

Nos. 14-CV-101 / 14-CV-126

IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
COURT OF APPEALS

COMPETITIVE ENTERPRISE INSTITUTE, *ET AL.*,

Defendants-Appellants,

and

NATIONAL REVIEW, INC.,

Defendant-Appellant,

v.

MICHAEL E. MANN, PH.D,

Plaintiff-Appellee.

On Appeal from the Superior Court of the District of Columbia

Civil Division, No. 2012 CA 008263 B

**BRIEF *AMICUS CURIAE* OF THE CATO INSTITUTE
SUPPORTING PETITION FOR REHEARING**

Ilya Shapiro (D.C. Bar #489100)

Counsel of Record

Trevor Burrus (D.C.

Bar#1048911)

CATO INSTITUTE

1000 Mass. Ave., N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20001

Tel: (202) 842-0200

Fax: (202) 842-3490

ishapiro@cato.org

Counsel for Amicus Curiae

CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The Cato Institute states that it has no parent companies, subsidiaries, or affiliates, and that it does not issue shares to the public.

Dated: January 3, 2019

s/ Ilya Shapiro
Ilya Shapiro

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----|
| CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT | i |
| TABLE OF AUTHORITIES | iii |
| INTEREST OF <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i> | 1 |
| ARGUMENT | 2 |
| I. DISAGREEMENT WITH OFFICIAL BODIES IS NOT EVIDENCE OF BAD FAITH | 2 |
| II. CALLS FOR INVESTIGATION, COMMONPLACE PEJORATIVE TERMS, AND ANALOGIES TO “NOTORIOUS” PERSONS CANNOT BE ACTIONABLE FOR LIBEL | 6 |
| CONCLUSION | 10 |
| CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE | 11 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

| | Page(s) |
|---|---------|
| Other Authorities | |
| Carla Marinucci, <i>Brown: FBI Director Comey Guilty of ‘Gross Violation of Professional Responsibility’</i> , Politico, Oct. 31, 2016, http://politi.co/2jfpabU | 8 |
| Chris McGreal, <i>Rick Perry Attacks Ben Bernanke’s ‘Treasonous’ Federal Reserve Strategy</i> , The Guardian, Aug. 16, 2011, http://bit.ly/2iQb4AU | 8 |
| Daniel Oliver, <i>We Should Pin the Stalin Moustache on Hillary, Not Trump</i> , The Federalist, July 14, 2016, http://bit.ly/29EZ26k | 8 |
| Daniel Payne, <i>Sorry, Mark Cuban: Hillary Clinton is Unquestionably Guilty</i> , The Federalist, Sept. 6, 2016, http://bit.ly/2iVDSZm | 4 |
| Editorial, <i>U.S. Attorneys, Reloaded</i> , N.Y. Times, May 10, 2007, http://nyti.ms/2iApp1n | 7 |
| Etan Thomas, <i>George Zimmerman Is Not a Celebrity, He Is a Murderer</i> , Huffington Post, Jan. 31, 2014, http://huff.to/2j30YdC | 4 |
| Fedja Buric, <i>Trump’s Not Hitler, He’s Mussolini</i> , Salon, March 11, 2016, http://bit.ly/24VG177 | 9 |
| *Hadas Gold, <i>Donald Trump: We’re Going to ‘Open Up’ Libel Laws</i> , Politico, Feb. 26, 2016, http://politi.co/1QC9BDZ | 9 |
| Ian Kullgren, <i>Peter King: CIA’s Brennan Should Be Investigated for ‘Hit Job’ On Trump</i> , Politico, Dec. 18, 2016, http://politi.co/2i3JRqE | 7 |
| Ilya Shapiro, <i>Eric Holder’s Tenure</i> , Townhall, Sept. 28, 2014, http://bit.ly/2iQm6UJ | 1 |
| Jennifer Epstein, <i>Palin Charges Critics with ‘Blood Libel’</i> , Politico, Jan. 12, 2011, http://politi.co/2iVo7RT | 8 |
| <i>Jimmy Carter: I Don’t Pay Any Attention to Oliver North; He Was a Criminal</i> , CNN.com, March 28, 2014, http://cnn.it/1i2va0N | 4 |
| John Shattuck, <i>Donald Trump Raises Specter of Treason</i> , Boston Globe, Dec. 16, 2016, http://bit.ly/2hDShIM | 7 |
| John Young, <i>Trump Enlists the Trigger-Finger Fringe</i> , Austin American-Statesman, Aug. 17, 2016, http://atxne.ws/2j4uvni | 8 |
| Jonathan Chait, <i>How Hitler’s Rise to Power Explains Why Republicans Accept Donald Trump</i> , N.Y. Mag., July 7, 2016, http://nym.ag/29vwVaY | 9 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Jordan Fabian, <i>Nader: Impeach Obama for ‘War Crimes’</i> , The Hill, March 20, 2011, http://bit.ly/2iqkjo8 | 4 |
| Keith Kloor, <i>Robert F. Kennedy Jr. Takes His Debunked Vaccine Concerns to Trump</i> , Newsweek, Jan. 11, 2017, http://bit.ly/2jfYiME | 5 |
| Leonard Pitts, Jr., <i>If It Talks Like a Hitler and Walks Like a Hitler ...</i> , Miami Herald, June 17, 2016, http://hrlld.us/2iTTYm8 | 9 |
| M.D. Kittle, <i>Ron Johnson: ‘Obamacare Is a Massive Consumer Fraud’</i> , Wisconsin Watchdog, Sept. 16, 2016, http://bit.ly/2d4p7R9 | 7 |
| Matt Wilstein, <i>PBS’ Bill Moyers: GOP ‘Stalked’ Obamacare Like ‘Jack the Ripper’</i> , Mediaite, Nov. 2, 2013, http://bit.ly/2iq6juR | 9 |
| Nikita Vladimirov, <i>Reid: Comey Should Be Investigated in Wake of Russia Report</i> , The Hill, Dec. 10, 2016, http://bit.ly/2hfN86M | 7 |
| Paul Campos, <i>How James Clapper Will Get Away with Perjury</i> , Salon, June 12, 2013, http://bit.ly/19QgJye | 4 |
| Peter Ross Range, <i>The Theory of Political Leadership that Donald Trump Shares with Adolf Hitler</i> , Wash. Post, July 25, 2016, http://wapo.st/2i4jrYS | 9 |
| <i>Politically Correct</i> , in William Safire, <i>Safire’s Political Dictionary</i> (2008)..... | 6 |
| Rebecca Gordon, <i>They Should All be Tried: George W. Bush, Dick Cheney, and America’s Overlooked War Crimes</i> , Salon, Apr. 30, 2016, http://bit.ly/2iQdZcV | 4 |
| Sarah Miller, <i>The Borden Murders: Lizzie Borden and the Trial of the Century</i> (2016)..... | 5 |
| Scott Lemieux, <i>How ObamaCare’s Fiercest Critic All But Admitted the Legal Case Against It Was a Scam</i> , The Week, July 22, 2015, http://bit.ly/2jNjRlg | 2 |
| *The Trial of Émile Zola 35–36 (Benjamin R. Tucker, ed., 1898)..... | 2-3 |
| Theodore Dalrymple, <i>The Architect as Totalitarian</i> , City Journal, Autumn 2009, http://bit.ly/2iQVCSV | 9 |
| Trevor Burrus, <i>Hopefully Dr. Michael E. Mann Doesn’t Sue Me for This Column</i> , Forbes, Aug. 14, 2014, http://bit.ly/2jfLUsu | 1 |
| Vincent Bugliosi, <i>Outrage: The Five Reasons Why O.J. Simpson Got Away With Murder</i> (1996)..... | 4 |
| Yannik Thiem, <i>Fascism in America: Donald Trump, America’s Hitler of the 21st Century?</i> , APA Blog, Oct. 20, 2016, http://bit.ly/2j3dWuT | 9 |

INTEREST OF *AMICUS CURIAE*

Amicus Cato Institute submits this brief in support of appellants’ petition for rehearing. Cato was established in 1977 as a nonprofit, nonpartisan public-policy research foundation dedicated to advancing individual liberty, free markets, and limited government. Cato’s Robert A. Levy Center for Constitutional Studies promotes the principles of limited constitutional government that are the foundation of liberty. Toward those ends, Cato publishes books and studies, conducts conferences, produces the annual *Cato Supreme Court Review*, and files *amicus* briefs.

This case concerns Cato because its scholars—like many people who live and work in the District of Columbia—have frequently voiced their concerns and suspicions regarding public figures, including by rhetorical comparison to “notorious” persons.¹ In fact, one has compared Mann himself to a “[playground] tattletale who complains to the teacher that someone said mean things about him.”² Cato scholars have also been criticized with similar rhetoric, without

¹ See, e.g., Ilya Shapiro, *Eric Holder’s Tenure*, Townhall, Sept. 28, 2014, <http://bit.ly/2iQm6UJ> (“One thing that differentiates Holder from other notorious attorneys general, like John Mitchell under Richard Nixon, is that Holder hasn’t gone to jail (yet; the DOJ Inspector General better lock down computer systems lest Holder’s electronic files ‘disappear’).”).

² Trevor Burrus, *Hopefully Dr. Michael E. Mann Doesn’t Sue Me for This Column*, Forbes, Aug. 14, 2014, <http://bit.ly/2jfLUUs>.

realizing that, after the panel’s decision, they can now make money by suing their critics.³ The panel’s decision could even open the door for this brief’s authors—among thousands of other commentators—to sue and be sued for libel on a regular basis. For the sake of free and open debate, that is a world we must avoid.

Unfortunately, the slight revisions to the panel opinion made on December 13, 2018 do nothing to alter the substantive dangers of the opinion to free speech.

ARGUMENT

I. Disagreement with Official Bodies Is Not Evidence of Bad Faith

The libel trial of Émile Zola was one of the low points in the history of free speech. In his open letter *J’accuse...!*, Zola had accused a French military tribunal of corruptly exonerating an army officer of treason in order to cover up the wrongful conviction of Alfred Dreyfus for the same crime. During his trial, Zola’s defense was repeatedly prevented from asserting any good-faith disagreement with Dreyfus’s trial. Instead, they were forced to operate under the legal fiction that no skepticism of a duly completed judicial proceeding could even be entertained:

The Judge —I repeat that no question will be put which would be a means of arriving at the revision of a case sovereignly judged.

M. Clemenceau —Then the court will put no question concerning good faith?

³ See, e.g., Scott Lemieux, *How ObamaCare’s Fiercest Critic All But Admitted the Legal Case Against It Was a Scam*, The Week, July 22, 2015, <http://bit.ly/2jNjRlg> (“With this sentence, [Cato’s Michael] Cannon is spitting out his own snake oil.”).

The Judge —Concerning anything that relates to the Dreyfus case. No. Offer your motions. I repeat that I will not put the question.

M. Labori —Will you permit me, *Monsieur le Président*, in our common interest, to ask you, then, what practical means you see by which we may ascertain the truth?

The Judge —That does not concern me.

The Trial of Émile Zola 35–36 (Benjamin R. Tucker, ed., 1898).

The panel’s decision here would create a similar legal regime in the United States. Rand Simberg and Mark Steyn have asserted a good-faith disagreement with the findings of several commissions, each assembled to investigate claims of misconduct against Dr. Michael Mann. But the panel expresses bafflement as to “how [the defendants] came to have such beliefs in light of the reports that had been issued.” Op. 89 n.57. The panel notes that they were “struck . . . by the composition of the investigatory bodies,” and that the reports “were conducted by credentialed academics and professionals.” Op. 85. The clear implication is that anyone in their right mind should have been awed at the assortment of titles and degrees these commissions had collected. Such obvious and unimpeachable authority, in the panel’s view, lends itself to a new *res ipsa loquitur* proof of actual malice: some commissions are so eminent, some institutions are so established, and some personnel are so qualified, that the simple act of voicing dissent with their views may itself be taken as sufficient evidence of bad faith. Op. 96–97.

The defendants have indeed refused to accept the findings of these official

reports. As Zola’s prosecutor put it—anticipating the panel by over 100 years—they have “done nothing here but open an audacious discussion on the thing judged.” Trial of Émile Zola 254. But they could have been forgiven for thinking their dissent was fully protected by the First Amendment’s actual malice standard.

After all, Simberg and Steyn are hardly the first to voice disagreement with an official exoneration. Oliver North was found not guilty by a court of law, but a former president still calls him a “criminal.”⁴ George Zimmerman and O.J. Simpson were likewise acquitted, but those who find fault with their trials still call them murderers.⁵ Despite a lack of prosecution, commentators have called for George W. Bush and Barack Obama to be tried for “war crimes,”⁶ and predicted that the Director of National Intelligence “will get away with perjury.”⁷ No charges were filed against a recent presidential candidate after a lengthy investigation that reached the highest level of the FBI. Is it now *per se* bad faith to

⁴ Jimmy Carter: *I Don’t Pay Any Attention to Oliver North; He Was a Criminal*, CNN.com, March 28, 2014, <http://cnn.it/1i2va0N>.

⁵ Etan Thomas, *George Zimmerman Is Not a Celebrity, He Is a Murderer*, Huffington Post, Jan. 31, 2014, <http://huff.to/2j30YdC>; Vincent Bugliosi, *Outrage: The Five Reasons Why O.J. Simpson Got Away With Murder* (1996).

⁶ Rebecca Gordon, *They Should All be Tried: George W. Bush, Dick Cheney, and America’s Overlooked War Crimes*, Salon, Apr. 30, 2016, <http://bit.ly/2iQdZcV>; Jordan Fabian, *Nader: Impeach Obama for ‘War Crimes’*, The Hill, March 20, 2011, <http://bit.ly/2iQkj08>.

⁷ Paul Campos, *How James Clapper Will Get Away with Perjury*, Salon, June 12, 2013, <http://bit.ly/19QgJye>.

nonetheless assert that she is “unquestionably guilty”?⁸ And, finally, would the division have found it actionable libel to say “Lizzie Borden took an axe and gave her mother forty whacks” given that Borden was acquitted? Sarah Miller, *The Borden Murders: Lizzie Borden and the Trial of the Century* (2016).

The National Science Foundation, which authored one of the reports at issue, is an eminent institution, much like our justice system. Mann describes it as “essentially the final arbiter of scientific research in the United States,” a view the division seems to tacitly accept. Appellee’s Brief 17. But it is precisely because so many official bodies can lay claim to being the “final arbiter” in their respective spheres that the panel’s decision is so dangerous. The panel’s rule would effectively make each such body a *de facto* truth commission, safe in the knowledge that its findings must be acknowledged as fact for fear that challenge would waive a speaker’s actual malice protection.

That result should be feared by those on *all* sides of the political spectrum since those bodies which have the most official authority will often change their views with the changing fortunes of our political parties. For example, President Trump once met with vaccine skeptic Robert F. Kennedy, Jr., and has said he

⁸ Daniel Payne, *Sorry, Mark Cuban: Hillary Clinton is Unquestionably Guilty*, *The Federalist*, Sept. 6, 2016, <http://bit.ly/2iVDSZm>.

would consider creating a commission to investigate vaccine safety.⁹ If such a commission were formed, would its report be regarded as the “final arbiter” of the possible vaccine-autism connection, and would accusing vaccine skeptics of “fraud” or “misconduct” then become actionable libel? Under the division’s rule, those who agree with “final arbiters” today will find themselves unable to criticize them in the future, once the new makeup of our national institutions has made their views no longer “politically correct.”¹⁰ Bad faith must be proven by the conduct of a speaker, not by object of his criticism. To hold otherwise is to seriously endanger free expression and debate.

II. Calls for Investigation, Commonplace Pejorative Terms, and Analogies to “Notorious” Persons Cannot be Actionable for Libel

According to the panel, “Mr. Simberg would not have concluded [his] article with the prescription that a ‘fresh, truly independent investigation’ is necessary, unless he supposed that ‘ordinary, reasonable readers could read the [article] as implying,’ that Dr. Mann was guilty of misconduct that had to be ferreted out.” Op. 63–64 (citation omitted).

⁹ Keith Kloor, *Robert F. Kennedy Jr. Takes His Debunked Vaccine Concerns to Trump*, Newsweek, Jan. 11, 2017, <http://bit.ly/2jfYiME>.

¹⁰ The term originated in reference to the beliefs endorsed at any given moment by the Communist Party in the Soviet Union, which were therefore, by definition, “correct” (until they weren’t). *Politically Correct*, in William Safire, Safire’s Political Dictionary (2008).

How much daily commentary and investigative journalism produced in the District of Columbia has been swept into the realm of actionable libel by this one sentence? During the 2016 election, an opinion columnist wrote:

There is no direct evidence that the president-elect was involved or knew in advance about the Russian government's actions. But the circumstances underscore the nation's need for a full investigation.¹¹

And when four indictments were issued shortly before an election, an editorial board urged that "Congress should investigate whether the indictments violated Justice Department guidelines."¹² Calls for investigation are now so common that the panel's rule would sweep up not just pundits, but politicians themselves: recently a sitting senator and congressman declared that the directors of the FBI and CIA "should be investigated."¹³ After the panel's decision, will anyone feel comfortable calling for investigations on matters of national importance?

Further, the division finds potential liability from the use of words such as "deception" and "misconduct." Op. 63. Senators will now have to watch what they say in political debates (away from the Senate floor)—describing the policy of a

¹¹ John Shattuck, *Donald Trump Raises Specter of Treason*, Boston Globe, Dec. 16, 2016, <http://bit.ly/2hDShIM>.

¹² Editorial, *U.S. Attorneys, Reloaded*, N.Y. Times, May 10, 2007, <http://nyti.ms/2iApp1n>.

¹³ Nikita Vladimirov, *Reid: Comey Should Be Investigated in Wake of Russia Report*, The Hill, Dec. 10, 2016, <http://bit.ly/2hfN86M>; Ian Kullgren, *Peter King: CIA's Brennan Should Be Investigated for 'Hit Job' On Trump*, Politico, Dec. 18, 2016, <http://politi.co/2i3JRqE>.

political opponent as a “massive consumer fraud” will likely be actionable.¹⁴ Likewise, the sitting governor of California might well be haled into court for accusing an FBI director of a “gross violation of professional responsibility.”¹⁵ But these are just the tip of the iceberg: in recent years politicians have referred to a public official’s policy decision as “treasonous” and accused critics of “blood libel,” far harsher terms than any used by Simberg and Steyn.¹⁶

Finally, according to the panel, comparing Dr. Mann to “notorious persons” is enough to make a statement actionable. Op. 69. How will this new rule change the terms of debate in “this town”? For one thing, opponents of the gun lobby will have to take their passion down a notch because, in the words of one columnist, “the only difference between [NRA Executive Director Wayne] LaPierre and, say, Timothy McVeigh, or Charles Manson, for that matter, is a good tailor.”¹⁷ Debating which presidential candidate to “pin the Stalin moustache” on could

¹⁴ M.D. Kittle, *Ron Johnson: ‘Obamacare Is a Massive Consumer Fraud’*, Wisconsin Watchdog, Sept. 16, 2016, <http://bit.ly/2d4p7R9>.

¹⁵ Carla Marinucci, *Brown: FBI Director Comey Guilty of ‘Gross Violation of Professional Responsibility’*, Politico, Oct. 31, 2016, <http://politi.co/2jfpabU>.

¹⁶ Chris McGreal, *Rick Perry Attacks Ben Bernanke’s ‘Treasonous’ Federal Reserve Strategy*, The Guardian, Aug. 16, 2011, <http://bit.ly/2iQb4AU>; Jennifer Epstein, *Palin Charges Critics with ‘Blood Libel’*, Politico, Jan. 12, 2011, <http://politi.co/2iVo7RT>.

¹⁷ John Young, *Trump Enlists the Trigger-Finger Fringe*, Austin American-Statesman, Aug. 17, 2016, <http://atxne.ws/2j4uvni>.

likewise be a costly choice for pundits,¹⁸ and Bill Moyers might have to compensate Mitch McConnell for describing Republicans as “stalking” Obamacare “like Jack the Ripper.”¹⁹ Even art critics will have to change their style. After this decision, who could have the confidence to start a magazine article with a sentence like “Le Corbusier was to architecture what Pol Pot was to social reform”?²⁰

Political thinkers would certainly like to believe that historical analogies are integral to expressing their views on important political choices. A former presidential candidate, now president, was consistently compared to Hitler,²¹ Hitler,²² Hitler,²³ Hitler,²⁴ and Mussolini.²⁵ Indeed, then-candidate Trump was so annoyed by this criticism that he threatened to “open up the libel laws” to prevent

¹⁸ Daniel Oliver, *We Should Pin the Stalin Moustache on Hillary, Not Trump*, *The Federalist*, July 14, 2016, <http://bit.ly/29EZ26k>.

¹⁹ Matt Wilstein, *PBS’ Bill Moyers: GOP ‘Stalked’ Obamacare Like ‘Jack the Ripper’*, *Mediaite*, Nov. 2, 2013, <http://bit.ly/2iq6juR>.

²⁰ Theodore Dalrymple, *The Architect as Totalitarian*, *City Journal*, Autumn 2009, <http://bit.ly/2iQVCSV>.

²¹ Peter Ross Range, *The Theory of Political Leadership that Donald Trump Shares with Adolf Hitler*, *Wash. Post*, July 25, 2016, <http://wapo.st/2i4jrYS>.

²² Jonathan Chait, *How Hitler’s Rise to Power Explains Why Republicans Accept Donald Trump*, *N.Y. Mag.*, July 7, 2016, <http://nym.ag/29vwVaY>.

²³ Leonard Pitts, Jr., *If It Talks Like a Hitler and Walks Like a Hitler...*, *Miami Herald*, June 17, 2016, <http://hrl.d.us/2iTTYm8>.

²⁴ Yannik Thiem, *Fascism in America: Donald Trump, America’s Hitler of the 21st Century?*, *APA Blog*, Oct. 20, 2016, <http://bit.ly/2j3dWuT>.

²⁵ Fedja Buric, *Trump’s Not Hitler, He’s Mussolini*, *Salon*, March 11, 2016, <http://bit.ly/24VG177>.

such speech in the future.²⁶ Luckily for him, the panel’s decision has done this work for him.

CONCLUSION

The panel’s interpretation of words, expressions, and analogies routine to political debate would expose thousands of commentators in the District of Columbia—including sitting members of Congress—to potential liability for exercising what had previously been assumed to be their First Amendment rights.

For the foregoing reasons, and for those stated by the appellants, the petition for rehearing should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Ilya Shapiro (D.C. Bar #489100)
Counsel of Record
Trevor Burrus (D.C. Bar#1048911)
CATO INSTITUTE
1000 Mass. Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001
Tel: (202) 842-0200
Fax: (202) 842-3490
ishapiro@cato.org

DATED: January 3, 2019

²⁶ Hadas Gold, *Donald Trump: We’re Going to ‘Open Up’ Libel Laws*, Politico, Feb. 26, 2016, <http://politi.co/1QC9BDZ>.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on January 3, 2019, I caused a copy of the foregoing Brief *Amicus Curiae* of the Cato Institute to be served through the Court's electronic filing and service system and through first-class mail, postage-prepaid, upon:

Andrew M. Grossman
David B. Rivkin, Jr.
Mark I. Bailen
Baker & Hostetler LLP
Washington Square, Suite 1100
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
agrossman@bakerlaw.com
*Counsel for Appellant Competitive
Enterprise Institute and Appellant
Rand Simberg*

John B. Williams
Williams Lopato PLLC
1707 L. St., N.W., Suite 550
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 296-1665
jbwilliams@williamslopato.com
Counsel for Appellee

Michael A. Carvin
Anthony J. Dick
Jones Day
51 Louisiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202)-879-3939
macarvin@jonesday.com
*Counsel for Appellant National Review,
Inc.*

Peter J. Fontaine
Cozen O'Connor
1650 Market St., Suite 2800
Philadelphia, PA 19103
(215) 665-2723
pfontaine@cozen.com
Counsel for Appellee

/s/ Ilya Shapiro
Ilya Shapiro