KSTARR Enterprises, LLC

The Negligent Shield™: Delegation, Immunity, and the Architecture of Negligent Governance

By Legal Theorist Katherine Starr™

I. The Architecture of Delegation and Immunity

Congress has, over multiple decades, enacted statutes that delegate core enforcement powers to private or quasi-private entities across nearly every sector of American life: telecommunications and digital platforms, pharmaceuticals and medicine, finance and banking, amateur sport and athlete safety, military and defense contracting, energy and nuclear operations, airlines and transportation, and environmental regulation. The statutory language differs, but the structural consequence is uniform: authority shifts from the government into private hands, those hands are fortified with immunity, and harmed parties are left without direct judicial recourse.

The result is a recurring pattern of immunity without accountability. Private actors are empowered to enforce rules, adjudicate disputes, and regulate conduct with the authority of the state but without the constitutional safeguards that bind the state. Victims of harm find themselves diverted into administrative schemes, arbitration systems, or outright denials of remedy. The more essential the sector, the more expansive the shield.

Earlier legal frameworks including *Negligent Delegation of Digital Enforcement*™[1] (NDDE™) and *Negligent Delegation of Digital Enforcement by a Sovereign Government*™[2] first exposed this structure in the digital sphere. The same architecture recurs across other sectors. But the pattern is not confined to platforms. It recurs in pharmaceuticals, where federal statutes immunize vaccine and drug manufacturers from design liability; in banking, where "too big to fail" bailouts shielded financial institutions; in sport, where SafeSport and the Ted Stevens Act outsource adjudication of abuse while barring judicial review; in the military, where doctrines like *Feres* and *Boyle* protect both the government and its contractors; in nuclear energy, where the Price-Anderson Act caps liability for catastrophic accidents; and in airlines, where post-9/11 legislation insulated carriers and security contractors. Layered onto this are environmental and regulatory schemes where statutory preemption eliminates local authority and blocks citizen redress.

© 2025 KATHERINE STARR | WWW.KATHERINESTARR.COM | ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Taken together, these delegations reveal a coherent governance model. What appears fragmented is in fact deliberate: a recurring design by which Congress and federal agencies deflect constitutional risk, preserve political capital, and shift liability away from the state while retaining centralized control. The **Negligent Shield™** names this architecture, establishes its legal lineage, and provides the framework for piercing it.

The sections that follow document the Shield industry by industry, trace its statutory and judicial roots, and align it with the NDDE™ frameworks. The conclusion is unavoidable: these are not isolated legislative choices but a systemic mode of governance. The Immunity Shield is not an exception, it is the rule, and it is the source of preventable harm that must be recognized and dismantled.

II. The Immunity Shield

At the core of this doctrine is the recognition that statutory delegation is rarely neutral. In the modern federal model, delegation is almost always coupled with a form of immunity that protects the delegate from civil liability and insulates the government from political and legal exposure. This construct referred to here as the **Immunity Shield** is not a single law or clause, but a structural arrangement in which power and protection move together: enforcement authority is granted to the private actor, while avenues for judicial accountability are simultaneously closed to the harmed.

The immunity itself may be explicit, as in statutes that bar private rights of action or direct all claims into an administrative forum, or implicit, as in laws that create de facto monopolies and remove market or legal competition. In either case, the effect is the same: the delegate exercises state-level control without being bound by state-level obligations.

This shield operates in two layers. The **first layer** protects the delegate. A platform immunized under Section 230, a sports body protected by the Ted Stevens Act, or a pharmaceutical manufacturer covered by the Vaccine Injury Compensation Program all act under government-conferred authority yet face no meaningful tort exposure. The **second layer** protects the government itself. By placing enforcement in private hands, Congress avoids both the operational burden of direct oversight and the constitutional constraints that would apply if the state were the enforcer. The harmed cannot sue the government because the government did not act; they cannot sue the delegate because the delegate is immunized.

This is not accidental. It is a design choice that has been replicated across industries precisely because it works: it delivers the benefits of regulation or control without the costs of liability. When harm occurs whether in the form of digital censorship, athlete abuse, vaccine injury, financial collapse, or environmental degradation there is no direct path to a courtroom capable of awarding redress. The shield absorbs all impact and disperses it into bureaucratic dead ends.

The Negligent Shield™ doctrine names this structure and targets it for dismantling when it meets two conditions: (1) there is clear evidence of harm; and (2) there is a demonstrable

© 2025 KATHERINE STARR | WWW.KATHERINESTARR.COM | ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

avoidance of accountability by both the government and the delegate. In such cases, the shield's existence becomes proof not of legitimate policy design but of negligent governance. By making the shield visible, the doctrine opens the way for legal strategies aimed at piercing it, restoring the possibility of remedy, and reasserting that no delegation can erase the duty to protect the public from foreseeable harm.

III. Telecommunications and Platform Law

The telecommunications and technology sectors provide some of the clearest and most durable examples of the Immunity Shield in operation. Two statutes, in particular, define the modern landscape: the **Telecommunications Act of 1996**[3] and **Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act**[4]. Together, they mark the beginning of a legislative pattern in which the government retreats from direct enforcement, hands regulatory control to private actors, and insulates both parties from liability.

The Telecommunications Act of 1996, enacted under the banner of deregulation[5], removed long-standing restrictions on ownership and market entry, effectively transferring large portions of the telecommunications infrastructure into the hands of private carriers. While competition was the stated aim, the Act simultaneously absolved these carriers of responsibility for the content and function of their networks[6]. The legal duty to manage or police harmful conduct online was displaced from the federal government, yet no corresponding legal obligation was imposed on the carriers themselves. This created the first modern version of the Immunity Shield in the digital realm: private control without public accountability.

Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act completed the architecture[7]. Passed as part of the same legislative wave, it granted online platforms broad immunity from liability for content posted by third parties[8], coupled with discretion to moderate that content without assuming the role of a "publisher[9]" in the legal sense. In effect, Congress designated private companies as arbiters of online speech a core public function without subjecting them to the constitutional constraints that bind the state. Those harmed by platform decisions found themselves in a procedural void: they could not sue the government, which had delegated its role, nor could they sue the platform, which was insulated by statute.

This is the Immunity Shield in its purest form. The state removes itself from the zone of liability, installs a private delegate in its place, and fortifies that delegate against legal challenge. The shield is durable because it is mutually beneficial: the government avoids constitutional limits on content control, while the platform avoids the costs and risks of tort litigation. Yet when harm occurs whether from algorithmic suppression of lawful speech, amplification of dangerous content, or the negligent handling of user safety there is no effective route to judicial remedy.

Under **The Negligent Shield™** doctrine, this arrangement becomes actionable when the harm is not hypothetical but documented, and when it can be shown that the immunity structure was designed or maintained in the face of foreseeable risks[10]. The combination of delegation and immunity ceases to be a legitimate regulatory choice and becomes evidence of negligent

© 2025 KATHERINE STARR | WWW.KATHERINESTARR.COM | ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

governance a shield that must be pierced to restore accountability to both the delegate and the state.

IV. Olympic and Amateur Sports

The Olympic and amateur sports system in the United States is governed primarily by the **Ted Stevens Olympic and Amateur Sports Act**[11] ("Ted Stevens Act"). On its face, the statute appears to be an administrative framework for organizing national sport. In practice, it is one of the most entrenched examples of Congress delegating public authority to private entities while erecting an Immunity Shield that denies redress to those harmed under its governance.

The Ted Stevens Act grants the United States Olympic & Paralympic Committee (USOPC) and its affiliated National Governing Bodies (NGBs) exclusive authority to govern their respective sports. This is not mere brand oversight or event management it is full regulatory control over athlete eligibility, competition standards, and dispute resolution. Once that authority is conferred, the federal government withdraws from direct involvement, leaving the NGBs as the sole gatekeepers of opportunity in their sport[12].

The shield is two-fold. First, the NGBs enjoy statutory exclusivity; no parallel governing body may be recognized, and no government agency stands ready to intervene if the NGB fails in its duties. Second, there is no private right of action for athletes harmed by the decisions or negligence of these organizations. Even in cases involving exclusion from competition, wrongful discipline, or systemic abuse, athletes find themselves bound to internal arbitration processes controlled by the same entities accused of wrongdoing[13]. Federal courts rarely entertain such disputes[14], deferring to the statutory grant of exclusive jurisdiction to the NGBs.

This is a textbook Immunity Shield. Congress has delegated regulatory power traditionally a governmental role to private bodies while ensuring that both the government and the delegate are insulated from liability. The NGB's monopoly is legally protected; its decisions are largely immune from judicial review. The government avoids the political and legal risks of being the enforcer, while the NGB faces no genuine threat of external accountability.

The harm is not theoretical. The sports sector has seen repeated cycles of abuse, discrimination, and governance failures that persisted precisely because the Immunity Shield prevented meaningful intervention. Athletes harmed under this system are left without recourse: the government will not act because it has delegated authority, and the NGB cannot be compelled through ordinary civil litigation.

Under **The Negligent Shield™** doctrine, the combination of exclusive authority, absence of governmental oversight, and lack of judicial remedy transforms the Ted Stevens Act from a governance framework into a structural negligence mechanism. When Congress maintains this arrangement despite well-documented harm whether in athlete abuse cases or systemic exclusion it is not simply deferring to sport autonomy; it is using the Immunity Shield to deflect constitutional and moral responsibility.

© 2025 KATHERINE STARR | WWW.KATHERINESTARR.COM | ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

V. Youth Protection and Abuse Oversight

The passage of the **Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse and Safe Sport Authorization Act (PYVSAA)**[15] in 2018 was presented as a decisive legislative response to decades of abuse within Olympic and amateur sport. In practice, it did not dismantle the Immunity Shield that had long protected the U.S. Olympic & Paralympic Committee (USOPC) and its National Governing Bodies (NGBs) from liability under the Ted Stevens Act. Instead, it added a new layer of delegation one that further distances victims from judicial recourse while allowing both Congress and the sports bodies to claim reform.

Under the PYVSAA, Congress did not create an independent, government-run enforcement body with full due process obligations. Instead, it authorized the U.S. Center for SafeSport, a private nonprofit[16], to act as the exclusive investigator and adjudicator of abuse allegations within the Olympic movement. SafeSport's jurisdiction is sweeping[17]: it has authority over athletes, coaches, officials, and other participants across all Olympic and Paralympic sports. Its findings are binding on the sports system, and its disciplinary decisions control who may participate in organized competition.

Historically, SafeSport's funding came almost entirely from the USOPC and the NGBs it oversees an arrangement rife with structural conflict, as those same entities have a vested interest in limiting liability and reputational harm. Congress has recently moved to partially shift this arrangement by appropriating direct federal funding, with proposals for significant public allocations now gaining traction and some appropriations already in motion. Yet even with new public dollars entering its budget, SafeSport remains structurally insulated. Its statutory immunity remains intact, its processes are not subject to constitutional due process guarantees, and federal courts continue to treat its rulings as final[18] within the Ted Stevens Act's exclusive governance structure. Funding source adjustments, without corresponding legal reform, do not alter the functional reality of its independence or accountability.

This is an evolution of the Immunity Shield. Where the Ted Stevens Act created a single wall of protection exclusive jurisdiction in the hands of the NGBs PYVSAA erected a second, higher wall around abuse cases. Now, the harmed athlete is routed into a process controlled by a federally authorized but operationally independent arbiter, whose decisions cannot be reviewed in any meaningful forum. The government cannot be sued because it delegated the role; the NGB cannot be sued because SafeSport controls the outcome; SafeSport itself cannot be sued because it is immunized.

The structural negligence is compounded. Congress knew the scale and severity of abuse in sport[19] when it passed PYVSAA. It also knew that the entities it was empowering USOPC, NGBs, and SafeSport were not bound by constitutional constraints, public oversight, or robust judicial review. By layering delegation upon delegation, and now coupling that with partial public funding absent any reform of the underlying immunity, Congress has not closed the accountability gap; it has fortified it. Abuse cases can be processed administratively without ever creating legal exposure for the government or its delegates.

© 2025 KATHERINE STARR | WWW.KATHERINESTARR.COM | ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Under **The Negligent Shield™** doctrine, PYVSAA and SafeSport represent one of the most fortified examples of negligent delegation in modern federal law: the intentional creation of an enforcement system designed to address harm without ever exposing the enforcers to the risk of remedy. The harm is not hypothetical it is documented, ongoing, and insulated by statutory design.

VI. Military & Defense Contractors

Few areas of federal law display the Immunity Shield as starkly as the military and defense sector. Here, Congress and the courts have constructed overlapping doctrines that insulate both the government and its private contractors from civil accountability, even in the face of foreseeable and well-documented harm.

The first layer is the *Feres Doctrine*[20], established by the Supreme Court in *Feres v. United States* (1950). Under this rule, members of the armed forces cannot sue the federal government for injuries that are "incident to service," regardless of whether the harm arises from negligence, medical malpractice, or even wrongful conduct. While justified as a means of preserving military discipline, the effect is sweeping: servicemembers are uniquely excluded from remedies otherwise available to every other class of citizen.

The second layer is the *government contractor defense*, articulated in *Boyle v. United Technologies Corp*[21]. (1988). This doctrine shields private defense contractors from liability for defective designs so long as they complied with reasonably precise federal specifications. In practice, it ensures that when military equipment causes injury, whether to soldiers or civilians, responsibility is diffused into a zone where neither the contractor nor the government can be held to account.

Together, these doctrines create a dual wall of immunity. The federal government avoids liability for harms to its own servicemembers, while contractors are insulated from the consequences of their products and decisions. Victims are left without remedy: they cannot sue the government because of *Feres*, and they cannot sue the contractor because of *Boyle*.

This is the Immunity Shield in one of its most fortified forms. By combining statutory delegation, judicially created immunity, and national security rhetoric, Congress and the courts have placed both state and private actors beyond meaningful legal reach. Under The Negligent Shield™ doctrine, this arrangement is not a neutral allocation of risk but a deliberate structure of negligent governance one that sacrifices accountability in the name of expedience, leaving foreseeable harms unremedied and shielded from judicial review.

VII. Pharmaceuticals – Vaccine Manufacturer Immunity

The National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986[22] represents one of the clearest examples of delegation paired with legal insulation in the public health domain. Under the Act,

© 2025 KATHERINE STARR | WWW.KATHERINESTARR.COM | ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

pharmaceutical manufacturers producing vaccines on the federal childhood immunization schedule are granted immunity from civil liability for vaccine-related injuries[23]. All claims are diverted to the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program (VICP), an administrative forum with limited scope, capped damages, and no jury trials[24]. Manufacturers operate under a government mandate but without the tort exposure that would normally accompany the distribution of a product capable of causing harm.

The effect is a twofold Shield. For the industry, the VICP eliminates the risk of mass tort litigation and places all claims into a tightly constrained process designed to minimize both cost and reputational damage. For the government, the statute deflects accountability for mandating vaccines: Congress can require their use without absorbing the political consequences of injury claims. Families harmed by adverse outcomes are not entitled to pursue traditional remedies in court; instead, they are bound to an administrative process with narrow evidentiary standards and limited awards.

This arrangement was justified as necessary to preserve vaccine supply, but its structure mirrors the Immunity Shield found in other sectors. Delegation is paired with immunity, accountability is displaced into administrative channels, and foreseeable harm is absorbed without exposing either the private actor or the state to genuine judicial scrutiny. Under The Negligent Shield™ doctrine, the Vaccine Act is not merely a public health policy; it is an engineered mechanism of negligent governance, one that places the stability of an industry above the rights of those foreseeably harmed.

VIII. Banking & Finance – "Too Big to Fail" and Regulatory Capture

In the financial sector, the Immunity Shield manifests through the implicit guarantees conferred on systemically important banks. During the 2008 financial crisis, and in subsequent legislation such as the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008[25] (which created the Troubled Asset Relief Program, or TARP) and the Dodd-Frank[26] Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, federal policy cemented the expectation that certain institutions would be rescued in the event of collapse. This expectation was not theoretical trillions of dollars in public funds were deployed to stabilize private institutions, insulating both their executives and their investors from the consequences of systemic failure.

This is a form of delegation: the Federal Reserve and other regulatory bodies authorize private banks to operate at national and global scale, while simultaneously committing public resources to absorb their failures. The market discipline that would ordinarily punish mismanagement or recklessness is replaced by a government backstop. When losses occur, they are socialized; when gains occur, they are privatized. The insulation from true market risk, coupled with the absence of personal accountability for executives, creates a durable Shield that protects both the banks themselves and the policymakers who enabled their risk-taking.

The Shield extends into the judicial realm as well. In *Bank of America v. City of Miami* (2017)[27], the Supreme Court narrowed the ability of municipalities to hold banks liable for discriminatory

© 2025 KATHERINE STARR | WWW.KATHERINESTARR.COM | ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

lending practices, effectively reducing the avenues through which communities harmed by financial misconduct can seek redress. In other contexts, doctrines of regulatory preemption and standing limitations have further restricted challenges to the financial sector, ensuring that disputes are resolved within narrow administrative or regulatory channels rather than through full judicial review.

This is not accidental. The financial sector is one of the clearest examples of regulatory capture: Congress and federal agencies deliberately construct a system where authority and profit are privatized, but risk and liability are public. Under The Negligent Shield™ doctrine, "too big to fail" is not an economic inevitability but a governance choice one that transforms foreseeable financial harm into a liability-free zone, shielding both state and private actors from accountability while leaving ordinary citizens and communities to bear the cost.

IX. Environmental Protection – Self-Policing and Non-Enforcement

In the environmental sector, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and related agencies frequently rely on industry self-reporting and compliance programs in lieu of robust governmental enforcement. Regulatory waivers, lobbying influence, and limited prosecutorial resources have allowed corporations engaged in high-risk activities such as hydraulic fracturing, large-scale chemical manufacturing, and industrial agriculture to operate with minimal federal intervention[28].

When harm occurs, affected communities often find themselves unable to secure relief in federal court due to statutory preemption, narrow standing requirements, or procedural exhaustion rules[29]. For example, in *Geier v. Honda* (2000)[30], the Supreme Court held that federal auto safety regulations preempted state tort claims, effectively blocking victims from pursuing liability for foreseeable design risks. Similar doctrines have been applied in environmental and product-safety contexts, where federal standards are invoked not as minimum protections but as shields against accountability.

The Shield is reinforced by the structure of environmental litigation itself. Citizens seeking redress under the Clean Air Act or Clean Water Act must navigate complex standing requirements, often being told that their harms are too diffuse or generalized to qualify. When communities attempt to hold polluters accountable directly, courts frequently defer to federal regulatory authority or demand exhaustion of administrative remedies that provide no meaningful relief. The result is that enforcement is delegated in practice to the very industries being regulated, while judicial review is foreclosed by design.

This too is an Immunity Shield: the government withdraws from direct enforcement, installs a private or quasi-private actor in its place, and either explicitly or implicitly removes that actor from the reach of ordinary civil litigation. The harms differ in nature, adverse health outcomes, poisoned water, degraded air, and irreversible ecosystem loss, but the underlying architecture is the same. The Immunity Shield is a transferable design, one that Congress has applied wherever

© 2025 KATHERINE STARR | WWW.KATHERINESTARR.COM | ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

it perceives political advantage in offloading constitutional risk without truly relinquishing control.

X. Nuclear & Energy – Liability Caps and Risk Transfer

The nuclear energy sector provides one of the most explicit statutory examples of the Immunity Shield. Since 1957, Congress has maintained the Price-Anderson Nuclear Industries Indemnity Act[31], a law designed to encourage private participation in nuclear power by capping industry liability in the event of an accident. Under the Act, operators of nuclear facilities are required to carry private insurance up to a statutory limit; however, beyond that threshold, liability is shifted to a federal compensation pool[32], which is funded in part by taxpayers. The statute thus ensures that even in the case of catastrophic harm, widespread contamination, long-term health effects, or displacement of entire communities, the companies directly responsible will never face the full financial consequences of their operations.

This structure is justified as a matter of public policy: without it, proponents argue, the risk of liability would make nuclear power economically unfeasible. Yet in practice, it is a textbook Immunity Shield. Congress has delegated the operation of nuclear energy to private entities while simultaneously immunizing them from true accountability. Victims of nuclear accidents cannot pursue ordinary tort remedies against the corporations that caused their harm; instead, they are channeled into a compensation system defined and limited by statute.

The Shield is not confined to nuclear energy alone. Similar patterns have emerged in other high-risk energy sectors, where liability caps, indemnity agreements, and federal preemption statutes limit exposure for oil, gas, and chemical corporations. In each case, the effect is the same: private actors are empowered to extract profit from inherently dangerous enterprises, while the costs of foreseeable disasters are displaced onto the public.

Under The Negligent Shield™ doctrine, the Price-Anderson Act and its analogues represent deliberate constructions of negligent governance. Congress has chosen to prioritize industry stability over citizen remedy, creating a liability-free zone around one of the most hazardous technologies in existence. The Shield ensures that those harmed by nuclear or energy-related accidents face not justice in a courtroom, but limited statutory payouts an arrangement that privileges political expedience and corporate interest at the direct expense of public safety and accountability.

XI. Airlines & Transportation – Crisis-Driven Immunity

The airline industry demonstrates how the Immunity Shield can be rapidly expanded in response to crisis. In the immediate aftermath of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, Congress passed the Air Transportation Safety and System Stabilization Act[33]. Presented as an emergency measure to preserve the aviation system and prevent economic collapse, the statute did far more than provide financial relief. It imposed strict limits on the liability of airlines, airports, and

© 2025 KATHERINE STARR | WWW.KATHERINESTARR.COM | ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

security contractors[34] for claims arising from the attacks, diverting litigation into a federally controlled compensation program[35] with capped damages and no jury trials.

The structure was familiar: Congress delegated authority to a private compensation scheme while simultaneously insulating both the government and the airline industry from meaningful judicial exposure. Families of victims were forced to choose between entering the compensation fund with its statutory limits or pursuing litigation constrained by severe liability caps and jurisdictional hurdles. In either case, the pathway to a courtroom capable of awarding full redress was functionally foreclosed.

This arrangement was justified as necessary to preserve national security and stabilize a vital industry. Yet it reveals the same Immunity Shield architecture evident in other sectors. Airlines continued to operate under the authority of federal regulators, but accountability for safety and security failures was displaced. The federal government avoided constitutional and political responsibility for its oversight failures, while the industry avoided liability through statutory protections.

The Shield has persisted beyond 9/11. Similar liability protections have been considered or enacted in the context of public health emergencies, natural disasters, and transportation crises, each time using the justification of urgency to construct immunity regimes that outlive the event itself. The result is a pattern: moments of national emergency become catalysts for durable immunity, reinforcing a system in which both government and industry are shielded from the consequences of foreseeable harm.

Under The Negligent Shield™ doctrine, these crisis-driven liability caps represent not temporary necessity but deliberate negligent governance. By insulating entire sectors under the guise of emergency, Congress converts foreseeable risks into zones of permanent unaccountability, ensuring that when disaster strikes, victims are compensated administratively, but justice itself is systematically withheld.

XII. Synthesis of Structural Failures

The examples documented here telecommunications, platform governance, Olympic and amateur sport, youth protection, pharmaceuticals, banking, environmental regulation, defense contracting, nuclear energy, and airlines are not isolated legislative outcomes. They are iterations of a single legal architecture, refined over decades, in which Congress and federal agencies have learned to preserve control while offloading both operational burden and constitutional risk.

The structure is consistent. Federal authority is delegated to a private or quasi-private entity, often with monopoly or near-monopoly jurisdiction. That delegate is then fortified with statutory or implied immunity, ensuring that harmed parties cannot bring ordinary civil claims. Judicial recourse is either explicitly barred or procedurally unattainable, replaced by administrative channels or arbitration schemes controlled by the delegate itself. The government, having withdrawn from direct enforcement, stands apart from liability: it cannot be sued for the

© 2025 KATHERINE STARR | WWW.KATHERINESTARR.COM | ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

delegate's failures because it did not act, and it faces no constitutional scrutiny because the delegate is not formally the state.

In each industry, the harms are foreseeable. The Telecommunications Act and Section 230 predictably produced platforms with unaccountable power over speech. The Ted Stevens Act, compounded by PYVSAA, predictably entrenched governance systems that failed to protect athletes from abuse. The Vaccine Injury Compensation Program predictably limited recovery for those harmed by a federally mandated product. "Too Big to Fail" banking policy predictably shielded institutions and executives from the consequences of reckless practices. Industry self-policing in environmental regulation predictably allowed environmental degradation to persist unchecked. The Feres Doctrine and the government-contractor defense predictably insulated both the military and its contractors from foreseeable injuries. The Price-Anderson Act predictably capped liability for nuclear accidents, displacing catastrophic costs onto the public. Post-9/11 airline legislation predictably limited victim remedies in the name of stabilization.

These are not unintended consequences. They are the product of a legislative method that treats delegation and immunity as complementary tools: delegation transfers the role, immunity erases the risk. The harmed are not merely overlooked; they are procedurally and structurally excluded from any remedy that could hold either the government or the delegate accountable.

From a negligence perspective, the pattern reveals a repeated breach of the government's duty to ensure that the delegation of public authority does not extinguish the public's ability to seek redress for harm. When the government knows of foreseeable harm, maintains the delegation, and preserves the immunity despite that knowledge, the Immunity Shield ceases to be a lawful governance choice and becomes an instrument of negligent governance.

The conclusion is unavoidable: across sectors, the federal government has codified a model in which accountability is the element systematically removed from the enforcement equation. This is the common structure that The Negligent Shield™ doctrine names, analyzes, and targets for dismantling when harm and evasion of remedy converge.

XIII. Framework Alignment

The Negligent Shield™ doctrine does not stand in isolation. It builds directly upon two earlier frameworks: *Negligent Delegation of Digital Enforcement™ (NDDE™)* and *Negligent Delegation of Digital Enforcement by a Sovereign Government™*. These frameworks first exposed how statutory delegation in the digital sector creates foreseeable harm when paired with immunity. NDDE™ addressed the delegation of content-enforcement authority to private technology platforms under Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act. *NDDE by a Sovereign Government™* expanded that analysis to the international and constitutional dimensions of state-level delegation.

The Immunity Shield identified in this work is the same legal structure revealed in NDDE™, now traced across multiple sectors. The pattern remains constant: the government withdraws

© 2025 KATHERINE STARR | WWW.KATHERINESTARR.COM | ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

from direct enforcement, installs a private delegate, and fortifies that delegate with immunity that removes the possibility of effective judicial remedy. In the digital context, NDDE™ demonstrates how this structure enables unaccountable moderation, algorithmic harm, and the suppression or amplification of lawful speech. In the cross-sector context, The Negligent Shield™ shows how the same architecture governs athlete abuse cases, vaccine injury claims, banking collapse, environmental degradation, and beyond.

By aligning these frameworks, the doctrine becomes a unified legal tool. NDDE™ and *NDDE by a Sovereign Government*™ supply the digital and sovereign governance case studies; The Negligent Shield™ generalizes the model to all industries where Congress has paired delegation with immunity. Together, they provide a comprehensive map of statutory designs that enable harm while foreclosing remedy.

This alignment is critical for both litigation and reform. In the courtroom, the frameworks can be used to argue that immunity must be pierced when two conditions are met: (1) the harm is known and foreseeable; and (2) the immunity exists in deliberate avoidance of accountability. In the legislative arena, they provide the structural analysis needed to rewrite statutes so that delegation does not eliminate judicial access.

Ultimately, The Negligent Shield™ completes the arc begun in NDDE™: moving from a sector-specific diagnosis of negligent delegation to a cross-industry doctrine capable of challenging one of the most enduring and harmful patterns in modern U.S. governance.

XIV. Conclusion

The pattern is clear. Across telecommunications, technology, Olympic and amateur sport, youth protection, pharmaceuticals, banking, environmental regulation, defense contracting, nuclear energy, and airlines, Congress has built and maintained a governance model in which delegation and immunity operate as a single mechanism. Authority is transferred to private or quasi-private entities, those entities are fortified against liability, and the harmed are diverted into processes that offer neither meaningful remedy nor judicial oversight. The federal government retains the benefits of control while shedding the burdens of accountability.

This is not regulatory evolution; it is deliberate risk displacement. The Immunity Shield is the legal architecture that makes this displacement possible. It is durable because it serves the interests of both the delegator and the delegate. It is harmful because it removes from the enforcement equation the one element that makes public authority legitimate: the duty to answer for the consequences of its exercise.

The Negligent Shield™ names this structure and targets it for dismantling when two conditions converge: the harm is known and foreseeable, and the immunity exists in deliberate avoidance of accountability. In those circumstances, the Shield is not simply an administrative convenience; it is a negligent governance design that can and must be challenged.

© 2025 KATHERINE STARR | WWW.KATHERINESTARR.COM | ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

By aligning this doctrine with *Negligent Delegation of Digital Enforcement*™ and *Negligent Delegation of Digital Enforcement by a Sovereign Government*™, the framework expands from the digital sphere to the full spectrum of delegated authority. It becomes both an analytical tool for identifying negligent delegation across sectors and a legal strategy for piercing immunity where it has been used to shield harm.

The task ahead is to make the Shield visible. What is visible can be contested; what is contested can be dismantled. The principle is simple and enduring: no delegation of public authority can extinguish the duty to protect the public from foreseeable harm.

Citations and Attributes

How to Cite This Paper

APA (7th ed.)
Starr, K. (2025). *The Negligent Shield™: Delegation, Immunity, and the Architecture of Negligent Governance*. Retrieved from https://katherinestarr.com/the-negligent-shield

Bluebook (21st ed.)
Katherine Starr, *The Negligent Shield™: Delegation, Immunity, and the Architecture of Negligent Governance* (2025), https://katherinestarr.com/the-negligent-shield.

MLA (9th ed.)
Starr, Katherine. *The Negligent Shield™: Delegation, Immunity, and the Architecture of Negligent Governance*. 2025. Katherine Starr, https://katherinestarr.com/the-negligent-shield.

---

[1] *Katherine Starr, Negligent Delegation of Digital Enforcement™: A Framework for Constitutional Accountability in Platform Governance, KStarr Enterprises, LLC (2025), https://www.katherinestarr.com/citations/Digital-Enforcement-Katherine-Starr.pdf*

[2] *Katherine Starr, Negligent Delegation of Digital Enforcement by Sovereign Governments™: A Framework for Global Constitutional Accountability in Privatized Enforcement Systems, KStarr Enterprises, LLC (2025), https://www.katherinestarr.com/citations/sovereign-digitalenforcement-katherine-starr.pdf*

[3] Telecommunications Act, 47 U.S.C. § 332(c)(7)
[4] 47 U.S.C. § 230
[5] Telecommunications Act, 47 U.S.C. § 332(c)(7)
[6] Cellco Partnership v. FCC, 700 F.3d 534
[7] 47 U.S.C. § 230
[8] Zeran v. AOL, 129 F.3d 327
[9] Roommates.com, 521 F.3d 1157
[10] Herrick v. Grindr, 765 F. App'x 586; Gonzalez v. Google, 598 U.S. ___
[11] 36 U.S.C. §§ 220501–220529
[12] Lee v. US Taekwondo Union, 331 F. Supp. 2d 1252 (D. Haw. 2004)
[13] Slaney v. IAAF, 244 F.3d 580
[14] Harding v. USFSA, 851 F. Supp. 1476

© 2025 KATHERINE STARR | WWW.KATHERINESTARR.COM | ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

[15] Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse and Safe Sport Authorization Act (2018): 36 U.S.C. § 220541 et seq

[16] Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse and Safe Sport Authorization Act of 2017, Pub. L. No. 115-126, 132 Stat. 318 (2018))

[17] Egbert v. Griswold et al, No. 1:2022cv02943 - Document 153 (D. Colo. 2024)

[18] 36 U.S.C. § 220541; Pub. L. No. 115-126

[19] U.S. Senate, Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Product Safety, Insurance, and Data Security, The Courage of Survivors: A Call to Action (2019).; U.S. Gov't Accountability Office, Olympic and Amateur Athletes: USOPC Should Strengthen Safeguards for Athlete Safety, GAO-20-605 (2020).

[20] Feres v. United States, 340 U.S. 135 (1950)

[21] Boyle v. United Technologies, 487 U.S. 500 (1988)

[22] 42 U.S.C. § 300aa

[23] Bruesewitz v. Wyeth, 562 U.S. 223

[24] Wyeth v. Levine, 555 U.S. 555

[25] Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008, Pub. L. No. 110-343, 122 Stat. 3765 (2008). , Troubled Asset Relief Program (TARP), established under Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008, Pub. L. No. 110-343, 122 Stat. 3765.

[26] Dodd-Frank Act

[27] Bank of America v. City of Miami, 581 U.S. ___ (2017)

[28] U.S. EPA, Incentives for Self-Policing ("Audit Policy"), 65 Fed. Reg. 19,618 (Apr. 11, 2000).

[29] Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. § 7604; Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1365.

[30] Geier v. Honda, 529 U.S. 861 (2000)); see also Friends of the Earth, Inc. v. Laidlaw, 528 U.S. 167 (2000).

[31] 42 U.S.C. § 2210; Piney Run Pres. Ass'n v. Cty. Comm'rs of Carroll Cty., 268 F.3d 255 (4th Cir. 2001)

[32] Duke Power v. Carolina Environmental Study Group, 438 U.S. 59 (1978)

[33] Air Transportation Safety and System Stabilization Act, Pub. L. No. 107-42, 115 Stat. 230 (2001).

[34] In re September 11 Litigation, 751 F.3d 86 (2d Cir. 2014)

[35] September 11th Victim Compensation Fund

© 2025 KATHERINE STARR | WWW.KATHERINESTARR.COM | ALL RIGHTS RESERVED