Student's Name

Professor's Name

Course

Date

The Antitrust Vision

A debate has emerged over the future of antitrust enforcement. Lina Khan is a leading figure in this issue. She argues that focusing solely on consumer prices disregards broader threats posed by today's tech giants. Khan's vision is rooted in an earlier era of antitrust, which emphasized the dangers of concentrated corporate power. This paper explores Khan's position on anti-monopoly enforcement. It has also examined the key critiques from early and recent opponents, including the strengths and weaknesses of each side. Generally, this legal scholar has raised compelling concerns about modern monopolies. On the other hand, her critical highlights challenges relating to the issue. They suggest that a balanced approach may be necessary.

The first area of focus is one of Lina Khan's antitrust arguments. Her scholarship and advocacy portray Amazon as a modern-day monopoly that has emerged from weakened enforcement of antitrust law. Khan argues that marginalizing monopoly law has enabled Amazon to amass structural power, allowing it to exert substantial control over the economy (Streitfeld). Thus, she believes that traditional antitrust disregarded Amazon's true market dominance. She asserts that the company has used its power to its advantage. This is evident in its control of online retail infrastructure. Khan views it as pressuring third-party sellers to use Amazon's own shipping service to qualify for the Prime badge. Moreover, it allows paid sponsored listings to outrank organic results on its site. She contends that such practices are foreclosure tactics that coerce and distort competition for digital shelf space. Her FTC complaint views Amazon as a monopolist using its power to harm its competitors (Streitfeld).

To back her arguments, Khan has drawn on the New Deal vision of antitrust. She cites historical principles that antitrust is meant to lower prices and prevent the concentration of power in a few hands. According to this theory, Amazon's scale and control over logistics can hinder innovation and damage its suppliers' operations. In the long run, these disastrous consequences of this situation may extend to democratic institutions. The idea originated from the trustbusters of the New Deal era. To them, the size of the company itself is a hazard. Khan notes that mid-century measures, such as the 1936 Robinson-Patman Act, were designed to protect small, local businesses from the price-cutting tactics of large chain stores (Epstein). The Yale Journal Paper has also warned that unchecked platform power could threaten the role of producers and suppliers in the economy. Media diversity could also be harmed, as some companies become too big to fail (Khan). Khan's premise is that antitrust must consider these broader harms, not the immediate consumer savings.

Commentators supporting Khan stress that a narrow focus on consumer prices is an outdated legal doctrine. Amazon's current low prices may be a temporary strategy to entrench power. They counter that market dynamics could allow a dominant firm to keep prices low in the short term while harming its rivals. Generally, Khan and her allies have emphasized that Amazon's dominance is not measured solely by prices and profits. Instead, what matters is its control over an entire online economy. They invoke antitrust's rationale that the law should regulate enterprises as they expand. This will help to protect small businesses and innovation in the long run. Khan is an FTC chair. So, she also had to take action based on her beliefs. Her agency, joined by 17 states, filed suit against Amazon in 2023. It accused Amazon of using interlocking tactics to maintain a monopoly (Federal Trade Commission). For instance, Amazon allegedly demotes listings from third-party merchants if they offer lower prices on other websites. It aims to ensure Amazon's site maintains the lowest prices but shuts down competition across platforms. Generally, these issues suggest that Amazon is attempting to hinder fair competition. Khan considers these techniques to be meant to entrench the corporation's dominance at the expense of open rivalry.

However, her aggressive stance provoked intense criticism. Early commentators mocked Khan's emphasis on Amazon's size and low prices. To them, antitrust should not punish success. Some have concluded that Khan's stance is internally inconsistent. This is because she had once praised Amazon's low prices as consumer-friendly. However, the FTC she now leads has charged Amazon with the offense of hiking prices (Tamny). They perceived her stance was driven by hipster antitrust. This concept equates bigness with badness without proving consumer harm (Streitfeld).

Additionally, others argue that it is an economically misguided return to old-fashioned trust busting. For them, the sole objective of antitrust law should be to maximize consumer welfare, and enforcement should weigh other social goals. For instance, Richard Epstein likened Khan's thesis to a New Deal-era philosophy that prizes small competitors over efficiency. The critics note that Amazon has not engaged in the classic behavior of a monopoly, such as gouging consumers. Instead, it has succeeded in delivering immense benefits to them. They contend that fears of predatory pricing by the company are misplaced. This is because it often uses 'loss-leader' products to attract buyers. These losses are then covered with other sales. Therefore, there is no evidence that it will later raise prices to recoup its costs. New competitors could always emerge and undercut any attempted monopoly pricing despite Amazon’s efforts (Epstein). The general idea is that punishing a company for its success would result in adverse outcomes for consumers. Thus, critics warn that Khan's proposals would be wickedly counterproductive, possibly forcing the organization to raise prices. In such a case, the antitrust policy would have triggered a perverse outcome. Ultimately, early critics demand that Khan provide clear evidence of consumer harm rather than targeting the concept of bigness itself.

Now, let us focus on the more recent critics. These have sharpened the early arguments. Their focus has particularly been in response to the FTC's lawsuit against Amazon. One of their critique is that the case lacks evidence on how Amazon is hurting consumers. The agency failed to demonstrate that the company's practices led to higher prices and adverse outcomes detrimental to shoppers. Instead, it relied on speculative theories that Amazon's dominance might hinder future competition. Opponents also note that the FTC defined an insignificant portion of the online superstore market for this case. It excluded brick-and-mortar retailers that make up over 80% of US retail sales (Chavez). This artificially inflates Amazon's perceived dominance.

As mentioned earlier, FTC has been criticized as being internally erratic. John Tamny argues that the agency is effectively faulting Amazon for practices that actually benefit consumers. For example, the firm's rule that third-party sellers not undercut their Amazon prices has drawn criticism from antitrust authorities. According to Tamny, this is a logical deal. This is because the company managed to sell at lower prices due to the bulkiness of its sales. On the other hand, third-party sellers cannot generate the volume that can support the lowest prices on their websites or stores. Additionally, a business cannot provide a shelf space to outside enterprises only to be undercut. This way, it could harm itself and its sales (Tamny). On the other hand, the FTC claims the policy inflates prices on other sites. It also asserts the company handles a dominant share of online sales. If Amazon is indeed the preference for most shoppers, ensuring the lowest price on its products means most customers pay less. Generally, this means that the government's case argues with itself. It would penalize Amazon for keeping prices low on its platform. Eventually, this would force the firm to slow down Prime shipping and feature higher prices. Such outcomes are directly opposed to consumer outcomes. Critics predict that the FTC's suit will lack a solid basis in court. They describe it as a political overreach founded in Khan's misinformed war toward American success.

The above debate between Lina Khan and her critics reveals differing premises. Khan's perception is that Amazon's size and structure drive competitive harm that traditional metrics miss. On the other hand, critics see this view as lacking evidence of actual harm to consumers and competition. They argue that Amazon's success cannot be considered an antitrust violation. From my assessment, each side has both valid points and areas of weakness. The paramount strength of Khan's argument is drawing attention to how qualitative harms to competition can be exercised by a contemporary tech monopoly, which is often overlooked by price-centric analyses. Khan points out that a dominant platform can, through its economic power, disadvantage its rivals and extract value from suppliers and innovators while keeping prices low for consumers. This insight ties back to the classical idea of antitrust. The aim is to prevent monopolists from engaging in extortion. (Henderson). It warns that the current law has failed to address the issue.

However, Khan's approach faces significant weaknesses. It is hard to prove these diffuse harms. Establishing remedies may drive unintended consequences for consumers. Therefore, as critics view it, antitrust enforcement must be grounded in evidence and in the outcomes for consumers. They emphasize tangible harm, keeping enforcers disciplined. However, their critiques might ignore long-term dangers. For instance, if Amazon's dominance goes unchecked, prices may rise, and innovation might decline to irreversible extremes. I recommend that enforcers take Khan's concern for market structure while considering the consumer welfare standard. They should pursue a balanced approach that targets new forms of monopoly power while demanding solid proof of harm.

In conclusion, this paper has reviewed the differing perspectives of Lina Khan's anti-monopoly vision and her critics. It examined Khan's argument that Amazon's dominance poses structural threats. On the other hand, counterarguments argued that her approach was unsound due to the lack of evidence of harm to the consumer. My assessment on both sides is that Khan's revival of broad antitrust goals highlights the fundamental challenges concerning platform monopolies. Critics have not been able to remind us that enforcement must be fact and consumer-welfare-informed. A synthesis of these perspectives could offer the way forward. Thus, my viewpoint is that we need polices to regulate anti-competitive tactics to preserve the traditional market structure. However, this should be done based on clear evidence. Its impact on consumers should be the priority. Generally, this debate has illustrated the challenge of applying traditional antitrust laws to modern digital marketplaces.

Works Cited

Chavez, Krista. "FTC V. Amazon Wilts Under Economic Scrutiny." *NetChoice*, 14 Mar. 2025, netchoice.org/ftc-v-amazon-wilts-under-economic-scrutiny/.

Epstein, Richard. "The Bezos Busters." *Hoover Institution*, 2018, www.hoover.org/research/bezos-busters.

Federal Trade Commission. "Amazon.com, Inc. (Amazon ECommerce)." *Federal Trade Commission*, 5 Nov. 2024, www.ftc.gov/legal-library/browse/cases-proceedings/1910129-1910130-amazoncom-inc-amazon-ecommerce.

Henderson, David. "Should Antitrust Be Used Against Amazon?" *Econlib*, 13 Sept. 2018, www.econlib.org/should-antitrust-be-used-against-amazon/.

Khan, Lina. "Amazon's Antitrust Paradox." *The Yale Law Journal*, 2017.

Streitfeld, David. "Amazon's Antitrust Antagonist Has a Breakthrough Idea." *The New York Times - Breaking News, US News, World News and Videos*, 7 Sept. 2018, www.nytimes.com/2018/09/07/technology/monopoly-antitrust-lina-khan-amazon.html.

Tamny, John. "With Its Attacks On Amazon, the FTC Is Arguing With Itself." *Forbes*, 7 Nov. 2023, www.forbes.com/sites/johntamny/2023/11/07/with-its-attacks-on-amazon-the-ftc-is-arguing-with-itself/.