

Federal Trade Commission

JONES DAY CHICAGO 20TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION MAY 2, 2007

Remarks of Deborah Platt Majoras Chairman, Federal Trade Commission

The Rule of Law in Chicago and Around the Globe

It is an honor for me to return to Chicago and celebrate this 20th anniversary with you; while I left the office more than 13 years ago, I still regard it with particular fondness. In Al Borowitz's book on the first 100 years of Jones Day's history, he quotes Bill Ritchie as saying, "When we arrived, we basically opened with a dozen people, and I think all the established firms in town kind of yawned." I laughed when I read that, thinking back to 1990, when I was deciding between Jones Day and one of "the established firms in town." I am sure that Bob Lee and Jim Hagy were getting tired of having to call me, but they never let it show (surprising especially for Lee). A lawyer at the other firm, however, finally said to me, "You know, Debbie, we really wanted you here because we thought you were special, one of us. But if you are seriously considering Jones Day, maybe we were wrong about you." I said, "you are right, I don't belong there," and I accepted at Jones Day the next day. There I would find a group of people who truly were exceptional, as lawyers and as people. Thank you for inviting me back.

¹Albert Borowitz, The First Century: Jones, Day, Reavis and Pogue 182 (1993).

Looking back to the 1980s, it could hardly be questioned that Jones Day belonged in Chicago – this major financial, commercial, and cultural center and by far the largest city in America's heartland. Indeed, Chicago became a significant pillar for a Jones Day on the verge at that time of becoming an international legal powerhouse. This was fitting, because, historically, the city of Chicago's contribution to the position of a young nation within the world economy cannot be questioned. In 1893, Chicago hosted the World's Columbian Exposition, better known to us as the Chicago World's Fair, to celebrate Christopher Columbus's discovery of the New World 400 years earlier. Having beat out New York City, Washington, D.C., and St. Louis for the honor, Chicago did not disappoint, as the Fair attracted over 27 million people from around the world – that was about half of the U.S. population at the time – over a six-month period and was considered to be the greatest event of its time, setting the standard for future world fairs.² Now, there is no question that this was an architectural, cultural, and entertainment masterpiece. And it also gave us new symbols of our nation's identity, as it introduced Columbus Day and the reciting of the Pledge of Allegiance by schoolchildren, the U.S. Postal Service produced its first commemorative stamp set, and the Mint offered its first commemorative coins.³ (Oh, and by the way, beer sales in Chicago doubled that year. Were you there, Melton?) Perhaps you knew all of this.

What I had failed to appreciate, though, was the enormous impact that this one event would have on the future of the United States and its place in the modern world. It had, reports

²Wikipedia.com, *World's Columbian Exposition*, available at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Columbian World Exposition.

 $^{^{3}}Id.$

one source, "a profound effect on . . . American industrial optimism," [And it] became a symbol of then-emerging American Exceptionalism. . . ." Says another [commentator], "[t]he advent of the consumer-based society in America received its first major expression and celebration at the World's Columbian Exposition." Indeed, products introduced for the first time at the Fair included Cracker Jacks, diet soda, Aunt Jemima syrup, Juicy Fruit gum, the hamburger (for the first time in America), and Pabst beer. 6

To realize the significance of this to the United States and to the world (right now you are thinking, how is she going to convince us that Pabst is significant?), we need to fast forward to today. Beginning in 1990, the Global McKinsey Institute, led by its founder, William Lewis, conducted a study to try to determine, to put it simply, why some nations are prosperous, while many remain poor even after years and years of foreign aid. McKinsey conducted the study by closely examining 13 nations in varying stages of economic development and tested some of the traditional hypotheses: differences in labor markets, capital markets, etc. But these were rejected as explanations when the evidence simply did not support them. No, Mr. Lewis and his Institute found that levels of productivity distinguished nations' economic health, and that it is the intensity of local market competition that makes the difference in productivity levels. A significant of the content of the significant of the signi

 $^{^{4}}Id.$

⁵Julie K. Rose, *The Legacy of the Fair* (1996), *available at* http://xroads.virginia.edu/~ma96/WCE/legacy.html.

⁶Wikipedia.com, *World's Columbian Exposition*, available at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Columbian World Exposition.

⁷William W. Lewis, The Power of Productivity: Wealth, Poverty, and the Threat to Global Stability 11 (2004).

⁸*Id.* at 13-14.

This is, of course, music to the ears of a competition enforcer, and indeed the United States has among the most intensely competitive markets in the world. Why? To understand McKinsey's conclusion, you need look no further than the title of Mr. Lewis' chapter on the United States: "Consumer is King." (Now I have been meaning to talk to Bill Lewis and tell him that "Consumer is Queen" might be accurate; I don't think anyone would doubt that I shop more than John does – although perhaps it evens out every time he gets new golf clubs). Says Lewis, "[t]he United States adopted the view that the purpose of an economy was to serve consumers much earlier than any other society," and we continue to "hold this view more strongly than alomost any other place." Significantly, he concludes that, "Consumers are the

⁹*Id*. at 80.

¹⁰*Id.* at 101.

¹¹*Id*. at 11.

And while I do not equate newly-created government bureaucracies with the existence of actual competition, the point is that the agencies were created – some converted from the old state monopoly offices – in recognition that markets and local competition are most likely to lead nations forward in their economic development.

Since the early 1990s, the FTC and the Department of Justice, mostly funded by U.S. AID, have worked together to provide technical assistance to competition agencies in developing countries. Not only do our attorneys and economists share effective investigational techniques and practical experiences, but they are supporting a generation of colleagues who can stand up for market forces in their nations. We started in Poland, Hungary, what is now the Czech Republic, and Venezuela. Our program soon expanded to include most of the rest of Eastern and Central Europe, Russia and the Ukraine, several more Latin American countries, and South Africa. Today, we are working extensively with China, which has been developing a new Anti-Monopoly law, and India – now among the biggest economies in the world.

This is hugely exciting, but enormously challenging. First, even in our own country that professes support for market forces over government interference, the market system is continually under attack from politicians who don't like the result the market is producing and special interests that want protection from the harshness of competition. (If you don't believe me, tune in the next time I get my head taken off when I testify about gasoline prices. One Senator complained of me last year, "she's always talking about supply and demand; she's like a broken record!") Now, think about trying to shift gears after enduring 50 or more years of a government-run economy, or in a society in which private property ownership is virtually unknown. The concept of competition and markets without government control is alien, and

know that the defendant is bribing the Judge, can we also bribe the Judge, and how much should we include in our budget for bribing judges?" Or, "when we are defining a market and computing shares, do we include counterfeit and black market products?" And worse, at a Workshop in which we explained how we would deal with a particular case in the oil industry, we were told that we had left out the very real threat that the competition official might be shot for taking such a position.

¹²See www.idlo.int/.

¹³Abanet.org, Gates Foundation Donates \$1.75 Million to Support American Bar Association's World Justice Project, available at

with independent ideas. We elevated tyrants. Why do Americans ridicule institutions that have helped protect personal freedom and create economic prosperity?"¹⁵

I congratulate Jones Day on this important occasion, and I thank you for your tremendous service to clients and your stewardship for the rule of law in this great American City and throughout the world.

¹⁵William E. Kovacic, *The Competition Policy Entrepreneur and Law Reform in Formerly Communist and Socialist Countries*, AM. U. J. OF INT'L LAW & POLICY 437, 464 (1996).