusion. The reference provided in the report is for the “Global Catastrophic Risks 2018” report from the “Global Challenges Foundation” and not peer-reviewed literature. (It is worth noting that this latter report also provides no peer-reviewed evidence to support this claim).

Furthermore, if it is apparently beyond our capability to model these impacts, how can they assign a ‘high likelihood’ to this outcome?

While it is true that warming of this magnitude would be catastrophic, making claims such as this without evidence serves only to undermine the trust the public will have in the science.

Daniel Swain, Researcher, UCLA, and Research Fellow, National Center for Atmospheric Research:

It seems that the eye-catching headline-level claims in the report stem almost entirely from these knock-on effects, which the authors themselves admit are “beyond their capacity to model.” Thus, from a scientific perspective, the purported “high likelihood of civilization coming to an end by 2050” is essentially personal speculation on the part of the report’s authors, rather than a clear conclusion drawn from rigorous assessment of the available evidence.

### T Courts – 2AC

#### Courts can expand ‘the scope of antitrust law.’

Bradford ’18 [Anu, Adam Chilton, Christopher Megaw, and Nathaniel Sokol; August 17; Law Professor at Columbia Law School; Law Professor at the University of Chicago; JD at Columbia Law School; Law Clerk at the United States Bankruptcy Court (Southern District of New York), JD at Columbia Law School; Journal of Empirical Legal Studies, “Competition Law Gone Global: Introducing the Comparative Competition Law and Enforcement Datasets,” Vol. 16, p. 8-9]

An additional potential limitation of our dataset is that we only coded competition statutes and not case law. For those most familiar with American antitrust law, this may seem like an important omission. However, a recent expert survey we conducted suggests there are few countries outside the United States—primarily common law jurisdictions— where courts play a significant role in creating new competition law. 16 One of the questions in the survey asked: “In practice, do the courts generate new law by changing the scope of the antitrust statutes in [insert country]? Please answer on a scale from 1 (no role) to 5 (extensive role).” Of the 86 countries from which we received survey responses, in only 11 jurisdictions did the respondents say that “courts play an extensive role” i.e., “courts have the power to change the scope of antitrust law and frequently do so.” In a further 4 jurisdictions, the experts described the role of courts as “large” i.e., “courts have the power to change the scope of antitrust statues and sometimes do so.” Thus, while limited to competition statutes, this dataset captures the vast majority of competition laws in the world and serves as an accurate proxy of the state of competition law in each country.

#### ‘Antitrust laws’ include court decisions.

Wallace ’92 [John Clifford; December 7; Chief Judge of the Ninth Circuit’s Court of Appeals; Westlaw, “Nugget Hydroelectric, L.P. v. Pac. Gas & Elec. Co.,” 981 F.2d 429]

2 Nugget first argues that the state action doctrine has been preempted as to utilities by the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 (Act), Pub.L. No. 95–617, 92 Stat. 3117 (codified as amended in scattered sections of 15, 16, 30, 42, and 43 U.S.C.). The specific section of the Act on which Nugget relies provides that “[n]othing in this Act or in any amendment made by this Act affects ... the applicability of the antitrust laws to any electric utility or gas utility (as defined in section 3202 of Title 15).” 16 U.S.C. § 2603(1). Nugget contends that the phrase “antitrust laws” refers only to statutory law and does not encompass the common law state action doctrine.

3 The Act's definition of “antitrust laws” “includes the Sherman Antitrust Act, the Clayton Act, the Federal Trade Commission Act, the Wilson Tariff Act, and the Act of June 19, 1936, chapter 592.” 16 U.S.C. § 2602(1) (citations omitted). The definition's use of the word “includes” suggests that the phrase “antitrust laws” may encompass more than just these statutes. See Highway & City Freight Drivers v. Gordon Transps., Inc., 576 F.2d 1285, 1289 (8th Cir.), cert. denied, 439 U.S. 1002, 99 S.Ct. 612, 58 L.Ed.2d 678 (1978); American Fed'n of Television & Radio Artists v. NLRB, 462 F.2d 887, 889–90 (D.C.Cir.1972); United States v. Gertz, 249 F.2d 662, 666 (9th Cir.1957). In interpreting another statute, the Supreme Court has held that the term “laws” encompasses both statutes and court decisions. See Illinois v. City of Milwaukee, 406 U.S. 91, 99–100, 92 S.Ct. 1385, 1390–91, 31 L.Ed.2d 712 (1972). We conclude that the phrase “antitrust laws” embraces not only the text of the Sherman Antitrust Act and the other listed statutes, but also the courts' interpretations of them. The state action doctrine is an interpretation of the Sherman Antitrust Act, see Parker, 317 U.S. at 350–51, 63 S.Ct. at 313–14, of which Congress was aware, see Director, Office of Workers' Compensation Programs v. Perini North River Assocs., 459 U.S. 297, 319–20, 103 S.Ct. 634, 648–49, 74 L.Ed.2d 465 (1983), when it chose the phrase “antitrust laws.” The plain meaning of section 2603(1) thus establishes that the Act is to have no effect on the applicability of the state action doctrine to gas and electric utilities like PG & E.

### T Per Se

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

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

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

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

A

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

Specifications for

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

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

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

And, it states on the first page,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

B

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

#### ‘Prohibitions’ are laws forbidding actions.

Garner ’19 [Bryan A; Editor in Chief of Black’s Law Dictionary; Westlaw, Black's Law Dictionary, Eleventh Edition, “Prohibitions”]

prohibition (15c) 1. A law or order that forbids a certain action; PROSCRIPTION (1).

### Cap K (Kentucky) – 2AC

#### Capitalism's sustainable and comparatively preferable to alternatives.

Schrager **‘**20 [Allison; Winter 2020; Ph.D. in Economics from Columbia University, Senior Fellow at the Manhattan Institute; "Why Socialism Won't Work," https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/01/15/socialism-wont-work-capitalism-still-best/]

WITH INCREASINGLY UBIQUITOUS IPHONES, internet, central air conditioning, flat-screen TVs, and indoor plumbing, few in the developed world would want to go back to life 100, 30, or even 10 years ago. Indeed, around the world, the last two centuries have brought vast improvements in material living standards; billions of people have been lifted from poverty, and life expectancy across income levels has broadly risen. Most of that progress came from capitalist economies.

Yet those economies are not without their problems. In the United States and the United Kingdom, the gap between the rich and poor has become intolerably large as business owners and highly educated workers in urban areas have become richer while workers' wages in rural areas have stagnated. In most rich countries, more trade has brought a bigger, better variety of goods, but it has also displaced many jobs.

With social instability in the form of mass protests, Brexit, the rise of populism, and deep polarization knocking at the capitalist economies' doors, much of the progress of the last several decades is in peril. For some pundits and policymakers, the solution is clear: socialism, which tends to be cited as a method for addressing everything from inequality and injustice to climate change.

Yet the very ills that socialists identify are best addressed through innovation, productivity gains, and better rationing of risk. And capitalism is still far and away the best, if not only, way to generate those outcomes.

TODAY'S SOCIALISM IS DIFFICULT TO DEFINE. Traditionally, the term meant total state ownership of capital, as in the Soviet Union, North Korea, or Maoist China. Nowadays, most people don't take such an extreme view. In Europe, social democracy means the nationalization of many industries and very generous welfare states. And today's rising socialists are rebranding the idea to mean an economic system that delivers all the best parts of capitalism (growth and rising living standards) without the bad (inequality, economic cycles).

But no perfect economic system exists; there are always trade-offs--in the most extreme form between total state ownership of capital and unfettered markets without any regulation or welfare state. Today, few would opt for either pole; what modern socialists and capitalists really disagree on is the right level of government intervention.

Modern socialists want more, but not complete, state ownership. They'd like to nationalize certain industries. In the United States, that's health care--a plan supported by Democratic presidential candidates Elizabeth Warren (who does not call herself a socialist) and Bernie Sanders (who wears the label proudly). In the United Kingdom, Labour Party leader Jeremy Corbyn, who was trounced at the polls in mid-December, has set his sights on a longer list of industries, including the water, energy, and internet providers.

Other items on the socialist wish list may include allowing the government to be the primary investor in the economy through massive infrastructure projects that aim to replace fossil fuels with renewables, as Green New Deal socialists have proposed. They've also floated plans that would make the government the employer of a majority of Americans by offering guaranteed well-paid jobs that people can't be fired from. And then there are more limited proposals, including installing more workers on the boards of private companies and instituting national rent controls and high minimum wages.

For their part, modern capitalists want some, but less, state intervention. They are skeptical of nationalization and price controls; they argue that today's economic problems are best addressed by harnessing private enterprise. In the United States, they've argued for more regulation and progressive taxation to help ease inequality, incentives to encourage private firms to use less carbon, and a more robust welfare state through tax credits. Over the past 15 years, meanwhile, capitalist Europeans have instituted reforms to improve labor market flexibility by making it easier to hire and fire people, and there have been attempts to reduce the size of pensions.

No economic system is perfect, and the exact right balance between markets and the state may never be found. But there are good reasons to believe that keeping capital in the hands of the private sector, and empowering its owners to make decisions in the pursuit of profit, is the best we've got.

ONE REASON TO TRUST MARKETS is that they are better at setting prices than people. If you set prices too high, many a socialist government has found, citizens will be needlessly deprived of goods. Set them too low, and there will be excessive demand and ensuing shortages. This is true for all goods, including health care and labor. And there is little reason to believe that the next batch of socialists in Washington or London would be any better at setting prices than their predecessors. In fact, government-run health care systems in Canada and European countries are plagued by long wait times. A 2018 Fraser Institute study cites a median wait time of 19.8 weeks to see a specialist physician in Canada. Socialists may argue that is a small price to pay for universal access, but a market-based approach can deliver both coverage and responsive service. A full government takeover isn't the only option, nor is it the best one.

Beyond that, markets are also good at rationing risk. Fundamentally, socialists would like to reduce risk--protect workers from any personal or economywide shock. That is a noble goal, and some reduction through better functioning safety nets is desirable. But getting rid of all uncertainty--as state ownership of most industries would imply--is a bad idea. Risk is what fuels growth. People who take more chances tend to reap bigger rewards; that's why the top nine names on the Forbes 400 list of the richest Americans are not heirs to family dynasties but are self-made entrepreneurs who took a leap to build new products and created many jobs in the process.

Some leftist economists like Mariana Mazzucato argue that governments might be able to step in and become laboratories for innovation. But that would be a historical anomaly; socialist-leaning governments have typically been less innovative than others. After all, bureaucrats and worker-corporate boards have little incentive to upset the status quo or compete to build a better widget. And even when government programs have spurred innovation--as in the case of the internet--it took the private sector to recognize the value and create a market.

And that brings us to a third reason to believe in markets; productivity. Some economists, such as Robert Gordon, have looked to today's economic problems and suggested that productivity growth--the engine that fueled so much of the progress of the last several decades--is over. In this telling, the resources, products, and systems that underpin the world's economy are all optimized, and little further progress is possible.

But that is hard to square with reality. Innovation helps economies do more with fewer resources--increasingly critical to addressing climate change, for example--which is a form of productivity growth. And likewise, many of the products and technologies people rely on every day did not exist a few years ago. These goods make inaccessible services more available and are changing the nature of work, often for the better. Such gains are made possible by capitalist systems that encourage invention and growing the pie, not by socialist systems that are more concerned with how the existing pie is cut. It is far too soon, in other words, to write off productivity.

Here, it is worth considering the lessons of a previous productivity boom: the Industrial Revolution. As the economist Joel Mokyr has shown, it took new innovations like the steam engine more than 100 years to appear in productivity estimates. The same could be happening today with smartphones and the internet. Meanwhile, even as that upheaval transformed the human experience, creating a more comfortable existence for most everyone, it was also messy and disruptive. The early part of that innovative cycle--like others since--displaced existing workers while the gains flowed to the owners of capital first, causing social instability.

#### Only capitalism can solve environmental risk.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Renewable profitability

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

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

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

Red China goes green

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

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

Hydrogen in three colours

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

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

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

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

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

Electric cars

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

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

From coal to wind

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

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

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

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

Nuclear

The latest thinking is that carbon-free energy capacity could be ramped up quickly by means of a cluster of British designed and manufactured small modular reactors (SMRs) which have a footprint smaller than two football pitches. A consortium of Rolls Royce (LON:RR), WS Atkins (LON:ATK), Laing O’Rourke (LON:JLG) and the National Nuclear Laboratory is in the vanguard of this technology. Rolls-Royce has experience and expertise in building nuclear reactors to power Britain’s fleet of nuclear submarines, so this is not new technology. Reportedly, the UK government is considering the injection of up to £2 billion of state funds to invigorate the concept – assuming it is permitted to do so by the EU (if there is an agreement).

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

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

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

The fate of the oil majors

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### Regulations CP – 2AC

#### 2 – Regulations cannot create private rights of action.

DOJ ’21 [Department of Justice; February 3; Federal executive department of the United States government tasked with the enforcement of federal law and administration of justice in the United States; *Department of Justice,* “IX. PRIVATE RIGHTS OF ACTION AND INDIVIDUAL RELIEF THROUGH AGENCY ACTION,” <https://www.justice.gov/crt/fcs/T6Manual9>; KS]

The Supreme Court’s Sandoval decision left open the question whether an individual may bring an action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 to enforce Section 602 regulations. Sandoval, 532 U.S. at 300–01 (Stevens, J., dissenting). A year later, the Supreme Court answered this question in a case brought under Section 1983 to enforce the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), finding that there is no private cause of action via Section 1983. Gonzaga Univ. v. Doe, 536 U.S. 273, 290 (2002). The issue before the Court was whether a plaintiff could bring an action under Section 1983 to enforce FERPA, even though FERPA created no private right of action. Id. The Supreme Court explained that there is no private right of action: “We have held that ‘[t]he question whether Congress … intended to create a private right of action [is] definitively answered in the negative’ where a statute by its terms grants no private rights to any identifiable class.” Id. at 283-84 (citing Touche Ross & Co. v. Redington, 442 U.S. 560, 576 (1979)). Following Sandoval and Gonzaga, a majority of circuits have held that where a statute does not confer a private enforceable right, regulations promulgated under the statute cannot create a private right of action.[3] Therefore, the regulations promulgated under Section 602 are unenforceable via a private action under Section 1983.

#### 3 – No private right of action or treble damages – Vaheesan & Gorodetsky say only private right of action create sufficient deterrence.

Hovenkamp ’12 [Hebert; December 21; Ben V. & Dorothy Willie Professor of Law, University of Iowa; *Penn Law: Legal Scholarship Repository;* “Antitrust and the 'Filed Rate' Doctrine: Deregulation and State Action,” <https://scholarship.law.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2853&context=faculty_scholarship>; KS]

Speaking through Justice Brandeis, the Supreme Court held in Keogh that although the Interstate Commerce Act did not exempt railroads from antitrust liability, a private plaintiff may not recover treble damages based on an allegedly monopolistic tariff rate 3 filed with the ICC. Keogh very likely grew out of Justice Brandeis's own zeal for regulation and his concern for the protection of small business—in this case, mainly 4 shippers whom he felt were protected from discrimination by filed rates. The Keogh doctrine served to absolutize regulated rates by making them nearly immune from collateral attack. Under various degrees of deregulation, the doctrine makes little sense.

Justice Brandeis gave four reasons for this rule, each of which was later criticized by Judge Friendly (although he ultimately followed Keogh) in the Square D case. First, Justice Brandeis doubted the need for an antitrust remedy, for Interstate Commerce Act §85 gave shippers injured by illegal filed rates their actual damages plus attorney's fees. However, Judge Friendly pointed out that antitrust damages are often available to those with remedies under other bodies of federal law.7

Moreover, no remedy would be available from the ICC for an approved rate that had in fact been the product of an earlier conspiracy. And increasingly under deregulation, competition has determined reasonableness.8

Second, Justice Brandeis emphasized that the filed rate was legal for all purposes and not to be “varied or enlarged by either contract or tort of the carrier.”9 Granting an antitrust damage remedy to some shippers would result in an arbitrarily discriminatory rate structure inconsistent with the purpose of the Interstate Commerce Act to prevent rate discrimination among shippers. Even if every shipper brought an action, the net rates would be discriminatory “unless the highly improbable happened, and the several juries and courts gave to each the same measure of relief.”10 But Judge Friendly pointed out that modern class actions increase the likelihood that all shippers affected by a monopoly rate can be joined and receive uniform relief and that the Brandeis argument proves too much. In all cases, one who recovers treble damages from a supplier receives a lower net price than those who do not. This puts the successful plaintiff in a favored position over the one who was equally injured but who failed to litigate or did so unsuccessfully.11

Third, Justice Brandeis noted that antitrust damages depend on proof that the rate paid exceeded the hypothetical rate that would have prevailed in the absence of the illegal conduct and that this hypothetical rate would have been approved by the ICC. What the ICC would have approved is a question better determined, at least initially, by the Commission rather than by the courts.12 But antitrust damages, far from forcing any particular rate on the ICC, merely reflect an estimate of what the price would otherwise have been­—neither more nor less accurately than in antitrust cases generally.13 Nor are damages necessarily more intrusive on agency processes than the antitrust injunctions available to private parties.15

Finally, Justice Brandeis believed that a shipper would not really be injured by an illegal rate that applied equally to its competitors, for all of them would then simply pass on the overcharge to their customers. The loss they actually absorbed would be purely speculative. But subsequent antitrust rulings have allowed those who pay an illegal overcharge to recover it (trebled) whether or not they passed it on.16 In any event, even if shippers in competition with one another are not injured significantly, the larger injury would accrue to consumers who would ultimately pay more for goods or services delivered by common carriers, or produced with energy supplied by price-regulated utilities.

The Supreme Court's Square D decision conceded that Keogh may have been “unwise as a matter of policy,”17 but reaffirmed it nonetheless on the ground that Congress had had ample opportunity to overturn it but had not done so.18 Since then the Supreme Court and lower courts have persisted in applying the doctrine and have even broadened its scope.

The implications of Keogh and Square D are that overcharge actions by consumers based on claims that a “filed” rate19 constitutes an antitrust violation will be dismissed. The rate must merely be filed and technically approved by the agency. It need not have been actively reviewed for accuracy or public interest considerations—indeed, it need not have been received at all in any meaningful sense.20 The doctrine operates as a rule against collateral attack: once filed, a rate may not be collaterally attacked in the courts. However, an objector may be able to ask the regulatory agency to review a rate within its jurisdiction, considering the objection.21 Of course, that proceeding would not be in antitrust and would not provide treble damages and attorney's fees as an inducement.

#### 4 – Agencies lack experience and expertise – rates may seem reasonable to the agency, but are the result of a price-fixing regime.

Gorodetsky ‘9 [Julia; Winter; Corporate securities lawyer for Andrews Kurth LLC; *Tulane Environmental Law Journal,* “Analogy By Necessity: The Filed Rate Doctrine and Judicial Review of Agency Inaction,” <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/43294073.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3A40dc35292abcd134d36ab5a0d941bbc6>; KS]

Unfortunately, the actions by the regulators are very troubling. FERC's failure to detect market manipulation in California stems from the agency's general lack of familiarity with deregulation and market- based tariffs monitoring.159 FERC has extensive expertise with cost-of- services rates, but market-based tariffs are very different.160 Thus, while FERC has the expertise to determine just and reasonable cost-of-service rates, it lacks similar expertise in determining which market-based rates are just and reasonable.161 Further, FERC has failed to make the requisite findings to address this problem. Until recently, FERC had never taken upon itself to devise rules and parameters for efficient markets.162

Thus, judicial deference to FERC's expertise in the context of market-based tariffs is unwarranted because the agency lacks both experience and expertise in the subject matter. Further, FERC is not equipped with the proper jurisdictional authority to retroactively remedy the claims resulting from tariffs FERC itself has found to be unfair and unreasonable.163 Given the situation, judicially enforced antitrust laws would be more efficient in addressing potential market power manipu- lation. Unlike FERC, courts possess a solid and constantly evolving expertise in dealing with competitive markets.164 Further, courts are more responsive than agencies to legislative actions aimed at remedying potential market power abuse. Also, courts can issue retroactive remedies.165

During California's crisis, FERC was confronted by a market which operated extremely fast and which was not structurally competitive.166 Further, FERC was faced with "aggressive traders and generators primed to find and use loopholes in the protocols to increase their companies' profits and their personal bonuses.”167

FERC, however, did not take these competitive market realities into account. It analyzed the filed market-based rates by looking at the market share of the regulated utility under the faulty assumption that insufficient market share effectively denies the potential for market manipulation.168 FERC assumed that generators with market shares of less than twenty percent were incapable of exercising market power.16 However, the numbers employed by FERC were erroneously borrowed from the measures used by DOJ and FTC in analyzing a firm's market power in nonelectricity markets.170 The unique characteristics of the electricity market confer market power on a utility with market share as small as one percent during peak hours of demand.171

The lack of synchronization between retail and wholesale rates, which contributed greatly to the California crisis, further highlight FERC's inexperience with market-based rates. It also shows the income- patibility between the filed rate doctrine and maintenance of a properly functioning competitive market.

When California froze its retail prices, it assumed that FERC would impose much lower wholesale prices during the period of transition to the newly deregulated market.172 If such calculations were correct, the "headroom" between retail and wholesale prices would have allowed utilities to recover costs following the state-ordered unbundling.173 This assumption proved to be a serious miscalculation on the part of the state.174 When the wholesale prices soared, Pacific Gas and Electric Company started to accumulate massive debts and eventually filed for bankruptcy, unable to recover costs in the retail market.175

While the state retail market based its rate calculation on a mistaken assumption in regards to wholesale rates, FERC's wholesale rates were approved based on retail tariffs.176 FERC required that wholesale seller either show that they lacked market power or that they took measures to mitigate such power in order to have their rates approved.177 One of the "measures" taken by the wholesale sellers was to successfully claim that the retail market rate freeze would prevent them from passing higher costs to the consumers.178 However, FERC's decision to approve these wholesale rates, no matter how faulty, was immune from judicial review pursuant to the filed rate doctrine.179 In Pacific Gas & Electric Co. v. Lynch, the California district court held that FERC was not "obligated to adjust wholesale rates to harmonize with retail rates," even if FERC did rely on the state retail price freeze in its initial calculation of market- based rates.180

Further, FERC's authority to impose penalties only extends to ordering prospective refunds for rates not found to be "just and reasonable.”181 FERC cannot administer any other monetary penalties against violators.182 Thus, FERC is not effective in policing deregulated markets and deterring future violations.183 Further, the "just and reasonable" rate standard does not account for the fact that the market- based rate may seem "reasonable" to FERC yet be a result of a price- fixing conspiracy, and thus higher than the rate dictated by free market competition.184 Thus, antitrust violations could pass FERC's review unnoticed.

FERC's Order, issued on December 15, 2000, in response to California's electricity crisis, revealed the extent of FERC's inability to discipline the wholesale market.185 The Order announced that FERC would not intervene and stated two major conclusions.186 One acknowledged that FERC was under the obligation to ensure that wholesale prices were just and reasonable and that the state's current wholesale rates, all previously filed and approved by the FERC, were neither just nor reasonable.187 That conclusion notwithstanding, FERC refused to cap the current wholesale prices.188 The second conclusion referred to the demand for retroactive relief, which FERC denied.189 It cited the filed rate doctrine as justification for the assertion that all rates previously found by FERC to be just and reasonable were not eligible for a refund.190

FERC's Order made it clear that the filed rate doctrine applied to cost-of-service and market-based rates alike, thus revealing FERC to be a "paper tiger" incapable of disciplining competitive markets.191 The file rate doctrine became a legal loophole for rampant abuse in the already dysfunctional California market. 192 The Order, coupled with the knowledge that FERC was probably incapable of deterring price and market power manipulation, invited utilities to "game the system at will" by manipulating electrical supply and demand and driving prices upwards.193 Predictably, prices increased substantially, and the general result of the FERC Order was that "[t]he equivalent of outright looting occurred in plain sight.194

The extent of FERC 's lack of expertise in dealing with deregulate market prices was further confirmed by the findings of the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs staff report in regards to FERC investigation of the Enron scandal.195 The report cited a "shocking absence of regulatory vigilance on FERC's part and a failure to structure the agency to meet the demands of the new, market-based system that the agency itself has championed.”196

### BBB – 2AC

#### Court shields.

Mazzone ’18 [Jason; August 9; Professor of Law at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; Chicago-Kent Law Review, “Above Politics: Congress and the Supreme Court in 2017,” [vol.](https://scholarship.kentlaw.iit.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=4207&context=cklawreview) 93]

Absent, too, in the modern Congress is any real sense that the Supreme Court can be brought to heel: say, by constitutional amendment, by stripping the Court of funding, by hauling in members of the Court to justify their rulings before congressional investigatory committees, by appointing special counsels to review and report back on what the Court does, by impeaching the Justices (or locking them up), or by simply ignoring or defying judicial rulings. Perhaps the Court does not rule in ways that offend enough members of Congress (or their constituents) for them to invest the energy—and political capital—required to generate these sorts of measures. Perhaps, instead, members of Congress do not consider such measures appropriate in our constitutional system. In either case, modesty on the part of Congress is the result, even in an era when a single party controls both the Congress and the White House. The lesson for the Court is that so long as it continues doing—more or less—what is has done in recent years, it has very little to fear from the Congress.

Conclusion

After President Trump nominated Neil Gorsuch to fill the vacancy on the Supreme Court left by the death of Justice Scalia, fifteen House Republicans sponsored a Resolution that “the House firmly supports the nomination of Neil Gorsuch to the Supreme Court” and “the Senate should hold a swift confirmation of this nomination.”229 The proposed resolution died, without further action, in the Committee on the Judiciary. While Gorsuch was, of course, confirmed, the failure of the Republican-controlled House to pass a simple resolution supporting the nomination is telling. After an election season in which the Supreme Court figured very prominently, aside from the Senate’s confirmation of a new Justice, Congress in 2017 accomplished nothing with respect to the Supreme Court. Various bills and resolutions—some sponsored by Republicans, others by Democrats, and some garnering bipartisan support—targeted statutory and constitutional rulings by the Court and sought also to impose new regulations upon the Court’s activities. Even the most modest of these proposals failed to advance through the legislative process and become law. We like to think that the Supreme Court, guided solely by the rule of law, is above politics. The experience of 2017 suggests that the Court may also be above politics in the quite different sense that its rulings and activities are largely immune to political response and redress.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Build Back Better

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### PC fails, probably backfires.

Nyhan ’21 [Brendan; March 19; Government Professor at Dartmouth University, interviewed by Brooke Gladstone; New York Public Radio, “Joe Biden and The Green Lantern Theory of The Presidency,” <https://www.wnycstudios.org/podcasts/otm/segments/joe-biden-and-green-lantern-theory-presidency-on-the-media>]

BROOKE GLADSTONE But according to Brendan Nyhan, a professor of government at Dartmouth College and the man who coined the term "the Green Lantern theory of the presidency," the idea overstates the power of the executive. He says that even when there's a will, there may not be a way.

BRENDAN NYHAN My understanding is the Green Lantern Corps have a ring whose powers are limited only by the wearer's willpower. Matt Iglesias is a blogger, he originally applied that idea to geopolitics. He was criticizing conservatives who said the failures of U.S. foreign policy in the post 9/11 era were attributable to a lack of will. And I saw that same idea as being applicable to domestic politics too, where the president's powers are actually quite limited.

BROOKE GLADSTONE And so all this brings us to the criticism currently directed at Joe Biden. Many progressives are upset by the failure to include the 15 dollar minimum wage, and argued that Biden could have done more to convince Democratic senators like Joe Manchin of West Virginia and Kyrsten Sinema of Arizona who voted against it. David Sirota wrote in The Guardian, he's a former speechwriter for Bernie Sanders, the famous example from Lyndon B. Johnson's fight for Medicare as proof that a tough president can strong arm members of Congress into adopting his goals.

BRENDAN NYHAN Yeah, I think that LBJ arm twisting myth has been a major contributor to Green Lantern style discourse around the president. That the president can, through the kind of cajoling described in these famous accounts, bring numerous votes to his side in Congress. It's very difficult for the president to move votes in Congress. Ask Barack Obama for most of his time in office. Ask Donald Trump, ask any occupant of the White House. LBJ came into office with huge Democratic majorities. Joe Biden has a margin of zero votes in the Senate. Joe Manchin represents a state where almost 70 percent of people voted for Donald Trump. I'm not sure what arm twisting could cause him to vote against his political interests. The Democrats are an anchor around his neck politically. Withdrawing their support from him is not some kind of a threat. It probably helps him.

BROOKE GLADSTONE Getting back to LBJ, you say that he is one of two main illustrations that would seem to support the Green Lantern theory. The other president is Ronald Reagan.

BRENDAN NYHAN Rather than LBJ style arm twisting. Activists say that the president could marshal public opinion, if they only made the case publicly, they could win over the public to their side and therefore rally Congress to support their priorities. This was a recurring theme in the Obama years because he was a quite skilled orator. The evidence, however, suggests that presidential speechmaking is often ineffective. Ronald Reagan wrote in his own diaries when he was president that his case for aid to the Contras in Latin America failed to rally support, and reportedly he was even told by his own pollster that the public comments he was offering on behalf of the cause were actually making it harder for him by rallying opposition. And that's the dilemma that presidents face. David Frum, the conservative commentator, has argued that one of the most effective communication strategies of the early Biden administration has been how little he has talked. Precisely because it avoids making him the focal point of a conversation, given that presidents are so polarizing in our current era. So, again, the idea here is it's not a case of the president failing to deploy their public communication powers, it's that those public communication powers are highly overrated. Once the president gets the issues where they don't have the votes, sometimes they will try. Barack Obama campaigned quite extensively on behalf of gun control and renewed those efforts after high profile mass shootings. But it was fruitless. He would campaign on behalf of it because maybe it could help move the needle, but it never was enough to successfully enact the legislation the administration was proposing.

#### Winners win.

Elving ’21 [Ron; April 10; Senior Editor and Correspondent, Washington Desk; National Public Radio, “Week In Politics: Biden's Pricey Plans For The Nation,” https://www.npr.org/2021/04/10/986042390/week-in-politics-bidens-pricey-plans-for-the-nation]

ELVING: Yes, that's right. And that's a good example. Political capital gets devalued pretty quickly if you don't use it. And when you've had some successes like the pandemic relief bill, the vaccination progress we've seen, that can build momentum for your next proposal, such as the infrastructure and jobs plan or the executive orders on guns, like the ban on guns assembled from kits that don't have serial numbers. That's a small step, but it is a step. So this is the Joe Biden who has learned lessons from the big Democratic movers and shakers of the 20th century like old FDR and LBJ.

### Pharma DA

#### There’s a typhoon of antitrust expansion in all domains – 2022 is a watershed.

Swartz ’1-1 [Jon; updated January 1; reporter, citing Bhaskar Chakravorti, dean of global business at the Fletcher School at Tufts University; MarketWatch, “Big Tech heads for ‘a year of thousands of tiny tech papercuts,’ but what antitrust efforts could make them bleed?” <https://www.marketwatch.com/story/big-tech-heads-for-a-year-of-thousands-of-tiny-tech-papercuts-but-what-antitrust-efforts-could-make-them-bleed-11640640776>]

This could finally change in 2022 as it did in the late 1990s, when some tech companies struck a cautious stance during the Justice Department’s investigation of Microsoft for monopolistic practices, Syed said.

“The difference is that we’re talking about interconnected companies that own an industry versus just one company [with Microsoft],” she said. “And there is bipartisan support, which makes it easier politically.”

With more than a dozen pieces of anti-tech legislation, a plethora of lawsuits and regulatory fines escalating in the U.S. and abroad, as well as the Biden administration rounding out Big Tech’s nightmare team of government agency heads, 2022 is shaping up as a seminal year for tech regulation after decades of inaction.

In rapid succession this year, Biden named and nominated an antitrust team of Tim Wu (to the newly created position of head of competition policy at the National Economic Council), Lina Khan (chair of the Federal Trade Commission) and Jonathan Kanter (head of the antitrust division of the Justice Department). Each is a heralded anti-monopolist advocate who has written extensively on the topic or represented companies making antitrust claims against Big Tech.

The trio have been referred to as members of a “New Brandeis movement,” named after Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis, whose decisions limited the power of big business in the early 20th century. With the New Brandeis trifecta in place, and Congress evaluating more than dozen possible anti-tech bills, next year is “shaping up to be the year of Tech Takedown,” Bhaskar Chakravorti, dean of global business at the Fletcher School at Tufts University, told MarketWatch.

More troubling for tech CEOs, he said, are the “many tiny actions at the FTC, Justice Department and Congress that will continue to keep feeding the news cycles with a steady stream of actions” that add up to a “a year of thousands of tiny tech papercuts.”

Big Tech’s treacherous path to antitrust enforcement has three potentially damaging roads: federal agencies challenging acquisitions and mergers; legislation tailored to stimulate competition and curtail the influence of tech’s dominant platforms; and federal and state lawsuits.

Closer scrutiny of M&A activity

The biggest immediate impact from the Biden administration’s all-out assault could be a cooling-off period of frenzied mergers and acquisitions by the biggest players. Regulators have been empowered with examining past deals and more strenuously inspecting tech’s latest purchases.

Major movement is already happening on the M&A front because, as lawyers and executives told MarketWatch, the FTC and Justice Department have new leadership empowered to more closely review and approve mergers while they await legislation and court actions. A non-binding [presidential executive order largely seen as aimed at Big Tech](https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2021/07/09/fact-sheet-executive-order-on-promoting-competition-in-the-american-economy/) announced a policy of greater scrutiny of mergers over the summer, and the FTC and Justice Department each would receive $500 million in new funding to boost staff working on antitrust enforcement as part of the House-passed reconciliation bill awaiting Senate action.

The FTC is signaling greater oversight over deals, requiring affirmative consent on certain transactions, which may prolong uncertainty on merger agreements. The agency has already sued to block the largest semiconductor deal ever — Nvidia Corp.’s [NVDA, 3.05%](https://www.marketwatch.com/investing/stock/NVDA?mod=MW_story_quote) proposed $40 billion acquisition of U.K.-based chip-design provider Arm Ltd., saying the deal would “distort Arm’s incentives in chip markets and allow the combined firm to unfairly undermine Nvidia’s rivals.”

Another FTC antitrust probe, into Meta’s plan to acquire VR fitness app Supernatural for $400 million, is underway, according to a [report](https://www.theinformation.com/articles/ftc-slows-meta-platforms-metaverse-strategy-by-extending-antitrust-probe-of-vr-deal?utm_source=ti_app)by The Information.

The Justice Department’s direction is less clear at this point, but signals from Kanter’s confirmation hearing point to “vigorous enforcement” of antitrust laws.

“Personnel is policy. With the trifecta of Khan, Kanter and Wu, there is a new sheriff in town,” Luther Lowe, senior vice president of public policy at Yelp Inc. [YELP, 2.73%](https://www.marketwatch.com/investing/stock/YELP?mod=MW_story_quote), told MarketWatch. “Efforts by Amazon and Facebook to recuse Khan, and Google’s attempt to recuse Kanter, is like arsonists asking for firefighters to be removed from a fire.”

An overwhelming swath of Americans, regardless of political affiliation, believe Big Tech wields too much power and should be held in check on acquisitions, according to a survey of 1,187 likely voters by Data for Progress in September. Wide majorities believe Big Tech “puts competitors at a disadvantage” (69%) and “shouldn’t be able to buy up smaller businesses because of the potential negative impacts on competition and consumers” (66%).

Agencies are more aggressively scrutinizing tech-related deals, antitrust attorney Valarie Williams told MarketWatch. Whether investigations block mergers, they “can be disruptive and stop mergers if not discourage them,” she said.

“Legislation or not, that will not affect at all DoJ and FTC in antitrust enforcement based on existing law,” Williams said. “The pendulum has definitely swung after years of inactivity and readily-approved mergers.”

At the very least, expect acquisitions to take longer to complete, if they can get through the regulatory process at all. And expect more scrutiny over smaller deals after [an FTC study](https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/press-releases/2021/09/ftc-report-on-unreported-acquisitions-by-biggest-tech-companies) in September revealed that Amazon, Apple, Google, Meta and Microsoft made 616 acquisitions from 2010 to 2019 that fell below the FTC’s $92 million reporting threshold but were worth at least $1 million.

“Investors have told us that they have built more time into deals being done, but still expect many to go through,” Ed Mills, Washington policy analyst at Raymond James, told MarketWatch. “They are ready for a longer process and agencies to be skeptical of acquisitions of nascent competitors by larger players.”

Deep-pocketed investors in startups hoping to be acquired have noticed. Bettina Hein, co-founder and chief executive of digital-healthcare startup Juli, put it in stark terms during the Dec. 15 Senate hearing on competition: 10 times as many tech startups seek acquisitions as they do an initial public offering.

Increasingly, executives and investors have reached out to antitrust law firms to assess the legislative and political climate and its impact on Big Tech’s aggressive M&A strategy, according to Nabiha Syed, president of The Markup.

“Boards with exit strategies are huddling with antitrust lawyers to see if this lasts the next two years,” she said. “A key question is how soon the FTC shakes things up. To me, they speed up the war drums and hit the ground running in 2022. There is a public appetite and more momentum this time than around” than when the Justice Department sued Microsoft in the 1990s, she added.

Legislation is on the way, but how soon?

As U.S. regulators prepare to crack down, legislators are ramping up bills for votes, the culmination of years of hearings and policy discussions.

“This is a watershed moment for Big Tech accountability, and 2022 will be the year that these companies finally face the regulation that will end their harmful and deceptive practices,” Sen. Edward Markey, D-Mass., told MarketWatch. Markey, author of the landmark Child Online Protection Act of 1998, has toiled on a sequel for years and is confident it will happen in 2022.

Next year could shape up as the biggest for tech legislation since Bill Clinton’s presidency, when the Telecommunications Act of 1996 significantly amended the Communications Act of 1934, according to Jim Steyer, CEO of Common Sense Media, a lobbying and advocacy organization, and co-chair of the Future of Tech Commission, appointed by White House in April.

Steyer anticipates changes to privacy law, with a federal law modeled after California’s CCPA in 2018, and platform accountability in the form of revisions to Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act. Most important, the $1 billion in funding for FTC and Justice as part of the evolving Build Back Better bill would give regulators the ability to enforce.

“Laws without enforcement are like sharks without teeth,” he told MarketWatch.

Facebook whistle-blower [Frances Haugen’s](https://www.marketwatch.com/story/meta-faces-another-day-of-reckoning-on-capitol-hill-as-facebook-whistleblower-frances-haugen-testifies-11638378756?mod=article_inline) impact “energized Congress on bipartisan bills” while Biden’s executive order “sent a clear message” that acquisitions won’t occur at the same pace. “The federal government, in the form of the FTC and Justice, will take longer looks at potential combinations” like Nvidia and Arm, Steyer said.

The House has introduced six bills, the Senate has at least three major pieces of legislation, and more are expected. Rep. David Cicilline, D-R.I., a key architect of the House’s six bills, has said he expects “we’ll be in a position to bring the bills to the floor” by the fall.

Big Tech has attempted to throw money at the problem. Amazon ($15.33 million), Facebook ($14.65 million) and Alphabet ($8.95 million) ranked among the top 20 spenders in lobbying efforts on government policy this year, [according to the nonprofit OpenSecrets](https://www.opensecrets.org/federal-lobbying/top-spenders), even as the debate over antitrust efforts took down a major Silicon Valley lobbying group.

And midterm elections could change the course of Democrats’ legislation. House Minority Leader Kevin McCarthy, R-Calif., in June signaled his opposition to giving regulators too much authority and that House Republicans plan to target other tech issues, namely around “free speech [Section 230] and free enterprise.”

Federal and state lawsuits

The Justice Department is rumored to be on the cusp of two major lawsuits: one targeting Google’s dominance of the digital advertising market, the other aimed at Apple, perhaps at the influence and business practices of its App Store though it remains unclear.

Justice’s next lawsuit against Google would be its second antitrust action. The first, in July, alleged Google illegally protected its monopoly over online search advertising. Separately, a group of 36 states and the District of Columbia sued Google in July, claiming its mobile app store abuses its market power and forces aggressive terms on software developers.

Perhaps the most intriguing of a handful of state-led cases against Google is one led by Texas Attorney General Ken Paxton. It claims Google commands a cut of 22% to 42% of U.S. ad spending that goes through its systems, according to [a newly unredacted lawsuit](https://www.wsj.com/articles/attorneys-general-launch-probe-of-google-11568055853?mod=article_inline&mod=article_inline).

Apple’s quandary is the ongoing Epic Games Inc. antitrust suit that is wending its way through appeals court. Though a federal judge ruled Apple did not break antitrust law, she issued an injunction that would have forced Apple to allow external payment options on its App Store by Dec. 9. [[Apple recently won a stay](https://www.marketwatch.com/story/apple-wins-appeal-in-epic-case-avoiding-changes-to-app-store-on-dec-9-2021-12-08?mod=article_inline) on appeal of the injunction. The stay, however, does not reverse the earlier ruling but puts enforcement on hold until the appeals court can fully hear the case, a process that will likely take months.]

Meanwhile, the FTC continues to plow ahead on its lawsuit to force the divesture of Instagram and WhatsApp from Meta. At the very least, the lawsuit sets a template for the agency’s avowed crack down on tech M&A action, regardless of the decision in the case.

This leaves Amazon, which could be bracing for an FTC suit led by its longtime nemesis Khan. The agency is currently probing Amazon as part of a series of ongoing investigations into Big Tech, and it is looking more closely at Amazon’s planned $8.45 billion purchase of MGM Studios.

#### Pharma innovation low.

Robinson 21 (James Claude Robinson is a professor of health economics in the School of Public Health at the University of California, Berkeley, 3-2-2021, accessed on 7-25-2021, JAMA Network, "Funding of Pharmaceutical Innovation During and After the COVID-19 Pandemic", <https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/fullarticle/2775400>)

The pharmaceutical industry has backed away from the position that prices should be based on what the market will bear without regard to actual research, development, and manufacturing expenditures. Some firms have pledged to set prices at nonprofit levels, at least during the COVID-19 pandemic. The Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations (a coalition of governmental and philanthropic organizations) is proposing advanced market commitments to fund vaccine research and development with the understanding that recipients will supply vaccines later at prices that only cover the cost of production.4 With advanced market commitments, the purchaser contracts for a defined number of vaccine doses at a negotiated price (to be delivered after the product is developed and manufactured), in effect committing the manufacturer to prioritize the contracted purchaser over others.

A Reassessment of Pricing

The COVID-19 pandemic is forcing experimentation throughout the health care system, including drug prices as a source of funding for innovation. Some of the new initiatives will recede as the pandemic ends. However, the changes observed reflect deeper trends that likely will persist.

The public and political resistance to high drug prices in the US is unlikely to abate. It is neither efficient nor equitable for US taxpayers and patients to pay drug prices substantially higher than those paid in other high-income countries, even though these prices likely help support drug development that benefits many individuals around the world. Postlaunch price increases not supported by new evidence of clinical benefit cannot be justified as either cost-based or value-based pricing principles. In the fragmented and competitive US health insurance market, rising drug prices are passed on directly to patients, further burdening the patients with the most severe illness who need access to the most expensive therapies. High drug prices in the US compared with other countries constitute a direct subsidy to foreign competitors. The high prices allow non-US pharmaceutical companies to repatriate high profits from the US market and finance expanded research and production capabilities at home, whereas US pharmaceutical companies do not gain commensurate profits from their sales abroad. This contrasts with public funding mechanisms, including grants and tax incentives, which are designed to favor research, product development, and manufacturing activities conducted in the US.

The limitations of pharmaceutical industry profits as a financing source extend beyond the scale of investment to include its direction. The traditional framework is concentrated on investments in therapeutic niches protected from competition, rather than those of the greatest social need. Prices remain high and investment remains robust for treatments targeting rare orphan conditions and for therapies based on the newest gene and cell technologies. But the pharmaceutical industry has been restricting its investments for major public health conditions (such as cardiovascular disease5), for new antibiotics6 that address drug-resistant infections, and for the treatment of neglected illnesses7 prevalent in low-income countries. The prices that can be charged and the revenues that can be earned in these domains do not satisfy the return on investment thresholds required by the pharmaceutical industry’s capital partners.

A Reassessment of Innovation Funding

The shortcomings of the traditional framework for funding pharmaceutical research and development have been evident for many years. But only in 2020, in response to the imperatives created by the COVID-19 pandemic, has the government been willing to expand its role. The passing of the pandemic, when it occurs, may reinvigorate industry-funded investments. The US will not be able to sustain its leading research and development position in global markets if it does not seize the opportunity presented by the COVID-19 pandemic to rethink its innovation strategy. Public funding will need to expand beyond scientific research to support product development and manufacturing, building on the model of the NIH Small Business Innovation Research program as well as the new models of Operation Warp Speed and the NIH Rapid Acceleration of Diagnostics program.8 The expansion in public funding likely will find bipartisan support in the light of rising concerns for China’s aggressive protection of and subsidies for its domestic life sciences industry.9

The lesson of the COVID-19 experience is that, when innovation in the life sciences is imperative, the traditional reliance on pharmaceutical industry prices and profits is jettisoned in favor of governmental grants and procurement. Sustained public funding for product development and commercialization will permit the sustained financing of innovation, a renewed attention to major public health needs, and the global position of the US pharmaceutical industry.

#### No disease impact.

Halstead 19 John Halstead, doctorate in political philosophy. [Cause Area Report: Existential Risk, Founders Pledge, https://founderspledge.com/research/Cause%20Area%20Report%20-%20Existential%20Risk.pdf]

However, there are some reasons to think that naturally occurring pathogens are unlikely to cause human extinction. Firstly, Homo sapiens have been around for 200,000 years and the Homo genus for around six million years without being exterminated by an infectious disease, which is evidence that the base rate of extinction-risk natural pathogens is low.82 Indeed, past disease outbreaks have not come close to rendering humans extinct. Although bodies were piled high in the streets across Europe during the Black Death,83 human extinction was never a serious possibility, and some economists even argue that it was a boon for the European economy.84 Secondly, infectious disease has only contributed to the extinction of a small minority of animal species.85 The only confirmed case of a mammalian species extinction being caused by an infectious disease is a type of rat native only to Christmas Island. Having said that, the context may be importantly different for modern day humans, so it is unclear whether the risk is increasing or decreasing. On the one hand, due to globalisation, the world is more interconnected making it easier for pathogens to spread. On the other hand, interconnectedness could also increase immunity by increasing exposure to lower virulence strains between subpopulations.87 Moreover, advancements in medicine and sanitation limit the potential damage an outbreak might do.

#### Bioweapons are super hard.

Jeffereson, et al. 14 All authors involved in Department of Social Science, Health and Medicine, King’s College London, informed by participation in expert committees and working groups, and public debates organized by scientific organizations. Catherine Jefferson, involved in discussions on bioweapons, biosecurity and arms control for a decade, Filippa Lentzos, engaged in the field of synthetic biology for the last 7 years, and Claire Marris, attending and participating in a wide range of scientific and policy events on synthetic biology for 5 years. [Synthetic Biology and Biosecurity: Challenging the “Myths”, 8-1-2014, https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpubh.2014.00115/full]

Challenges to Myth 3 When speaking about DNA synthesis, it is useful to distinguish between (a) the synthesis of oligonucleotides, commonly referred to as “oligos,” which are typically less than 100 nucleotides in length; (b) “gene synthesis,” a term used to refer to the de novo synthesis of “gene-length” DNA sequences, typically 200–3,000 base pairs (bp); and (c) the assembly of de novo synthesized gene-length fragments into genetic circuits and whole genomes. There are a number of ways in which DNA synthesis could be used to create a synthetic viral genome [(44), p. 134]. An entire viral genome could be ordered online from a commercial gene synthesis company. Short, single stranded oligonucleotides could also be ordered from different gene synthesis companies and “stitched” together to create a complete viral genome. Alternatively, oligonucleotides could be synthesized using a purchased or custom-built DNA synthesizer, and these fragments could then be assembled into a complete viral genome. Several challenges should be taken into account when assessing the potential for this technology to be misused. Ordering short oligos and then assembling them into a genome was the method used in the polio and Spanish flu experiments, but this required specialist expertise, experience, and equipment, which were all available in the academic laboratories involved but would not be easily accessible to an amateur working from home. Obtaining the oligos (as was done by The Guardian journalist for the smallpox virus) is only the first step in a complicated process. This is the first challenge to Myth 3. The second challenge to Myth 3 is that, contrary to what is stated in Wikipedia, and what is often implied in the policy discourse described above, even specialized DNA synthesis companies cannot easily synthesize de novo any desired DNA sequence. Several commercial companies provide routine gene synthesis services for sequences under 3,000 bp, but length is a crucial factor, the process is error prone, and some sequences are recalcitrant to chemical synthesis (those that are “complex,” have high GC content, or result in the expression of particular proteins when cloned). Thus, in a recent review of large-scale de novo DNA synthesis, Kosuri and Church conclude that: Today, reconstructions of complete viral and bacterial genomes are testaments of how far our synthetic capabilities have come. Despite the improvements, our ability to read DNA is better than our ability to write it [(45), p. 499]. The polio and phi174 viruses both have relatively small genomes, but these are still 7,400 and 5,400 bp, respectively. Thus, several de novo synthesized DNA fragments would have to be assembled in order to produce a full genome and (even if this was not already regulated by voluntary guidelines adopted by DNA synthesis companies) it would not be possible to simply order the full-length genome sequence of a small virus online. The third challenge is that for sequences longer than 5–10 kb, assembly of DNA fragments becomes the crucial step, not de novo DNA synthesis. This was the major technological feat in the work conducted at the JCVI that produced the “synthetic” bacterial genome, and the “Gibson Assembly method” developed for that project is now widely used. The description of that work, however, demonstrates how the assembly of smaller fragments into larger ones and eventually into a functioning genome required substantial levels of expertise and resources, including those needed to conduct trouble-shooting experiments to identify and correct errors when assembled DNA constructs did not perform as expected (46). The fourth challenge to Myth 3 relates to cost. The price of gene synthesis has declined greatly over the last 20 years, and the policy discourse that underlies biosecurity fears often implies that it will naturally become even cheaper over time, and thus widely affordable. The decline in price has, however, more or less stagnated around 0.3 US$ per base pair since 2008; and Carlson (47), Kosuri and Church (45), and Shetty (48) each discuss reasons why investment in this area may not be sufficient or well directed enough to generate further significant advances. The fifth and fundamental challenge to Myth 3 is that constructing a genome size DNA fragment is not the same as creating a functional genome. In particular, ensuring the desired expression of viral proteins is a complex challenge, which has been well documented in Vogel’s (5) account of the 2002 poliovirus synthesis experiment. Drawing on interviews with the researchers involved in the experiment, Vogel found that making HeLa cell-free extracts was a crucial step in translating the synthetic genome into infectious virus particles; and it was also one of the most difficult parts of the experiment. Successful preparation of the HeLa cell-free extracts depended on craft-like techniques that require specialized and localized know-how. Yet, as Vogel notes, despite the difficulties encountered in this step of the process, published protocols of the experiment give no indication of this contingency: As this case study illustrates, successful replication of the published 2002 poliovirus experiment hinges not only on the availability of the genetic sequence of the virus, commercial pieces of DNA, or the posting of the publication on the internet but also on the ability to master the mundane yet idiosyncratic biological techniques and adhere to specific laboratory disciplines [(5), p. 86]. Published accounts of science imply that experiments are readily replicable and transferrable from one lab to the next, but Vogel’s analysis demonstrates the significance of tacit knowledge in scientific practice and how this would limit the “proliferation” of skills anticipated in the dominant narrative on synthetic biology. Recognizing the importance of such tacit knowledge would enable more refined analyses of the potential biosecurity threat posed by advances in DNA synthesis technologies. Additional challenges to Myth 3 include the fact that while DNA or RNA sequence data are available for many pathogenic viruses, genomes published in publicly available databases can contain errors or may be derived from attenuated laboratory strains (49). Producing viral particles in a laboratory is, moreover, not the same as creating and deploying an effective biological weapon. Challenges to the processes of scaling up, storage, and developing a suitable dissemination method are discussed under Myth 5.

# 1AR

## Regulations CP

### FERC does the CP

#### **FERC does the CP.**

FERC ND [https://www.ferc.gov/about/what-ferc/what-ferc-does]

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, or FERC, is an independent agency that regulates the interstate transmission of electricity, natural gas, and oil. FERC also reviews proposals to build liquefied natural gas (LNG) terminals and interstate natural gas pipelines as well as licensing hydropower projects. The Energy Policy Act of 2005 gave FERC additional responsibilities as outlined and updated Strategic Plan. As part of that responsibility, FERC:

Regulates the transmission and wholesale sales of electricity in interstate commerce;

Reviews certain mergers and acquisitions and corporate transactions by electricity companies;

Regulates the transmission and sale of natural gas for resale in interstate commerce;

Regulates the transportation of oil by pipeline in interstate commerce;

Approves the siting and abandonment of interstate natural gas pipelines and storage facilities;

Reviews the siting application for electric transmission projects under limited circumstances;

Assess the safe operation and reliability of proposed and operating LNG terminals;

Licenses and inspects private, municipal, and state hydroelectric projects;

Protects the reliability of the high voltage interstate transmission system through mandatory reliability standards;

Monitors and investigates energy markets;

Enforces FERC regulatory requirements through imposition of civil penalties and other means;

Oversees environmental matters related to natural gas and hydroelectricity projects and other matters; and

Administers accounting and financial reporting regulations and conduct of regulated companies.

### Regs PIC – 1AR

#### Does not solve:

#### 1 – No private rights of action or treble damages.

Gorodetsky ‘9 [Julia; Winter; Corporate securities lawyer for Andrews Kurth LLC; *Tulane Environmental Law Journal,* “Analogy By Necessity: The Filed Rate Doctrine and Judicial Review of Agency Inaction,” <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/43294073.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3A40dc35292abcd134d36ab5a0d941bbc6>; KS]

A. Antitrust Laws and Agency Regulation

Antitrust laws are codified in the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, the Robinson-Patman Act, and the Federal Trade Commission Act.7 Antitrust actions can be brought by either private parties, the Department of Justice (DOJ), or the Federal Trade Commission (FTC).8 The Antitrust Division of DOJ may enforce the Sherman, Clayton, and Robinson-Patman Acts "through either civil or criminal prosecution.”9 The FTC is the "sole enforcer" of the Federal Trade Commission Act (unfair trade practices), and it also shares jurisdiction with DOJ over the civil provisions of the Clayton Act.10

For the purposes of this Article, I will only address the potential enforcement of federal antitrust laws by private parties. Under the court-developed doctrine of "primary jurisdiction," antitrust laws are preempted by the specific provision of a federal regulatory statute "when it is clear that enforcement of the antitrust laws would frustrate the specific regulatory scheme."11 As discussed below, the electricity market, which is the main subject of this study, is regulated by the Federal Power Act (FPA), which delegates to FERC the exclusive authority in reviewing and approving filed rates.12 Thus enforcement by either the DOJ or FTC would be contrary to the congressional scheme. However, private enforcement suits of antitrust laws are not preempted if the agency entrusted with evaluating the anticompetitive conduct is not engaged in "a full consideration of the consequences for competition," but rather engages in a "pro-forma" evaluation.13 It is the argument of this Article that FERC's inadequate review of filed market-based tariffs justifies judicial review of FERC's decision in the context of the private party antitrust claims.

The private enforcement suit is traditionally embraced by courts and is authorized by section 4 of the Clayton Act, which states that "any person . . . who has been injured in its 'business or property' by reason of an antitrust violation may sue to recover treble damages, costs of the suit, and attorney fees.”144 Section 4 of the Clayton Act authorizes private antitrust enforcement under "(1) sections 1, 2 and 3 of the Sherman Act, (2) section 2(a)-(f) of the Clayton Act (price discrimination), (3) section 3 of the Clayton Act (exclusive dealing and tying arrangements), (4) section 7 of the Clayton Act (merger), and (5) section 8 of the Clayton Act (interlocking directorates).”15 The scope of this Article is limited to antitrust laws that deal directly with prices, namely the Sherman Act sections 1 and 2, because the filed rate doctrine blocks antitrust suits predicated upon filed rates (i.e., the prices consumers pay).

Congress created modern antitrust law by passing the Sherman Act in 1890.16 The Act's purpose was to preserve "free trade and competition as fundamental components of American economic policy.”17 Section 1 of the Act prohibits combinations of restraints on trade, and section 2 prohibits monopolization.18 Courts have attempted to interpret the Sherman Act's broad statutory language.19 The Supreme Court held section 1 to apply to "unreasonable" restraints only.20 The Court defined the term "restraints" as "cartelization - agreements among competitors that possess market power, formed with the intent or that have the necessary tendency to restrict the output of the cartel members.”21

Compared to the regulatory response to anticompetitive behavior, the possibility of private enforcement of antitrust laws confers the advantages of both deterrence and considerable financial incentives for the successful plaintiff.22 Further, antitrust laws have the power to provide prospective and retroactive remedy to the injured parties, unlike a regulatory agency, which is limited by its legislative authority.23

#### 2 – No remedies.

Rossi ‘9 [Jim; November; Harry M. Walborsky Professor and Associate Dean of Research, Florida State University College of Law; *Administrative & Regulatory Law News*, “Why the Filed Rate Doctrine Should Not Imply Blanket Judicial Deference to Regulatory Agencies,” <https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1319065>; KS]

As regulators implement competition policy for formerly rate-regulated services, judicial enforcement of remedies for market abuses based on violations of antitrust, tort and contract law can play an important role in protecting public welfare. While courts do not have the same degree of expertise that an agency possesses, courts do have some a comparative institutional competence in implementing enforcement regimes that could benefit competitive markets. Unlike regulatory agencies, courts do not depend on budget allocations or legislative delegations of specific regulatory jurisdiction. Courts have wider remedial authority and discovery powers than do regulatory agencies, and also have greater political independence.

Overbroad application of the filed rate doctrine is especially inappropriate where regulators have limited jurisdiction. For example, in 2004, a U.S. district court in Texas applied the filed rate doctrine to preclude antitrust claims for illegal conduct in deregulated wholesale power markets against numerous power supply companies. Texas Commercial Energy v. TXU Energy, Inc., 2004-2 Trade Cases ¶ 74,497, Util. L. Rep. ¶14,512 (S.D. Tex. 2004) (S.D. Tex., Corpus Christi 2004), affirmed 413 F.3d 503 (5th Cir. 2005). In declining to consider the merits of the antitrust claims, the court reasoned that the agency charged by the state legislature with overseeing the Texas electricity market, the Texas Public Utilities Commission (TPUC), possesses the “institutional competence to address rate-making issues in the [] market, one of the principles underlying the filed rate doctrine.” However, a regulator could only possess institutional competence if it also has the authority to act; at the time Texas had no express or implied private right of action for injured purchasers, and TPUC also lacked authority to order refunds and damages.

To the extent courts allow the mere filing of tariffs to presumptively determine whether a court will entertain the merits of claims of anticompetitive conduct, the filed rate doctrine invites even more radical deregulation than either Congress or the regulatory agencies accepting tariffs would prefer – that is, markets absent antitrust and common law remedies. Surely, Congress did not intend this in the Federal Power Act or in subsequent energy legislation. To the extent the filed rate doctrine privileges private choice over assessment of the public interest in choosing the mechanism for enforcement, courts should refuse to apply it automatically to preclude judicial enforcement.

#### 3 – Agencies lack experience and expertise.

Gorodetsky ‘9 [Julia; Winter; Corporate securities lawyer for Andrews Kurth LLC; *Tulane Environmental Law Journal,* “Analogy By Necessity: The Filed Rate Doctrine and Judicial Review of Agency Inaction,” <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/43294073.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3A40dc35292abcd134d36ab5a0d941bbc6>; KS]

Despite current judicial deference, FERC's limited authority to impose penalties in deregulated markets, as well as its lack of expertise in competitive markets, makes FERC a poor institution to deter market power abuse and manipulation.247 Thus, unless Congress acts to expand FERC's legislative authority to impose meaningful penalties, the filed rate doctrine will continue to shield violators of the Sherman Act and conceal poorly made administrative decisions from judicial oversight.248 This legislative expansion of punitive authority, however, is unwise, because FERC does not have the much-needed expertise to police the newly deregulated and competitive markets, so the ability to punish effectively will only resolve part of the problem.249

#### 4 – Prefer comparative evidence.

Vaheesan ’19 [Sandeep; October 25; Legal director at the Open Markets Institute. Vaheesan previously served as a regulations counsel at the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, where he helped develop and draft the first comprehensive federal rule on payday, vehicle title, and high-cost installment loans; “MOTION OF OPEN MARKETS INSTITUTE FOR LEAVE TO FILE AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT,” <https://static1-squarespacecom.proxy.lib.umich.edu/static/5e449c8c3ef68d752f3e70dc/t/5eaa1d9d2790182e187cc171/1588207017816/19-1678_Documents-as-filed.pdf>; KS]

Second, the full application of the antitrust laws, including through private enforcement, complements FERC market oversight and is necessary to ensure competitive market-based prices in gas and electricity. FERC’s oversight of these markets has important limitations and cannot be counted on to root out all collusive, exclusionary, and other unfair conduct or compensate purchasers harmed by such practices. The enforcement of the antitrust laws, including through lawsuits brought by injured consumers and businesses, is critical to ensuring that the market-based pricing of gas and electricity serves the public.

#### Regulations fail – no authority to evaluate for non-discrimination.

Rossi ‘9 [Jim; November; Harry M. Walborsky Professor and Associate Dean of Research, Florida State University College of Law; *Administrative & Regulatory Law News*, “Why the Filed Rate Doctrine Should Not Imply Blanket Judicial Deference to Regulatory Agencies,” <https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1319065>; KS]

Before resorting to the filed rate doctrine to decline considerations of the merits of a dispute involving allegations of market wrongs, a court first needs to evaluate whether agency accepting a tariff possesses the authority to protect against nondiscrimination and uses it in ways that would present a conflict with courts or make judicial enforcement unnecessary. In many contexts, as in Texas, it is not at all clear that agency regulators possess the authority to evaluate tariffs for nondiscrimination, or to remedy discrimination and other market abuses.

In other contexts, as in FERC’s market based tariffs, it is not at all clear that regulators routinely evaluate and exercise authority to protect against nondiscrimination. Lockyer v. FERC held that the filed rate doctrine can apply to FERC’s market-based rates, but only if FERC does something more than make a cursory finding of no market power in accepting a rate filing. 383 F.3d 1006 (9th Cir. 2004). If FERC does not actively monitor market-based rates for market abuses, “the purpose of the filed rate doctrine is undermined” and “the tariff runs afoul of . . . . the FPA.” Id at 1013.

Nondiscrimination may a questionable regulatory goal in today’s regulatory environment, in which markets not regulators are increasingly determining prices. However, as regulators are increasingly moving to competitive market approaches, nondiscrimination should no longer give rise to a presumptive filed rate defense.

In addition, federal courts have at their disposal commonly-used doctrines that better promote the other purposes of the filed tariff doctrine, such as federal preemption and deference. Absent a clear regulatory policy of protecting against nondiscrimination, along with active regulatory program designed to do so, there is no reason to give a filed tariff an independent legal effect in order to further these goals.

### Links to NB

#### Regulations link more than the plan.

Boliek ’11 [Babette; November 1; Associate Professor of Law at Pepperdine University School of Law. J.D., Columbia University School of Law; Ph.D., Economics University of California, Davis; *Boston College Law Review,* “FCC REGULATION VERSUS ANTITRUST: HOW NET NEUTRALITY IS DEFINING THE BOUNDARIES,” <https://lawdigitalcommons.bc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3175&context=bclr>; KS]

Although the two regimes share a commonality of purpose—to protect consumers and to promote allocative efficiencies in production—the two have quite distinct, predominately opposing, means of securing social benefits. As Justice Stephen Breyer stated when serving as a judge on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, although regulation and the antitrust laws “typically aim at similar goals—i.e., low and economically efficient prices, innovation, and efficient production methods” —regulation looks to achieve these goals directly “through rules and regulations; [but] antitrust seeks to achieve them indirectly by promoting and preserving a process that tends to bring them about.”5 The battle between these two regimes may be broadly summarized in a single issue thusly: in the face of the industry-specific regulator, what is (or what should be) the role of antitrust law?6

Antitrust law preserves the process of competition across all industries by condemning anticompetitive conduct when it occurs. In contrast, industrial regulation by its nature is a public declaration that, in a given industry, market forces are too weak or underdeveloped to produce the consumer benefits that are realized in competitive markets—regulated industries are carved out from the rest of the economy and are subject to proactive, regulatory intervention that goes above and beyond antitrust enforcement measures.7 Not surprisingly, regulatory agencies were historically created as substitutes for market forces in the few markets that, by the nature of the product or technology, were natural monopolies or severely prone to monopoly.8 In the vast major- ity of markets, however, the antitrust law is the default government control, designed to supplement market forces to inhibit or prevent the growth of monopoly.

#### 1 – Compliance costs.

Beales et al ’19 [Howard; August 28; Professor Emeritus of Strategic Management and Public Policy School of Business, The George Washington University; *Regulatory Transparency Project;* “The Proper Role of Rules in a Gloriously Unruly Economy,” <https://regproject.org/paper/the-proper-role-of-rules-in-a-gloriously-unruly-economy/>; KS]

I. The Public Bears the Unconstrained Cost of Regulations

Regulations, or rules, are binding laws written and enforced by unelected government officials. Few would argue with the expressed goals of most regulations, such as a clean environment, safe foods and drugs, and fair work practices. But, in practice, the costs of compliance can be quite high. The public is often unaware of this, even though they ultimately bear these costs through higher prices, fewer available products and services, and stifled wages and job opportunities. Businesses don’t simply “absorb” such losses; they must fall on real people.

Regulatory costs can rarely be traced to their source. We cannot know the total impact of government regulation because, unlike non-regulatory government programs supported by a fiscal budget, the cumulative costs of regulation are never assigned to an agency or tallied up. Regulatory costs imposed by the government on the public do not face an annual budget review from elected officials nor do they compete for budget dollars with other priorities, as government appropriations do. From a regulator’s perspective, costs are not limited by available resources.3

Congress authorizes regulation through statutes that express broad (usually laudatory) goals, but it delegates the power to write and enforce detailed rules— “the fine print”—to regulatory agencies. Lacking the budget constraints that their nonregulatory counterparts face, regulatory agencies tend to pursue their narrow missions without regard to other legitimate goals, such as a strong and growing economy and consumer choice.4 To a hammer, everything looks like a nail; to a regulatory agency, the solution to any problem is more regulation.

Further, once they are in place, agencies rarely evaluate regulations to see if they are working as intended. Unfortunately, too often rules can end up doing more harm than good. For instance, well-connected groups—those who can hire lobbyists and know the right people in Washington—can manipulate new or revised regulations so that the groups’ members gain at the expense of ordinary citizens. Large, established interest groups, such as large companies, trade associations, environmental groups, trial lawyers, unions, and state, local, and tribal governments, generally have much better access to legislators and regulatory officials and thus can better influence how regulations are designed and enforced.5 This can disadvantage everyone else: ordinary consumers, taxpayers, workers, small businesses, the middle class, and the poor.

## Innovation DA

#### No impact – medicine and public health improves communication and coordination – does not reach isolated regions.

Ord ’20 [Toby; 2020; Senior Research Fellow in Philosophy at Oxford University, “The Precipe: Existential Risk and The Future of Humanity,” <http://web.b.ebscohost.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/ehost/detail/detail?vid=0&sid=97d166c4-0844-47d3-8a28-95b5c3eadd9a%40pdc-v-sessmgr03&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZSZzY29wZT1zaXRl#AN=2500442&db=nlebk>; KS]

But we have also changed the world in ways that offer protection. We have a healthier population; improvedsanitation andhygiene; preventative and curativemedicine; and a scientificunderstandingof disease. Perhaps most importantly, we have public health bodies to facilitate global communication and coordination in the face of new outbreaks. We have seen the benefits of this protection through the dramatic decline of endemic infectious disease over the last century (though we can’t be sure pandemics will obey the same trend). Finally, we have spread to a range of locationsand environments unprecedented for any mammalian species. This offers special protection from extinction events, because it requires the pathogen to be able to flourish in a vast range of environments and to reach exceptionally isolated populations such as uncontacted tribes, Antarctic researchers and nuclear submarine crews.

It is hard to know whether these combined effects have increased or decreased the existential risk from pandemics. This uncertainty is ultimately bad news: we were previously sitting on a powerful argument that the risk was tiny; now we are not. But note that we are not merely interested in the direction of the change, but also in the size of the change. If we take the fossil record as evidence that the risk was less than one in 2,000 per century, then to reach 1 percent per century the pandemic risk would need to be at least 20 times larger. This seems unlikely. In my view, the fossil record still provides a strong case against there being a highextinctionrisk from “natural” pandemics. So most of the remaining existential risk would come from the threat of permanent collapse: a pandemic severe enough to collapse civilization globally, combined with civilization turning out to be hard to re-establish or bad luck in our attempts to do so.

#### Empirics.

Ord ’20 [Toby; 2020; Senior Research Fellow in Philosophy at Oxford University, “The Precipe: Existential Risk and The Future of Humanity,” <http://web.b.ebscohost.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/ehost/detail/detail?vid=0&sid=97d166c4-0844-47d3-8a28-95b5c3eadd9a%40pdc-v-sessmgr03&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZSZzY29wZT1zaXRl#AN=2500442&db=nlebk>; KS]

Are we safe now from events like this? Or are we more vulnerable? Could a pandemic threaten humanity’s future?10

The Black Death was not the only biological disaster to scar human history. It was not even the only great bubonic plague. In 541 CE the Plague of Justinian struck the Byzantine Empire. Over three years it took the lives of roughly 3 percent of the world’s people.11

When Europeans reached the Americas in 1492, the two populations exposed each other to completely novel diseases. Over thousands of years each population had built up resistance to their own set of diseases, but were extremely susceptible to the others. The American peoples got by far the worse end of exchange, through diseases such as measles, influenza and especially smallpox.

During the next hundred years a combination of invasion and disease took an immense toll—one whose scale may never be known, due to great uncertainty about the size of the pre-existing population. We can’t rule out the loss of more than 90 percent of the population of the Americas during that century, though the number could also be much lower.12 And it is very difficult to tease out how much of this should be attributed to war and occupation, rather than disease. As a rough upper bound, the Columbian exchange may have killed as many as 10 percent of the world’s people.13

Centuries later, the world had become so interconnected that a truly global pandemic was possible. Near the end of the First World War, a devastating strain of influenza (known as the 1918 flu or Spanish Flu) spread to six continents, and even remote Pacific islands. At least a third of the world’s population were infected and 3 to 6 percent were killed.14 This death toll outstripped that of the First World War, and possibly both World Wars combined.

Yet even events like these fall short of being a threat to humanity’s longterm potential.15

[FOONOTE]

In addition to this historical evidence, there are some deeper biologicalobservationsand theories suggesting that pathogens are unlikely to lead to the extinction of their hosts. These include the empirical anti-correlation between infectiousness and lethality, the extremerarity of diseases that kill more than 75% of those infected, the observed tendency of pandemics to become less virulent as they progress and the theory of optimal virulence. However, there is no watertight case against pathogens leading to the extinction of their hosts.

[END FOOTNOTE]

In the great bubonic plagues we saw civilization in the affected areas falter, but recover. The regional 25 to 50 percent death rate was not enough to precipitate a continent-wide collapse of civilization. It changed the relative fortunes of empires, and may have altered the course of history substantially, but if anything, it gives us reason to believe that human civilization is likely to make it through future events with similar death rates, even if they were global in scale.

The 1918 flu pandemic was remarkable in having very little apparent effect on the world’s development despite its global reach. It looks like it was lost in the wake of the First World War, which despite a smaller death toll, seems to have had a much larger effect on the course of history.

#### 200,000 years of history.

Halstead 19 John Halstead, doctorate in political philosophy. [Cause Area Report: Existential Risk, Founders Pledge, <https://founderspledge.com/research/Cause%20Area%20Report%20-%20Existential%20Risk.pdf>]

However, there are some reasons to think that naturally occurring pathogens are unlikely to cause human extinction. Firstly, Homo sapiens have been around for 200,000 years and the Homo genus for around six million years without being exterminated by an infectious disease, which is evidence that thebaserateof extinction-risk natural pathogensis low.82 Indeed, past disease outbreaks have not come close to rendering humans extinct. Although bodies were piled high in the streets across Europe during the Black Death,83 human extinction was never a serious possibility, and some economists even argue that it was a boon for the European economy.8

4 Secondly, infectious disease has only contributed to the extinction of a smallminorityof animal species.85 The only confirmed case of a mammalian species extinction being caused by an infectious disease is atype ofrat native onlyto Christmas Island. Having said that, the context may be importantly different for modern day humans, so it is unclear whether the risk is increasing or decreasing. On the one hand, due to globalisation, the world is more interconnected making it easier for pathogens to spread. On the other hand, interconnectedness could also increase immunity by increasing exposure to lower virulence strainsbetween subpopulations.87 Moreover, advancements in medicine and sanitation limit the potential damage an outbreak might do.