

INDEX

- abuse of dominance in Article 82 of EC treaty. *See* Article 82
- actual versus likely effects.
 - See under* effects
- Adams, W., 91
- agreements restricting competition, 49 n.165
- Ahlborn, C., 118
- aims of Article 82. *See* objectives of Article 82
- allocative efficiency, 23, 27, 69
- Amato, G., 3, 184
- Amsterdam, Treaty of, 1 n.1
- antitrust in Article 82 of EC treaty.
 - See* Article 82
- The Antitrust Paradox* (Bork), 33
- Areeda, P., 30
- Article 81
 - exemption, 50
 - horizontal price fixing, 177
 - welfare standard, 23
- Article 82, 1–19
 - case law. *See* case law
 - concepts of abuse and dominance, defining, 10–11
 - consumer welfare. *See entries at* consumer welfare
 - creating certainty in application, 8
 - effects. *See* effects
 - efficiency considerations, 48–57
 - objective justification language, 53
 - structure of Article, room for efficiency in, 49–54
 - equivalent transactions treated dissimilarly, 105–7
 - exemption, no allowance for, 12, 49
 - formerly Article 86, 1
 - future application. *See* future application of Article 82
 - Guidance Paper*. *See Guidance Paper*
 - objective justification language, 53.
 - See also* efficiency
 - objectives. *See* objectives of Article 82
 - protection of competition versus competitors, 16–19, 93, 165, 183
 - ‘protection of other trading parties’.
 - See under* consumer welfare
 - objective, legitimacy of
 - review and reform, 1, 5, 11–16, 164–5, 176
 - text, 9
 - Treaty goals as a whole, 175
 - uncertainties regarding application, 1–8, 164–72, 176, 185
- Article 86 (now Article 82), 1.
 - See also* Article 82
- assumptions of abuse, 132–47
 - actual or likely effects, 123
 - conclusions regarding, 146–7, 148, 179–81, 183
 - consumer harm in presence of harm to structure of competition, 126, 132, 171, 179, 183
 - Guidance Paper*, 169, 183
 - intent
 - consumer welfare, 137–42
 - proxy for abuse, 133–7
 - methodology and objectives, distinguishing, 177–9
 - relationship between harm to economic freedom and harm to consumers, 127

- risk of elimination of competition as proxy for abuse, 142–6
- Bain, J., 30, 31
- barriers to entry. *See* market entry/ barriers to entry
- Böhm, F., 97, 98
- Bork, R., 21, 33–5, 38, 137
- Bowman, W., 33
- Brittan, L., 28, 70
- Brock, J. W., 91
- burden of proof, evidential, efficiency considerations affecting, 54–6
- Burstein, M., 33
- case law
- assumptions, 132–47, 148
 - consumer welfare as objective of Article 82
 - early jurisprudence, 71–4
 - recent jurisprudence, 74–6
 - economic freedom
 - endangered by alteration of competitive market structure, 88
 - fundamental right in EC legal order, 102–4
 - relative efficiency, 91
 - effects analysis, 124
 - European constitutionality, 99
 - fundamental human rights,
 - consistent protection of, 102 n.101
 - Guidance Paper*
 - courts not bound by, 156
 - legitimate expectations established by, 154–6
 - interpretations of Article 82, 2, 8–11
 - intrinsic versus instrumental
 - protection of competition, 94
 - ‘protection of other trading parties’ as protection of consumers, 107–10
 - reform of Article 82, 12
 - Chicago School, 21, 28, 29, 32–7, 48, 176
 - choice, anticompetitive foreclosure
 - reducing, 119–21
 - classical liberalism versus
 - ordoliberalism, 45, 98.
 - See also* ordoliberalism
 - coercion and foreclosure in
 - tying cases, 120
 - collusion, Chicago School on, 36
 - Colomer, R.-J., 139–40, 143
 - competition law in Article 82 of EC treaty. *See* Article 82
 - competition on the merits
 - (performance competition), 45, 45 n.155, 131, 165, 178
 - competition, protection of.
 - See* protection of competition
 - competitors
 - foreclosure, anticompetitive, 117–19
 - inefficient competitors, protecting economic freedom of, 85, 92, 129, 131, 132, 165–8
 - protection of competition versus protection of, 16–19, 93, 165, 183
 - complete (perfect) competition, 45–7, 136
 - constitutional issues
 - economic freedom as fundamental right. *See under* economic freedom
 - Treaty of Rome as constitution of EC, 99
 - consumer surplus welfare standard, 27, 69
 - consumer welfare, as objective of Article 82, 69–76, 82
 - assumptions regarding.
 - See* assumptions of abuse
 - balancing with economic freedom, 181
 - in Commission reports and papers, 70–1
 - defining consumer for purposes of, 17 n.71
 - early court cases, 71–4
 - effects-based approach. *See* effects
 - exclusionary conduct not always harming, 136
 - foreclosure, 115–117, 121

- consumer welfare, as objective of
 Article 82 (*cont.*)
Guidance Paper, 161
 intent and presumption of abuse,
 137–42
 legitimacy. *See* consumer welfare
 objective, legitimacy of
 methodology and objectives,
 distinguishing, 177–9
 protection of competition, as means
 of, 17
 recent court cases, 74–6
 relationship to economic freedom,
 127, 179
 risk of elimination of competition as
 proxy for abuse, 142–6
 theory. *See* consumer welfare theory
 consumer welfare objective, legitimacy
 of, 2, 3–5, 7, 84–112
 conclusions regarding, 110–12,
 150, 175
 economic freedom
 balancing with, 181
 fundamental right, status as, 84,
 94–105. *See under* economic
 freedom
 instrumental protection of
 competition in order to
 increase consumer welfare,
 90–3, 94
 potential conflict with, 16, 56,
 76, 84, 85–94, 111,
 172–4, 179
 ‘protection of other trading
 parties’ as protection of
 consumers, 85, 105–10
 case law regarding, 107–10
 competitive disadvantage,
 placement of other trading
 parties at, 107
 conclusions regarding, 110, 112
 equivalent transactions treated
 dissimilarly, 105–7
 utilitarian rule, consumer welfare
 as, 84, 88
 consumer welfare theory, 7, 20–58
 Chicago School on, 21, 28, 29, 32–7,
 48, 176
 consumer surplus welfare
 standard, 27, 69
 defining consumer welfare, 20
Discussion Paper on, 23, 51, 54, 70,
 161, 175
 efficiency. *See* efficiency
 Harvard School, 21, 28,
 29–32, 47–8
 ordoliberalism, 21, 39–48.
See also ordoliberalism
 Post-Chicago School, 21, 29, 37–9
 producer surplus welfare
 standard, 27
 schools of thought regarding, 28–9
 total welfare standard, 26
 US influence, 28
 Council of Europe, 8 n.28
 counterfactuals, importance of
 clarifying, 173
 Cournot, A. A., 24
 court cases. *See* case law
 criminalisation of European
 competition enforcement,
 136 n.116
 defence, efficiency as, 51, 53, 54–7
 Demsetz, H., 33
 DG COMP
*Discussion Paper. See Discussion
 Paper*
 responsibilities of, 15 n.59
 direct effect of EU law,
 doctrine of, 99
 Director, A., 32
Discussion Paper, 2, 15–16
 allocative efficiency, 69
 bibliographical information, 2 n.7
 consumer welfare theory, 23, 51, 54,
 70, 161, 175
 inefficient competitors, protecting,
 92, 131
 objectives of Article 82, 161
 substantive guidelines, 157–8
 dissimilar treatment of equivalent
 transactions, 105–7
 dominance, Article 82 of EC treaty on
 abuse of. *See* Article 82
 dynamic efficiency, 25, 27

- EAGCP (Economic Advisory Group on Competition Policy) report, 14, 176
- EC. *See* European Community
- Economic Advisory Group on Competition Policy (EAGCP) report, 14, 53, 114, 176
- economic freedom
- choice, anticompetitive foreclosure reducing, 119–21
 - complete (perfect) competition as standard, 45–7, 136
 - consumer welfare, 127, 179
 - defined, 5 n.19, 76
 - effects-based approach. *See* effects
 - efficiency, 85, 87–93
 - exclusionary conduct always harming, 136
 - fundamental right, 84, 94–105
 - conclusions regarding, 104, 111
 - in EC legal order, 101–4
 - in ordoliberal economic constitution, 95–8
 - relationship between EC legal order and ordoliberal economic constitution, 98–101
 - intrinsic versus instrumental protection of competition, 90–3, 94
 - market integration, 65
 - objective of Article 82, 5–6, 76–82, 83
 - assumptions regarding. *See* assumptions of abuse
 - balancing with consumer welfare, 181
 - case law, 76–82
 - Commission's early emphasis on, 76
 - conclusions regarding, 150, 175
 - consumer welfare. *See* consumer welfare objective, legitimacy of
 - economies of scale, protection of competitors lacking, 86, 93
 - foreclosure, 82, 83, 115, 117–121
 - inefficient competitors, protection of, 85, 92, 129
 - market integration, 142
 - as means to end or as end in itself, 87–93
 - methodology and objectives, distinguishing, 177–9
 - potential conflict with consumer welfare, 16, 56, 76, 84, 85–94, 111, 172–4, 179
 - protection of competition, as means of, 17
 - ordoliberalism
 - as fundamental right, 95–8
 - valorisation of, 5–6, 43–4, 45, 46, 76, 85, 87, 89
 - risk of elimination of competition as proxy for abuse, 142–6
 - structural arguments relating to effects, 121–32, 171, 179
- economies of scale, protection of competitors lacking, 86, 93
- ECSC. *See* European Coal and Steel Community
- effects, 6
- actual versus likely, 122–3
 - assumptions regarding, 123
 - choice, reduction of, 119
 - conclusions regarding, 148
 - foreclosure, 116, 119, 126
 - Guidance Paper* on, 168
 - risk of elimination of competition as proxy for abuse, 142–6
- anticompetitive foreclosure. *See* foreclosure, anticompetitive
- assumptions regarding. *See* assumptions of abuse
- conclusions regarding, 147–9, 151, 175, 183
- exclusionary abuse, demonstrating, 113
- Guidance Paper* on, 168–71
- market effects as effects on consumer versus structure of competition, 123–5
- methodology and objectives, distinguishing, 177–9
- methodology and objectives, link between, 113
- objectives, link to, 113

- effects (*cont.*)
 structural arguments, 121–32, 148, 171, 179
 tying cases
 coercion and foreclosure, 120, 126
 structure of competition, 125–30
- efficiency, 21, 22–8
 allocative, 23, 27, 69
 under Article 82, 48–57
 objective justification
 language, 53
 structure of Article, 49–54
 Chicago School on, 33
 correlation of different welfare standards, 22, 26–8
 defence, 51, 53, 54–7
 DG COMP *Discussion Paper* and, 23
 dynamic, 25, 27
 economic freedom, 85, 87–93
 evidential burden of proof, 54–6
Guidance Paper, 54, 56, 57, 165–8, 169–70, 171
 Harvard School, 31
 objective of competition, 69
 ordoliberal view, 47, 87
 productive, 24–5, 26, 27
 protection of competition as means to end or as end in itself, 87–93
 structure of competition analysis
 rejecting, 127–8
 types, 23–6
 Williamson's trade-off model, 22, 24, 25, 69
- efficient competitor test, 165–8, 171
 Elzinga, K., 91
 English clause, 107
 equivalent transactions treated
 dissimilarly, 105–7
 Erhard, L., 41, 95
 Eucken, W., 39 n.114, 40, 44
 European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC)
 historical background, 8 n.28
 Treaty, 72
 European Community (EC)
 Article 82 of EC Treaty. *See* Article 82
 economic freedom as fundamental right in legal order, 101–4
 fundamental human rights as basis of general principles of EC law, 102 n.103
 historical précis, 8 n.28
 ordoliberal economic constitution, 98–101
 terminology, 8 n.28, 8 n.29
 Treaty of Rome as constitution, 99.
See also Rome, Treaty of
- European Parliament Report, *Institutional and legal implications of soft law instruments*, 152, 159
- European Union (EU), 8 n.28
- evidential burden of proof, efficiency considerations affecting, 54–6
- exclusionary abuse
 allocative efficiency, 69
 application of Article 82, 18
 Article 82 not distinguishing
 between exploitative abuse and 9
 defined, 9 n.33, 27 n.33
 economic freedom and consumer welfare, 136
 effects demonstrating, 113
 foreclosure. *See* foreclosure, anticompetitive justification, 53 n.186
- exclusive purchasing agreements, 81–2, 105–7, 168
- executive action and fundamental rights, 103 n.106
- exemption, Article 82 not allowing for, 12, 49
- exploitative abuse
 application of Article 82, 17
 Article 82 not distinguishing
 between exclusionary abuse and, 9
 defined, 9 n.33
 foreclosure, 116
 total welfare standard, 27
- Fennelly, N., 144, 145–6
 fidelity rebates, 81–2, 105–7, 178
 fines, *Guidance Paper* on setting, 163
 foreclosure, anticompetitive, 114–21
 actual versus likely, 116, 119, 126

- choice reduction, 119–21
- coercion and foreclosure in tying cases, 120, 126
- competition on the merits, 178
- conclusions regarding, 147
- consumer welfare, 115–117, 121
- customers, competitors and business partners, 117–19
- economic freedom, 82, 83, 115, 117–121
- Guidance Paper*, 115–16, 163, 169, 170
- horizontal, 115
- objectives of Article 82, 115
- ordoliberal dislike of market power, 118
- structure of competition analysis, 128–9
- vertical, 115
- Fox, E., 137
- freedom of competition. *See* economic freedom
- Freiburg School, 39 n.114, 39–40
- Friedman, W., 32
- fundamental rights
- case law consistently protecting, 102 n.101
 - economic freedom. *See under* economic freedom
- executive action, 103 n.106
- general principles of EC law, 102 n.103
- future application of Article 82, 175–85
- assumption of abuse, 179–81, 183
 - balancing consumer welfare and economic freedom, 181
 - efficiencies, 175, 184
 - Guidance Paper*, 172–4
 - methodology and objectives, distinguishing, 177–9
 - undistorted competition, as overriding objective, 175, 181, 182
- geographic price discrimination, 66–8
- Germany, origins of ordoliberalism in, 39 n.118, 39–40
- goals of Article 82. *See* objectives of Article 82
- Gormsen, L. L., 3 n.13, 14 n.54, 19 n.77, 30 n.41, 76 n.93, 85 n.2, 113 n.3, 177 n.10
- Grave, C., 118
- Guidance Paper*, 8, 150–74
- aim, 157–61
 - assumptions of abuse, 169, 183
 - bibliographical information, 4 n.18
 - Chicago School, 175
 - Commission framework, 162–4
 - conflict between consumer welfare and economic freedom not resolved by, 172–4
 - consumer welfare theory, 70, 161
 - defence, lack of terminology of, 54
 - Discussion Paper*, 16, 157–8
 - effects, 168–71
 - efficiencies, 54, 56, 57, 165–8, 169–70, 171
 - foreclosure, 115–16, 163, 168, 170
 - future application of Article 82, 172–4
 - Harvard School, 47
 - inefficient competitors, 131
 - legal basis for issuing, 156–7
 - legal certainty, providing, 154
 - legitimate expectations, establishing, 154–6
 - objectives of Article 82, 4, 161, 168, 172–4, 182
 - priority guidelines
 - consumer welfare as priority rather than objective, 161
 - legal basis for issuing, 156–7
 - versus substantive guidelines, 157–61
 - role, 152–6
 - setting fines, 163
 - soft law, guidelines as, 152–3, 156, 159
 - substantive versus priority guidelines, 157–61
 - transparency, ensuring, 154, 154 n.12, 155
 - uncertainties regarding application of Article 82, 164–72, 185
- Harvard School, 21, 28, 29–32, 47–8
- Hawk, B. E., 3

- horizontal foreclosure, 115
horizontal price fixing, 177
Hovenkamp, H., 37–8
human rights, fundamental.
 See fundamental rights
- ICN (International Competition Network) report, 4, 4 n.14
- inefficiency and economic freedom preferred by ordoliberals, 47, 87
- inefficient competitors, protecting economic freedom of, 85, 92, 129, 131, 132, 165–8
- Institutional and legal implications of soft law instruments* (European Parliament Report), 152, 159
- instrumental versus intrinsic protection of competition, 90–3, 94
- integrated market, as objective of Article 82, 64–9, 82, 135 n.115, 142, 168, 173
- intent
 consumer welfare, 137–42
 criminalisation of European competition enforcement, 136 n.116
 proxy for abuse, 133–7
- International Competition Network (ICN) report, 4, 4 n.14
- interpretations of Article 82, 2, 8–11
- intervention by state in ordoliberal view, 44–5
- intrinsic versus instrumental protection of competition, 90–3, 94
- Jacobs, F. G., 102 n.104
Jacobs, M., 55, 75, 137–9, 141, 145
Joliet, R., 17
judicial cases/jurisprudence. *See* case law
- Kant, I., 87
Kaysen, C., 30
Kokott, J., 13, 89, 117, 158
Kroes, N., 2, 17, 50, 53, 123
- legal basis for issuing guidelines, 156–7
- legal certainty, guidelines providing, 154
- liberalism, classical, versus ordoliberalism, 45, 98.
 See also ordoliberalism
- liberalisation of markets formerly containing monopolies, 60, 92
- likely versus actual effects. *See* effects, actual versus likely
- Lisbon Treaty, 8 n.29, 12
- Lowe, P., 1, 2, 2 n.5, 14 n.52, 39, 90–1, 117
- loyalty rebates, 81–2, 105–7, 178
- Maastricht Treaty, 8 n.28
- Maduro, M. P., 100
- margin squeeze, 166, 166 n.71
- market effects as effects on consumer versus structure of competition, 123–5
- market entry/barriers to entry
 Chicago School, 36
 economic freedom versus consumer welfare, 80
 effects of barriers to entry, Article 82 as corrective to, 135 n.115
 Harvard School, 31, 47
 structural analysis, 129
- market failures
 ordoliberalism, 44
 Post-Chicago School, 38
- market integration, as objective of Article 82, 64–9, 82, 135 n.115, 142, 168, 173
- market liberalisation, 60, 92
- market power
 assessed by effects on market, 124
 Harvard School and ordoliberalism compared, 48
 ordoliberalism on, 46, 118
- market share, 162, 183
- Marshall, A., 24
- Mason, E., 30
- Mazák, J., 142–6
- McGee, R., 33
- mergers

- foreclosure, 116
vertical. *See* vertical mergers and restraints
- Mestmäcker, E. J., 17, 65, 99
- methodology and objectives of Article 82, 113, 177–9
- Miksch, L., 44
- monopolies
liberalisation of markets formerly containing, 60, 92
structure of competition and consumer welfare, 130
- Monti, G., 92
- Monti, M., 1, 7 n.26, 124, 164
- Möschel, W., 46
- Nazi Germany and origins of ordoliberalism, 39 n.118, 39–40
- objective justification. *See* efficiency
- objective of competition, efficiency viewed as, 69
- objectives of Article 82, 1–5, 7, 59–83
conclusions regarding, 150, 175
consumer welfare. *entries at* consumer welfare
economic freedom. *See under* economic freedom
effects, link to, 113
foreclosure, 115
Guidance Paper, 4, 161, 168, 172–4, 182
market integration, 64–9, 82, 135 n.115, 142, 168, 173
methodology, 113, 177–9
multiplicity, 59, 168
undistorted competition, 60–4, 82, 83, 173, 175, 181, 182
- Ordnungspolitik*, 41, 45
- ordoliberalism
competition policy, 42–5
complete (perfect) competition, concept of, 45–7
consumer welfare theory, 21, 39–48
EC legal order, relationship to, 98–101
- economic freedom
fundamental constitutional right, 95–8
valorisation, 5–6, 43–4, 45, 46, 76, 85, 87, 89
efficiency, 47, 87
foreclosure, anticompetitive, 118
Harvard School compared, 47–8
ideology, 40–2
intervention by state, 44–5
market power, 46, 118
origins and development, 39 n.118, 39–40
traditional classical liberalism differentiated, 45, 98
- parallel trade, 67–9, 137–42
- Paulis, E., 54–5
- penalties, *Guidance Paper* on setting, 163
- per se* rules, 5, 36–7, 139, 169, 177, 178
- perfect (complete) competition, 45–7, 136
- performance competition (competition on the merits), 45, 45 n.155, 131, 165, 178
- Pescatore, P., 77
- Popper, K., 178
- Posner, R., 21, 52, 92
- possible/probable versus actual effects. *See* effects, actual versus likely
- Post-Chicago School, 21, 29, 37–9
- predation, Chicago School on, 35
- predatory pricing, 142–146, 177, 178
- predictability (legal certainty), guidelines providing, 154
- presumptions. *See* assumptions of abuse
- price discrimination, geographic, 66–8
- price fixing, horizontal, 177
- price regulation, 92, 131, 141, 166
- pricing, predatory, 142–146, 177, 178
- priority guidelines
consumer welfare as priority rather than objective, 161
legal basis for issuing, 156–7
versus substantive guidelines, 157–61

- probable/possible versus actual effects.
 See effects, actual versus likely
 producer surplus welfare standard, 27
 productive efficiency, 24–5, 26, 27
 proof, evidential burden of, efficiency
 considerations affecting, 54–6
 protection of competition.
 See also economic freedom
 intrinsic versus instrumental, 90–3,
 94
 means to end or as end in itself,
 87–93
 protection of competitors versus,
 16–19, 93, 165, 183
 ‘protection of other trading parties’ in
 Article 82. *See under* consumer
 welfare objective, legitimacy of
 purposes of Article 82. *See* objectives of
 Article 82
- Rawlinson, F., 152
 reason, rule of, 5, 36
 rebates, 81–2, 105–7, 133, 133 n.91, 135,
 142, 177
 recoupment, 142–6
 refusal to supply, 77, 137–42, 177
 review and reform of Article 82, 1, 5,
 11–16, 164–5
 rights, fundamental. *See* fundamental
 rights
 risk of elimination of competition as
 proxy for abuse, 142–6
- Roemer, K., 72
 Rome, Treaty of
 Article 82. *See* Article 82
 constitution of EC, 99
 economic freedom as fundamental
 right, 101–4
 historical significance, 8 n.28
 legal authority of EC Commission,
 156–7
 reading Article 82 in context of full
 Treaty goals, 175
 relationship between EC legal order
 and ordoliberal economic
 constitution, 98–101
 Spaak Report, 66 n.35
 TFEU, future designation as, 8 n.29
- Röpke, W., 44
 rule of reason, 5, 36
- S-C-P paradigm, 30, 33
 sanctions, *Guidance Paper* on setting,
 163
 Senden, L., 152
 Sherman Act (US), 1 n.2, 2, 29
 Siragusa, M., 18
 Smith, A., 98
 Snyder, F., 152
 social market economy.
 See ordoliberalism
 soft law, 152–3, 156, 159, *See Guidance
 Paper*
Spaak Report, 65, 66 n.35, 100 n.82
 state intervention, ordoliberal view of,
 44–5
 Stigler, G., 32, 38
 structural arguments relating to
 effects, 121–32, 148, 171, 179
 substantive versus priority guidelines,
 157–61
 supremacy of EU law, doctrine of, 99
- Telser, L., 33
 TFEU (Treaty on the Functioning of
 the European Union), 8 n.29
 total welfare standard, 26, 34
 trade liberalisation, 60, 92
 trade-offs
 EAGCP, 53
 Williamson’s trade-off model, 22,
 24, 25, 69
 transparency, guidelines ensuring,
 154, 154 n.12, 155
- Treaties
 Amsterdam, 1 n.1
 ECSC, 72
 Lisbon, 8 n.29, 12
 Maastricht, 8 n.28
 Rome. *See* Rome, Treaty of
 TFEU (Treaty on the Functioning of
 the European Union), 8 n.29
- Turner, D., 30
 tying cases
 coercion and foreclosure
 in, 120, 126

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-76714-9 - A Principled Approach to Abuse of Dominance in European Competition Law

Liza Lovdahl Gormsen

Index

[More information](#)

INDEX

207

- effects on the structure of competition, analysing, 125–30
- undistorted competition, as objective of Article 82, 60–4, 82, 83, 173, 175, 181, 182
- unfair competition, Article 82 of EC treaty on. *See* Article 82
- United States antitrust law
 - consumer welfare theory, different schools influencing, 28
 - Sherman Act, 1 n.2, 2, 29
- utilitarian rule
 - consumer welfare, 84, 88
 - defined, 88 n.19
- Van Gerven, W., 108
- vertical foreclosure, 115
- vertical mergers and restraints
 - Chicago School, 35
 - economic freedom versus consumer welfare, 80
 - Harvard School, 32
- Von der Groeben, H., 72
- Waelbroeck, M., 65
- Williamson's trade-off model, 22, 24, 25, 69