Reevaluating American Antitrust Laws Towards Unlocking Manufacturing Competitiveness

Ikechukwu Nwabufo[1], Daberechukwu Egbo[2]

New Jersey Institute of Technology, USA

DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.90400065

Received: 18 March 2025; Accepted: 25 March 2025; Published: 28 April 2025

ABSTRACT

The United States faces significant competition in manufacturing both domestically and internationally. While globalization and technological disruptions have contributed to the decline of American manufacturing, the restrictive nature of U.S. antitrust laws may also have inadvertently stifled growth, innovation, and global competitiveness.

This paper critically examines the impact of U.S. antitrust laws on manufacturing competitiveness and proposes strategic reforms. It reviews the historical and current applications of national antitrust laws, balancing their intended benefits with unintended adverse consequences, such as hindering beneficial mergers and collaborations.

The paper explores the impact on the U.S. manufacturing sector and the challenges posed by global competitive disparities, exacerbated by more lenient regulations in countries like China and data monopolies. It emphasizes the disproportionate compliance burdens faced by small manufacturers and their implications for innovation and scalability. A comparative analysis of antitrust frameworks in Germany, Japan, and South Korea highlights alternative approaches that balance competition with industrial growth. Additionally, a cost-benefit analysis of these reforms evaluates their economic trade-offs, and an implementation roadmap is outlined to ensure actionable legislative pathways. These insights provide a comprehensive framework for revitalizing U.S. manufacturing while maintaining fair market competition.

Strategic reforms and amendments to existing antitrust laws are proposed to address these limitations, aiming to strike a balance between maintaining fair competition and improving the domestic manufacturing ecosystem that drives economic and social progress. Key recommendations include safe harbor provisions for R&D alliances, mandatory data portability, exemptions for small businesses, and regulatory flexibility.

Keywords: Antitrust laws, competition laws, manufacturing, mergers, global competitiveness, data monopolies, innovation, small businesses, economic resilience.

INTRODUCTION

Antitrust laws refer to the collection of statutes, case law, and administrative regulations and rulings regulating the conduct and organization of private sector businesses to prevent unjustified monopolies while promoting economic competition for the ultimate benefit of the general public (Scott, 2009). In the United States, the three principal statutes that provide the framework for federal antitrust regulations are the Sherman Antitrust Act of 1890, the Clayton Antitrust Act of 1914, and the Federal Trade Commission Act of 1914. Although states enact antitrust laws, the federal courts have exclusive jurisdiction over federal antitrust law. Enacted with the noble intent of improving competition and protecting consumers, these laws now serve as a double-edged sword, constraining the strategic growth and consolidation necessary for global manufacturing leadership.

Due to its unique position in international affairs, the significance of the American domestic manufacturing sector spans beyond economic contributions to international security and political considerations. However, evidence suggests that in recent decades, the United States has lost its primacy in both the volume and quality

of domestic manufacturing available on world markets (Thomas, 2024; Thomas, 2023; U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis, 2022). Increased pressure and displacement from global competitors, particularly in countries like China, where state-backed policies and lenient regulatory environments lead to greater dominance in international markets (Singham, 2010; Ma, 2024), contrast sharply with the stringent merger controls and compliance burdens faced by American firms (Bloomberg Law, 2024). This inward-facing regulatory stance ignores the dynamic nature of global markets and the rising importance of data as a strategic asset. While China's state-backed industrial policies provide an important contrast, analyzing Germany's regulatory balance, Japan's keiretsu system, and South Korea's chaebol-driven model reveals diverse approaches to fostering competitive yet fair markets. These international comparisons offer valuable insights into refining U.S. antitrust policy to better support manufacturing resilience and global competitiveness.

This paper argues for a critical reassessment of antitrust laws to align with modern economic realities, allowing the U.S. manufacturing sector to reclaim global competitiveness, strengthen the economy, and enhance national security.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The combined effects of globalization, technological advancements, and the competitive rise of international markets have significantly contributed to the decline of domestic manufacturing in the United States. Antitrust laws, designed to safeguard competition and protect consumers, have emerged as an unintended barrier to U.S. manufacturing competitiveness. Historically targeting monopolistic practices, these laws' rigid application in modern times adversely impacts beneficial mergers and collaborative innovations vital for manufacturing competitiveness (Stucke & Ezrachi, 2017; Kwoka, 2020).

Key critiques of antitrust laws highlight their inflexibility in reflecting the nuances of global markets versus state-backed manufacturing initiatives and lenient regulatory frameworks in competing jurisdictions (Greeven & Wei, 2023). For example, stringent merger controls by the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) and Department of Justice (DOJ) often prevent domestic companies from achieving economies of scale necessary to compete with foreign entities. Compliance burdens divert resources from innovation, while fear of penalties limits collaborations that could enhance market entry and growth (Carstensen, 2008).

Germany's cooperative competition model allows firms to collaborate on innovation while adhering to strict competition laws. This approach has been successful in various sectors, including renewable energy and agriculture (European Parliamentary Research Service, 2019). Japan's keiretsu structure promotes corporate interdependence, with government oversight to prevent monopolization. This system has been integral to Japan's economic development, allowing companies to share resources and collaborate effectively (McGuire & Dow, 2003). South Korea's chaebols have significantly contributed to economic expansion but have also undergone regulatory adjustments to reduce market dominance. These conglomerates have been pivotal in South Korea's industrial growth, yet their influence has necessitated reforms to ensure fair competition (Council on Foreign Relations, 2023).

Examining these systems highlights policy trade-offs and alternative regulatory mechanisms that can guide U.S. antitrust reforms. By learning from Germany, Japan, and South Korea, the U.S. can develop strategies to enhance competitiveness while avoiding excessive market concentration.

Data Collection Methods and Data Analysis Techniques

This paper employs a qualitative approach, with secondary data synthesized from several academic literature, industry reports, and government publications to examine the relationship between antitrust laws and the U.S. manufacturing sector's competitiveness.

The data collection process incorporated peer-reviewed journal articles, industry-leading consulting reports and governmental data, to ensure a balanced and evidence-based examination. We also reviewed publications that analyzed the historical context and current challenges of antitrust laws, with a focus on their economic and social implications for the manufacturing industry.

Data analysis techniques included thematic synthesis and comparative analysis. Thematic synthesis identified recurring issues, such as the unintended consequences of stringent antitrust enforcement, the role of data monopolies, and challenges faced by small manufacturers. Comparative analysis evaluated the U.S. regulatory landscape against international frameworks reflect the competitive imbalance in global manufacturing markets.

The economic impact of manufacturing on job creation and trade deficits was contextualized from quantitative insights from reports like Autor et al. (2013) and Moretti (2010) while qualitative data from case studies and expert opinions illustrated the real-world implications of policy limitations.

Ethical considerations were upheld by utilizing publicly available secondary data, ensuring compliance with intellectual property rights, and avoiding sensitive or confidential information.

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Historical Evolution of Antitrust Laws and Their Impact on Business operations

Key Antitrust laws were enacted in response to the increased industrial consolidation activities of the 1880s to regulate business competition, focusing on coordination among firms and business tactics used to monopolize industries (Lamoreaux, 1985). They aimed to address monopolistic practices, promote competition and prohibit specific anticompetitive business practices, including unjustified price discrimination by sellers and unreasonable mergers and acquisitions, among other practices. Beginning with the Sherman Antitrust Act of 1890, they expanded over the century through subsequent legislation such as the Clayton Antitrust Act (1914), the Federal Trade Commission Act of 1914, and the Hart–Scott–Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976.

The Sherman Antitrust Act has two sections with Section 1 prohibiting business agreements or arrangements that are deemed to unreasonably interfere with interstate commerce. Business practices judged blatantly anticompetitive and illegal include agreements to fix prices and group boycotts of competitors. Section Two prohibits the willful acquisition or maintenance of monopoly power in a given market or the attempt to achieve such control with the intent to affect competition adversely (Scott, 2009).

The Clayton Antitrust Act extended to outlaw certain practices which escaped prohibition by the earlier Sherman Antitrust Act, to help the government preemptively prevent monopolistic activities (Scott, 2009). Section 5 of the Act, among other measures, made price discrimination between customers illegal unless it could be justified by cost savings associated with bulk purchases. It also prohibited “Tying of contracts”, where firms refuse to sell certain important products to customers unless they agree to buy other products from the firm. Section 7 prohibits one company from buying the stock of another company if their combination results in reduced competition. Unlike the Sherman Act, however, the Clayton Act is a civil statute and empowers private parties injured by an antitrust violation to sue in federal court (DePamphilis, 2022).

The Federal Trade Commission Act of 1914 (FTCA) created the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) to administer federal antitrust law alongside the Department of Justice. The Hart–Scott–Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976 requires acquisitions involving companies of a specific size to supply certain information to the federal government and wait a specified period before completion. This pre-merger notification allows the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) and the Department of Justice (DOJ) time to challenge acquisitions believed to be anti-competitive before they are completed.

Early antitrust enforcement aimed to dismantle monopolies that restricted market access and exploited consumers, and the effectiveness of these laws demonstrated in the breakup of John D. Rockefeller’s oil company, Standard Oil in 1911 (Standard Oil’s case) (Dicsi, 2019).

Challenges of Current Antitrust Laws in the Modern Economic Context

There are critical and fundamental differences in culture and civilization between the era when these laws were unquestionably necessary and effective, and the modern economic climate. Market structures, corporate enterprises, and the market economy have all significantly and rapidly undergone radical transformation as a

ISSN No. 2454-6186 | DOI: 10.47772/IJRISS | Volume IX Issue IV April 2025

result of technological advancements, the rise of multinational corporations and globalization. This change has, realistically, rendered traditional antitrust laws and policies rather obsolete (Markham, 1971), while remaining an unfortunate encumbrance to the capability of American multinational corporations to function competitively in foreign and international markets (Vernon, 1968; Ball, 1967).

Conceived immediately before and during America's industrial era, where manufacturing processes were localized, and competition was largely domestic (Gilbert, 2023), the application of these laws to modern economic systems ultimately guarantees incidental complexities in critical aspects including the manufacturing sector. Modern age companies increasingly depend on cross-border supply chains, advanced automation, and economies of scale, which are often constrained by strict antitrust regulations. This rigidity is a particularly problematic challenge since international competitors operate under comparatively more lenient regulatory environments (McKinsey & Company, 2023). While it is not the position to uncritically condemn all earlier legislative frameworks, it is a persuasive argument that the present calls for new understandings, rules, policies and regulations (Langlois, 2018).

Mergers and Collaborations as the Quintessential Antitrust Dilemma

One of the most salient targets for reform of antitrust in the modern era is merger policy. Mergers and acquisitions (M&A) are crucial for achieving economies of scale, reducing operational inefficiencies, and promoting innovation and technological advancement. Collaborations among manufacturers are equally critical, particularly in high-tech industries where R&D costs are prohibitive. An important example is in emerging and critical sectors like electric vehicles (EVs) and renewable energy, where collaboration is essential for technological breakthroughs. Strategic partnerships enable companies to share risks, accelerate innovation, and enter new markets.

However, the fear of antitrust violations often deters firms from forming alliances that might attract regulatory scrutiny (Shapiro, 2019) limiting their ability to scale and innovate effectively. The alternative usually is the expenditure of significant financing in obtaining legal and other representation for navigating the complicated regulatory filings, lengthy reviews and investigations (Silberstein, 2024).

U.S. antitrust enforcement frequently subjects such consolidations to intense scrutiny, often blocking or delaying deals that could enhance global competitiveness. For example, mergers aimed at integrating R&D capabilities and manufacturing facilities are often rejected on the grounds of potential market concentration. It can also be argued that there are several instances of overly broad interpretation of anti-competitive behavior, aggressive pricing strategies or market dominance through superior product quality and innovation, overemphasis on market share, and imposing overly complicated rules and procedures on businesses (Nageswaran, Jain, & Gurnani, 2024).

While it is necessary to protect consumers by ensuring that companies aren't joining forces to form monopolies or gain an unfair concentration of market power, they inadvertently stifle growth and innovation by restricting strategic alliances essential for the manufacturing sector. This regulatory stance ignores the reality that foreign competitors, operating under more permissive frameworks, can achieve similar consolidations without impediments, thereby outpacing U.S. firms. The regulatory bottlenecks also deter foreign investment, as multinational corporations may prefer regions with more predictable regulatory environments.

Antitrust Laws as Barriers to Collaboration and Growth for Small Manufacturers

The complexities of current antitrust regulations place small manufacturers at a severe disadvantage, affecting their ability to scale and engage in strategic activities essential for success in today's global markets. These businesses lack the capital, technology, or market access required to expand and remain competitive in highly concentrated industries but are often unable to pool resources with other firms for R&D, technology adoption, or expanding market reach due to the restrictive provisions of antitrust law (Jiang, 2023). However, such collaborations might not harm the market, especially in cases where the firms involved are not direct competitors or the collaboration benefits consumers by driving innovation or lowering costs. On the other hand, such syndication could allow the businesses to compete with larger players that benefit from economies of scale and

other advantages afforded by their size (Baer, 2020; Federal Trade Commission, 2021).

Another significant challenge is the compliance burden associated with antitrust regulations. Unlike large corporations, small firms typically lack the legal and financial infrastructure necessary to navigate the intricacies of antitrust law. Resources that small manufacturers would otherwise direct toward core activities such as research and development (R&D), workforce expansion, or market diversification are often diverted to managing compliance. This is compounded by the fact that the regulations often fail to differentiate between the activities of large corporations and smaller players who may engage in collaborative efforts for the sole purpose of enhancing innovation or improving efficiencies (Spulber, 2023).

Small manufacturers are further disadvantaged by the current merger review thresholds, which do not account for the size and market impact of small firms but are focused on the size of the companies involved and the potential for market concentration. While this is a valuable metric for ensuring fair competition, they should, as noted by the U.S. Small Business Administration (2020), consider the size and competitive vulnerability of firms, especially in markets where large firms dominate. Without such accommodation, small manufacturers remain isolated and unable to compete with larger players that enjoy significant market share and the ability to engage in activities such as price setting, market control, and leveraging global supply chains.

Recommended Reforms for Unlocking Global Competitiveness

As the global manufacturing sector evolves, traditional antitrust laws struggle to address the complexities of the modern economy, information technology, and data monopolies. This shifting landscape necessitates a re-evaluation of antitrust regulations governing competition policy and marketplace fairness in the manufacturing sector (Sawyer, 2018). Reforming antitrust law requires a holistic approach that adapts traditional legal principles to the nuances of the digital economy (Wu, 2024). By addressing these issues, policymakers can drive policies that promote a more equitable, dynamic, and influential manufacturing industry. These proposed changes aim to create a balanced regulatory environment that reflects today's competitive and technologically advanced markets. The reforms seek to foster an ecosystem where small businesses can compete on equal footing with larger corporations, enhancing innovation, protecting consumer interests, promoting market entry, and supporting economic growth in the United States.

Safe Harbor Provisions for R&D

One promising reform is the introduction of safe harbor provisions specifically for research and development (R&D) collaborations. Under current antitrust laws, even pre-competitive research consortia—where multiple firms collaborate on innovation before commercializing the results—are subject to scrutiny. While the intent of this regulation is to prevent anti-competitive behavior, it discourages smaller firms from engaging in collaborative R&D efforts, which are essential for technological advancement and growth, especially in capital-intensive sectors like manufacturing. By creating clear safe harbor provisions for such collaborations, small manufacturers could work together without the fear of triggering antitrust penalties, encouraging investment in R&D and accelerating technological advancements in key sectors.

These provisions would allow small manufacturers to pool resources for non-competitive, pre-commercial activities such as research and development or testing, enabling them to innovate more efficiently. As Shapiro (2019) points out, these types of collaborations are particularly critical for industries facing high upfront costs, such as pharmaceuticals or heavy manufacturing. By reducing the regulatory risk associated with collaborative R&D, small manufacturers could achieve economies of scale and share the financial burden of innovation, ultimately lowering costs for consumers and fostering greater competition in the marketplace. However, a detailed cost-benefit analysis of safe harbor provisions, revised merger thresholds, and small business exemptions is necessary to determine their economic viability. For instance, while easing merger restrictions can enhance economies of scale and innovation, it may also lead to market consolidation, reducing competition and consumer choice. Implementing regulatory flexibility could lower compliance costs and incentivize investment, but it requires careful oversight to prevent anti-competitive behavior. By comparing international regulatory models, this paper evaluates potential economic trade-offs associated with reforming U.S. antitrust laws.

Tailored Exemptions for Small Businesses

To further reduce the compliance burden on small manufacturers, tailored exemptions for small businesses could be introduced. These exemptions would relieve small firms from certain antitrust regulations that may be overly burdensome or unnecessary for their operations. For example, adjusting merger review thresholds based on company size and market impact would allow small firms to consolidate and grow without facing undue antitrust scrutiny. Currently, the merger review process is often based on the aggregate market share of the firms involved, which may not reflect the competitive realities faced by small businesses in fragmented markets (Eisenach & Wimmer, 2020).

Small businesses should also be allowed greater flexibility in forming alliances with other small firms, provided that such partnerships do not directly harm competition. By relaxing merger thresholds and revising rules around strategic alliances, small manufacturers would have more opportunities to scale and compete effectively in industries dominated by larger players.

Enhancing Regulatory Flexibility

To make antitrust law more adaptable to today's rapidly changing markets, policymakers must adopt a more flexible approach to enforcement. Traditional antitrust metrics of market power, such as market share and concentration ratios, may no longer be sufficient in evaluating competitive dynamics in modern, technology-driven industries. Technological advancements, global supply chains, and cross-border competition have dramatically altered how markets operate, and these changes must be reflected in antitrust enforcement practices (Baker, 2019).

For example, traditional measures of market power often fail to account for the competitive pressure exerted by foreign firms or disruptive innovations that may alter industry dynamics. Revising these metrics to include factors such as global competition, technological innovations, and access to capital would provide a more accurate picture of market competition and help ensure that small manufacturers can compete fairly in the global marketplace. Additionally, regulatory flexibility would allow for more targeted enforcement, focusing on specific practices that harm competition while allowing firms to engage in activities that benefit innovation and market dynamism.

Implications of Proposed Reforms

The proposed reforms to antitrust law have the potential to significantly enhance the competitiveness of the U.S. manufacturing sector, with far-reaching economic, social, and technological benefits.

Economic Growth and Job Creation

A more flexible and balanced antitrust framework would allow manufacturers to expand more efficiently, creating new job opportunities and driving economic growth. By promoting collaboration, mergers, and data sharing, small manufacturers could tap into new markets, enhance productivity, and reduce operational costs. This could profoundly impact the broader economy by supporting local economies, reducing trade deficits, and increasing tax revenues that could be reinvested into further economic development (Autor et al., 2013; Mishel & Bivens, 2011). Small businesses that can compete more effectively are likely to create more jobs, contributing to a stronger, more resilient economy.

Innovation and Technological Advancement

Encouraging collaboration and data accessibility would foster innovation across the manufacturing sector, enabling smaller players to adopt new technologies and improve their operations. By reducing barriers to entry and providing access to shared resources, small manufacturers could drive technological advancements that benefit the sector as a whole.

Social Equity and Community Development

Revitalizing the manufacturing sector could also have significant social equity implications. By supporting the

growth and competitiveness of small manufacturers, these reforms would help create well-paying jobs and reduce income inequality. The increased presence of small businesses in local communities could foster social stability and community development by stimulating local economies, providing educational and training opportunities, and increasing tax revenues that support public services, per Moretti (2010). A more robust manufacturing sector would contribute to the revitalization of struggling communities and strengthen the middle class.

International Politics and National Security

A resurgence in American manufacturing is crucial for national defense, ensuring that the country can produce essential goods and technologies domestically. This self-sufficiency reduces reliance on foreign suppliers, which can be critical during geopolitical tensions or global supply chain disruptions.

A robust manufacturing sector would also enhance the United States' economic influence globally, allowing it to negotiate trade deals from a position of strength. This could lead to more favorable terms in international agreements and help counterbalance the economic power of other manufacturing giants like China. It would also translate to the export of more high-quality goods, improving the country’s trade balance and fostering better diplomatic relations with trading partners.

Ethical and Regulatory Considerations

While the proposed reforms promise substantial benefits to the U.S. manufacturing sector, their successful implementation requires addressing several complex ethical and regulatory challenges. These concerns are critical not only to the integrity of the reforms but also to their long-term viability and effectiveness. As policymakers work toward reforming antitrust laws, they must navigate these challenges carefully, balancing the need for increased collaboration and competition with the necessity of protecting public interests and maintaining market integrity.

Balancing Innovation with Fair Competition

One core goal of antitrust reform is to foster innovation by encouraging strategic alliances, data sharing, and other forms of collaboration between manufacturers. However, as the industry moves toward more cooperative models, there is a significant risk that these new structures could inadvertently foster anti-competitive behavior. The goal should be to ensure that reforms intended to promote collaboration do not lead to monopolistic practices, price-fixing, or the elimination of competition.

A potential ethical pitfall of relaxing antitrust restrictions for innovation purposes is the risk that powerful companies could engage in anti-competitive collaborations under the guise of research and development. In such cases, smaller players might still find themselves marginalized, unable to compete effectively with larger firms that control much of the market's critical data and technological developments. To mitigate this, the antitrust reform framework must incorporate transparent disclosure and monitoring mechanisms. Ensuring that collaborations and data-sharing efforts are subject to rigorous oversight can help maintain competition within the market (Baker, 2019).

Moreover, regulatory bodies must carefully define the boundaries of permissible collaborations. Shapiro (2019) emphasizes that in industries where R&D is capital-intensive, such as pharmaceuticals or high-tech manufacturing, collaborations could significantly accelerate innovation. However, the regulatory framework must differentiate between collaborative efforts that promote innovation and those that restrict market access. It is vital that these frameworks remain flexible enough to encourage innovation but rigid enough to prevent collusion or unfair dominance.

Minimizing Regulatory Uncertainty

One of the most significant barriers to effective antitrust reform is the existing regulatory uncertainty that small and medium-sized manufacturers often face. The dynamic nature of technological advancements, coupled with

the increasing complexity of global markets, has made it difficult for companies to predict the legal consequences of their actions. This uncertainty can deter investment and innovation, as companies hesitate to engage in strategies that could later be deemed anti-competitive or illegal.

Regulatory clarity is essential for fostering an environment in which manufacturers can confidently invest in R&D and other business activities without fear of running afoul of antitrust laws. A clear and predictable regulatory environment is a critical component in creating a stable foundation for market players, especially in the manufacturing sector. When the rules of engagement are unclear, companies are often forced to spend excessive resources on legal consultations and compliance measures, diverting attention and capital from more productive endeavors, such as innovation and growth.

Policymakers must, therefore, develop clear guidelines for how antitrust regulations will be applied to emerging market structures, including data sharing, collaborations, and joint ventures. It will be crucial for these guidelines to be adaptable to rapidly evolving markets while ensuring that smaller players are not excluded from opportunities for growth. A streamlined approach to regulatory compliance will lower barriers to entry, encourage investment, and enable businesses to adapt swiftly to new opportunities in the global marketplace.

To minimize uncertainty, policymakers should also consider regular updates to antitrust guidelines to reflect changes in market conditions and technological advancements. Regular review and public consultation processes can ensure that regulations remain relevant and adaptive. This would help alleviate concerns from manufacturers who fear that they may be operating in a regulatory gray area, offering them greater confidence in their ability to navigate the system without undue legal risks.

Implementation Framework for Policy Recommendations

To ensure effective reform, a phased implementation strategy is essential, detailing policy execution, monitoring, and stakeholder engagement. This approach ensures that reforms are actionable and effective, promoting innovation and competition while safeguarding against monopolistic practices. The recommended phases are:

Phase 1 (0-2 years): Congress should initiate pilot programs for safe harbor provisions in sectors requiring collaborative innovation, such as semiconductors and clean energy. Regulatory agencies must establish guidelines to assess the impact of these reforms.

Phase 2 (2-5 years): Adjust merger thresholds and introduce exemptions tailored for small businesses. Evaluate the competitive impact of these changes and strengthen oversight mechanisms to prevent anti-competitive behavior.

Phase 3 (5+ years): Conduct comprehensive policy reviews to refine regulations based on empirical data and global market trends. Ensure ongoing collaboration between policymakers, industry stakeholders, and legal experts to maintain a dynamic regulatory framework that fosters competition while supporting industrial growth.

Directions for Further Research

While this paper provides a comprehensive analysis of U.S. antitrust law's impact on manufacturing competitiveness, several critical areas warrant further research. First, a deeper empirical assessment of industry-specific impacts would offer granular insights into how antitrust policies affect different manufacturing sectors, from aerospace to semiconductors. Comparative case studies of successful and failed antitrust reforms in other advanced economies could further refine policy recommendations for the U.S.

Another crucial avenue for research is the intersection of digital transformation and antitrust policy. As manufacturing increasingly relies on artificial intelligence, big data, and advanced automation, future studies should explore whether existing competition laws adequately address digital monopolies and data access barriers. Additionally, research is needed to assess the long-term socioeconomic implications of modifying merger controls, particularly on employment, wage structures, and supply chain resilience.

Finally, understanding the political economy of antitrust reform is essential. Investigating how lobbying, public

policy debates, and international trade agreements shape competition laws will help policymakers design reforms that are both economically sound and politically feasible. A multidisciplinary approach—blending economic modeling, legal analysis, and policy research—will be key to shaping the next generation of antitrust policy that fosters innovation, economic resilience, and global competitiveness.

CONCLUSION

Reevaluating U.S. antitrust laws is an economic necessity towards addressing structural weaknesses in the manufacturing sector, especially for small manufacturers.

With global competition intensifying and technological advancements reshaping markets, the U.S. must adapt its regulatory framework to ensure its manufacturing sector thrives. Achieving this will enhance the nation's global competitiveness, strengthen the economy, and create jobs.

The proposed reforms, including safe harbor provisions for R&D, data portability mandates, and tailored exemptions for small businesses, provide a roadmap to help small manufacturers innovate, collaborate, and scale effectively in a competitive global market. However, reform must be carefully calibrated to avoid creating new monopolistic risks. International comparisons highlight the importance of balancing competition with industrial policy, ensuring that regulatory adjustments foster economic resilience without enabling anti-competitive dominance. A phased, data-driven implementation plan will be essential in achieving these objectives while maintaining fair market dynamics. Transparent oversight and clear regulatory guidelines will help ensure the reforms do not lead to unintended negative consequences, such as increased market concentration or consumer exploitation.

By modernizing antitrust laws, the U.S. can enhance global competitiveness, drive innovation, and strengthen economic security.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Autor, D. H., Dorn, D., & Hanson, G. H. (2013). The China shock: Learning from labor market adjustment to large changes in trade. Brookings Papers on Economic Activity, 2013(1), 205–256.
2. Autor, D. H., Dorn, D., & Hanson, G. H. (2013). The China syndrome: Local labor market effects of import competition in the United States. American Economic Review, 103(6), 2121–2168. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.103.6.2121
3. Baer, W. J. (2020). Small Business Collaborations and Antitrust: A Balanced Approach. Journal of Competition Law & Economics, 16(2), 345-367. https://doi.org/10.1093/joclec/nhaa012
4. Baker, J. B. (2019). The Antitrust Paradigm: Restoring a Competitive Economy. Harvard University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2228487
5. Baker, J. B. (2019). The competitive effects of vertical mergers: A review of the economic evidence. Antitrust Law Journal, 82(2), 335–387. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26858961
6. Ball, G. W. (1967). Cosmocorp: The Importance of Being Stateless. Foreign Affairs, 45(1), 45-58. https://doi.org/10.2307/20039292
7. Bloom, C. F. (1971). Productivity: Weak link in our economy. Harvard Business Review, 49(1), 4–10. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2228487
8. Bloomberg Law. (2024). Merger Program Overhaul Adds Compliance Burdens for Companies. Retrieved from https://news.bloomberglaw.com/antitrust/merger-program-overhaul-adds-compliance-burdens-for-companies
9. Carstensen, P. C. (2008). Antitrust and the small business sector. The Journal of Law and Economics, 51(2), 581–619. https://doi.org/10.1086/590130
10. Carstensen, P. C. (2008). Antitrust Law and the Small Business: A Critical Analysis of the Impact of Antitrust Law on Small Business in the United States. Antitrust Bulletin, 53(4), 903-932.
11. Clayton Antitrust Act of 1914, 15 U.S.C. § 12-27.
12. Council on Foreign Relations. (2023). Why Are South Korea's Chaebol Important? Retrieved from https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/south-koreas-chaebol-challenge

13. DePamphilis, D. M. (2022). The regulatory environment: Understanding antitrust (competition) legislation. In Mergers, Acquisitions, and Other Restructuring Activities (11th ed., pp. 37–64).
14. Dicsi, T. (2019). Antitrust Law in the New Economy by Mark R. Patterson. Osgoode Hall Law Journal, 56(2), 462-467. Retrieved from https://digitalcommons.osgoode.yorku.ca/ohlj/vol56/iss2/7
15. Eisenach, J. A., & Wimmer, K. (2020). The Impact of Antitrust Regulations on Small Business Growth. Journal of Regulatory Economics, 58(3), 345-367. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11149-020-09403-7
16. European Parliamentary Research Service. (2019). Cooperatives: Characteristics, activities, status, challenges. Retrieved from https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2019/635541/EPRSBRI(2019)635541EN.pdf635541_EN.pdf)
17. Federal Trade Commission Act of 1914, 15 U.S.C. § 41-58.
18. Federal Trade Commission. (2021). The Impact of Small Business Collaborations on Market Competition. Retrieved from https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/documents/reports/impact-small-business-collaborations-market-competition/ftcsmallbusinesscollaborationsreport_2021.pdf
19. Gilbert, R. J. (2023). Antitrust reform: An economic perspective. Annual Review of Economics, 15, 151-175. http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev-economics-082222-070822
20. Greeven, M. J., Yip, G. S., & Wei, W. (2023). Pioneers, Hidden Champions, Changemakers, and Underdogs: Lessons from China's Innovators. MIT Press. Retrieved from https://mitpress.mit.edu/9780262547895/pioneers-hidden-champions-changemakers-and-underdogs/
21. Jiang, P. (2023). The Impact of Industry Growth and Antitrust Litigation on the Importance of Gross Margin Rate. Temple University Graduate Board. https://doi.org/10.34944/temple.0225E.15378.
22. Kwoka, J. E. (2020). Controlling Mergers and Market Power: A Program for Reviving Antitrust in America. ProMarket Books. https://doi.org/10.1086/711375
23. Lamoreaux, N. (1985). The great merger movement in American business, 1895–1904. Cambridge University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511664842
24. Langlois, R. N. (2018). Hunting the big five: Twenty-first century antitrust in historical perspective. Department of Economics Working Paper Series. http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3124356
25. Ma, A. (2024). Convergent Antitrust Regulation of the Digital Economy in China, the European Union, and the United States: Mirror of an Intensifying Geopolitical Competition. Asian Review of Political Economy, 3(9). https://doi.org/10.1007/s44216-024-00027-3
26. Markham, J. W. (1971). Antitrust policy: Challenge and defense. Washington and Lee Law Review, 28(2), 287–324. https://scholarlycommons.law.wlu.edu/wlulr/vol28/iss2/2
27. Markham, J. W. (1971). Conglomerate Enterprise and Economic Performance. Harvard University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2228487
28. McGuire, J., & Dow, S. (2003). The persistence and implications of Japanese keiretsu organization. Journal of International Business Studies, 34(4), 374-388. doi: 10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8400038. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/3557181
29. McKinsey & Company. (2023). The State of Organizations 2023. Retrieved from https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/people-and-organizational-performance/our-insights/the-state-of-organizations-2023
30. Mishel, L., & Bivens, J. (2011). The manufacturing footprint and the importance of U.S. manufacturing jobs. Economic Policy Institute.
31. Moretti, E. (2010). Local Multipliers. American Economic Review, 100(2), 373-377. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.100.2.373
32. Nageswaran, L., Jain, A., & Gurnani, H. (2024). Anti-competitive Effects of a Dominant Retailer's Guaranteed Profit Margin and Low-Price Contracts. SSRN. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4730025.
33. Sawyer, L. P. (2018). American fair trade: Proprietary capitalism, corporatism, and the new competition, 1890–1940. Cambridge University Press.
34. Sawyer, L. P. (2019). US antitrust law and policy in historical perspective. Harvard Business School. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780199329175.013.623
35. Scott, R. (2009). Business law and ethics. In Promoting legal and ethical awareness (pp. 160–201). Mosby. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-323-03668-9.00007-8

36. Shapiro, C. (2019). Protecting Competition in the American Economy: Merger Control, Tech Titans, Labor Markets. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 33(3), 69-93. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.33.3.69
37. Sherman Antitrust Act of 1890, 15 U.S.C. § 1-7.
38. Silberstein, F. (2024). How antitrust laws affect mergers and acquisitions. SFP Advisors. Retrieved from https://sfpadvisors.com/how-antitrust-laws-affect-mergers-and-acquisitions/
39. Singham, S. A. (2010). Impact of China's Antitrust Law and Other Competition Policies on U.S. Companies. U.S. Government Printing Office. Retrieved from https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CHRG-111hhrg57430/pdf/CHRG-111hhrg57430.pdf
40. Spulber, D. F. (2023). Antitrust and Innovation Competition. Journal of Antitrust Enforcement, 11(1), 5-50. https://doi.org/10.1093/jaenfo/jnac013.
41. Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey v. United States, 222 U.S. 1 (1911).
42. Stucke, M. E., & Ezrachi, A. (2017). Artificial Intelligence & Collusion: When Computers Inhibit Competition. University of Illinois Law Review, 2017(5). Retrieved from https://illinoislawreview.org/print/vol-2017-no-5/artificial-intelligence-collusion/
43. The Hart–Scott–Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976, 15 U.S.C. § 18a.
44. Thomas, D. (2024). Annual Report on the U.S. Manufacturing Economy: 2024. National Institute of Standards and Technology. https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.AMS.600-16
45. Thomas, D. (2023). Annual Report on the U.S. Manufacturing Economy: 2023. National Institute of Standards and Technology. https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.AMS.600-13
46. U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis. (2022). Annual Report on U.S. Manufacturing Industry Statistics: 2022. Retrieved from https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/ams/NIST.AMS.100-49.pdf
47. U.S. Small Business Administration. (2020). Small Business Economic Profile. SBA Office of Advocacy.
48. Vernon, R. (1968). Sovereignty at Bay: The Multinational Spread of U.S. Enterprises. Basic Books. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2228487
49. Wu, Y. (2024). Critical thinking pedagogics design in an era of ChatGPT and other AI tools—Shifting from teaching "what" to teaching "why" and "how." Journal of Education and Development, 8(1), 1. https://doi.org/10.20849/jed.v8i1.1404
50. Wu, Y. (2023). Data governance and human rights: An algorithm discrimination literature review and bibliometric analysis. http://dx.doi.org/10.26855/jhass.2023.01.018