



GW Law Faculty Publications & Other Works

Faculty Scholarship

2024

The Future of Jurisdiction

Paul S. Berman

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarship.law.gwu.edu/faculty_publications

 Part of the [Law Commons](#)

The Future of Jurisdiction

By Paul Schiff Berman^{1*}

102 WASH U. L. REV. ____ (forthcoming 2025)

Abstract

A new paradigm for conceptualizing the doctrine of personal jurisdiction is long overdue. In the 19th century the U.S. Supreme Court established a firm territorialist approach to jurisdiction befitting a geographically spread-out country with many local micro-economies. The more flexible “minimum contacts” test articulated in 1945 by International Shoe v. Washington ushered in a 20th century vision responding to increased automotive transportation and national industrial production. But now, at least three decades into the Internet and information economy era, the U.S. Supreme Court has yet to land on a coherent jurisdictional framework for the new century.

It’s not for want of trying. Since 2010, the Supreme Court has decided at least seven major jurisdiction cases. But all seven have resulted in conceptually problematic resolutions, and in two of them—including the most recent, Mallory v. Norfolk Southern Railway—the Court could not even muster a true majority rationale. Indeed, even the basic purpose of jurisdictional law—is it to ensure fairness to defendants or is it to prevent states from encroaching on other states?—has remained murky since the very beginning. And as Mallory makes clear, the Court’s confused and bi-furcated approach regarding the purpose of jurisdictional law can lead to very different outcomes in particular cases.

Fundamentally, we need to recognize that “minimum contacts” has become an unsatisfying approach in a 21st century dominated by virtual social life, deterritorialized goods and effects, and the ability of both large industrialists and individuals to reach consumers anywhere anytime. In such a world, “contacts” with a territorially-based entity does not capture the reality of the underlying transaction.

Instead, this Article proposes a distinct framework for analyzing jurisdiction cases, one based on community affiliation. The real question underlying jurisdiction, I argue, is whether a legal dispute sufficiently implicates a community such that it is appropriate for that community to assert dominion over the dispute without unduly encroaching on the sovereignty of other states. And though the answer to that question is surely not always beyond dispute, it at least focuses attention on the core issues that should determine a jurisdictional inquiry.

* Walter S. Cox Professor of Law, The George Washington University Law School.

My argument in favor of this approach proceeds in four Parts. Part One focuses on the problem of territoriality as the basis for jurisdiction, emphasizing the various ways in which a territorialist approach fails to capture the reality of 21st century social life and commercial activity. Part Two examines the U.S. Supreme Court's conceptual confusion about the purpose of jurisdictional doctrine and argues for an approach based on the connection between the case and the community, rather than the due process rights of defendants. Part Three traces the development of the Supreme Court's general v. specific jurisdiction dichotomy and argues for a less categorical approach. Finally, Part Four sets forth a set of principles that should guide the future of jurisdiction. And while these principles do not "solve" all difficult jurisdictional issues, they do provide a more coherent analytical framework for courts as they wrestle with jurisdictional conundrums in the 21st century.

DRAFT—DO NOT CITE OR QUOTE WITHOUT PERMISSION

The Future of Jurisdiction

By Paul Schiff Berman^{2*}

102 WASH U. L. REV. ____ (forthcoming 2025)

A new paradigm for conceptualizing the doctrine of personal jurisdiction is long overdue. In the 19th century the U.S. Supreme Court established a firm territorialist approach to jurisdiction befitting a geographically spread-out country with many local micro-economies.³ The more flexible “minimum contacts” test articulated in 1945 by *International Shoe v. Washington*⁴ ushered in a 20th century vision responding to increased automotive transportation and national industrial production. But now, at least three decades into the Internet and information economy era, the U.S. Supreme Court has yet to land on a coherent jurisdictional framework for the new century.

It’s not for want of trying. Since 2010, the Supreme Court has decided at least seven major jurisdiction cases.⁵ But all seven have resulted in conceptually problematic resolutions, and in two⁶ of them—including the most recent, *Mallory v. Norfolk Southern Railway*⁷—the Court could not even muster a true majority rationale. Indeed, even the basic purpose of jurisdictional law—is it to ensure fairness to defendants or is it to prevent states from encroaching on other states?—has remained murky since the very beginning. And as *Mallory* makes clear, the Court’s confused and bi-furcated approach regarding the purpose of jurisdictional law can lead to very different outcomes in particular cases.⁸

Fundamentally, we need to recognize that we are living through a period of large-scale societal transition, requiring a shift in jurisdictional law. Just as the pure territorialist 19th century vision of jurisdiction espoused in *Pennoyer v. Neff*⁹ gave way to

* Walter S. Cox Professor of Law, The George Washington University Law School.

³ *Pennoyer v. Neff*, 95 U.S. (5 Otto) 714 (1877).

⁴ 326 U.S. 310 (1945).

⁵ *Mallory v. Norfolk S. Ry. Co.*, 600 U.S. 122 (2023); *Ford Motor Co. v. Mont. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 141 S. Ct. 1017 (2021); *Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Super. Ct. of Cal.*, 582 U.S. 255 (2017); *BNSF Ry. Co. v. Tyrrell*, 581 U.S. 402 (2017); *Daimler AG v. Bauman*, 571 U.S. 117 (2014); *Walden v. Fiore*, 571 U.S. 277 (2014); *J. McIntyre Mach., Ltd. v. Nicastro*, 564 U.S. 873 (2011).

⁶ *McIntyre*, 564 U.S. at 877; *Mallory*, 600 U.S. at 125.

⁷ 600 U.S. at 125.

⁸ *See id.* at 152–54 (Alito, J., concurring).

⁹ 95 U.S. (5 Otto) 714, 724–25 (1877).

the *International Shoe* “minimum contacts” test,¹⁰ so too “minimum contacts” has become an unsatisfying approach in a 21st century dominated by virtual social life, deterritorialized goods and effects, and the ability of both large industrialists and individuals to reach consumers anywhere anytime. In such a world, “contacts” with a territorially-based entity does not capture the reality of the underlying transaction. Indeed, although the U.S. Supreme Court has not directly addressed a jurisdiction case involving only Internet-based interaction, the Court’s oral arguments¹¹ and even opinions¹² in this area frequently invoke hypotheticals regarding online activity, with the justices recognizing that the Internet poses distinctly difficult problems that hover in the background of every jurisdiction case the Court faces.

But instead of shying away from online interaction or treating it as an unsolvable conundrum to be addressed in some other future case, the Court needs a new framework that will allow it to tackle the reality of the 21st century and the way in which social life and commercial activity actually operate. Doing so requires jettisoning the relentless focus of personal jurisdiction law on factors such as convenience of the parties or contacts with a territorially based location.

Instead, this Article proposes a distinct framework for analyzing jurisdiction cases, one based on community affiliation. The real question underlying jurisdiction, I argue, is whether a legal dispute sufficiently implicates a community such that it is appropriate for that community to assert dominion over the dispute without unduly encroaching on the sovereignty of other states. And while the answer to that question is surely not always beyond dispute, it at least focuses attention on the core issues that should determine a jurisdictional inquiry.

In contrast, our current jurisdictional regime has long been tethered to the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.¹³ This has meant that the focus has not been on the connection between the case and the community, but on fairness to the defendant. In the 19th century, such an emphasis was perhaps justifiable. It did indeed feel unfair for a defendant to be sued far away from home when traveling to the jurisdiction might involve considerable expense and take days or weeks. And even corporations were generally local businesses with limited scope, scale, and resources.

But due process is an unhelpful rubric today, when travel is relatively inexpensive and easy, when online communications allow for depositions and even trials to be conducted from a distance, and when it is not at all difficult for corporations to hire local counsel in any state in the union and defend suits there. Indeed, the very idea that personal jurisdiction is really any more about the fairness of forcing a defendant to travel to a far-off jurisdiction is laughable. After all, when large corporations challenge

¹⁰ 326 U.S. 310 (1945).

¹¹ See e.g., Transcript of Oral Argument at 39, *Ford Motor Co. v. Mont. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 141 S. Ct. 1017 (2021) (No. 19-368).

¹² See, e.g., *J. McIntyre Mach., Ltd. v. Nicastro*, 564 U.S. 873, 892 (Breyer, J., concurring) (2011); *Ford Motor*, 141 S. Ct. at 1028 n.4 (discussing whether an individual living in Maine who carves and sells small wooden duck decoys over the Internet could be sued in any state if harm arises from the decoy).

¹³ See *Pennoyer*, 95 U.S. at 733.

personal jurisdiction, they are almost never doing so because it is truly inconvenient or burdensome for them to defend a suit there. Rather, they are contesting whether it is appropriate for that community to exercise dominion over them or apply its community norms to their activities. Those are difficult questions, to be sure. But at least they are the right questions to be asking.

The emphasis on due process also leads to another conceptual difficulty. If jurisdiction is an individual right, then it can be waived just like almost every other individual right. And we do allow parties to waive their right to contest jurisdiction.¹⁴ Indeed, under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, if a party does not contest jurisdiction in its first filing it will be deemed to have waived jurisdiction automatically.¹⁵

But treating jurisdiction as a waivable due process right opens up two problems. First, plaintiffs with no connection to a community may travel there and bring suit despite their lack of connection.¹⁶ Second, potential defendants can be forced to waive personal jurisdiction in advance by any state that aggressively requires such a waiver as the price of traveling to or doing business in the state.¹⁷ Both sorts of waiver open the door to lawsuits to proceed even if they have minimal or no connection to a community. In contrast, an approach focused on community affiliation and sovereignty asks the right questions: what is the connection between the dispute and the state, and will a state's exercise of regulatory power unduly infringe upon the prerogatives of other states or upon interstate commerce more generally? Indeed, it is significant that Justice Alito, writing separately in *Mallory*, suggested that the Dormant Commerce Clause¹⁸ might be the better analytical framework for jurisdiction questions, rather than the Due Process Clause.¹⁹

In addition, the US Supreme Court has also encountered difficulties because it has mistakenly embraced an unduly categorical distinction between so-called general (or all-purpose) jurisdiction and specific (or case-linked) jurisdiction. In truth, there is not a clear dividing line between these categories; it is far more helpful to think of them along a continuum. The more interaction a party has with a given community, the more affiliated that party is with the community and therefore the more justifiable it is that a party could sue or be sued in that community, even if the topic of the particular suit is less related to the community. Conversely, a party with only one interaction with a community might still be able to sue or be sued in that community if the one interaction is precisely what the suit is about. Thus, the amount of interaction with a community and the degree to which the lawsuit is related to that interaction operate along a spectrum.

¹⁴ See *Adam v. Saenger*, 303 U.S. 59, 67–68 (1938).

¹⁵ Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(1)(B).

¹⁶ See, e.g., *Keeton v. Hustler Mag., Inc.*, 465 U.S. 770, 779 (1984) (observing that personal jurisdiction is appropriate even when the plaintiff's contacts with the forum state are “entirely lacking.”).

¹⁷ See *Mallory v. Norfolk S. Ry. Co.*, 600 U.S. 122, 130, 139 (2023); *Nat'l Equip. Rental, Ltd. v. Szukhent*, 375 U.S. 311, 315 (1964); *Wuchter v. Pizzutti*, 276 U.S. 13, 18–19 (1928).

¹⁸ *Mallory*, 600 U.S. at 150 (Alito, J., concurring).

¹⁹ *Id.* at 156–57.

Instead, the Court has cleaved a wedge into the continuum and attempted to create a fixed category known as General Jurisdiction, under which a party can be sued in a single state about any activity anywhere in the country, and perhaps anywhere in the world.²⁰ This is potentially too broad. But conversely, once a lawsuit is deemed to invoke only the fixed category known as Specific Jurisdiction, then jurisdiction fails if the lawsuit is deemed “unrelated” to the contacts, even if the community affiliation is massive.²¹ This has led to legal decisions denying jurisdiction over companies that conduct millions of dollars worth of business in a state.²² Viewing degree of community affiliation and extent of relatedness between the affiliations and the lawsuit as a continuum helps avoid these distortions.

In short, the US Supreme Court has placed itself in a series of unsatisfying conceptual boxes of its own making. But the world no longer fits those boxes, if it ever did. This article, therefore, aims to chart a path towards a more conceptually satisfying rubric for personal jurisdiction. This approach has the following principles at its core:

- Personal jurisdiction should not be based on physical contacts with a territory, but on affiliation with a community. This is especially important in a world where physical location is sometimes difficult (or impossible) to pinpoint and sometimes largely irrelevant to the reality of the underlying transaction being analyzed. In addition, it means that the effects of activities can sometimes provide a plausible basis for the assertion of jurisdiction, even without a territorial nexus.
- The relevant inquiry for personal jurisdiction is the degree to which a community can legitimately exercise dominion over a lawsuit rather than whether the exercise of jurisdiction is unfair to the defendant or whether a party (plaintiff or defendant) has waived a personal jurisdiction defense. This also means that online terms of service or other contracts of adhesion that purport to limit jurisdiction based on waiver or consent should not be determinative.
- The community affiliations of both the plaintiffs and the defendants should be relevant to the personal jurisdiction inquiry.
- Trying to serve a market is a more relevant jurisdictional hook than targeting a territory. Thus, a company seeking to sell or distribute a product nationwide should be deemed to have affiliated with any community where that product is sold, regardless of whether or not the company has targeted a particular state.
- The location of online servers or data and the place of incorporation of a corporation may sometimes be relevant to the jurisdictional calculus, but should not be determinative, given that such factors often are arbitrary,

²⁰ Ford Motor Co. v. Mont. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct., 141 S. Ct. 1017, 1024 (2021).

²¹ See Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Sup. Ct. of Cal., 582 U.S. 255, 259–264 (2017) (holding that California did not have specific jurisdiction over Bristol-Myers Squibb even though Bristol-Myers Squibb sold almost 187 million pills there, because the pills involved in the lawsuit were not bought, sold, or ingested in, California).

²² See *id.* at 259.

manipulable, and divorced from the substantive connections that should be the focus of the jurisdictional inquiry.

- The size, sophistication, and economic breadth of an actor is relevant to the jurisdictional inquiry. This is particularly important in an online environment where it is not only large corporations that can cause impacts from far away.

My argument in favor of these principles proceeds in four Parts. Part One focuses on the problem of territoriality as the basis for jurisdiction, emphasizing the various ways in which a territorialist approach fails to capture the reality of 21st century social life and commercial activity. Part Two examines the U.S. Supreme Court’s conceptual confusion about the purpose of jurisdictional doctrine and argues for an approach based on the connection between the case and the community rather than the due process rights of defendants. Part Three traces the development of the Supreme Court’s general v. specific jurisdiction dichotomy and argues for a less categorical approach. Finally, Part Four sets forth a set of principles that should guide the future of jurisdiction. And while these principles do not “solve” all difficult jurisdictional issues, they do provide a more coherent analytical framework for courts as they wrestle with jurisdictional conundrums in the 21st century.

I. Jurisdiction and the Deterritorialization of Social Life

Legal jurisdiction is more than a set of technical rules about where a lawsuit can be brought. Rather, the assertion of jurisdiction is fundamentally the mechanism by which a community attempts to assert dominion over an act or actor. As such, jurisdictional rules inevitably reflect social conceptions of space, place, distance, and the tie between community definition and physical geography.

Accordingly, it is not at all surprising that the jurisdictional rules of 19th century America would have been strongly based on a territorialist conception of community power. As historian Robert Wiebe has famously observed, “America during the nineteenth century was a society of island communities.”²³ With weak communication and limited interaction, these “islands” felt widely dispersed, and it is not surprising that local autonomy became “[t]he heart of American democracy.”²⁴ Even though France had long since developed a centralized public administration, Wiebe argues that Americans still could not even conceive of a distant managerial government. In such a climate, geographical loyalties tended to inhibit connections with a whole society. “Partisanship . . . grew out of lives narrowly circumscribed by a community or neighborhood. For those who considered the next town or the next city block alien territory, such refined, deeply felt loyalties served both as a defense against outsiders and as a means of identification within.”²⁵

²³ ROBERT H. WIEBE, *THE SEARCH FOR ORDER: 1877-1920*, at xiii (1967).

²⁴ *Id.*

²⁵ *Id.* at 27.

As the nineteenth century progressed, massive socioeconomic changes brought an onslaught of seemingly “alien” presences into these island communities. Immigrants were the most obvious group of outsiders, but perhaps just as frightening was the emergence of powerful distant forces such as insurance companies, major manufacturers, railroads, and the national government itself. Significantly, these threats appear to have been conceived largely in spatial terms. According to Wiebe, Americans responded by reaffirming community self-determination and preserving old ways and values from “outside” invasion.²⁶

Given such a social context, it is to be expected that jurisdictional rules of the period might emphasize state territorial boundaries. Indeed, it is likely that the burdens of litigating in another state far exceeded simply the time and expense of travel, substantial as those burdens were. Just as important was the *psychic* burden of being forced to defend oneself in a foreign state, which may have felt little different from the idea of defending oneself in a foreign country. An 1874 Pennsylvania state court decision illustrates the idea of this psychic burden.²⁷ In the case, a resident of New York had contested jurisdiction in Pennsylvania. The court acknowledged that the Pennsylvania courthouse was only “a few hours’ travel by railroad” from New York, but nevertheless ruled that the defendant could not be sued personally, in part because “nothing can be more unjust than to drag a man thousands of miles, perhaps from a distant state, and in effect compel him to appear.”²⁸ The court disregarded the relatively slight literal burden in the case at hand, and instead focused on the specter of being “dragged” to a “distant state” located “thousands of miles” away. Indeed, the decision explicitly equated other states with foreign countries, referring to a “defendant living in a remote state or foreign country . . . [who] becomes subject to the jurisdiction of this, to him, foreign tribunal.”²⁹ These passages indicate that the psychic significance of defending oneself in another state was at least as important as the literal difficulties of travel.

It was against this backdrop that the U.S. Supreme Court decided *Pennoyer v. Neff*,³⁰ the case that first established the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment³¹ as the constitutional basis for jurisdictional rights. In *Pennoyer*, the Court adopted a rigidly territorialist understanding of jurisdiction: states possess complete jurisdictional power over anyone or anything physically located within their borders, but no jurisdictional power over anything beyond.³² In crafting this approach, the Court drew from public international law principles of nation-state sovereignty. Referencing Joseph

²⁶ *Id.* at 52–58. For a fictional account of this period that gives texture to this description, see WILLA CATHER, *MY ÁNTONIA* (Houghton Mifflin Co. 1926) (1918).

²⁷ See Coleman’s Appeal, 75 Pa. 441 (1874).

²⁸ *Id.* at 457.

²⁹ *Id.*

³⁰ 95 U.S. (5 Otto) 714 (1877).

³¹ *Id.* at 733.

³² See *id.* at 722–24.

Story's treatise on international conflicts of law, the *Pennoyer* Court stated categorically that "every State possesses exclusive jurisdiction and sovereignty over persons and property within its territory... [but] no State can exercise direct jurisdiction and authority over persons or property without its territory."³³

In the succeeding decades, both the literal and psychic burdens associated with out-of-state litigation changed as a result of the urban industrial revolution at the turn of the twentieth century, a revolution that profoundly altered American social space. Increasingly, economic and governmental activities were administered from afar by impersonal managers at centralized locations. In such a world, another state was likely to be viewed less as a foreign country and more as yet another distant power center, just one of many "anonymous, bureaucratic, regulatory bodies in an increasingly complex society."³⁴

In addition, advances in transportation and communications helped to weaken territoriality as the central category in which Americans understood their space. "As long as daily lives were focused to a large extent on the local, a state boundary symbolized the edge of the world and everything outside that boundary was alien and foreign."³⁵ With increased mobility, however, Americans regularly crossed state boundaries by train, by car, and later by airplane, which inevitably diminished the sense that other places were alien. The rise of radio and television meant that events in other states could become a regular part of one's daily consciousness. "Physical distance as a social barrier began to be bypassed through the shortening of communication 'distance.'"³⁶ These communication and transportation advances reinforced the functional interdependence that began to characterize the United States in the first half of the twentieth century. As a result, people came to be regularly affected by people, institutions, and events located far away.

In this altered social space, the call to defend a lawsuit in the courts of another state remained an imposition, but the burdens were no longer perceived in stark territorial terms. Thus, it is not surprising that, although courts continued to use *Pennoyer*'s territorial framework, they repeatedly created legal fictions to respond to these social changes and provide mechanisms for states to assert jurisdiction over physically absent defendants.³⁷

These responses took two principal forms. First, courts developed the idea of corporate presence. Given that *Pennoyer* had said that presence in a state was sufficient

³³ *Id.* at 722.

³⁴ Terry S. Kogan, *Geography and Due Process: The Social Meaning of Adjudicative Jurisdiction*, 22 RUTGERS L.J. 627, 651 (1991) (citations omitted).

³⁵ *Id.* at 652.

³⁶ JOSHUA MEYROWITZ, NO SENSE OF PLACE: THE IMPACT OF ELECTRONIC MEDIA ON SOCIAL BEHAVIOR 116 (1985).

³⁷ See Philip B. Kurland, *The Supreme Court, the Due Process Clause and the In Personam Jurisdiction of State Courts, From Pennoyer to Denckla: A Review*, 25 U. CHI. L. REV. 569, 585-86 (1958) (describing the difficulty in applying *Pennoyer*'s principles to a world facing changes in economic activity, means of transportation, and communication).

for jurisdiction, judges faced with increasingly nationalized corporate activity determined that doing business in a given state could be sufficient to make corporations *constructively* present there, even if the corporation's headquarters or place of incorporation were elsewhere. Thus, a series of cases emerged where the jurisdictional calculus was based on whether the corporation did enough business in a state to be deemed present there.³⁸

Simultaneously, courts also expanded the idea of consent, which the *Pennoyer* Court had suggested, in dicta, could be a valid basis for the assertion of jurisdiction.³⁹ Indeed, the U.S. Supreme Court explicitly blessed the consent approach in the 1917 case of *Pennsylvania Fire Insurance Co. of Philadelphia v. Gold Issue Mining & Milling Co.*,⁴⁰ where the Court found that a Missouri statute requiring foreign insurance companies to acquire a license to do business in Missouri and submit to jurisdiction in Missouri was enforceable even absent actual presence in the state.⁴¹ Six years later, the Court went further and ruled that even without actual consent a defendant could be deemed to have *implicitly* consented to a state's exercise of jurisdiction, at least so long as the suit involved activity in the state. In *Hess v. Pawloski*, a Massachusetts law stated that by driving in the state, out-of-state citizens automatically consented to the appointment of the Massachusetts registrar of motor vehicles as their agent for any suit involving the motor vehicle.⁴² The Court upheld the use of such statutes, despite the fact that no actual consent was involved.⁴³

Thus, by 1940, the seemingly restrictive territorial approach of *Pennoyer* had been expanded considerably. Courts used the legal fictions of corporate presence and implied consent to create more scope for a state's exercise of jurisdiction over out-of-state defendants. And instead of a test based on mere territorial presence in the state, the inquiry under these legal fictions had shifted to the more fundamental question of whether the defendant had sufficient connections to the state asserting jurisdiction or whether the particular lawsuit concerned activity that had occurred in the state.

The stage was therefore set for the Supreme Court's watershed opinion in *International Shoe Co. v. Washington*,⁴⁴ which sought to do away with the post-*Pennoyer* fictions altogether. Instead, Justice Stone's opinion made clear that the strict territorialist framework for jurisdiction was no longer workable in the 20th century, a century now dominated by both national corporate activity and expanded transportation and communication technologies.⁴⁵ Given that people and states were more likely to be

³⁸ See, e.g., *St. Louis Sw. Ry. Co. of Tex. v. Alexander*, 227 U.S. 218, 226 (1913) (citing cases); *Pa. Lumberman's Mut. Fire. Ins. Co. v. Meyer*, 197 U.S. 407, 413–15 (1905); *Conn. Mut. Life Ins. Co. v. Spratley*, 172 U.S. 602, 610 (1899); *St. Clair v. Cox*, 106 U.S. (16 Otto) 350, 355 (1882).

³⁹ See 95 U.S. (5 Otto) 714, 733 (1877).

⁴⁰ 243 U.S. 93 (1917).

⁴¹ *Id.* at 95.

⁴² 274 U.S. 352 (1927).

⁴³ *Id.* at 356–57.

⁴⁴ 326 U.S. 310 (1945).

affected by distant acts or actors, the Court constructed a new, more flexible, framework for analyzing jurisdiction, one focused on contacts with a state rather than territorial presence there. In the Court's famous formulation, states were no longer constrained only to assert jurisdiction over actors within their territorial borders. Instead, the defendant need only have sufficient "minimum contacts with the forum such that the assertion of jurisdiction satisfied traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice."⁴⁶

Although the flexibility of the *International Shoe* test is perhaps its greatest virtue, the "minimum contacts" inquiry is nevertheless sufficiently vague that the U.S. Supreme Court has been called upon again and again since 1945 to try to apply the test to various new contexts. And significantly, those new situations often reflected changes in technology, the expanded scope of corporate activity, the increasing use of global supply chains, and so on. Thus far, the Court has continued to use *International Shoe* as the touchstone for jurisdictional analysis, but the sheer number of jurisdiction cases reaching the Court, the conceptual confusion evidenced at oral argument in these cases, and the inability of the Court to reach consensus on how to apply that test to various specific factual scenarios together suggest that *International Shoe*, like *Pennoyer* before it, is under pressure and may have become outmoded.

To some degree, these conceptual difficulties pre-date the Internet. For example, in the 1980 case of *Asahi Metal Industry Co., Ltd. v. Superior Court of California*,⁴⁷ the justices were faced with the reality of global supply chains and the so-called "stream of commerce" problem. An allegedly defective valve was manufactured in one country, incorporated into a tire in another country, and then was shipped with a motorcycle to the United States, where it allegedly caused harm in California. In such circumstances, did the valve manufacturer have sufficient "minimum contacts" with California to be sued there? On the one hand, the valve manufacturer did not have any direct contacts with either California specifically or the United States generally. But on the other, if the valve manufacturer did indirectly derive substantial revenue from those motorcycle sales in the United States as a regular component of its business model, and if the valve caused harm in the United States, shouldn't a U.S. plaintiff be able to sue the manufacturer at home? The justices could not muster a majority for either of these two positions. Ultimately, the Court was able to leave this difficult question undecided because as it happened the U.S. plaintiff in the case had already settled, and so the remaining lawsuit was only between the foreign tire manufacturer and the foreign valve manufacturer.⁴⁸ Accordingly, all the justices agreed that there was no reason for that particular suit to be heard in a U.S. court.⁴⁹ But the core question of how to deal with harms caused through the cross-border "stream of commerce" remained unresolved.

⁴⁵ See *id.* at 316–17.

⁴⁶ *Id.* at 316 (internal quotation marks and citation omitted).

⁴⁷ 480 U.S. 102 (1987).

⁴⁸ *Id.* at 106.

⁴⁹ See *id.* at 105, 114.

Fast forward to 2012, when the U.S. Supreme Court faced another stream of commerce case. In *J. McIntyre Machinery, Ltd. v. Nicastro*,⁵⁰ a UK manufacturer selling through a distributor in the United States sold a machine in New Jersey that allegedly caused harm there. At least two factors made this a stronger case for jurisdiction than in *Asahi*. First, the New Jersey plaintiff was still in the case. Second, the UK manufacturer deliberately intended to sell throughout the United States and even used a US distributor to do so.

Nevertheless, the U.S. Supreme Court again ruled that the foreign corporation could not be subjected to jurisdiction. And again, there was no majority rationale. Justice Kennedy, writing for a four-justice plurality, determined that there was no jurisdiction in New Jersey because, although the company had deliberately attempted to sell in the United States as a whole, it had not specifically targeted New Jersey sufficient to indicate that it had subjected itself to the sovereignty of that particular state.⁵¹ In contrast, the three dissenting justices contended that targeting the United States as a whole was sufficient to subject a large multinational industrialist to jurisdiction in any state where its product was sold.⁵²

The controlling concurrence by Justice Breyer, joined by Justice Alito, explicitly wrestled with the difficulty of applying the minimum contacts test in an era of global supply chains and Internet sales. Breyer rejected the plurality's focus on whether the defendant "inten[ded] to submit to the power of the sovereign."⁵³ Instead, the concurrence reasonably asked:

But what do those standards mean when a company targets the world by selling products from its Web site? And does it matter if, instead of shipping the products directly, a company consigns the products through an intermediary (say, Amazon.com) who then receives and fulfills the orders? And what if the company markets its products through popup advertisements that it knows will be viewed in a forum?⁵⁴

At the same time, however, Breyer and Alito were not prepared to potentially allow for jurisdiction in all fifty states over any foreign defendant that targets the United States as a whole, especially given that in this case only one of defendant's product had actually been sold in New Jersey. Again, Breyer expressed concern about categorical rules, given the variety of types of sales possible in the new Internet era:

[M]anufacturers come in many shapes and sizes. It may be fundamentally unfair to require a small Egyptian shirt maker, a Brazilian manufacturing cooperative, or a Kenyan coffee farmer, selling its products through international distributors, to respond to products-liability tort suits in virtually every State in the United States,

⁵⁰ 564 U.S. 873 (2011).

⁵¹ *Id.* at 885–86.

⁵² *Id.* at 905–06 (Ginsburg, J., dissenting).

⁵³ *Id.* at 882 (plurality opinion).

⁵⁴ *Id.* at 890 (Breyer, J., concurring).

even those in respect to which the foreign firm has no connection at all but the sale of a single (allegedly defective) good.⁵⁵

McIntyre is not the only U.S. Supreme Court case in which the specter of Internet-based contacts have hovered in the background. In *Walden v. Fiore*, the Court explicitly took pains to avoid speaking to the question of online contacts, noting that the “case does not present the very different questions whether and how a defendant's virtual ‘presence’ and conduct translate into ‘contacts’ with a particular State.”⁵⁶ And in *Ford Motor Co. v. Montana Eighth Judicial Court*, both the majority⁵⁷ and one of the concurring opinions⁵⁸ went out of their way to discuss a hypothetical presented by Chief Justice Roberts at oral argument involving Internet-based sales. Chief Justice Roberts posited a “retired guy in a small town” in Maine who “carves decoys” for ducks and uses “a site on the Internet” to sell them.⁵⁹ Chief Justice Roberts asked: “Can he be sued in any state if some harm arises from the decoy?”⁶⁰ As in *Walden*, the majority distinguished the case before it and therefore seemed pleased to kick the Internet-contacts can down the road to a future case.⁶¹ Meanwhile, Justice Gorsuch in concurrence, joined by Justice Thomas, used the Internet sales hypothetical as a reason for eschewing the *International Shoe* test altogether and perhaps returning to the *Pennoyer* framework.⁶² According to Gorsuch, “today, even an individual retiree carving wooden decoys in Maine can ‘purposefully avail’ himself of the chance to do business across the continent after drawing online orders to his e-Bay ‘store’ thanks to Internet advertising with global reach.”⁶³

Thus, it seems clear that the globalization of business and the rise of online commercial activity is at the very least complicating the jurisdictional inquiry. There are six principal reasons that online interaction destabilizes jurisdictional regimes that have historically been based either on physical presence in a territory (*Pennoyer*) or on contacts with a territory (*International Shoe*).

First, it is now far easier for an individual or corporation in one physical location to affect people in a different physical location, even without direct physical contacts with a territory. As a thought experiment, one can imagine an “effects map,” in which one identifies a territorial locality and plots on a map every action that has an effect on that locality.⁶⁴ Five hundred years ago, such effects would almost surely have been

⁵⁵ *Id.* at 892.

⁵⁶ 571 U.S. 277, 290 n. 9 (2014).

⁵⁷ 141 S. Ct. 1017, 1028 n.4 (2021).

⁵⁸ *Id.* at 1035 (Gorsuch, J., concurring in the judgment).

⁵⁹ Transcript of Oral Argument at 39, *Ford Motor Co. v. Mont. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 141 S. Ct. 1017 (2021) (No. 19-368).

⁶⁰ *Id.*

⁶¹ *Ford Motor*, 141 S. Ct at 1028 n.4.

⁶² *Id.* at 1038–39 (Gorsuch, J., concurring in the judgment).

⁶³ *Id.* at 1038.

⁶⁴ David G. Post, *Against “Against Cyberanarchy”*, 17 BERKELEY TECH. L.J. 1365, 1381–83 (2002) (articulating this thought experiment).

clustered around the territory, with perhaps some additional effects located in a particular distant imperial location. One hundred years ago, those effects might have begun spreading out. But today, while locality is surely not irrelevant, the effects would likely be diffused over many corporate, governmental, and technological centers.

Second, because of the ease of interaction at a distance, an individual or small corporation can now have a broad reach without also having the resources usually associated with large national or multinational firms. It is worth noting that in 1945, International Shoe was one of the largest corporations in America,⁶⁵ and underlying the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in that case was surely the assumption that any company capable of having such a large footprint in a distant state probably was also a company with sufficient resources to litigate in that state.⁶⁶ In short, geographical scope could function as a rough proxy for size and resources. That equivalence no longer holds. Now, a lone artisan selling out of a garage through Amazon or Etsy or eBay can have a global reach without having much (or any) institutional support. This difference complicates the jurisdictional calculus along with the idea of what constitutes a "burden" on a defendant.

Third, it is difficult to assign various online transactions to a particular physical location. Where is a website? Where is a social media post? Where is an email message? Where does a Zoom call take place? Where is an AI algorithm located? Obviously, the law could develop ways of answering those questions, but are those answers likely to be satisfying? For example, we could focus on where the data underlying these transactions is stored. But the territorial location of data is often arbitrary and substantively unimportant. If I, as a United States citizen based in Maryland, have a g-mail account, and Google, a U.S. corporation, decides to store my archived e-mails in Ireland or France or Indonesia (or indeed to split up the data fragments that make up each e-mail message among data warehouses in all three countries), that decision seems irrelevant to any question of whether I have somehow affiliated myself with any of those communities or governments for purposes of jurisdictional analysis.

Fourth, as the g-mail example makes clear, even if we can somehow territorialize these deterritorialized transactions, the result is likely to be both arbitrary and easily manipulable. For example, if jurisdiction depends on where a company locates its servers, then the company has carte blanche to choose its place of jurisdiction simply by deciding where to place its servers, even though the server location may have nothing to do with the transactions the company is undertaking. In addition, to the extent data is stored by third parties in the data warehouses that collectively make up what we colloquially refer to as the "cloud," the decision about the data's location may be made by a totally separate entity from the one actually engaging in the transaction. In either case, trying to localize these transactions can result in deliberately manipulated or nonsensical outcomes.

⁶⁵ Richard A. Rochlin, *Cyberspace, International Shoe, and the Changing Context for Personal Jurisdiction*, 32 CONN. L. REV. 653, 665–66 (2000).

⁶⁶ See *id.* at 667.

Fifth, to the extent the due process inquiry revolves around the presumed burden on the defendant, that inquiry is radically destabilized in a world of online interaction. As noted above, the presumption that a company with a global reach must be a large company with plenty of resources is no longer true. But it is also the case that depositions, and even trials, can be held over Zoom, document discovery has been largely automated, and lawyers can do almost all of their work without being in the physical jurisdiction where a case is pending (so long as they nominally affiliate with local counsel, which is itself an archaic vestige of an earlier era). Thus, it is difficult to say that a defendant is truly burdened by defending a lawsuit in a distant state. And while there may still be reasons that defendants should not be subject to jurisdiction everywhere, those reasons are more productively expressed based on principles other than the purported burden on the defendant to litigate far from “home.”

Finally, what all of these complexities reflect is that on a fundamental level physical location and physical distance are simply not as significant to our social identity as they once were. Indeed, the radical shift to online interaction fundamentally reshapes the relationship of people to their geography.⁶⁷ As Joshua Meyrowitz observed nearly forty years ago, electronic media create “a nearly total dissociation of physical place and social ‘place’” because “where we are physically no longer determines where and who we are socially.”⁶⁸ Meyrowitz pointed out that, historically, communication and travel were synonymous, and it was not until the invention of the telegraph that text messages could move more quickly than a messenger could carry them.⁶⁹ Thus, “informational

⁶⁷ Some have conceptualized this shift as a change in the way we experience and represent space and time. See, e.g., ANTHONY GIDDENS, *THE CONSEQUENCES OF MODERNITY* 64 (1990) (describing the problem of today’s higher level “time-space distanciation” which has stretched local and distant social forms); JOHN TOMLINSON, *GLOBALIZATION AND CULTURE* 4–5 (1999) (describing the way airline journeys transform “spatial experience into temporal experience”). In that regard, it is interesting to link this change to shifts in the arts. For example, in visual arts, Friedland and Boden have observed that the fall of the linear perspective of early Renaissance painting occurred along with the rediscovery of Euclidean geometry and the emergence of spatial representation, such as maps. Roger Friedland & Deirdre Boden, *NowHere: An Introduction to Space, Time and Modernity*, in *NOWHERE: SPACE, TIME AND MODERNITY* 1, 2 (Roger Friedland & Deirdre Boden eds., 1994) (citing Denis Cosgrove, *Prospect, Perspective, and the Evolution of the Landscape Idea*, in *10 TRANSACTIONS OF THE INSTITUTE OF BRITISH GEOGRAPHERS* 45, 46–48 (1985)). In the late nineteenth century, the impressionists “fragmented light (and thus time).” Friedland, *supra*, at 1–2. Then, postimpressionists such as Cézanne built “a new language, abandoning linear and aerial perspective and making spatial dispositions arise from the modulations of color.” *Id.* at 2 (citing CHARLES TAYLOR, *SOURCES OF THE SELF: THE MAKING OF THE MODERN IDENTITY* 468 (1989)). The cubists went still further, “providing simultaneous images of the same moment from different points in space and multiple views of a single scene at various points in time.” Friedland, *supra*, at 2; see also Stephen Kern, *Cubism, Camouflage, Silence, and Democracy: A Phenomenological Approach*, in *NOWHERE: SPACE, TIME AND MODERNITY*, *supra*, at 163, 167 (describing how artists such as “Picasso and Braque gave space the same colors, texture and substantiality as material objects and made objects and space interpenetrate so as to be almost indistinguishable”). Likewise, the development of the modern novel—with books such as MARCEL PROUST, *REMEMBRANCE OF THINGS PAST* (C.K. Scott Moncrieff & Terence Kilmartin trans., 1954); JAMES JOYCE, *FINNEGANS WAKE* (1939); and VIRGINIA WOOLF, *MRS. DALLOWAY* (1925)—also mined changes in the equation between space and time.

⁶⁸JOSHUA MEYROWITZ, *NO SENSE OF PLACE: THE IMPACT OF ELECTRONIC MEDIA ON SOCIAL BEHAVIOR* 115 (1985).

⁶⁹See *id.* at 116 (describing the impact of telegraphic technology).

differences between different places began to erode.”⁷⁰ Obviously, that process of deterritorialization has accelerated in the four decades since Meyrowitz wrote. For better or worse, our sources of information, our online communities, our cultural influences, and even our health risks are all increasingly divorced from physical location.

So, how should law respond to these tectonic shifts in social life? At least since 1995, scholars focused on internet jurisdictional issues have fallen into two camps. On one side are the cyberspace “unexceptionalists,” who argue in various contexts that the online medium does not significantly alter the legal framework to be applied.⁷¹ On the other, cyberspace “exceptionalists” argue that the medium itself creates radically new problems that require new analytical work to be done.⁷²

With regard to jurisdiction in particular, the exceptionalists argue that the rise of online interaction requires new rules for legal jurisdiction by upsetting old assumptions about the general tie between legal effects and territorial location. In response, unexceptionalists insist that online activity creates no fundamentally new legal problem and that “well-settled” principles in existing jurisdictional doctrines are adequate to address any issues to be resolved.⁷³

The problem with the unexceptionalist position, however, at least with regard to jurisdiction, is that it assumes that there actually *are* well-settled “general” principles of law that can simply be applied to new legal settings without alteration. And yet it is the nature of law that it changes over time, particularly in common law systems. Thus, what is “well-settled” for one generation (or in one century) is apt to be very different from what is well-settled for the next. Even more importantly, new technologies that alter the culture are precisely the sorts of changes that tend to result in shifts to well-settled legal principles.⁷⁴

Indeed, as discussed above, in the nineteenth century “well-settled” U.S. legal principles saw jurisdiction as rooted almost exclusively in the territorial power of the sovereign.⁷⁵ Each sovereign was deemed to have jurisdiction, exclusive of all other

⁷⁰*Id.*

⁷¹ E.g., Jack L. Goldsmith, *The Internet and the Abiding Significance of Territorial Sovereignty*, 5 IND. J. GLOBAL LEGAL STUDIES 475 (1998); Allan R. Stein, *The Unexceptional Problem of Jurisdiction in Cyberspace*, 32 INT’L LAW. 1167 (1998). More recently, a similar position has been taken by Andrew Woods. See, e.g., Andrew K. Woods, *Against Data Exceptionalism*, 68 Stan. L. Rev. 729 (2016).

⁷² E.g., David R. Johnson & David G. Post, *Law and Borders: The Rise of Law in Cyberspace*, 48 STAN. L. REV. 1367 (1996); Post, *supra* note 62; Dan L. Burk, *Federalism in Cyberspace*, 28 U. CONN. L. REV. 1095 (1996). More recently, a similar position has been taken by Jennifer Daskal. See, e.g., Jennifer C. Daskal, *Data’s Difference*, 71 VAND. L. REV. 179 (2018); Jennifer C. Daskal, *The Un-Territoriality of Data*, 125 YALE L.J. 326 (2015). For a discussion of the connections between the older and newer versions of these debates, see Paul Schiff Berman, *Legal Jurisdiction and the Deterritorialization of Data*, 71 VAND. L. REV. EN BANC 11, 13-20 (2018), <https://perma.cc/78ZY-8LYJ>.

⁷³ See Jack L. Goldsmith, *Against Cyberanarchy*, 65 U. CHI. L. REV. 1199 (1998).

⁷⁴ These cultural shifts are discussed in more detail in PAUL SCHIFF BERMAN, *GLOBAL LEGAL PLURALISM: A JURISPRUDENCE OF LAW BEYOND BORDERS* (2012).

⁷⁵ See, e.g., *Pennoyer v. Neff*, 95 U.S. 714 (1877).

sovereigns, to bind persons and things present within its territorial boundaries. By the early twentieth century, growth of interstate commerce, transportation, and cross-border corporate activity put pressure on the idea that a state's judicial power extended only to its territorial boundary. In particular, the invention of the automobile and the development of the modern corporation meant that far-away entities could inflict harm within a state without actually being present there at the time of a lawsuit. Not surprisingly, by the end of the twentieth century, it had become "well-settled" in U.S. jurisdiction jurisprudence that a state may at least sometimes assert jurisdiction over a defendant if the effects of the defendant's activities are felt within the state's borders, even if the defendant had not literally set foot there.⁷⁶ And, of course, these new "well-settled" rules felt as commonsensical and obvious to most judges, lawyers, and observers as the more territorialist view felt in the nineteenth century.

Now, it seems safe to say that jurisdictional rules are in flux again, at least in part because of online interaction. Indeed, as discussed above, the idea of basing jurisdiction on where effects are felt is difficult to apply to online interaction because our social lives are increasingly spread out in many different locations, anywhere our data is stored, used, or viewed, and we are potentially affected by activity taking place anywhere, without regard to physical territory.

The answers that law will ultimately evolve to address these sorts of problems are difficult to predict, and scholars and judges will no doubt have differing approaches to specific questions of jurisdiction regarding online interaction, virtual worlds, data storage, digital currencies, autonomous entities, and the like. Suffice to say that however one resolves the issues, "well-settled" principles of law are unlikely to be very helpful because such principles are themselves always in flux, often precisely because of the pressures placed on such principles by new communications technologies such as the Internet and new ways in which social lives become deterritorialized. Thus, in some sense, a pure unexceptionalist position is difficult to maintain. But if unexceptionalists relied too much on the application of mythical well-settled principles, the exceptionalists, at times, tended to the opposite extreme, assuming that the rise of online interaction, data storage and the like upend nearly all extant ideas about law and the role of the state. And indeed, it is true that so far courts have managed to use *International Shoe*—at least nominally—as the rubric for analyzing jurisdiction.

In the end, I think it is most accurate to say that we are at the very least in a period of change, when judges are still using the *International Shoe* formulation, even while recognizing that the test does not really reflect the changing social reality. Thus, just as in the period of legal fictions between *Pennoyer* and *International Shoe*, we are in an era of transition, and it may finally be time for the U.S. Supreme Court to articulate a new framework for analyzing jurisdiction that takes better account of the new reality.

II. Grounding Jurisdictional Rules in the Dormant Commerce Clause Rather than the Due Process Clause

⁷⁶ See, e.g., *International Shoe v. Washington*, 326 U.S. 310 (1945).

While the increasing deterritorialization of social life poses perhaps the greatest challenge to current jurisdiction doctrine, it is not the only source of conceptual confusion. An added complication is the fact that the U.S. Supreme Court’s personal jurisdiction doctrine has repeatedly vacillated between two different concerns: (1) protecting the due process rights of litigants, and (2) addressing issues of interstate federalism and protecting the sovereignty of states.⁷⁷ In the nineteenth century, these two concerns often were indistinguishable from each other, as states were conceptualized as akin to separate countries. Thus, states not only had very separate sovereign interests, but travel from one to the other was also difficult, both psychically and logistically. But over the course of the twentieth and now twenty-first centuries, these two rationales have diverged, creating difficulties for modern jurisdiction jurisprudence. This Part surveys this history and argues that the U.S. Supreme Court’s current due process framework for jurisdiction is increasingly unsatisfying. Indeed, the key issue in most contemporary jurisdictional debates is no longer the burden on the defendant but the core question of whether a community has sufficient connection to a dispute that it is appropriate for that community to assert dominion and impose its norms on an out-of-state defendant. This inquiry is far more akin to the Court’s jurisprudence surrounding the “Dormant” Commerce Clause⁷⁸ than it is to due process.

As discussed in Part I,⁷⁹ *Pennoyer v. Neff*⁸⁰ established for the first time that the entire jurisdictional inquiry was grounded in the Fourteenth Amendment’s Due Process Clause.⁸¹ Yet, the Court’s jurisprudence on personal jurisdiction contained a paradox right from the beginning, because the core justification for limits on personal jurisdiction articulated by the *Pennoyer* Court was not principally focused on ideas about fairness to the parties, but instead about the essential attributes of state sovereignty. Indeed, as noted above,⁸² the *Pennoyer* Court closely tracked Justice Story’s treatise that built conflicts of law theory from conceptions of nation-state sovereignty. Quoting Story, the Court emphasized:

⁷⁷ Writing for a plurality, Justice Gorsuch acknowledged, “Some of our personal jurisdiction cases have discussed the federalism implications of one State’s assertion of jurisdiction over the corporate residents of another. But that neglects an important part of the story. . . . After all, personal jurisdiction is a personal defense . . .” *Mallory v. Norfolk S. Ry. Co.*, 600 U.S. 122, 144 (2023) (plurality op.). Justice Jackson, in a concurring opinion wrote, “the interstate federalism concerns informing that right are ‘ultimately a function of the individual liberty interest’ that this due process right preserves.” *Mallory*, 600 U.S. at 147 (Jackson, J., concurring) (citations omitted).

⁷⁸ Deriving from Chief Justice Marshall’s opinion in *Gibbons v. Ogden*, 22 U.S. (9 Wheat.) 1 (1824), the U.S. Supreme Court’s dormant Commerce Clause jurisprudence rests on the notion that the grant of power to Congress to regulate interstate commerce in Article I section 8 necessarily implies that the states *cannot* regulate interstate commerce. See *Tenn. Wine & Spirits Retailers Ass’n v. Thomas*, 139 S. Ct. 2449, 2459-60 (2018) (tracing the dormant Commerce Clause’s roots to *Gibbons*).

⁷⁹ See *supra* text accompanying notes 28-29.

⁸⁰ 95 U.S. 714 (1878).

⁸¹ *Id.* at 733.

⁸² See *supra* text accompanying note 31.

The several States are of equal dignity and authority, and the independence of one implies the exclusion of power from all others. And so it is laid down by jurists as an elementary principle that the laws of one State have no operation outside of its territory except so far as is allowed by comity, and that no tribunal established by it can extend its process beyond that territory so as to subject either persons or property to its decisions. “Any exertion of authority of this sort beyond this limit,” says Story, “is a mere nullity, and incapable of binding such persons or property in any other tribunals.” Story, *Confl.Laws*, sect. 539.⁸³

Yet, contrary to the idea that jurisdiction involved core limitations on a state’s power to encroach upon the sovereignty of another state, the *Pennoyer* Court also stated that, consistent with the idea of an individual right, that right could always be waived.⁸⁴ Moreover, according to the Court, a state could even go so far as to *require* an individual doing business in a state to appoint an agent there and effectively waive a jurisdiction defense,⁸⁵ regardless of how much that might encroach on the sovereignty of other states.

This tension between an individual right and a state sovereignty principle came to the fore in subsequent cases applying *Pennoyer*. As discussed in Part I,⁸⁶ in the succeeding decades courts used the due process rationale to allow states to assert jurisdiction based on expanded conceptions of consent. The U.S. Supreme Court allowed states to condition the operation of a business in the state on consent to jurisdiction and even allowed states to assert jurisdiction based on the idea that defendants had implicitly consented to jurisdiction even without knowledge that they had done so.⁸⁷

Nevertheless, in at least one case, *Davis v. Farmers Coop. Equity Co.*, the Court made clear that this consent idea did *not* extend to cases where the transaction at issue was *unrelated* to the state asserting jurisdiction, regardless of consent.⁸⁸ And significantly, the Court based its decision in *Davis* solely on the Commerce Clause, without considering the Due Process Clause at all.⁸⁹

⁸³ *Pennoyer*, 95 U.S. at 722-23.

⁸⁴ See *id.* at 735-36 (“It is not contrary to natural justice that a man who has agreed to receive a particular mode of notification of legal proceedings should be bound by a judgment in which that particular mode of notification has been followed, even though he may not have actual notice of them.” (internal quotation omitted)).

⁸⁵ *Id.* at 735 (“Neither do we mean to assert that a State may not require a nonresident entering into a partnership or association within its limits, or making contracts enforceable there, to appoint an agent or representative in the State to receive service of process and notice in legal proceedings instituted with respect to such partnership, association, or contracts, or to designate a place where such service may be made and notice given, and provide, upon their failure, to make such appointment or to designate such place that service may be made upon a public officer designated for that purpose, or in some other prescribed way, and that judgments rendered upon such service may not be binding upon the nonresidents both within and without the State.”).

⁸⁶ See *supra*, text accompanying notes 37-41.

⁸⁷ See *Hess v. Pawloski*, 274 U.S. 352 (1927).

⁸⁸ *Davis v. Farmers Coop. Equity Co.*, 262 U.S. 312, 317 (1923) (deciding there was no personal jurisdiction in Minnesota over a Kansas railroad who had submitted to suit by statute in Minnesota when the transaction giving rise to the suit was entirely in Kansas).

In the 1940 jurisdiction case of *Milliken v. Meyer*,⁹⁰ however, the Court returned to the Due Process Clause and more explicitly connected jurisdiction to an inquiry focused on fairness to the defendant. Here, the Court considered whether service at the in-state domicile of a defendant temporarily absent from the state was sufficient to establish jurisdiction. The Court concluded that as long as the service is “reasonably calculated to give [the defendant] actual notice,” it is sufficient to create jurisdiction because “the traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice implicit in due process are satisfied.”⁹¹ *Milliken* therefore anticipated the fairness approach of *International Shoe* just a few years later.

Although the *International Shoe* Court rightly recognized the need to replace the fictions of expanded presence and consent with a new paradigm for assessing jurisdiction, the decision unfortunately continued *Milliken*’s focus on the Due Process Clause rather than the Commerce Clause. Indeed, the famous formulation of the *International Shoe* test emphasizes that it is the due process requirement alone that requires a defendant “not present within the territory of the forum . . . to have certain minimum contacts with [the forum] such that the maintenance of the suit does not offend ‘traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.’”⁹² And of course the idea of “traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice,” taken from *Milliken*, suggests that the inquiry is about fairness to the defendant more than it is about the sovereignty of states. The Court further indicated that “[a]n ‘estimate of the inconveniences’” to the defendant was relevant to the analysis,⁹³ further cementing that the new jurisdictional test would emphasize the burden on the defendant.

In the decades following *International Shoe*, the Court vacillated again between a due process conception of jurisdiction and one based more on federalism concerns. In *McGee v. International Life Insurance Co.*,⁹⁴ the Court clearly read *International Shoe* as an invitation to use the Due Process Clause to increase a state’s jurisdictional reach in order to respond to the increasing cross-border nature of business activities. According to the Court,

a trend is clearly discernible toward expanding the permissible scope of state jurisdiction over foreign corporations and other nonresidents. In part this is attributable to the fundamental transformation of our national economy over the years. Today many commercial transactions touch two or more States and may involve parties separated by the full continent. With this increasing nationalization of commerce has come a great increase in the amount of business conducted by mail across state lines. At the same time modern transportation and

⁸⁹ *Id.* at 318.

⁹⁰ 311 U.S. 457 (1940).

⁹¹ *Id.* at 463 (citations omitted).

⁹² *International Shoe v. Washington*, 326 U.S. 310, 316 (1945) (quoting *Milliken*, 311 U.S. at 463).

⁹³ *Id.* at 324.

⁹⁴ 355 U.S. 220 (1957).

communication have made it much less burdensome for a party sued to defend himself in a State where he engages in economic activity.⁹⁵

Thus, *McGee* focused on the burden to the defendant, consistent with a due process approach, but observed that the burdens on a corporate defendant were far less than in an earlier era.

The due process approach has also meant that consent is almost always sufficient to justify the assertion of jurisdiction over *plaintiffs*, regardless of whether or not the plaintiff has any connection to the forum. For example, in *Keeton v. Hustler Magazine*,⁹⁶ the Court of Appeals had ruled that New Hampshire could not exercise jurisdiction over the suit because the plaintiff had no ties to New Hampshire and therefore the state had insufficient interest in the suit.⁹⁷ This ruling reflected an approach that focused on the community affiliation between the state and the suit. The U.S. Supreme Court, however, appeared to reject that approach, transforming it into one that focused only on the defendant, not the plaintiff's ties (or lack of ties) to the state. Thus, the Court stated, "We agree that the 'fairness' of haling respondent into a New Hampshire court depends to some extent on whether *respondent's* activities relating to New Hampshire are such as to give that State a legitimate interest in holding respondent answerable on a claim related to those activities."⁹⁸ But of course the appeals court had based its judgment about lack of state interest *not* on the activities of Hustler Magazine, the respondent, but on *Keeton's* lack of ties to the forum.

In this sleight of hand, the Court sidestepped even a discussion of whether a plaintiff's lack of ties to a forum should be relevant. And subsequently, courts have tended to assume that a plaintiff is automatically subject to jurisdiction because by filing a suit in a state the plaintiff has voluntarily waived any jurisdictional objection.⁹⁹ Likewise, a defendant who chooses to show up to defend a suit is deemed to have waived jurisdictional objections, regardless of that defendant's ties or lack of ties to the state.¹⁰⁰ And the Court has likewise generally viewed any type of contractual consent to be sufficient to support jurisdiction.¹⁰¹ Such voluntary waiver and contractually based

⁹⁵ *Id.* at 222–23.

⁹⁶ 465 U.S. 770 (1984).

⁹⁷ *Keeton v. Hustler Mag., Inc.*, 682 F.2d 33, 35–36 (1st Cir. 1982), *rev'd and remanded*, 465 U.S. 770 (1984).

⁹⁸ *Keeton*, 465 U.S. at 775-76 (emphasis added).

⁹⁹ See, e.g., *Adam v. Saenger*, 303 U.S. 59, 67–68 (1938) ("The plaintiff having, by his voluntary act in demanding justice from the defendant, submitted himself to the jurisdiction of the court, there is nothing arbitrary or unreasonable in treating him as being there for all purposes for which justice to the defendant requires his presence. It is the price which the state may exact as the condition of opening its courts to the plaintiff."); *Grupke v. Linda Lori Sportswear, Inc.*, 174 F.R.D. 15, 17 (E.D.N.Y. 1997) ("In the vast majority of cases a plaintiff, by virtue of bringing suit, waives venue and personal jurisdiction objections to a defendant's counterclaims.") (citing *Adam v. Saenger*, 303 U.S. 59, 58 (1938)); *Viron Int'l Corp. v. David Boland, Inc.*, 237 F. Supp. 2d 812, 818 (W.D. Mich. 2002) ("A court may lack personal jurisdiction over a defendant, but never over a plaintiff, who consents to such jurisdiction by filing suit.").

¹⁰⁰ Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(1)(B).

consent are only possible, of course, if jurisdiction is conceptualized as an individual due process right.

Nevertheless, since *McGee*, outside of the waiver/consent context, the U.S. Supreme Court has mostly been pulling back from *McGee*'s expansive reading of the *International Shoe* framework. Indeed, although the minimum contacts test was almost certainly intended to provide a more robust basis for plaintiffs to assert jurisdiction over out-of-state defendants, the test has more often been used since *McGee* to deny plaintiffs jurisdiction. And interestingly the language of state sovereignty has crept back in to the Court's opinions, often to justify refusing jurisdiction.

For example, in *Hanson v. Denckla*,¹⁰² the Court called personal jurisdiction "more than a guarantee of immunity from inconvenient or distant litigation," and instead seemed to view jurisdiction as "a consequence of territorial limitations on the power of the respective States."¹⁰³ Therefore, "however minimal the burden of defending in a foreign tribunal" the defendant bank was not deemed subject to jurisdiction in the state where its customer had died.¹⁰⁴ Likewise, in *World Wide Volkswagen v. Woodson*,¹⁰⁵ the Court denied the state of Oklahoma jurisdiction over a New York car dealer and regional distributor because Oklahoma, where the car exploded, was not a state where those defendants sold or distributed cars. Even though it was entirely foreseeable that a car sold in New York could be driven to Oklahoma, and even though there was no burden on these defendants because the manufacturer of the automobile almost certainly would have taken the laboring oar in the litigation, the Court ruled that jurisdiction was improper. And though the Court reiterated that the *International Shoe* test "protects the defendant against the burdens of litigating in a distant or inconvenient forum,"¹⁰⁶ it also emphasized that the test "acts to ensure that the States, through their courts, do not reach out beyond the limits imposed on them by their status as coequal sovereigns in a federal system."¹⁰⁷ Thus, although the burden on these defendants was minimal, the Court determined that defendants could not be sued in a state where those defendants conducted no business at all if their only contact with the state was the consumer's unilateral decision to bring the product there.

Turning to the 21st century, the Court remains divided and uncertain regarding the rationale underlying the jurisdictional analysis. As discussed in Part I, the Court could not muster a majority rationale in the 2011 case of *J. McIntyre Machinery v. Nicastro*.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰¹ See, e.g., *Nat'l Equip. Rental v. Szukhent*, 376 U.S. 311, 314(1964), *Carnival Cruise Lines, Inc. v. Shute*, 499 U.S. 585, 595 (1991); see also *Corp. of Ir. v. Compagnie des Bauxites de Guinee*, 456 U.S. 694, 703 (1982).

¹⁰² 357 U.S. 235 (1958).

¹⁰³ *Id.* at 251.

¹⁰⁴ *Id.*

¹⁰⁵ 444 U.S. 286 (1980).

¹⁰⁶ *Id.* at 292

¹⁰⁷ *Id.*

¹⁰⁸ 564 U.S. 873, 878 (2011).

Writing for four Justices, Justice Kennedy took a position far closer to a sovereignty rationale than one based on due process:

Freeform notions of fundamental fairness divorced from traditional practice cannot transform a judgment rendered in the absence of authority into law. As a general rule, the sovereign’s exercise of power requires some act by which the defendant purposefully avail itself of the privilege of conducting activities within the forum State, thus invoking the benefits and protections of its laws.¹⁰⁹

Kennedy’s vision of jurisdiction seems to require some explicit invocation of the sovereign power of a state before jurisdiction is appropriate, regardless of the burden on the defendant (or lack of it) and regardless, it seems, of how many products manufactured by McIntyre had actually been sold in the state or how much revenue McIntyre had derived from those sales. In contrast, Justice Ginsburg’s dissent, joined by Justices Sotomayor and Kagan, argued that “there should be no genuine debate” that “the constitutional limits on a state court’s adjudicatory authority derive from considerations of due process not state sovereignty.”¹¹⁰ And, focusing on due process considerations alone, she concluded that a large industrialist seeking to sell throughout the United States should be subject to jurisdiction wherever the product ended up being sold.

In 2021, the Supreme Court explicitly acknowledged the duality at the heart of its jurisdiction jurisprudence. Writing for the Court in *Ford Motor Co. v. Montana Eighth Judicial District Court*, Justice Kagan forthrightly proclaimed that jurisdictional “rules derive from and reflect two sets of values—treating defendants fairly and protecting ‘interstate federalism.’”¹¹¹ She acknowledged that, alongside the due process interests of defendants is a separate set of interests: “those of the States in relation to each other.”¹¹² Thus, because “[o]ne State’s ‘sovereign power to try’ a suit...may prevent ‘sister States’ from exercising their like authority, jurisdictional principles seek ‘to ensure that States with ‘little legitimate interest’ in a suit do not encroach on States more affected by the controversy.”¹¹³

Finally, we come to the Court’s fractured opinion in *Mallory*.¹¹⁴ Here, the question was whether Pennsylvania could assert jurisdiction over an out-of-state defendant in a suit concerning activity unrelated to Pennsylvania based solely on the fact that the defendant had consented to jurisdiction as a condition of doing business there.¹¹⁵ Reaching back to pre-*International Shoe* caselaw, five justices agreed that jurisdiction, because it is based in due process, is waivable and that the defendant therefore, could be forced to consent to jurisdiction, even regarding unrelated suits.¹¹⁶ As Justice Jackson

¹⁰⁹ *Id.* at 880 (internal quotation marks omitted).

¹¹⁰ *Id.* at 899.

¹¹¹ *Ford Motor Co. v. Montana Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 141 S. Ct. 1017, 1025 (2021) (quoting *World-Wide Volkswagen Corp. v. Woodson*, 444 U. S. 286, 293 (1980)).

¹¹² *Ford Motor Co.*, 141 S. Ct. at 1025.

¹¹³ *Id.*

¹¹⁴ *Mallory v. Norfolk S. Ry. Co.*, 600 U.S. 122 (2023).

¹¹⁵ *Id.* at 127–28.

emphasized in concurrence, “the due process requirement of personal jurisdiction is an individual, waivable right” and therefore any subsidiary “interstate federalism concerns informing that right” do not constitute an independent constraint on the assertion of jurisdiction.¹¹⁷ Instead, she argued that those sovereignty concerns are “ultimately a function of the individual liberty interest’ that this due process right preserves.”¹¹⁸

Four justices dissented, arguing that allowing this sort of blanket waiver of jurisdiction, even over conduct unrelated to the state, would effectively eviscerate all limits on the assertion of jurisdiction.¹¹⁹ Thus, states that would not have jurisdiction under *International Shoe* and its progeny could simply manufacture jurisdiction through a broad consent statute.

Justice Alito concurred only in part.¹²⁰ He provided the fifth vote for the idea that the defendant’s due process right was waivable,¹²¹ but he argued that the assertion of jurisdiction should independently be analyzed under the dormant Commerce Clause.¹²² Citing *Davis* (a case ignored by the majority),¹²³ Alito suggested that Pennsylvania should not be able to assert jurisdiction over an out-of-state corporation regarding an out-of-state dispute, despite the fact that the company had, in theory, consented to Pennsylvania jurisdiction as a condition of doing business there.¹²⁴ According to Alito, for Pennsylvania to assert jurisdiction in such circumstances would be a form of extraterritorial regulation that might violate the sovereignty of other states in violation of the Commerce Clause.¹²⁵

It should be clear even from this brief survey that whatever the relative merits of any given decision based on any given set of facts, there is a fundamental confusion lying at the heart of U.S. jurisdictional law. Indeed, the U.S. Supreme Court has embraced diverging justifications for jurisdictional doctrine over time, and as the fractured opinions in *Mallory* suggest, one’s perspective on the constitutional basis for jurisdictional rules can result in different outcomes.

Yet, due process is an increasingly anachronistic framework for understanding the nature and purpose of jurisdictional rules. As discussed above,¹²⁶ the burdens of distant

¹¹⁶ *Id.* at 144.

¹¹⁷ *Id.* at 147 (Jackson, J., concurring) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted).

¹¹⁸ *Id.* (Jackson, J., concurring) (quoting *Insurance Corp. of Ireland v. Compagnie des Bauxites de Guinee*, 456 U.S. 694, 703 n.10 (1982)).

¹¹⁹ *Id.* at 178-89 (Barrett, J., dissenting).

¹²⁰ *Id.* at 149-63 (Alito, J., concurring in part).

¹²¹ *Id.* at 144 (Alito, J., concurring in part).

¹²² *Id.* at 157-63 (Alito, J., concurring in part).

¹²³ *Davis v. Farmers Coop. Equity Co.*, 262 U.S. 312 (1923); see *supra* text accompanying notes 85-86 (discussing *Davis*).

¹²⁴ *Mallory*, 600 U.S. at 159-61 (Alito, J., concurring in part).

¹²⁵ See *Id.*

¹²⁶ See *supra* Part I.

litigation are now far less than in a previous era, and defendants are rarely truly arguing about the burden of litigating when they raise jurisdictional defenses. Instead, the real question is whether the community asserting jurisdiction has a sufficient connection to the events underlying the lawsuit or to the litigants so as to justify exercising dominion over the dispute. Indeed, it is worth noting that European jurisdictional law has long been focused on the court's connection to a dispute rather than the rights of the defendant.¹²⁷

Significantly, the due process framework results in both overly broad and overly narrow assertions of jurisdiction. By conceiving of jurisdiction as a waivable right, the due process inquiry allows plaintiffs to bring suits in states with which they have no community affiliation. It also means that states can draft broad consent statutes that potentially subject defendants to suits about events that have no connection to the state at all. And contractual forum selection clauses, often embedded in contracts of adhesion or online terms of service,¹²⁸ can channel suits to states that have little connection to a dispute.¹²⁹ On the other hand, an approach emphasizing the burden on the defendant can result in the denial of jurisdiction over an absent defendant even when that defendant has caused significant harm in a community.

Justice Alito's approach in *Mallory* points towards a more fruitful alternative framework. If jurisdictional assertions must be analyzed under the U.S. Constitution, the dormant Commerce Clause at least focuses courts on the core questions underlying jurisdiction: Does this community have sufficient connections with the dispute to justify the assertion of dominion? Will a community's exercise of dominion unduly infringe on the ability of other communities to regulate? Will the assertion of jurisdiction result in intolerable inconsistent regulation for a defendant that operates in multiple states? Moreover, these questions open up the possibility that courts might use choice of law to mitigate concerns about broader assertions of jurisdiction. After all, a court asserting jurisdiction over an out-of-state actor could nevertheless apply the law of the defendant's home state in order to address potential dormant Commerce Clause problems.

¹²⁷ See, e.g., Gerlinde Berger-Walliser, *Reconciling Transnational Jurisdiction: A Comparative Approach to Personal Jurisdiction over Foreign Defendants in US Courts*, 51 VAND. J. OF TRANSNAT'L L. 1243, 1252-54 (2018) (describing the European approach to jurisdiction as based on whether the jurisdiction "has the authority to decide an international case, or whether the courts of another country are better suited to adjudicate").

¹²⁸ For a discussion of the problems of contracts of adhesion and online terms of service, see MARGARET JANE RADIN, *BOILERPLATE: THE FINE PRINT, VANISHING RIGHTS, AND THE RULE OF LAW* (2013).

¹²⁹ See, e.g., *Unionmutual Stock Life Ins. Co. v. Beneficial Life Ins. Co.*, 774 F.2d 524, 527 (1st Cir. 1985) (a court "need not decide whether Beneficial also had 'minimum contacts' with the [forum state] to justify the assertion of personal jurisdiction" when there's a valid forum selection clause); *H.H. Franchising Sys., Inc. v. Brooker-Gardner*, No. 14-CV-651, 2015 WL 4464774, at *3 (S.D. Ohio July 21, 2015) ("The presence of a valid and enforceable forum-selection clause obviates the need to conduct a due-process and minimum-contacts analysis because such a clause acts as consent to jurisdiction in the contracted-for forum."); *Koninklijke Philips Elecs. v. Digit. Works, Inc.*, 358 F. Supp. 2d 328, 333 (S.D.N.Y. 2005) ("A valid forum selection clause establishes sufficient contacts with New York for purposes of jurisdiction and venue.").

Using the dormant Commerce Clause to analyze jurisdiction is not a panacea, of course, and jurisdictional questions will still often be difficult and context-specific. But at least courts will be analyzing the actual core question of whether a community's assertion of jurisdiction is appropriate, rather than engaging with largely fictional arguments about the burden on defendants or ignoring the inquiry altogether by relying on consent (which itself is often not true consent) in order to dissolve jurisdictional questions. And as we will see in Part IV, a focus on community affiliation also allows courts to better approach issues of jurisdiction in the Internet era.

III. Conceptualizing General and Specific Jurisdiction as a Continuum

One final conceptual confusion surrounding jurisdiction must be addressed in order to begin to construct a 21st century approach. In analyzing jurisdiction, the U.S. Supreme Court has unfortunately adopted a categorical divide between what it sees as two distinct forms of jurisdiction. General, or all-purpose, jurisdiction involves a state's assertion of jurisdiction concerning a dispute unrelated to the defendant's connections to the state.¹³⁰ In contrast, specific, or case-linked, jurisdiction is when the suit is related to the defendant's contacts with the state.¹³¹ The problem is that the boundaries between these two categories have always been fuzzy, but by developing a completely different jurisdictional inquiry for each category, the Supreme Court has made the distinction between the two categories far more consequential than it should be. This, in turn, has led to unnecessarily contorted caselaw, as the general v. specific distinction has come to assume talismanic significance. This Part discusses the history of the distinction and argues against the Court's current categorical approach.

In many ways, *International Shoe v. Washington*¹³² was an easy case for jurisdiction. The International Shoe Corporation shipped shoes into Washington regularly and derived substantial ongoing revenue from customers there; its contacts with the state were what the Supreme Court described as "continuous and systematic."¹³³ In addition, the lawsuit at issue concerned unemployment insurance taxes the state wished to collect based on the salespeople that International Shoe employed in the state.¹³⁴ Thus, the case featured a company with a large *number* of contacts with the state asserting jurisdiction, and those contacts were directly *related* to the underlying lawsuit.

The obvious question left unresolved by *International Shoe*, therefore, was how to analyze jurisdiction in more difficult cases, when either (1) the number of contacts were fewer, or (2) the lawsuit was more tangential to those contacts.

McGee v. International Life Insurance Co.,¹³⁵ addressed the first of these

¹³⁰ *Goodyear Dunlop Tires Operations v. Brown*, 564 U.S. 915, 919 (2011).

¹³¹ *Id.*

¹³² 326 U.S. 310 (1945).

¹³³ *Id.* at 315, 317.

¹³⁴ *Id.* at 311–12.

¹³⁵ 335 U.S. 220 (1957).

questions. In *McGee* a Texas insurance company had only one insured in California, but the lawsuit concerned that particular insurance policy. The Supreme Court determined that even that one contact between the defendant and California was sufficient for California to assert jurisdiction because “the suit was based on a contract which had substantial connection with [the forum].”¹³⁶

Meanwhile, as to the second question, it is significant that the Court in *International Shoe* had left the door open for a contextual approach, noting that “there have been instances in which ... continuous corporate operations within a state were thought so substantial and of such a nature as to justify suit against it on causes of action arising from dealings entirely distinct from those activities.”¹³⁷ *Perkins v. Benguet Mining* continued in this same flexible vein.¹³⁸ The case involved a suit against a Philippines corporation based on activities in the Philippines, but the suit could not be brought there because of the Japanese occupation of the Philippines during World War II.¹³⁹ During that time, Benguet’s president kept an office in Ohio where he conducted basic business functions, such as sending correspondence, distributing salary checks, and supervising the company’s limited wartime functions.¹⁴⁰ The Court concluded that these contacts were sufficient to warrant jurisdiction over the company in Ohio, even though the dispute was unrelated to Ohio.¹⁴¹

World-Wide Volkswagen,¹⁴² discussed in Part I,¹⁴³ aptly demonstrates how the sheer number of contacts a defendant has with a state could be sufficient to justify jurisdiction. As discussed previously, the Supreme Court ruled that there was no jurisdiction in Oklahoma over the local New York car dealer and regional distributor of the allegedly defective car because they had no contacts with Oklahoma other than the fact that the consumer drove the car there.¹⁴⁴ But what about the car manufacturer, Audi, or the national importer, Volkswagen of America? Significantly, those two parties did not even contest personal jurisdiction in Oklahoma,¹⁴⁵ presumably because they believed they had no legitimate jurisdictional defense.¹⁴⁶ Why? Because it is highly likely that there were hundreds or thousands of Audi cars sold in Oklahoma and regularly driving on roads there. And though none of those cars sold in Oklahoma happened to be the precise car that crashed, the fact that the manufacturer and importer had so many contacts with

¹³⁶ *Id.* at 223.

¹³⁷ *Int’l Shoe Co.*, 326 U.S. at 318.

¹³⁸ *Perkins v. Benguet Mining Co.*, 342 U.S. 437 (1952).

¹³⁹ *Id.* at 439.

¹⁴⁰ *Id.*

¹⁴¹ *Id.* at 447.

¹⁴² 444 U.S. 286 (1979)

¹⁴³ See *supra* Part I.

¹⁴⁴ *World-Wide Volkswagen Corp.*, 444 U.S. at 295.

¹⁴⁵ See *Id.* at 288 (1980).

¹⁴⁶ Mary Twitchell, *The Myth of General Jurisdiction*, 101 HARV. L. REV. 610, 661 n.224 (1998).

Oklahoma was thought to be sufficient to subject them to jurisdiction in Oklahoma even regarding a car that had been sold outside the state. As the World-Wide Volkswagen Court noted in dicta, “[I]f the sale of a product of a manufacturer or distributor such as Audi or Volkswagen is not simply an isolated occurrence, but arises from the efforts of the manufacturer or distributor to serve, directly or indirectly, the market for its product in [several or all] other States, it is not unreasonable to subject it to suit in one of those States if its allegedly defective merchandise has there been the source of injury to its owner or to others.”¹⁴⁷

Thus, by the 1980s a rough continuum seemed to be emerging. The fewer contacts a defendant had with a state the more important it was that those contacts be directly related to the lawsuit (with *McGee* as the extreme case of just a single, highly-related contact). On the opposite end of the spectrum, the more contacts a defendant had with a state the less important it was that those contacts be related to the particular suit. Here, the extreme case would be a suit brought in the defendant’s state of citizenship, which might well justify jurisdiction over any suit, whether related to that state or not.

In a 1984 case, *Helicopteros*,¹⁴⁸ the Court for the first time explicitly named these two types of jurisdictional assertion, drawing on a law review article by Arthur T. von Mehren and Donald T. Trautman.¹⁴⁹ The Court stated that, “when a controversy is related to or ‘arises out of’ a defendant’s contacts with the forum . . . a ‘relationship among the defendant, the forum, and the litigation’ is the essential foundation of in personam jurisdiction.”¹⁵⁰ This, the Court, following von Mehren and Trautman, called specific jurisdiction.¹⁵¹ However, according to the Court, “Even when the cause of action does not arise out of or relate to the foreign corporations’ activities in the forum State, due process is not offended by a State’s subjecting the corporation to its in personam jurisdiction when there are sufficient contacts between the State and the foreign corporation.”¹⁵² This was general jurisdiction.

Simply naming the two categories of jurisdiction “general” and “specific” was not a problem, in and of itself, so long as it continued to be understood that these two types of jurisdiction operated along a spectrum from greater to fewer contacts and from more to less relatedness between those contacts and the underlying lawsuit. But perhaps inevitably, the categories hardened, narrowed, and became more formulaic.

¹⁴⁷ *World-Wide Volkswagen Corp.*, 444 U.S. at 297.

¹⁴⁸ 466 U.S. 408 (1984).

¹⁴⁹ *Id.* at 414 n.8 & 9 (citing von Mehren & Trautman, *Jurisdiction to Adjudicate: A Suggested Analysis*, 79 HARV. L. REV. 1121 (1966)).

¹⁵⁰ *Id.* at 414 (1984).

¹⁵¹ *Id.* at 414 n.8 (1984) (“It has been said that when a State exercises personal jurisdiction over a defendant in a suit arising out of or related to the defendant’s contacts with the forum, the State is exercising ‘specific jurisdiction’ over the defendant”).

¹⁵² *Id.* at 414. The Court cited von Mehren & Trautman for this definition. *Id.* at 414 n.5 (“When a State exercises personal jurisdiction over a defendant in a suit not arising out of or related to the defendant’s contacts with the forum, the State has been said to be exercising ‘general jurisdiction’ over the defendant”) (citing von Mehren & Trautman, *supra* note 145).

Thirty years after *Helicopteros*, in *Goodyear Dunlop Tires Operations v. Brown*,¹⁵³ the Court tightened the test for general jurisdiction. Instead of conceptualizing the relationship between the number and the relatedness of contacts as points on a continuum, the Court now stated more categorically that “[a] court may assert general jurisdiction over foreign ... corporations to hear any and all claims against them when their affiliations with the State are so ‘continuous and systematic’ as to render them essentially at home in the forum State.”¹⁵⁴ Further, the Court noted in a parenthetical that “domicile, place of incorporation, and principal place of business [are] ‘paradig[m]’ bases for the exercise of general jurisdiction.”¹⁵⁵ It is worth noting the linguistic sleight of hand here. The *International Shoe* court had referred to the general proposition that continuous and systematic activity could sometimes be sufficient to render a defendant subject to jurisdiction even over unrelated conduct.¹⁵⁶ But the *Goodyear* Court transformed that formulation into one that required not just continuous and systematic activity, but continuous and systematic activity such as to render the defendant “essentially at home.”¹⁵⁷

The full implications of this shift became clear in 2014, when the Court decided *Daimler AG v. Bauman*.¹⁵⁸ Here, the Court confirmed that in almost all circumstances general jurisdiction would be limited *only* to the defendant’s place of incorporation and principal place of business.¹⁵⁹ The Court referred to those locations as the places where the defendant was “essentially at home,”¹⁶⁰ likely adding the word “essentially” only so that it did not have to overrule *Perkins*.¹⁶¹ The Court reasoned that limiting general jurisdiction to two places would promote simplicity in jurisdictional rules and was easily ascertainable, while affording at least one forum where a plaintiff could bring any claim.¹⁶² Moreover, the Court made clear that “engag[ing] in a substantial, continuous, and systematic course of business” in a state would not on its own be enough to justify general jurisdiction over a claim unrelated to that state.¹⁶³ Subsequently, in *BNSF Railway Co. v. Tyrrell*,¹⁶⁴ the Court refused to allow a state to exercise general jurisdiction over an out-of-state rail corporation, despite the fact that the company maintained 2,000 miles of railway track in the state and employed more than 2,000 people there.¹⁶⁵

¹⁵³ 564 U.S. 915 (2011).

¹⁵⁴ *Id.* at 919.

¹⁵⁵ *Id.* at 924.

¹⁵⁶ *Int’l Shoe Co. v. Washington*, 326 U.S. 310, 318 (1945).

¹⁵⁷ *Goodyear*, 564 U.S. at 924.

¹⁵⁸ 571 U.S. 117 (2014).

¹⁵⁹ *Id.* at 137.

¹⁶⁰ *Id.* at 139.

¹⁶¹ *Perkins v. Benguet Mining Co.*, 342 U.S. 437, 447 (1952).

¹⁶² *Daimler AG*, 571 U.S. at 137.

¹⁶³ *Id.* at 138 (2014).

¹⁶⁴ 581 U.S. 402 (2017).

¹⁶⁵ *Id.* at 414.

These three cases together have created a sea-change in the U.S. Supreme Court’s approach to jurisdictional law. *International Shoe* seemed to establish an approach that viewed the relationship between contacts and relatedness along a continuum. But now the Court has created an artificially sharp border between cases involving related and unrelated contacts. As a result, many jurisdictional determinations will turn entirely on whether a lawsuit is deemed to be related or unrelated to contacts in a state, thereby landing the suit in the general jurisdiction or specific jurisdiction category.

The problem, of course, is that “relatedness” is often indeterminate and subject to definitional conundrums. And yet because of the Supreme Court’s unfortunate new taxonomy, defining a suit as “related” or “unrelated” to contacts in a state is often the only relevant question.

To see the consequences of the Court’s overly formalistic definition of general jurisdiction, one need only look to two recent cases. First, in *Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Superior Court of California*,¹⁶⁶ the U.S. Supreme Court analyzed a suit brought in California by 86 California residents and 592 residents from 33 other States against a large drug company.¹⁶⁷ The California court undisputedly asserted proper jurisdiction over the claims of the California residents, but with regard to the out-of-state residents, Bristol-Myers Squibb challenged jurisdiction.¹⁶⁸

At first blush, jurisdiction over the defendant in California concerning all the claims—by the California and the non-California residents alike—might seem eminently reasonable. Although Bristol-Myers Squibb is not a citizen of California, it is a very large company that had conducted a nationwide marketing and distribution campaign regarding Plavix, the particular drug at issue.¹⁶⁹ Moreover, it had worked with a California distributor to distribute the drug¹⁷⁰ and had distributed millions of Plavix pills in California and earned \$900 million from Plavix sales in the state.¹⁷¹ Finally, given that California’s jurisdiction over Bristol Myers-Squibb regarding the Plavix sales to the California residents was uncontested, the company could not credibly claim that it was in any way inconvenient or burdensome for it to litigate in California.¹⁷² At most, there might have been choice-of-law questions about the proper law for the California court to apply to the claims of the non-California residents, but that would not, in and of itself, defeat jurisdiction.

The California Supreme Court, however, could not invoke general jurisdiction over Bristol-Myers Squibb—regardless of the company’s extensive contacts with the

¹⁶⁶ 582 U.S. 255 (2017).

¹⁶⁷ *Id.* at 259.

¹⁶⁸ *Id.*

¹⁶⁹ *Id.*

¹⁷⁰ See *id.* at 268. (“The bare fact that BMS contracted with a California distributor is not enough to establish personal jurisdiction in the State.”).

¹⁷¹ See *id.* (“Between 2006 and 2012, [Bristol-Myers Squibb] sold almost 187 million Plavix pills in the State and took in more than \$900 million from those sales.”).

¹⁷² *Id.*

state—because of the U.S. Supreme Court precedents described above.¹⁷³ So, it instead tried to use a continuum approach as part of the specific jurisdiction inquiry regarding how related the contacts were to the lawsuit.¹⁷⁴ Under this approach, according to the court, “the more wide ranging the defendant's forum contacts, the more readily is shown a connection between the forum contacts and the claim.”¹⁷⁵ “Applying this test, the majority concluded that ‘BMS's extensive contacts with California’ permitted the exercise of specific jurisdiction ‘based on a less direct connection between BMS's forum activities and plaintiffs' claims than might otherwise be required.’”¹⁷⁶

The U.S. Supreme Court reversed.¹⁷⁷ The majority rejected the California court's sliding scale approach, calling it “a loose and spurious form of general jurisdiction,” rather than a proper specific jurisdiction analysis.¹⁷⁸ For specific jurisdiction, according to the opinion, there needed to be a more particularized link between the claim and the defendants' activities in California.¹⁷⁹ But in this case, “the nonresidents were not prescribed Plavix in California, did not purchase Plavix in California, did not ingest Plavix in California, and were not injured by Plavix in California.”¹⁸⁰ Accordingly, while the company's state of citizenship meant that there could be no assertion of general jurisdiction, the claims of non-California residents were deemed not to sufficiently relate to California to justify specific jurisdiction either.¹⁸¹

Regardless of whether or not one agrees with the outcome of this particular case, it makes clear that the U.S. Supreme Court's categorical bifurcation of the jurisdiction inquiry has put enormous pressure on the question of whether a claim is related or unrelated to the defendant's contacts with the state. Yet, as this case also makes clear, a lot turns on how one defines “relatedness.” After all, as the dissent pointed out, this was not a claim that Bristol-Myers Squibb had improperly maintained the sidewalk outside its corporate headquarters in New York, a claim that would clearly be unrelated to its activity in California.¹⁸² Instead, this case concerned a drug actively marketed and sold in California in large numbers. In such a case, whether the claim is sufficiently related to justify jurisdiction seems at least somewhat indeterminate; yet in the Court's categorical approach, it is the crux of the entire jurisdictional inquiry.

Not surprisingly, the outcome in *Bristol-Myers Squibb* encouraged further litigation regarding the question of relatedness. In *Ford Motor Co. v. Montana Eighth*

¹⁷³ See *supra* text accompanying notes 147–59.

¹⁷⁴ *Bristol-Myers Squibb Co.*, 582 U.S. at 260.

¹⁷⁵ *Id.* (quoting *Bristol-Myers Squibb v. Sup. Ct. of California*, 377 P.3d 874, 889 (2016)).

¹⁷⁶ *Id.* (quoting *Bristol-Myers Squibb*, 377 P.3d at 889).

¹⁷⁷ *Id.* at 269.

¹⁷⁸ *Id.* at 264.

¹⁷⁹ *Id.*

¹⁸⁰ *Id.*

¹⁸¹ *Id.* at 265.

¹⁸² *Id.* at 273 (Sotomayor J., dissenting).

Judicial District Court,¹⁸³ suits had been brought in two states concerning automobile crashes that occurred in-state.¹⁸⁴ But significantly, the allegedly defective cars that had crashed had not been bought in those states; they had been bought elsewhere and had been driven to the state prior to the crashes.¹⁸⁵ So, Ford tried to use *Bristol-Myers* to argue that, although *other* identical cars were sold in those states, the *particular* cars at issue were not.¹⁸⁶ According to Ford, just as the Plavix pills ingested by non-California residents were not sufficiently related to California, so too cars bought outside a state were not sufficiently related to that state.¹⁸⁷

The U.S. Supreme Court, however, was not willing to extend the logic of *Bristol-Myers Squibb* that far. In particular, these suits involved residents of the forum states, and the car crashes at issue took place in the forum states,¹⁸⁸ unlike the non-resident plaintiffs in *Bristol-Myers Squibb*.¹⁸⁹ Thus, the Court ruled that the suits were more connected with the states that were asserting jurisdiction. That determination is surely sensible, but note that it does not truly depend on the factors that are supposedly relevant to the Court's stated test for relatedness, which purports to look at the relatedness of the claim to the *defendant's* contacts in the state. But with regard to the defendant in *Ford Motor*, the Court's logic is less persuasive because the location of the accident and the residence of the plaintiffs are actually irrelevant to the defendant's contacts. In response to that concern, the Court recounted Ford's extensive contacts in the states at issue: its many dealerships, its advertising campaigns, and so on. But those facts don't really distinguish the case from *Bristol-Myers Squibb*, which likewise advertised Plavix and sold massive numbers of Plavix pills in the state. Perhaps not surprisingly, three of the eight justices who heard this case concurred only in the judgment, arguing that the majority's test for relatedness was too broad and might open the floodgates to more expansive assertions of jurisdiction all over again.¹⁹⁰

Meanwhile, the Court's dicta may also enable still other types of assertion of jurisdiction. In describing the scope of general jurisdiction, the Court stated that in suits brought in a defendant's state of citizenship, the "claims need not relate to the forum State or the defendant's activity there; they may concern events and conduct *anywhere in the world*."¹⁹¹ Such a statement seems to suggest that even purely local claims occurring abroad can nevertheless be brought in U.S. courts.

¹⁸³ 141 S. Ct. 1017 (2020).

¹⁸⁴ *Id.* at 1022.

¹⁸⁵ *Id.* at 1023.

¹⁸⁶ *Id.*

¹⁸⁷ *Id.*

¹⁸⁸ *Id.*

¹⁸⁹ *Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Superior Ct. of California*, 582 U.S. 255, 259 (2017).

¹⁹⁰ *Ford Motor Co.*, 141 S. Ct. at 1032 (Alito, J., concurring in the judgment); *id.* at 1034 (Gorsuch, J., concurring in the judgment).

¹⁹¹ *Id.* at 1024.

Thus, the U.S. Supreme Court's insistence on cleaving a sharp divide between general and specific jurisdiction has resulted in conceptual confusion regarding both how broadly general jurisdiction extends and what exactly makes a claim relate to the defendant's contacts for purposes of specific jurisdiction. But both confusions only arise because the Court has unwisely jettisoned the continuum approach by trying to adopt clear divisions between general and specific jurisdiction. Instead, the Court would be wise to simply say that the more contacts a defendant has with a state the less related the claim has to be. So, of course a suit brought in a defendant's home state, where defendant presumably has numerous contacts, would support jurisdiction over most claims (though perhaps not purely local issues occurring in other countries). Likewise, a suit brought in a state where a defendant has numerous contacts but is *not* a citizen might nevertheless be sufficiently related to justify jurisdiction, but the amount of relatedness could be less than in a case like *McGee*, where the defendant had only one customer in the state. In that sort of case, the suit would need to be very directly tied to the defendant's only contact.

This is not to say that every decision would be easy, and certainly various contextual factors would still matter. But at least judges would not tie themselves in knots trying to fit every lawsuit into only two boxes: general or specific. And, as we will see, such an approach will help courts focus less on counting contacts with a territorial entity and more on the question that really should guide all jurisdictional analysis: is there sufficient affiliation between the suit, the parties, and the community asserting jurisdiction.

IV A New Approach to Jurisdiction

How might we build an approach to jurisdiction that better reflects a world of online interaction and deterritorialized data? How can we build a vision that takes account of changing social reality without either starting from scratch and throwing out all extant jurisdictional principles on the one hand, or simply assuming current doctrine will suffice on the other? In short, how can we meld exceptionalist and unexceptionalist positions to develop workable provisional compromises to govern the ubiquitous virtual worlds of the twenty-first century?

As a true believer in common law case-by-case adjudication, I cannot provide a comprehensive code that anticipates all permutations of human activity and provides a single definitive answer. Indeed, one of the important lessons of conflicts of law, it seems to me, is that there is no single unifying grand theory that can provide an authoritative answer to every possible dilemma or account for the infinite variety of human activity that may arise. And even if we could, such a grand theory would instantly become obsolete as new advances in technology, science, communications, and transportation keep galloping on ahead of the lumbering efforts of law to catch up.

Thus, all I can offer is a set of provisional principles that might guide the future of jurisdiction. These principles, at most, provide a framework for analyzing the knotty jurisdictional problems that online interaction, deterritorialized data, and global supply chains create.

1. *Community affiliation is a more plausible basis for analyzing legal jurisdiction than contacts with a territorially based sovereign.*

A new concept has begun to creep into the Supreme Court’s jurisdiction lexicon: the idea of community affiliation. Prior to 2011, the language of community affiliation was rarely used. But in *Goodyear*, the Court for the first time defined both general and specific jurisdiction in terms of affiliation. According to the Court, general jurisdiction over defendants requires that they have “affiliations with the State” that are “so continuous and systematic as to render them essentially at home in the forum State,” whereas “specific jurisdiction requires an “affiliation between the forum and the underlying controversy.”¹⁹² That same year, in *McIntyre*, Justice Ginsburg’s dissent argued that “[a]djudicatory authority is appropriately exercised where actions by the defendant...give rise to the affiliation with the forum.”¹⁹³ Three years later, the Court in *Daimler* repeated the affiliation language from *Goodyear* and emphasized that under *Goodyear*, “only a limited set of affiliations with a forum” allow the forum state to exercise general jurisdiction.¹⁹⁴

In *Bristol-Myers Squibb*, the Court again emphasized affiliation, but this time focused not so much on the defendant’s affiliation with the forum, but on the need for “an affiliation between the forum and the underlying controversy.”¹⁹⁵ And in *Ford Motor*, the Court picked up on the affiliation language in *Goodyear*, *Daimler*, and *Bristol-Myers Squibb*, quoting each of these cases and four times referring to the idea of affiliation, before concluding that “each of the plaintiffs brought suit in the most natural State—based on an “affiliation between the forum and the underlying controversy.”¹⁹⁶

Finally, in *Mallory*, the Court added the word “community” into the mix, justifying the assertion of jurisdiction in Pennsylvania, based in part on the fact that the defendant had “proclaimed itself a proud part of the Pennsylvania Community.”¹⁹⁷

Although this new language may or may not signal an intentional shift in the Court’s views of jurisdiction, I believe the concept of community affiliation offers a preferable rubric for analyzing jurisdiction in a world where counting contacts with a physical territory is no longer a reliable metric.

Consider a website or a social media account. Such online presences are viewable in multiple jurisdictions. As such, they could potentially create harm in multiple jurisdictions. In the early days of the Internet, judges viewed websites as akin to 24-hour television commercials, continuously beaming into multiple communities in multiple physical locations.¹⁹⁸ That approach quickly proved unworkable because it would subject

¹⁹² *Goodyear*, 564 U.S. at 919 (internal quotation marks and citations omitted; emphasis added).

¹⁹³ *McIntyre*, 564 U.S. at 905 (Ginsburg, J., dissenting) (emphasis added).

¹⁹⁴ *Daimler AG*, 571 U.S. at 137 (emphasis added).

¹⁹⁵ *Bristol-Myers Squibb*, 582 U.S. at 262 (quoting *Goodyear*, 564 U.S. at 919).

¹⁹⁶ *Ford Motor Co.*, 141 S. Ct. at 1031.

¹⁹⁷ *Mallory*, 600 U.S. at 2043 (internal quotation marks and citation omitted).

anyone who posts anything online to potentially universal jurisdiction.

At the other extreme, one could say that jurisdiction is only appropriate in the physical location where the content creator uploads the content. This approach also has multiple difficulties. First, content posted in one location can create real harms elsewhere, and it is untenable for communities to be denied jurisdiction just because the defendant created the harm elsewhere. That would return us to the *Pennoyer* world where someone could cause harm in a state but avoid local jurisdiction by remaining physically outside the borders. Second, such an approach allows a potential defendant to manipulate jurisdiction based on where that defendant chooses to upload content. Third, what does it mean anyway to try to physically locate precisely where content is uploaded? Is it where the content creator is at the time the upload button is pressed? Is it the content creator's place of residence or place of business? Is it the location where the website or social media account is registered? Is it the location of the third-party company that hosts the website or runs the social media platform? Is it the location where the data that collectively constitute the content are stored?

Perhaps instead of focusing on the physical place where content is uploaded, we could construct an approach focused on the location of the viewers of the website or the followers of the social media account. That approach, however, starts moving back towards universal jurisdiction, particularly if one has many viewers/followers in multiple physical locations. It also means that a potential plaintiff can manufacture jurisdiction by encouraging just one (or a handful) of people in a state to view the online content. And again, is it enough that a viewer who is a resident of the state accesses the content, or must the viewer be physically located in the state at the time the content is accessed?

To some degree, all of these questions turn on what is at root level a nonsensical metaphysical question. Can we really effectively conceptualize online interaction either as if the content "enters" the homes of the viewers, or as if viewers "travel to" the website? The problem is that neither of these formulations captures the nature of the interaction, and yet because of our historic need to tie legal jurisdiction to physical territory, these sorts of spatial metaphors are the only ones we have.

In contrast, a community affiliation analysis asks a more fundamental question: does the community asserting dominion have sufficient connection to the parties or the dispute so as to justify that assertion? This can be difficult to answer, of course, but at least this analytical framework focuses on the question that should be at the heart of jurisdictional analysis.

Consider, for example, a Fourth Circuit case from 2002,¹⁹⁹ involving the ownership rights to the domain name *barcelona.com*. Joan Nogueras Cobo ("Nogueras"), a Spanish citizen, registered *barcelona.com* with the Virginia-based domain name registrar, Network Solutions.²⁰⁰ Subsequently, Nogueras formed a corporation under U.S.

¹⁹⁸ See, e.g., *Inset Systems, Inc. v. Instruction Set, Inc.*, 937 F. Supp 161 (D. Conn. 1996) (asserting jurisdiction over an out-of-state defendant based on the fact that its website was viewable in the forum state).

¹⁹⁹ *Barcelona.com, Inc. v. Excelentísimo Ayuntamiento de Barcelona*, 330 F.3d 617 (4th Cir. 2003).

²⁰⁰ *Id.* at 620.

law, called Bcom, Inc.²⁰¹ Despite the U.S. incorporation, however, the company had no offices, employees, or even a telephone listing in the United States.²⁰² Nogueras (and the Bcom servers) remained in Spain.²⁰³

The Barcelona City Council asserted that Nogueras had no right to use barcelona.com under Spanish trademark law and demanded that he transfer the domain name registration to the City Council.²⁰⁴ When Nogueras refused, the City Council filed a complaint with the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO).²⁰⁵ Several months later, the WIPO panelist ruled in favor of the City Council.²⁰⁶ Instead of transferring the domain name, however, Bcom filed suit in federal court, again in Virginia, seeking a declaratory judgment that the registration of barcelona.com was not unlawful.²⁰⁷

Should such a case be heard in Virginia under U.S. trademark law? I think not. After all, the dispute was fundamentally between a Spanish citizen and a Spanish city concerning the ownership of a domain name associated with that Spanish city. In such an instance, the assertion of jurisdiction by a Spanish court applying Spanish trademark law seems most appropriate given that Spain was the relevant community affiliation of the parties. In contrast, the registration of the domain name and the incorporation of Bcom in Virginia was a purely paper transaction, as the company had no offices, employees or activities related to the United States.

Likewise, consider *Young v. New Haven Advocate*.²⁰⁸ Two Connecticut newspapers featured stories about Connecticut prisoners who had been transferred to a prison in Virginia and then had been subjected to poor treatment there.²⁰⁹ The Virginia prison warden sued for defamation in Virginia.²¹⁰ Should the newspapers be subject to jurisdiction there? From a pure territorialist point-of-view, perhaps yes. After all, the article concerned a Virginia prison. If defamatory, the harm to the warden was largely to be felt in Virginia, and there were a handful of Virginia-based subscribers to the newspapers.²¹¹ In addition, the website with the article was certainly accessible in Virginia²¹² and was surely accessed in the state by at least a few people.

²⁰¹ *Id.*

²⁰² *Id.*

²⁰³ *Id.*

²⁰⁴ *Id.*

²⁰⁵ *Id.* at 621. Every domain name issued by Network Solutions is issued under a contract, the terms of which include a provision requiring resolution of disputes through the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) promulgated by the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers. *Id.* The WIPO complaint was filed in accordance with the terms of the UDRP. *Id.*

²⁰⁶ *Id.*

²⁰⁷ *See id.*

²⁰⁸ 315 F.3d 256 (4th Cir. 2002).

²⁰⁹ *Id.* at 259.

²¹⁰ *Id.*

²¹¹ *See id.* at 261-62.

The Fourth Circuit nevertheless appropriately ruled that the newspapers could not be sued in Virginia because the “content of the websites [was] decidedly local.”²¹³ According to the court, “these newspapers maintain their websites to serve local readers in Connecticut, to expand the reach of their papers within their local markets, and to provide their local markets with a place for classified ads. The websites are not designed to attract or serve a Virginia audience.”²¹⁴ And although the article was about the Virginia prison, it focused on the prison not as part of an article that was principally about Virginia prisons or even prison conditions nationally. Instead, the newspapers were focused on the fact that Connecticut prisoners had been transferred there.²¹⁵ Thus, the link to Connecticut was the relevant community affiliation.

In contrast, if a company *does* actively attempt to access a market, that should be sufficient evidence of community affiliation, regardless of whether or not the company has physical contacts with that state. So, for example, *The New York Times*, *Washington Post*, or *Wall Street Journal*, despite the geographic specificity of their names, are clearly attempting to be national (or international) companies serving a wide audience. Accordingly, jurisdiction over those publications regarding an article on Virginia prison conditions could justifiably be treated differently from the far more local Connecticut newspapers in the *Young* case.

Likewise, if an internet service provider, such as Yahoo or Microsoft or Google is making a sustained effort to access a commercial market as part of its global or national business strategy, the company is purposely affiliating itself with those markets, and regulation by those communities is justifiable, regardless of physical contacts. Of course, in a world of deterritorialized data and multinational corporate activities, it can be difficult to determine when a corporation has truly affiliated with a particular jurisdiction. But it seems odd if a desire to access a global market would allow a company to *avoid* jurisdiction in any particular jurisdiction just because no single jurisdiction was explicitly targeted.

Turning to physical goods, if a company chooses to seek access to the U.S. national market for goods, it is deliberately affiliating with all fifty states and should therefore potentially be subject to jurisdiction wherever its product is sold and causes harm, regardless of whether or not it targeted that state in particular. Thus, under a community affiliation approach the plurality opinion in *McIntyre v. Nicastro*²¹⁶ is unsupportable. According to the plurality, the UK corporation had not explicitly targeted New Jersey,²¹⁷ but as the dissent pointed out, the company was aiming to exploit a national market and so the fact that it wasn’t targeting any particular state should not deny the state a basis for asserting jurisdiction.²¹⁸ In the case of a product offered on an

²¹² See *id.*

²¹³ *Id.* at 263.

²¹⁴ *Id.*

²¹⁵ See *id.* at 263-64.

²¹⁶ 564 U.S. 873 (2011).

²¹⁷ See *id.* at 884 (plurality op.).

undifferentiated basis to a widespread set of markets it can be difficult to determine whether the product is truly being targeted anywhere, but that fact alone should not protect the company from jurisdictional assertions if its product causes harm within a particular community.

2. *The relevant inquiry for personal jurisdiction is the degree to which a community can legitimately exercise dominion over a lawsuit rather than whether the exercise of jurisdiction is an unfair burden on the defendant.*

Another benefit of a community affiliation analysis is that it would allow the U.S. Supreme Court to pivot from viewing jurisdiction as a question of due process to one focused on the dormant Commerce Clause. The analysis would therefore turn not on the burden placed on an out-of-state defendant, but on whether a community has sufficient ties to a dispute that it is competent to impose regulatory penalties on the defendant without unduly encroaching on the sovereignty of other states and without unduly interfering with interstate commerce.

As discussed earlier, the due process inquiry no longer captures the essence of the jurisdiction question. Indeed, it is rare that a defendant contests personal jurisdiction because defending a lawsuit is truly a burden. Transportation and communication technologies have advanced numerous times since *Pennoyer v. Neff* first grounded the jurisdictional inquiry in the Due Process Clause. As a result, the burdens of foreign litigation have dramatically decreased, and yet judges continue to recite the fictional idea that they are assessing the “burden” a defendant faces from the assertion of jurisdiction in another state.

Of course, a person or corporation operating solely in one state might still object to being sued in some other state with which they are unaffiliated. One need only look at the abortion landscape of the United States since the U.S. Supreme Court’s cataclysmic decision in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women’s Health Organization*²¹⁹ to see that, for example, doctors performing an abortion in a pro-access state might worry about being sued in an anti-abortion state.²²⁰ But that sort of objection is not grounded in the idea that it is actually a burden to defend a suit in the other state. Instead, the real argument is whether the distant state should be able to assert dominion or exercise regulatory authority over the defendant. And that is a question of extraterritorial regulation, federalism, and sovereignty that is best analyzed through the rubric of the dormant Commerce Clause, not the Due Process Clause.

Using the dormant Commerce Clause rather than the Due Process Clause will sometimes allow more expansive assertions of jurisdiction, but sometimes will limit the scope of jurisdiction. For example, so-called stream-of-commerce jurisdiction, where a product is sold into a state indirectly through a distribution or supply chain would be

²¹⁸ See *id.* at 893 (Ginsburg J., dissenting).

²¹⁹ 142 S. Ct. 2228 (2022).

²²⁰ For a discussion of such issues, see Paul Schiff Berman et. al., *Conflicts of Law and the Abortion War Between the States*, 172 U. PENN. L. REV. 1 (2024).

much more justifiable under a dormant Commerce Clause approach. Although the unilateral act of a consumer to bring a product into a community is probably still not sufficient to justify an assertion of jurisdiction, if a product passes through a regular commercial supply chain and then harms people in a community, it is likely that the company has sufficiently harmed that community to justify the assertion of jurisdiction, especially if the allegedly responsible entity indirectly derives revenue from sales in the state.

On the other hand, as Justice Alito's concurrence in *Mallory* suggests,²²¹ a dormant Commerce Clause analysis would likely prevent states from using expansive consent statutes to justify jurisdiction over disputes with no connection to the state. That is because if jurisdiction is analyzed through the dormant Commerce Clause rather than the Due Process Clause, jurisdiction ceases to be a personal right held by the defendant that can simply be waived through a consent statute.

In addition, if jurisdiction is no longer a waivable right, then it is also more difficult for corporations to try to dodge assertions of jurisdiction by imposing contractual forum selection clauses on end users. This is a big deal in the modern world when most forum selection clauses are not true bargained-for exchanges, but are instead contracts of adhesion that are buried in Terms of Service Agreements, those "click through" contracts that most users never read, but simply agree to in order to gain entrance to the site they are accessing.²²² Or they are embedded in form contracts that again are rarely read and are never subject to bargaining.²²³ But if jurisdiction is no longer a waivable right, then those supposed contractual agreements cannot, in and of themselves, settle the jurisdictional question. Instead, a court will examine any such agreement to ensure that the contractually mandated forum has a sufficient relevant connection to the underlying transaction so as to justify jurisdiction. Thus, the forum selection clause remains a relevant factor, but a truly unfair or unrelated forum can be resisted, regardless of the contractual language. To be sure, courts can do that now, but doing so usually requires invoking consumer protection laws or common law doctrines such as unconscionability that are generally used sparingly. If jurisdiction is no longer a waivable right, then this sort of inquiry becomes automatic.

Finally, it is worth noting that if jurisdiction is no longer a waivable due process right, then courts should examine the community affiliation of *both* plaintiffs and defendants. Accordingly, in a case such as *Keeton v. Hustler Magazine*,²²⁴ the plaintiff could not simply choose to sue in New Hampshire just because she preferred that state's statute of limitations. Instead, she would need to show why either she or the harm she

²²¹ *Mallory*, 600 U.S. at 150-63 (Alito, J., concurring in part).

²²² See generally Margaret Jane Radin, *Regulation by Contract, Regulation by Machine*, 160 J. OF INSTITUTIONAL & THEORETICAL ECONOMICS 142 (2004) (discussing how contracts of this sort replace the legal regimes of the state).

²²³ See generally MARGARET JANE RADIN, *BOILERPLATE: THE FINE PRINT, VANISHING RIGHTS, AND THE RULE OF LAW* (2013) (describing how boilerplate—the fine-print terms and conditions that we become subject to when we click "I agree" online, rent an apartment, enter an employment contract, sign up for a cellphone carrier, or buy travel tickets—pervades all aspects of modern life).

²²⁴ 465 U.S. 770 (1984).

suffered had sufficient affiliation with New Hampshire to justify the assertion of jurisdiction there. *Keeton* concerned a defamation claim, so the plaintiff could plausibly have argued that she was harmed every time a reader in New Hampshire opened the magazine and read the alleged defamatory content. In contrast, had she been an employee of Hustler working elsewhere and was simply suing for breach of her employment contract or for sexual harassment, or a slip and fall case in Hustler's offices, it would be more difficult to establish a community affiliation with New Hampshire, regardless of how many copies of the magazine were sold there. In any event, the key point is that jurisdiction over a plaintiff would not simply be assumed; the plaintiff would need to show a sufficient affiliation or a connection between the suit and the community in which the plaintiff filed suit.

3. *General and Specific Jurisdiction should be conceptualized not as discrete categories, but as points along a continuum that compares the number of contacts with a community against the relatedness of those contacts to the lawsuit.*

As discussed in Part III, the U.S. Supreme Court's jurisdiction jurisprudence over the past twenty years has unfortunately imposed two overly rigid categories onto what should be seen as points along a continuum. The Court could rectify this wrong turn by doing away with the categories of general and specific jurisdiction and simply making it clear that the greater the defendant's affiliation with a community, the more different types of suits against that defendant can be brought there. Thus, if a defendant is intimately tied to a community, even if it is not the defendant's state of citizenship, suits that are more tangentially related to the community could still be brought there.

This more flexible inquiry would make cases such as *Ford Motor* and *Bristol-Myers Squibb* both more intellectually satisfying and easier to resolve. For example, because Ford was not a citizen of the forum states, the Court could not use general jurisdiction,²²⁵ and so the Court's multiple decisions were left to battle about whether the lawsuit "arose out of" or were "related to" Ford's contacts in the relevant states, leading to confusing hair-splitting over whether "arising out of" and "relating to" are two different categories or only one.²²⁶ The Court was also forced to confront questions about whether the inquiry about related contacts should be based on the overall number of cars Ford sold in the forum state, or whether only cars of the same model as the car that crashed should count, or whether (as Ford argued) it was only relevant whether the *particular* car that crashed had been sold in the state.²²⁷

²²⁵ *Ford Motor Co.*, 141 S. Ct. at 1024.

²²⁶ Compare *id.* at 1026 ("[Specific jurisdiction] demands that the suit arise out of *or relate to* the defendant's contacts with the forum. The first half of that standard asks about causation; but the back half, after the "or," contemplates that some relationships will support jurisdiction without a causal showing."). (internal quotation marks and citation omitted); with *id.* at 1033 (Alito, J., concurring in the judgment) (criticizing the majority opinion for reading the "arise out of or relate to" language as if it were a statute and thereby recognizing "a new category of cases in which personal jurisdiction is permitted: those in which the claims do not "arise out of" (*i.e.*, are not caused by) the defendant's contacts but nevertheless sufficiently "relate to" those contacts in some undefined way"); and *id.* at 1034 (Gorsuch J., concurring in the judgment) (criticizing the majority opinion for interpreting the "relate to" language as distinct from a strict causal test for specific jurisdiction).

A continuum approach does not render these issues completely irrelevant, but it means that far less turns on the resolution of each question, so courts can do less hair-splitting and instead use a more flexible, common-sense analysis. For example, in the *Ford Motor* case itself, the Court could simply have noted the large amount of affiliation Ford had with the state: its ubiquitous advertising, its many dealerships, the number of Ford cars on the roads, the large volume of sales, the revenue produced by customers from the state, and so on. Given the large amount of community affiliation, the precise relationship between the suit and Ford's contacts need not be so exact or specific. Thus, the mere fact that the crashes occurred in the states was probably more than enough to justify jurisdiction given the large amount of affiliation. On the other hand, if a solo artisan craftsman with no connection to a state (like the duck decoy manufacturer in Chief Justice Roberts' hypothetical²²⁸) happens to sell a product into a state through Etsy or Amazon, that tenuous affiliation could at most justify jurisdiction over a suit only about a problem directly related to that individual product.

With regard to Bristol-Myers Squibb, the same inquiry would likely result in assertion of jurisdiction over all of the plaintiffs in California. Certainly, the affiliation of Bristol-Myers Squibb with California was approximately as extensive as Ford's with Montana and Minnesota. Bristol-Myers Squibb generated a large number of sales, and even a large number of Plavix sales specifically, in California,²²⁹ and it even distributed through a California-based distributor.²³⁰ In addition, it was undisputed that California could assert jurisdiction over the 86 California plaintiffs,²³¹ so the extent of Bristol Myers Squibb's affiliation with California seems sufficient to allow jurisdiction over the non-California plaintiffs as well, especially given that the same drug with the same formulation was distributed nationwide, so the issues were identical. Although the claims of the non-California plaintiffs should perhaps be decided based on the law of the home state, there is no reason that a California court could not assert jurisdiction and apply that foreign law.

But, one might ask, what about the idea that plaintiffs also need to have community affiliation, discussed above? If the out-of-state plaintiffs in *Bristol-Myers Squibb* neither purchased nor ingested their Plavix in California and did not suffer harm there, maybe those plaintiffs have insufficient affiliation with California to justify jurisdiction, even if Bristol-Myers Squibb has a substantial community affiliation with the state? To my mind, this is a difficult question to resolve, and if this were a case

²²⁷ See *id.* at 1028-29 (distinguishing a case “in which Ford marketed the models in only a different State or region” and addressing Ford’s contention that it is relevant for jurisdictional purposes “that the company sold the specific cars involved in these crashes outside the forum States, with consumers later selling them to the States’ residents”).

²²⁸ See *id.* at 1028 n.4 (discussing this hypothetical scenario); *id.* at 1035 (Gorsuch J., concurring in the judgment) (same).

²²⁹ *Bristol-Myers Squibb*, 582 U.S. at 259 (“Between 2006 and 2012, [Bristol-Myers Squibb] sold almost 187 million Plavix pills in the State and took in more than \$900 million from those sales.”).

²³⁰ See *id.* at 268. (“The bare fact that BMS contracted with a California distributor is not enough to establish personal jurisdiction in the State.”).

²³¹ See *id.* at 259 (noting that Bristol-Myers Squibb only challenged jurisdiction with regard to the non-resident plaintiffs).

where a single plaintiff from outside California tried to sue in California, I think even the large number of contacts Bristol-Myers Squibb had with California would be insufficient to justify jurisdiction, not because of the defendants' lack of community affiliation, but because the plaintiff would be insufficiently affiliated. Nevertheless, in the *Bristol-Myers Squibb* case itself there were so many plaintiffs from so many states that it would not be problematic for a case to go forward in California where the defendants had substantial affiliation and where a large percentage of the plaintiffs were located. Otherwise, as Justice Sotomayor pointed out in dissent,²³² there would never be any state other than the corporation's state of citizenship where such a suit could proceed, and it is unclear why the defendant should be able to impose its home state's jurisdiction on plaintiffs who were harmed elsewhere.

4. *The territorial location of data or servers is irrelevant.*

In an era of cloud computing, data can be anywhere. Even a simple e-mail message can be stored in a location completely unrelated to the sender or recipient, or even the home of the company that controls the storage. Further, the message might not even be stored in one location; its component data parts could be split among data warehouses within multiple territorial sovereignties. And not only is the location arbitrary, but it is malleable. The data can easily be shifted from place to place instantly and algorithmically, with no human being even making a conscious decision to relocate. Finally, it is the service provider, not the end user, that ultimately controls the data location. Even if an individual lives all her life in one territorial location and deposits money in her local branch of a multinational financial institution, data related to that account could move anywhere, all based on the data storage scheme of the financial institution.

The arbitrary and malleable nature of data storage wreaks havoc on jurisdictional systems that rely on territorial location. In response, some countries have pursued legislation that would require the localization of data.²³³ Under these statutes, data related to an individual must remain stored within the home country of that individual.

This strikes me as the wrong way to go about solving the problem. It seems to me that, if jurisdictional rules do not map well onto the reality of human activity, it's a sign that jurisdictional rules need to change, not that we need to squelch or limit that human activity. For example, as discussed in Part I, the strict territorial conception of jurisdiction that held sway in the United States in the nineteenth century—states have complete power over individuals within their borders but no power outside their borders—could not keep up with technological innovations such as the automobile.

²³² See *id.* at 278 (Sotomayor J., dissenting) (“The effect of the Court's opinion today is to eliminate nationwide mass actions in any State other than those in which a defendant is essentially at home. Such a rule hands one more tool to corporate defendants determined to prevent the aggregation of individual claims, and forces injured plaintiffs to bear the burden of bringing suit in what will often be farflung jurisdictions.” (internal quotation marks and citation omitted)).

²³³ See generally Anupam Chander & Uyên Lê, *Data Nationalism*, 64 EMORY L.J. 677 (2015) (describing this trend).

Courts quickly came to realize that a driver could enter a state, injure a pedestrian in that state, and then drive out of the state, thus depriving the state of jurisdiction over the driver in a case involving the accident. This was untenable, and not surprisingly jurisdictional doctrine evolved over several decades until it was ultimately replaced by a legal framework that would allow jurisdiction even over absent parties who had created harm within the state, at least under certain circumstances.

But imagine what would have happened if instead courts and legislators had tried to insist that human activity conform to jurisdictional rules, rather than vice versa. We might have seen rules limiting automobile travel or corporate activity to the confines of one state. Such rules clearly would have stunted the development and utility of the automobile or the corporation. Likewise, restrictions on data's movement could easily make data storage less efficient or more costly, thus decreasing utility for all.

Instead, as with the automobile, it is our jurisdictional scheme that should change, not the social reality of ubiquitous data storage. And the change would not even be that complicated; all that is required is for courts to ignore data location in their jurisdictional calculus. That means, for example, that the jurisdictional decision must be made independent of the location of the underlying data. Likewise, servers or other computing equipment that enable transactions are often physically located in places unrelated to the underlying transaction or the principal activities of the intermediary. Basing a jurisdictional determination on that location, therefore, potentially allows the intermediary to choose its own jurisdiction simply by making a decision to deploy the equipment in one place versus another.

5. The place of incorporation of a corporation is potentially relevant to the jurisdictional calculus, but should not be determinative.

Even those who accept that data and server location should not determine jurisdiction may balk at the idea that place of incorporation should similarly not be determinative. After all, we may think that a corporation should be free to choose the state or country by which it is regulated. And certainly sometimes the place of incorporation signals both a substantive affiliation with that jurisdiction and a willingness to submit to that jurisdiction's laws.

Yet, sometimes place of incorporation is just as arbitrary and manipulated as data or server location. As the *Barcelona.com* case illustrates, individuals with no connection with the United States can easily create a U.S. company and then claim the jurisdiction of U.S. courts even though nothing about the dispute really evinces a connection with the United States. Likewise, corporations can incorporate in a state while maintaining nothing but a post office box there. If jurisdiction is automatically tied to place of incorporation without any further analysis of the underlying social or economy reality, therefore, distortions may result.

6. The size, sophistication, and economic breadth of an actor is relevant to the jurisdictional inquiry.

Since the very first Internet jurisdiction cases in the mid-1990s, courts and commentators have struggled with what seem to be two unpalatable jurisdictional options: either jurisdiction is only legitimate where the operator of the website is located, or jurisdiction is potentially appropriate wherever the website is viewable. The first option allows for regulatory evasion and the other pushes towards a form of universal jurisdiction.

But there is no necessary reason that the case of an individual posting on a personal website or Facebook page needs to be treated the same as a major news organization posting an article on its home page. Likewise, there is no reason that an individual artisan duck decoy manufacturer needs to be treated the same as Ford Motor Company. Indeed, as Justice Breyer recognized in his concurrence in *McIntyre*, the possible types of Internet transactions are so varied that it is difficult to create one overarching rule.²³⁴ He posits a coffee farmer in Kenya selling artisanal coffee online in small quantities through third parties, and he contrasts that scenario with a large multinational industrialist selling thousands of units per year through a dedicated distributor.²³⁵ Even if both potentially produce a product that causes harm abroad, there is no reason that both defendants need to be treated identically for jurisdictional purposes.

Community affiliation analysis provides a way out of this seeming conundrum. A large industrialist seeking to sell multiple units on a regular basis as part of a global business plan, or a large news organization deliberately disseminating content to a global audience are trying to access a market and affiliate with a community in a way that is very different from the Kenyan coffee farmer or a solo professor posting thoughts on a personal webpage or social media site. Of course, the artisanal product can cause harm and the professor's thoughts may constitute hate speech or libel or copyright infringement in some other jurisdiction. And that might cause a court to look at how intentional the acts of the defendant were. For example, if the professor knew she was writing controversial gossip about a person in a particular community, it might be appropriate to say that the professor has deliberately affiliated herself with that community and should be subject to jurisdiction there. Likewise, if the duck decoy artisan receives an order from someone in another state and deliberately ships to that person and it is that precise product that causes harm, jurisdiction where the product was shipped may likewise be appropriate. But to use the facts from *Ford Motor*, assume our duck decoy artisan sells and ships a product to California and then the receiver in California subsequently sells the product to someone else who brings it to Montana, that does not mean that the artisan has any affiliation with Montana. And by using a combination of community affiliation

²³⁴ See *McIntyre*, 564 U.S. at 890 (Breyer J., concurring in the judgment) (“[W]hat [does the plurality’s approach] mean when a company targets the world by selling products from its Web site? And does it matter if, instead of shipping the products directly, a company consigns the products through an intermediary (say, Amazon.com) who then receives and fulfills the orders? And what if the company markets its products through popup advertisements that it knows will be viewed in a forum?”).

²³⁵ See *id.* at 892 (Breyer J., concurring in the judgment) (“[M]anufacturers come in many shapes and sizes. It may be fundamentally unfair to require a small Egyptian shirt maker, a Brazilian manufacturing cooperative, or a Kenyan coffee farmer, selling its products through international distributors, to respond to products-liability tort suits in virtually every State in the United States, even those in respect to which the foreign firm has no connection at all but the sale of a single (allegedly defective) good.”).

analysis and a continuum approach to general and specific jurisdiction, it is easy to see why Ford should be treated differently from the duck decoy artisan. Moreover, this framework does not require mental gymnastics of the sort the Court engaged in to try to show that the car crashes in that case were sufficiently related to Ford's contacts with the forum. Instead, we need only look at the degree of community affiliation Ford has with those states as compared to the artisan.

7. The effects of activities can provide a plausible basis for the assertion of jurisdiction even without a territorial nexus.

Finally, we must recognize that, notwithstanding community affiliation (or the lack of it), there might be some extreme cases where a community might justifiably wish to assert jurisdiction over a distant act or actor based on the egregious impact of the act within the local community. Harm from pollution is the example that immediately springs to mind. It is easy to imagine a company in one state dumping toxic waste into a river, which then flows downstream and causes harm to communities in a different state. In such a circumstance, one can readily imagine the downstream community wishing to assert jurisdiction, based not on a contact with the jurisdiction, but because the company has effectively formed an affiliation with the downstream community by harmfully impacting that community.

The tricky question is how far this sort of effects-based conception of community affiliation should extend. Taken to an extreme, it could swallow up all the other rules and lead to universal jurisdiction, because an act in one place could always potentially cause harm somewhere else. So, any assertion of purely effects-based jurisdiction should also consider all the other factors described: community affiliation, effort to exploit a market, size of company, extent of harm, foreseeability of the harm, and so on. And although it is impossible to predict all the potential factual settings in which this question may arise, the point is that these factors should at least temper the potential problems associated with jurisdiction based only on effects.

Conclusion

The seven principles offered above could usefully form the basis of a new jurisdiction jurisprudence, one that builds on existing precedent, but points the way to a 21st century conception that more accurately reflects the deterritorialization of social life and the realities of commercial activity, both online and off. Of course, these principles do not "solve" all jurisdiction questions. Nor should they. Human activity is simply too multifaceted and varied for wooden formalistic rules based on fixed, unchanging definitions. Indeed, the whole reason the rigid territorialism of *Pennoyer v. Neff* first came under pressure was that its approach did not usefully respond to changes in technology, transportation, and commercial activity. As social life shifts, as our sense of space, distance, and place shifts, as our understanding of community affiliation shifts, jurisdictional law must shift also.

Over the past thirty years, human society has been transformed by waves of innovation and transformation: online interaction, ubiquitous mobile phone technology,

social networking, nearly unlimited data storage, digital currencies, artificial intelligence, and on and on. In the face of these cataclysmic changes, it would be astonishing if jurisdictional law didn't shift as well.

Accordingly, this Article points towards a possible future for jurisdictional law. It offers a set of principles and inquiries that eschew rigid categories tied to territorial location and an outmoded sense of what it means to provide fair process to the parties in the lawsuit. Instead, courts should ask whether the community asserting jurisdiction has sufficient affiliation with the parties or the dispute such that it is appropriate for that community to exercise dominion over the suit. To answer that question, the analysis should consider the community's connection to the dispute, and the extent of the affiliation both the plaintiff and defendant have to that community. And courts should not allow arbitrary and easily malleable factors such as server and data location or corporate citizenship to determine the outcome without further inquiry into true substantive affiliation and foreseeable effects.

Most importantly, an embrace of these principles will help us jettison legal fictions related to supposed burdens on defendants from litigating in a territorially distant location, or asserted territorial connections, such as data location that bear no relation to the reality of the interaction at issue, or hair-splitting distinctions between related and unrelated contacts. Jurisdictional contestation is inevitable, but at least the debates about them should be oriented around the actual substantive ties between a dispute and a community. We need a true 21st century approach to jurisdiction, and as we continue to navigate wave upon wave of technological innovation and societal change, it is ever more apparent that a new paradigm is long past due.