

Michigan Journal of International Law

Volume 1 | Issue 1

1979

Index

Michigan Journal of International Law

Follow this and additional works at: <https://repository.law.umich.edu/mjil>



Part of the [International Trade Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Michigan Journal of International Law, *Index*, 1 MICH. J. INT'L L. 317 (1979).

Available at: <https://repository.law.umich.edu/mjil/vol1/iss1/20>

This Index is brought to you for free and open access by the Michigan Journal of International Law at University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Michigan Journal of International Law by an authorized editor of University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact mLaw.repository@umich.edu.

Index

- Accounting principles, 144, 194–96
- Adjustment assistance, 53–58, 74–75, 107
- Administrative Procedure Act, 149–50
- Agency for International Development, 35
- American Banana Co. v. United Fruit Co.*, 92
- Antidumping Act of 1916, 66, 78
- Antidumping Act of 1921
- administration of, by International Trade Commission, 15, 157–59, 148–49, 191
 - administration of, by Treasury Department
 - domestic economic changes affecting, 100–103
 - generally, 5–6, 14–15, 23, 44–45, 51, 103–5, 138–48, 156–57, 186–91
 - global economic changes affecting, 97–100
 - suggested changes, 106–110, 139–48, 153
- calculation of dumping margins, 187–91, 193
- combating unfair trade practices, 6–7, 13–14, 53, 58, 124–25, 206–7
- contrasted with safeguard relief, 13–14, 54–57, 71
- defenses
- meeting competition, 68–69, 176
 - promotional pricing, 68–74, 176–77
- determination of LTFV sales, 117–18, 125, 138–39, 143–48, 187–91
- effectiveness, 57–59
- inconsistency with GATT, 107–8, 132, 133, 161, 188, 196–97, 205–22
- interference with free trade, 24–25, 57–59, 127
- investigation, chilling effect on imports, 38, 115–16, 119–20, 154, 188
- legislative history, 69, 103, 167, 192
- likelihood of injury, 174–77
- price assurances, 109–10, 128–29, 237, 240
- questionnaire, 138, 141, 188
- suggested changes
- adjustments, 110, 130–31, 143–48
 - cash deposit of estimated duties, 109, 129–30
 - cost of production, 25, 131–33
 - disclosure conference, 142–43
 - early determination of injury, 107–8, 154–55, 213–15
 - judicial review, 149–50
 - price assurances, 109–10, 128–29, 237, 240
 - publication of decisions, 113
 - revised schedule of investigation, 139–40, 153
 - self-initiation, 110–13, 122
 - single proceeding and remedy, 106–7, 128, 139–41
- Withholding of Appraisal Notice, 117, 138, 142, 155, 188
- See also* Constructed value; Cost of production; Fast-track procedure; Industry; Injury; Judicial review of dumping decisions
- Antidumping Code, 69, 80, 196–97, 205–22
- United States accession to, 209–11
- See also* GATT

- Antitrust
 cartels, 34, 36, 39, 43-46
 generally, 25, 104, 121-22, 123, 127
 statutes, 53, 66-67, 69, 78, 87
 Voluntary Restraint Agreements, 38-41
- Automobile industry, 15, 21, 25, 46-49, 125, 212
- Constructed value, 143, 186-91, 215-17
- Consumers Union v. Rogers*, 50
- Cost of production, 131-33, 186, 187, 191-93, 216-17
 determination of, 194
 history of statute, 192
- Council of Economic Advisor, 35
- Countervailing duties, 4, 27, 97, 105-6
- Customs Court, 149-50
- Davignon plan, 17, 42, 132
- Davis-Walker Corp. v. Blumenthal*, 92, 112, 136
- Dumping
 continuous dumping, 12-15, 20
 cyclical demand dumping, 71-75
 domestic politics, 2, 5, 19-21, 24, 34, 39-40, 121, 122, 127
 GATT definition of, 3, 186, 215
 increase in, 14-15, 19-23
 intermittent dumping, 13
 long-term dumping, 75-77
 monetary devaluation, 23, 32, 100
 nonpredatory short-term dumping, 70-71
 predatory short-term dumping, 5, 13-14, 22, 53, 65-69
 as price discrimination, 4-5, 15, 16, 20, 25, 59, 62-63, 118
 reasons for dumping
 economies of scale, 14
 government encouragement, 11-12, 13, 22-23, 99
 increased oil prices, 12, 21, 102
 inflation, 100-101
 market entry strategy, 22
 overcapacity, 12, 21-22
 recessionary forces, 12, 19-20, 102
 sporadic dumping, 13
 See also Antidumping Act of 1921; Economic theory of dumping; Injury
- Economic theory of dumping
 aggregate welfare, 63-64
 below-cost pricing
 average cost, 61-62, 206
 cost of production, 186-216
 marginal cost, 62-64, 70
 comparative advantage, 103-104
 demand elasticity, 60-61, 72, 74-75
 marginal revenue, 60-61
 supply elasticity, 19
- Ellis K. Orlowitz Co. v. United States*, 180
- Escape clause relief, 14, 53-58, 71, 74, 77-78
- European Community
 Antidumping Code, 230, 234, 239, 240, 243
 antidumping procedures, 234-37
 antidumping regulations, 231-34, 277-93
 judicial review, 241
 price assurances, 237, 240
 reaction to dumping, 207-8
- European steel industry, 16-18, 20, 23
- Fast-track procedure
 compliance with Antidumping Code, 213-15
 definition of injury, 157-59
 ITC administration of, 157-59
 need for, 110-12, 121-22, 154-56
 procedure, 156-57
 Treasury administration of, 156-57
- Fisher, Bart S.*, criticism of views of, 75-77, 85-86, 90, 91
- Foreign relations and dumping, 1-2, 11-13, 77-78, 125-26, 127-28
- Freedom of Information Act, 117
- F. W. Myers and Co. v. United States*, 153

- GATT (General Agreement of Tariffs and Trade)
 Antidumping Code, 80, 132, 205–22, 230
 Article VI, 54, 55, 132, 167, 196–97, 222
 Article XIX, 54
 definition of dumping, 3, 186
 inconsistent with Antidumping Act, 132, 133, 230, 234, 239–40
 Government encouragement of dumping, 11–12, 13, 22–23, 99
- Imbert Imports, Inc. v. United States*, 180–229
- Industry, definition of, in Antidumping Act
 aggregation of industries, 166
 definition, 158–59, 165–66, 219–220
 regional industry, 55, 121, 158–59, 165–66, 180, 219–20
- Injury, definition of, in Antidumping Act
 Antidumping Act standard, 28, 55–57, 148, 167–68, 217–20
 causation, 55–57, 159, 171–74, 218–19
 determination of injury, 148
 dumping by many countries, 168
 GATT standard, 3–4, 55, 167, 217–20
 Likelihood of injury, 174–77
 proof of injury
 lost profits, 56, 156, 158, 171, 191
 lost sales, 56, 156, 169–71, 191
 market penetration, 56, 156, 158, 169–71, 191
 predatory intent, 168
 price depression, 56, 168–69
 safeguard relief standard, 55–57
- James C. Goff Co. v. United States*, 153
- Japanese antidumping laws, 245–48, 292–94
- Japanese steel industry, 16, 20, 22, 24, 37–38, 40–41
- J. C. Penney Co. v. United States*, 153
- J. H. Cottman & Co. v. United States*, 256
- Judicial review of dumping decisions
 European Community, 241
 United States, 149–50
- Labor, 19–21, 31, 40
- Monetary system, breakdown of, 3, 100
- Most Favored Nation treatment, 58
- Multilateral Trade Negotiations, 105–35, 136, 221–22
- Oil price increase, 3, 12, 21
- Orderly marketing agreements, 35, 38–40, 112
- Outboard Marine Corp. v. Pezetel*, 113
- Petrochemical industry, 21
- Price assurances, 109–10, 128–29, 237, 240
- Price controls, 1971–74, 36
- Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act of 1934, 13
- Robinson-Patman Act, 67–68, 77, 86, 88
- SCM Corp. v. United States International Trade Commission*, 153
- Simonet plan, 11, 28–29
- Solomon report, 41
- State-controlled economies (SCEs)
 constructed value, 253–54
 reasons for SCE dumping, 250–51
 third country rule, 252–54, 256
 Treasury regulations, 253
 United States cases, 251–253
- State-owned enterprises, 22–23, 99
- Steel industry, American, 13, 15–19, 21, 23–29, 35–41, 45–46, 49
 estimated loss due to dumping, 16–19
 EEC dumping, 16–18, 24
 Gilmore Steel case, 186–202

- Gilmore Steel case (*continued*)
 increase in dumping, 15–16
 innovation, 36–38
 Japanese dumping, 24
 price competition, 35–41
 quotas, 34, 36, 38–41, 112
 See also European steel industry;
 Japanese steel industry; Trig-
 ger Price Mechanism
- Tariff Act of 1930, 107, 149
Television industry, 30
Third country rule, 61, 143, 145,
 252–54, 256
Timken Co. v. Simon, 229
Trade Agreements Act of 1934, 134
- Trigger Price Mechanism (TPM), 6,
 23–24, 33, 35, 41–43, 45, 110–12,
 125–27, 132, 190
- United States Constitution, 25, 33,
 229
United States v. Sisal Sales Corp., 92
- Viner, Jacob, criticism of views on
 nonpredatory dumping, 70, 72,
 85, 89
- Voluntary Restraint Arrangement,
 35, 38–40, 112
- Zenith Radio Corp. v. Matsushita
 Elec. Ind. Co., Ltd.*, 86, 87