

## Index

- Abuse of governmental processes, 141, 186  
 Abuse of standard-setting processes, 141  
 Administrability, 5, 59. See also Effects-based tests;  
   Profit-focused tests  
     Methodology, 18  
     Post-Chicago School theories, 59  
 Algorithms. See Purpose: Algorithmic  
   decision-making  
 Allocative efficiency. See Economic efficiency:  
   Allocative efficiency  
 Amazon, 34, 60, 140  
 Anticompetitive effect  
   EC Guidance Paper ‘anti-competitive  
   foreclosure’, 167  
   Microsoft case, 162  
   Substantial lessening of competition, 172–6  
 Antitrust Paradox, The, 117  
 Aristotle. See History of unilateral anticompetitive  
   conduct laws: Aristotle  
 Arrow, Kenneth, 52  
 Arsonist example, 143  
 Australia  
   Australian Competition and Consumer  
   Commission  
     ACCC Draft Framework for Guidelines on  
     Misuse of Market Power, 225  
     ACCC Interim Guidelines on Misuse of  
     Market Power, 171, 194, 225  
     Effects test advocacy, 3, 19, 95  
     Enforcement under previous provision, 14  
 Australian Industries Preservation Act 1906  
   (Cth), 31, 66–80  
   Amendment of, 76–8  
   Disuse, Reasons for, 78–80  
   Repeal, 78  
 Australian Labor Party, 79, 88  
 Authorization. See Misuse of market power:  
   Authorization  
 Background to misuse of market power debate,  
   3, 90–7  
 Birdsville Amendment, 89, 105  
 CCA section 46 text, after 2017 amendments, 15  
 CCA section 46 text, prior to 2017 amendments,  
   12  
 Chilling effects, Arguments concerning, 14,  
   20–1, 96, 172, 192–5  
 Coal Vend case  
   Consumer welfare vs total welfare, 74–6  
   Economic freedom, 75  
   Facts, 71  
   Full High Court decision, 73–5  
   Generally, 70–98  
   High Court decision, 71–4  
   Intention, 72–3  
   Monopolization defined by Isaacs J, 71–2, 74  
   Privy Council decision, 74–6  
   Public, Meaning of, 73  
   Restraint of trade, 74–6  
   US law, Relevance of, 75  
 Competition and Consumer Amendment  
   (Competition Policy Review) Act 2017  
   (Cth), 3, 65  
 Competition and Consumer Amendment  
   (Misuse of Market Power) Act 2017  
   (Cth), 15, 65, 105  
 Competition, Meaning of, 106  
 Conduct approach, 56  
 Constitutional law issues, 69–70, 79, 87  
 Consumer welfare, 107–8, 175–6, 179  
 Debate over misuse of market power standard,  
   12–15, 20–1  
 Dominance per se, Proposal to prohibit, 49

- Australia (cont.)  
 Effects test. See Substantial lessening of competition test  
 Green Paper 1984, 93  
 Harper Amendments, 3, 15, 65, 89  
 Harper recommendations, 15, 107, 223  
 Harper Review, 15, 96  
 History  
   Australian Industries Preservation Act 1906 (Cth), 31, 66–80  
   Barwick, Sir Garfield, Investigation and proposal, 81–6  
   Billson, Bruce, 38  
   Effects debate, 12–15, 90–7  
   Evans, Gareth, 93  
   Great Depression, 78, 80  
   Hughes, William (Billy), 76–7  
   Labour Party, 68  
   Liberal Country Party, 91  
   McKay, H V, 68  
   Monopoly problem, 51, 81, 88  
   Murphy, Lionel, 87, 90, 100, 123  
   Nationalization, 68, 79  
   Orderly marketing, 80  
   Purpose debate, 90–7  
   Snedden, Billy, 99  
   State legislation, 79  
   Trade Practices Commission, 87–8  
   Unilateral conduct laws, Successive, 65, 86–9  
 Hunting dog, 3  
 Legislation generally  
   Detailed, 66  
   Multiple amendments, 66, 89–103  
 Objectives of misuse of market power provision, 104–9  
 Purpose element, Criticism of, 14, 90  
 QCMA decision, 106  
 Reviews  
   Dawson Review, 13  
   Generally, 12–13, 20, 90–7  
   Green Paper 1984, 93  
   Harper Review, 15, 96  
   Recommendations on effects test, 14  
   Senate Economics Review Committee 2011, 15  
   Swanson Committee, 91–2  
 Sims, Rod, 15  
 Small business, 37–8, 103–4  
 Structural focus, 107  
 Substantial lessening of competition test. See Substantial lessening of competition test  
 Take advantage element, Criticism of, 14  
 Take advantage test. See Take advantage test  
 Trade Practices Act 1965 (Cth), 86, 98  
 Trade Practices Act 1974 (Cth), 88  
   Amendment of, 89  
 Trade Practices Amendment Act 1977 (Cth), 12, 92  
 Trade Practices Legislation Amendment Act 2008 (Cth), 126–7  
 Trade Practices Revision Act 1986 (Cth), 93  
 Uncertainty, Arguments about, 14  
 United States approach rejected, 84  
 United States influence, 31, 67, 69, 83  
 Austrian school of antitrust, 44  
 Authorization. See Misuse of market power: Authorization  
 Balancing effects, 187–90, 239  
 Barwick, Sir Garfield, 81–6  
 Bork, Robert, 116, 120  
 Buying up critical input, 175  
 Canada, 67, 82–3  
 Case-by-case analysis. See Effects-based tests: Case-by-case analysis  
 Causation, 143  
 Certainty, 5. See also Effects-based tests: Profit-focused tests; Substantial lessening of competition test  
   Competition law, characterized by uncertainty, 20  
   Compliance costs, 18  
   Methodology, 18  
   Substantial market power requirement, 63  
 Cheap exclusion, 141–4  
   Meaning, 141  
   Non-dominant firm, Possible for, 144  
 Chicago School. See United States of America: Chicago School  
 Coal Vend case. See Australia: Coal Vend case  
 Coase, R H, 159  
 Common law  
   England  
     Engrossing, 25  
     Forestalling, 25, 28  
     Regrating, 25  
     Restraint of trade, 26–7  
   United States  
     Restraint of trade, 30  
 Comparative analysis  
   Choice of comparators, 17  
   Functionalism, 17  
   Methodology, 16–18  
 Competition for the market, 198  
 Competition on the merits, 106  
 Compliance costs. See Certainty

- Concentration, 1, 29  
 Innovation, Effect on, 53  
 Conduct approach, 45, 48–51, 55–7  
 Conduct-specific tests. See Multiple tests  
 Consumer surplus, 38, 40  
 Consumer welfare, 43. See also Substantial lessening of competition test  
 Australia  
 Coal Vend case, 75  
 Meaning, 38–9  
 Narrow definition, 44  
 Objectives, 38–9  
 Costs of monopoly  
 Allocative inefficiency, 41–3  
 Dynamic inefficiency, 42–3  
 Economic inefficiency, 40–1  
 Formal monopolies, price and quality, 24–5  
 Managerial slack, 42  
 Mixed effects, 43  
 Output limitation, 41, 43  
 Political freedom, 2, 30  
 Productive inefficiency, 41–3  
 X-inefficiency, 42  
 Counterfactual, 118, 132–3, 148–9, 167, 173  
 Creative destruction, 52
- Data  
 Access to, 60  
 Behavioural discrimination, 2  
 Big data, 2  
 Platform markets, 175  
 Price discrimination, 2  
 Privacy, 104, 175  
 Deadweight loss. See Economics: Deadweight loss  
 Deceitful practices, 186  
 Decision theory, 156–60, 166. See also Error-cost analysis: Decision theory  
 Democracy. See Costs of monopoly: Political freedom  
 Deontological view. See Objectives: Competition, Protection of  
 Deterrent effects, 3  
 Disproportionality. See Effects-based tests:  
 Hovenkamp's 'proportionality' definition  
 Dominance per se  
 Not prohibited, 64  
 Prohibition of, 46–9  
 Dominant firm. See Substantial market power  
 Durable monopolies, 57  
 Dynamic competition. See Economic efficiency:  
 Dynamic efficiency
- Easterbrook, Frank H, 157–99  
 Economic efficiency  
 Allocative efficiency, 41, 43  
 Dynamic efficiency, 42–3, 177–8  
 Arrow, Kenneth, 52–3  
 Schumpeter, Joseph, 52  
 Substantial lessening of competition test, 177–8  
 Meaning, 39  
 Productive efficiency, 41, 43  
 Chicago School, 53  
 Economic freedom. See Objectives: Economic freedom; European Union: Objectives  
 Economics  
 Absolute monopolies, 39, 53  
 Competitive price, 39  
 Deadweight loss, 41–2  
 Market power, 40  
 Minimum efficient scale, 50  
 Monopoly pricing, 40  
 Natural monopoly, 50  
 Pareto optimality, 41  
 Perfectly competitive markets, 39–41  
 Effects-based tests  
 Administrability, 155, 187–90  
 Advantages  
 Alignment with objectives, 154, 186, 240  
 Flexibility, 160  
 Objective analysis, 235  
 Assumptions underlying, 155  
 Balancing effects, 187–90  
 Case-by-case analysis, 158, 161–3, 165, 187, 190  
 Common themes, 186–7  
 Consumer harm, 186  
 Counterfactual, 167, 173  
 Criticisms of, 155–6, 187–99  
 Definition, 4, 154  
 Disadvantages  
 Costs of enforcement and administration, 159  
 Disincentive effects, 156, 159–60, 190–9  
 False positives, 158–9  
 Uncertainty, 156, 166, 195–9  
 Easterbrook criticisms, 157–99  
 EC Guidance Paper, 166–70, 190–1  
 Anti-competitive foreclosure, 167  
 Criticism of, 169–70  
 Efficiency defence, 168–9  
 Objective necessity, 168  
 Predatory pricing, 193  
 Efficiencies, Consideration of, 187  
 EC Guidance Paper, 168–9  
 Substantial lessening of competition test, 170, 176–9  
 Error cost debate, 160–1, 190–9  
 Ex ante assessment, 229  
 Free products. See Zero-priced services  
 Generally, 154–7

- Effects-based tests (cont.)  
 Hovenkamp's 'proportionality' definition, 165–6, 190  
 Innovation, 195–9  
 Integration approach, 160–1, 165  
 Microsoft case, DC Circuit decision, 8, 161–99  
 Mixed effects, 43, 155, 187–90  
 Objective analysis, 166  
 Pricing, Above-cost predatory, 192–5  
 Remedies, Difficulty constructing, 156, 158, 166  
 Rule of reason, 158, 161–99  
 Salop's consumer harm test, 163–5, 189–90  
 Predatory pricing, 193  
 Product design changes, 197–8  
 Similarities, 186–7  
 Substantial lessening of competition test, 170–86  
 Engrossing. See Common law: England:  
 Engrossing
- Equally efficient competitor  
 EC Guidance Paper, 167–8, 193–4  
 Generally, 37, 116, 131  
 Predatory pricing, 194  
 SLC test, 183, 194
- Error-cost analysis. See also Effects-based tests;  
 Profit-focused tests  
 Australian arguments about false positives, 20–1  
 Chicago School, Use by, 19–20  
 Competition law, Use in, 19–21  
 Decision theory, 19  
 Easterbrook, Challenges to, 20  
 Easterbrook, Frank, 19–20  
 Error costs, Meaning, 19  
 False negative errors, 19  
 False positive errors, 19  
 Methodology, 18–21
- EU TFEU Article 102 'dominant position', 63
- European Union  
 Abuse of dominance, 56  
 Exclusionary conduct, 56  
 Exploitative practices, 56  
 Article 102 TFEU text, 9  
 Australian law, Influence on, 82–3  
 Commission of the European Communities, 5, 9–11  
 Conduct approach, 56  
 Debate about test for abuse of dominance, 9–11  
 DG Competition Staff Discussion Paper 2005, 10  
 Dominant position, 61  
 Economic Advisory Group on Competition  
 Policy Report 2005, 10, 33  
 Effects-based analysis, 9–11, 166–70  
 Efficiency defence, 226–7  
 Formalism, 5, 9–11  
 Guidance on Commission's Enforcement  
 Priorities in Applying Art 82 of the EC  
 Treaty, 10–11, 166–70, 226–7  
 History  
 Ordoliberalism, 31, 36, 44  
 Dominance per se, 46–7  
 Treaty of Rome Art 82, 31  
 Modernization, 9–11, 166  
 Objective justification, 226–7  
 Objectives  
 Competitive process, Protection of, 32  
 Economic freedom, 32, 36  
 Market integration, 33  
 Predatory pricing, 131, 193  
 Special responsibility, 98  
 Exclusivity agreements, 175  
 Exploitative conduct, 56, 60  
 Exploitative practices  
 European Union, 56
- Facebook, 34, 60
- Federal Trade Commission. See United States of  
 America: Federal Trade Commission
- Financial power. See Take advantage test: Use of  
 financial power distinguished
- First-mover advantages, 56–7
- Forestalling. See Common law: England:  
 Forestalling
- Formal monopolies. See History of unilateral  
 anticompetitive conduct laws: Formal  
 monopolies
- Formalism. See European Union: Formalism
- Fox, Eleanor, 108
- Free markets, 28–9
- Game theory. See United States of America:  
 Post-Chicago School: Game theory
- Germany, 82  
 Competition legislation, Early, 31  
 Gesetz gegen Wettbewerbsbeschränkungen  
 ('GWB') 1957, 31  
 Objectives  
 Economic freedom, 36  
 Political freedom, 34  
 Ordoliberalism, 31–2, 34, 36, 44  
 Dominance per se, 46–7  
 Treaty of Rome Art 82, German influence on, 31  
 United States influence, 31, 82
- Goals. See Objectives
- Google, 1, 34, 60  
 European Commission decision, 5–6  
 US Federal Trade Commission investigation,  
 5–6
- Governmental processes, Abuse of, 141, 186

- Great Britain, 82  
 Australian law, Influence on, 83, 85  
 Guild system. See Common law: England:  
 Restraint of trade
- Harper Review, 3
- Harvard School. See United States of America:  
 Harvard School
- History of unilateral anticompetitive conduct laws  
 Aristotle, accounts of monopolies, 24  
 England  
 Engrossing, 25  
 Forestalling, 25  
 Formal markets, 25  
 Re-grating, 25  
 Restraint of trade, 26–7  
 First unilateral conduct laws, 23–4, 30, 67  
 Formal monopolies, 24–5, 28  
 Free market advocates, Early, 28–9  
 Freedom of contract, 29  
 Pendulum analogy, 46  
 Sherman Act section 2, 23–4  
 Statute of Monopolies, 25  
 United Kingdom  
 Influence on US and Australia, 24  
 Restraint of trade, 24  
 United States of America, 23–4
- Hovenkamp, Herbert, 165–6
- Hughes, William (Billy), 76–7
- Hunting dog. See Australia: Hunting dog
- Incentives. See Monopoly profit: Incentive to  
 invest; Effects-based tests: Disadvantages
- Inequality, 1
- Innovation, 43, 51, See also Predatory Innovation;  
 Costs of monopoly: Dynamic  
 inefficiency  
 Arrow, Kenneth, 52–3  
 Competition spurring, 52–3  
 Monopoly profit as reward. See Monopoly  
 profit: Incentive to invest
- Schumpeter, Joseph, 52
- Structure, Market, 53
- Substantial lessening of competition test,  
 177–8
- Intent. See Purpose
- International context  
 Comparative analysis. See Comparative analysis  
 Competition law in other jurisdictions, 82  
 Consensus, Attempts to reach, 2  
 Debate, European Union and United States of  
 America, 2, 5–6  
 Unilateral anticompetitive conduct laws  
 generally, 31
- Intrabrand vs interbrand competition, 182
- Isaacs, Isaac, 66–8, 71, 74
- Japan, 82
- Jury trials. See United States of America: Jury trials
- Laissez-faire, 28–9  
 Chicago School  
 Error-cost analysis, 19
- Land banking, 225
- Legitimacy  
 Methodology, 18  
 Substantial lessening of competition test, 13, 235,  
 240
- Legitimate business rationale. See Purpose:  
 Legitimate business purpose
- Likely effect. See Substantial lessening of  
 competition test: Likely effect
- Limits of Antitrust, The, 157–60, See *also*  
 Error-cost analysis: Easterbrook, Frank
- Market power. See also Substantial market power  
 Meaning, 40  
 Threats to economic efficiency, 40–1
- Melamed, Douglas, 121, 130, 137
- Microsoft, 35
- Microsoft case. See United States of America:  
 Microsoft case
- Minimum efficient scale, 50
- Misuse of market power  
 ACCC Interim Guidelines on Misuse of Market  
 Power, 171, 194
- Authorization  
 Economic efficiency, 109, 176  
 Effectiveness of process, 179–80, 239  
 Generally, 101–4  
 Grounds, 102  
 Harper Amendments, 90, 102  
 Harper recommendation, 102  
 Origins, 88  
 Process, 102  
 Weaknesses of, 179–80
- Competitive process, Protection of, 106
- Consumer interests, 107
- Defence, Proposed Harper ‘rational business  
 decision’, 225
- Likely effect vs purpose, 203–29
- Objectives of section 46(1), 103–4
- Predatory pricing, 194–5
- Small business, 104–9
- Substantial lessening of competition test. See  
 Substantial lessening of competition test
- Mixed effects. See Effects-based tests: Mixed  
 effects; Costs of monopoly: Mixed effects

- Mixed effects, Conduct with, 137–9, 155  
 M oligopolies, 178  
 Monopolization. *See* United States of America:  
   Monopolization  
 Monopoly leveraging  
   Australia, misuse of market power, 170  
   Chicago School, 54  
   Post-Chicago School, 57  
 Monopoly pricing. *See* Economics: Monopoly  
   pricing  
 Monopoly profit  
   Incentive to invest, 60  
   Incentive to invest, 8, 51–3  
     Greater with competition, 52–3  
   Schumpeter, Joseph, 52  
 Motive, 203  
 Multiple tests, 165, 191, 202
- Naked exclusion. *See* Plain exclusion  
 National champions, 50  
 Natural monopolies, 49–50, 60  
 Network effects, 140  
 New economy markets, 140  
 New Zealand, 82–3, 111  
 No economic sense test. *See* Profit-focused tests:  
   No economic sense test  
 Non-dominant firms  
   Comparison with dominant firm conduct, 98,  
     124–6, 132–3, 139–40, 149  
   Exclusionary conduct by, 64  
   Legitimate business purpose, 138  
 Norms, Implicit, 142, 147, 188, 201
- Objective anticompetitive purpose  
   Characterization of conduct, 226–33  
   Definition, 201  
   Likely effect distinguished, 229–31  
   Signposts in existing case law, 228–9  
 Objective necessity. *See* Effects-based tests: EC  
   Guidance Paper
- Objectives  
   Competition, Protection of, 32–3, 44–5  
     Deontological vs utilitarian view, 44  
   Competitive process, Protection of, 32–3, 44–5  
   Competitors, Not protecting, 32–3  
   Consumer interests, long-term, 43  
   Consumer welfare, 38–9, 45  
     Broad definition, 43  
     Narrow definition, 44  
   Economic efficiency, 38–44  
   Economic freedom, 32, 35–8, 44, 47, 75, 84  
   Fairness, 33, 37  
   Market integration, 33  
   Political freedom, 30, 33–4, 44, 47
- Producer welfare, 39  
 Robust markets, 108  
 Total welfare, 39–40
- Online platforms. *See* Platforms  
 Ordoliberalism  
   Böhm, Franz, 47  
   Competition per se, Protection of, 44  
   Complete competition, 46  
   Criticism of, 47  
   Dominance per se, Prohibition of, 46–7  
   Influence on EU law, 31  
   Objectives, 44, 47  
   Private economic power, 34
- Output limitation. *See* Costs of monopoly: Output  
   limitation
- Pareto optimality. *See* Economics:  
   Pareto optimality
- Patents  
   Fraudulent acquisition of, 141, 166  
   Gaming of patent regulations, 141  
   Product hopping, 134–5, 238–9
- Perfectly competitive markets. *See* Economics:  
   Perfectly competitive markets
- Pharmaceuticals, 134–5, 142  
   Product hopping, 238–9
- Plain exclusion, 141–4  
   Purpose of substantially lessening competition,  
     236  
   Truncated analysis, 142, 229, 236
- Platforms, 2  
   Direct regulation, 60  
   Effects across markets, 178, 192  
   Exploitation of content providers, 185  
   Network effects, 140  
   Political power of ‘super platforms’, 34  
   Predatory conduct arguments, 192  
   Public utilities, As, 60  
   Zero-price services, 175
- Political power. *See* Costs of monopoly: Political  
   freedom
- Post-Chicago School. *See* United States of  
   America: Post-Chicago School
- Predatory innovation  
   Effects-based tests, 195–9  
   Meaning, 195  
   No economic sense test, 134–5  
   Pharmaceuticals, 134–5  
   Product design changes, 135, 195  
   Product hopping, 134–5, 238–9  
   Under-inclusive approach, 196
- Predatory pricing  
   Above-cost predation, 192–5  
   Areeda-Turner test, 115–16, 131

- Average variable cost, Pricing below, 116
- Chicago School, 54
- EU approach, 131
- Legitimate business reason, 225
- Marginal cost, Pricing below, 116
- New economy markets, 140–1
- Non-dominant firm comparison, 140–1
- Platform markets, 175
- Post-Chicago School, 57
- Purpose, Relevance of, 130–1
- Recoupment, 193
- Substantial lessening of competition test, 194–5
- US case law, 119
- Zero-priced services, 175, 192
- Price control
  - Australian war-time regulation, 78
  - England and France, Sixteenth and Seventeenth century, 24–5
  - Medieval governments, Price-setting, 26
- Price regulation, 60
- Price theory. See United States of America: Chicago School: Price theory
- Prices, Excessive, 60
- Privacy, 104, 175
- Procompetitive justifications, 162, 221
- Producer surplus, 39
- Producer welfare, 40, 43
- Product design changes, 135, 195–9
- Product hopping, 134–5
- Profit-focused tests
  - Administrability, 121, 147–53
  - Advantages, 130–5
    - Beneficial conduct not captured, 133–5
    - Market power and conduct relationship, 132–3
    - Objective purpose, Explaining, 130–2, 229
  - Areeda-Turner test, 115–16, 131
  - Bork's definition of exclusionary conduct, 116–17
  - But for test, 120–1
  - Certainty, 147–53
  - Definition, 112–13
  - Disadvantages
    - Cheap exclusion not captured, 141–4
    - Counterfactual, Difficulty constructing, 148–9
    - Mixed effects, Under-inclusive for conduct with, 137–9
    - Over-inclusiveness, 146–7
    - Plain exclusion, Treatment of, 142
    - Under-inclusiveness, 133, 135–7
  - Effects under, 131
  - Effects-based tests distinguished, 112–13
  - Melamed's 'profit sacrifice' test, 121–2, 130, 137
    - Cheap exclusion, 142
    - Non-dominant firm, Conduct possible for, 140
    - Over-inclusiveness, 146–7
  - Mixed effects, Conduct with, 137–9
  - No economic sense test, 122–3, 131, 134, 137
    - Cheap exclusion, Treatment of, 143
    - Non-dominant firm, Conduct possible for, 140
    - Over-inclusiveness, 147
    - Plain exclusion, Treatment of, 143
    - Use of financial power, 145
  - Ordovery and Willig's profit sacrifice test, 117–19
  - Predatory pricing, 119–20
  - Profit sacrifice test, 8, 130
  - Take advantage test. See Take advantage test
  - US case law on profit sacrifice, 119–20
- Purpose
  - AIPA, Intent requirement under, 70
  - Algorithmic decision-making, 212
  - Australia
    - Case law on intent, 209
    - Coal Vend case, Intent in, 72–5
    - Subjective purpose, 213–17
  - Case law, Purpose and intent in, 205
  - Common law
    - Restraint of trade, intent to injure, 27
  - Corporate purpose or intent, 211
  - Eliminatory purpose or intent, Meaning, 208
  - European Union
    - Commercial interest, Protecting, 227
    - Objective justification, 220
    - Objective necessity, 226–7
  - Generally, 201–42
  - Innovation, 147
  - Intent
    - Distinguished, 203
    - General, 203
    - Specific, 203, 205
  - Legitimate business purpose, 202, 229
    - ACCC Draft Framework, 225
    - Australian case law, 138, 222–3
    - Generally, 220–8
    - Harper Panel 'rational business decision', 223
    - US case law, 204–21
  - Likely effect distinguished, 229–31
  - Meaning, 203
  - Motive distinguished, 203
  - Objective anticompetitive purpose
    - Cheap exclusion, 142
    - Likely effect distinguished, 203–29
    - Meaning, 201
    - Signposts in existing case law, 228–9
  - Objective procompetitive purpose, 147
  - Objective purpose
    - Characterization of conduct, 207
    - Meaning, 204

- Purpose (cont.)  
 Profit-focused tests, Under, 130–1, 142  
 Subjective purpose distinguished, 217–20  
 Purpose *plus* effect, 210  
 Subjective purpose  
 Australian case law, 213–17  
 Competitive process, Of harming, 209–13  
 Meaning, 204  
 Objective factors, 229  
 Objective purpose distinguished, 215–17  
 Surrounding circumstances, 215–17  
 US case law on intent, 208
- Raising Rivals' Costs (RRC), 57
- Rational business decision. See Purpose:  
 Legitimate business purpose
- Refusal to deal  
 ACCC Draft Framework for Guidelines on  
 Misuse of Market Power, 225  
 Australian case law under previous provision,  
 124–6  
 Disincentive effects, 166  
 Narrow approach, 166  
 Profit sacrifice test, 120  
 Take advantage test, 124–6, 129  
 US case law, 120
- Regrating. See Common law: England
- Remedies. See Effects-based tests: Remedies
- Remedies, Difficulty constructing, 156
- Research and development, 146–7
- Restraint of trade. See Common law: England:  
 Restraint of trade
- Reward. See Monopoly profit: Incentive to invest
- Robust markets objective, 108
- Ruinous competition. See Australia: Coal Vend  
 case: Full High Court decision
- Rule of reason  
 Classic definition, 158  
 Criticism by Easterbrook, 157–99  
 EC Guidance Paper, 11  
 Hovenkamp's 'meta' rule of reason, 191  
 Microsoft case, 7, 161–3
- Salop, Steven C., 159–63
- Schumpeter, Joseph, 52  
 Incentive to invest, 52  
 Innovation, 52
- Self-correcting markets, 53  
 Chicago School, 54  
 Constraint on monopoly power, 51  
 Easterbrook, Frank H., 159  
 Post-Chicago School, 57  
 List of enduring monopolies, 57  
 Schumpeter, Joseph, 52
- Transaction Cost Economics (TCE), 56
- Sherman Act. See United States of America:  
 Sherman Act
- Small business. See United States of America:  
 History: Small business; Australia: Small  
 business
- Smith, Adam, 28–9
- South Africa  
 Effects-based test for abuse of dominance, 184  
 Exclusionary act, 184  
 First competition laws, 82  
 Predatory pricing, Above-cost, 195
- Standards. See Comparative analysis: Generally
- Standard-setting processes, Abuse of, 141
- Statute of Monopolies. See History of unilateral  
 anticompetitive conduct laws: Statute of  
 Monopolies
- Structure, Market  
 Australian Qcma explanation of 'competition',  
 107  
 Dynamic competition, Effect on, 42  
 Harvard School, 47–8  
 Innovation, Effect on, 42, 53
- Structure-conduct-performance paradigm. See  
 United States of America: Harvard School
- Substantial lessening of competition test  
 ACCC Interim Guidelines on Misuse of Market  
 Power, 171, 194
- Advantages  
 Alignment with objectives, 13  
 Consistency in CCA Part IV, 13  
 Consistency with laws in other jurisdictions, 13  
 Objective analysis, 235
- Burden of proof, 191
- Case law, 172, 180–3
- Competitor, Small but significant, 174
- Conduct 'as a supplier or an acquirer', 185
- Consumer welfare, 175–6, 179
- Counterfactual, 173
- Criticisms of, 171, 184
- Discrete market test, 178
- Dynamic competition, 177–8
- Effect, Ex post, 199–200, 238
- Effect, Relevant, 172–6
- Efficiency considerations under, 176–9
- Efficiency defence, No, 170
- Exclusionary element, No, 184, 235
- Exploitative conduct, 184–5
- Generally, 157–70
- Harper Amendments, 97
- Harper recommendation, 15, 96, 170
- Innovation, 177–8, 198–9, 237
- Intrabrand vs interbrand competition, 182
- Legislative guidance removed, 170–1, 176



- Likely effect
  - Ex ante analysis, 238
  - Meaning, 182–3, 199
  - Purpose distinguished, 203–29
- Predatory innovation, 198–9
- Predatory pricing, 194–5
- Pricing, Above-cost predatory, 192–5
- Procompetitive rationale, 178–9, 199, 237
- Product design changes, 198–9
- Purpose, 213–17
  - Naked exclusion, 236
  - Plainly procompetitive purpose, 237
- Purpose, Subjective, 236
- Relevant markets, 170, 178, 184
- Substantial, Meaning of, 180–2
- Substantial market power
  - Australia, CCA section 46 ‘substantial degree of power in a market’, 62–3
  - Barriers to entry, 62
  - Causal connection with conduct, 143
  - Dominance per se, Prohibition of, 46–9
  - Dominant firm, Use of the term, 18
  - Economic inefficiency, 40–1
  - EU Art 102 TFEU ‘dominant position’, 61
  - Ex ante or ex post, 63, 139
  - Exclusionary conduct possible without, 64
  - Legal construct, 63
  - Market power, 40, 61
  - Market share, 61–2
  - Non-dominant firms compared, 139
  - Screening function, 63, 139
  - Threshold requirement, 61, 63, 139
  - US Sherman Act ‘monopoly power’, 61, 63
- Take advantage test
  - Administrability, 147–53
  - Amendment, section 46(6A), 126–7, 145
  - Arsonist example, 143
  - Case law, 124–30, 149–52
  - Causal connection between power and conduct, 143
  - Cement Australia case, 141, 146, 149, 151
  - Cheap exclusion, Treatment of, 143
  - Counterfactual, 132–3, 148–9
  - Counterfactual, Difficulty constructing, 148–9
  - European Union position compared, 97
  - Generally, 123
  - Harper Amendments, 101
  - Harper recommendation, 100
  - History and origins, 97
  - Inconsistent application, 149–53
  - Legitimate business purpose, 138
  - Mixed effects, Conduct with, 138
  - Murphy, Lionel, 100
  - New Zealand review, 111
  - Non-dominant firm comparison, 98, 124–6, 132–3, 138–52
  - Plain exclusion, Treatment of, 143
  - Profit-focused test, 111, 114
  - Proponents, 110
  - Repeal, 101
  - Rural Press case, 114, 126, 144–5, 151
  - Seminal decision, 124–6
  - Trade Practices Bill (1965) Origins, 98
  - Uncertainty, 114, 147–53
  - United States position compared, 97
  - US profit-focused tests distinguished, 114, 133, 137
  - Use of financial power distinguished, 100, 144–6
  - Use of market power, 97–8, 124–6, 143
- Tech giants, 1–2, 34, 60, 178
- Tests for unilateral anticompetitive conduct. See also Effects-based tests; Profit-focused tests
  - Comparative analysis, 17–18
  - Multiple tests, 165, 191, 202
  - Single or unitary test, 8
- Threats to deter entry, 141, 174
- Tortious conduct, 186
- Total welfare, 39–40, 43
- Transaction Cost Economics (TCE), 56–7
  - First-mover advantages, 56–7
  - Self-correcting markets, 57
- Trusts. See United States of America: History: Trusts
- Turgot, A R J, 28
- Tying
  - Chicago School, 54
  - Profit-focused tests and, 137
- Unilateral anticompetitive conduct
  - Definition, 58, 64
  - Difficulty in identifying, 59
  - European Union, 56
  - Examples, Broad, 58
  - Suppression, Meaning of, 58
  - United States of America, 55
  - Unlimited types, 59
- United Kingdom
  - Australian law, Influence on, 31
  - Statute of Monopolies, 25
- United States of America
  - Alcoa case, 46
  - Aspen Skiing case, 221
  - Australian law, Influence on, 31, 67, 69, 83
  - Bork, Robert, 120
  - Chicago School, 6–7
    - Dominance per se, Prohibition of, 49
    - Harvard School, Criticism of, 53

- United States of America (cont.)
  - Impossibility theorems, 54, 57
  - Influence on courts and agencies, 55
  - Judicial intervention, Scepticism, 54
  - Monopoly leveraging, 54
  - Narrow approach to unilateral conduct rules, 53–5
  - Post-Chicago School criticism of, 57
  - Predatory pricing, 54
  - Price theory, 54
  - Reagan Administration, 55
  - Scepticism about single-firm harm, 53, 159
  - Self-correcting markets, 53–4
  - Single monopoly profit theorem, 54, 57
  - Transaction Cost Economics criticism of, 56–7
  - Tying, 54
  - Under-inclusive, Deliberately, 20, 53–5
- Common law, Restraint of trade, 30
- Conduct approach, 55–7
- Debate about test for monopolization, 7–9
- Department of Justice, 7–8
  - But for test, 120–1
  - Under-inclusiveness acknowledged, 136
- Enforcement of Sherman Act section 2, 6–8
- Federal Trade Commission, 5
- Harvard School, 6
  - Chicago School differences, 53
  - Dominance per se, Prohibition of, 47–8
  - Durable monopolists, 48
  - Expansive approach, 84
  - Structuralism, 47–8
  - Structure-Conduct-Performance paradigm, 47–8
- History
  - Reagan Administration, 55
  - Sherman Act
    - Economists, Opposition by, 29
    - Enforcement, 6–7, 55
    - First unilateral conduct rules, 23
    - Passage, 30
    - Special interest legislation, 35
  - Small business, 30, 35, 84
  - Trusts, 29–30
- Intent, 208
- Jury trials, 136, 191
- Microsoft case, 7–8, 161–99, 221
- Monopolization, 6–9
  - Elements, 55
  - Exclusionary conduct, 55
- Monopoly power, 61, 139
- Narrow approach, 8
- Objectives
  - Consumer welfare, 38, 43
  - Economic freedom, 35–6
  - Political freedom, 33–4
- Output limitation, Focus on, 43–4, 108
- Post-Chicago School, 57
  - Administrability, 59
  - Game theory, 57
  - Monopoly leveraging, 57
  - Possibility theorems, 57
  - Predatory pricing, 57
  - Raising Rivals' Costs (RRC), 57
- Procompetitive justification, 221
- Profit sacrifice test in the case law, 119–20
- Scalia, Justice, 8
- Sherman Act, Section 2, 6–9
- Supreme Court, 7–8, 159
- Transaction Cost Economics (TCE), 56–7
- Treble damages, 136, 191
- Trinko case, 8, 120
- Uncertainty over monopolization law, 7–9
- Warren Court, 84
- Utilitarian view. See Objectives: Competition, Protection of
- Valid business reason. See Purpose: Legitimate business purpose
- Vexatious litigation, 186
- Weighing effects, 187–90, 239
- Welfare economics, 38–43
- Werden, Gregory, 122, 131, 137
- Williamson, Oliver, 48, 56, 160–1
- Wilson, Woodrow, 50
- X-inefficiency. See Costs of monopoly: X-inefficiency
- Zero-price services, 175, 192