

Contents

Part I Introduction to Part I: Basic Concepts and Approaches

1	The “Correct” Definition of “the Impact of a Choice on Economic Efficiency”	7
	1. The Correct Definition of Economic Efficiency	7
	2. Why My Definition Is Correct	11
2	The Components of the Difference Between a Firm’s Price and Conventional Marginal Costs and the Intermediate Determinants of the Intensity of Quality-and-Variety-Increasing-Investment Competition	15
	1. The Price-Competition Conceptual Scheme	16
	A. The Price-Competition Conceptual Scheme for Individualized-Pricing Situations	18
	B. The Price-Competition Conceptual Scheme for Across-the-Board-Pricing Situations	26
	2. The QV-Investment-Competition Conceptual Scheme	40
	A. The Intermediate Determinants of the Intensity of QV-Investment Competition	43
	B. The Three Different Types of QV-Investment Equilibria and the Conditions for Their Generation	49
3	How “Monopolizing Conduct,” “Attempts to Monopolize,” and “Exclusionary or Foreclosing Conduct” Should Be Defined by Economists	69
4	The Actor-Coverage of, Conduct-Coverage of, Tests of Illegality Promulgated by, and Defenses Recognized by U.S. Antitrust Law and E.C./E.U. Competition Law	73
	1. The Actor-Coverage of, Conduct-Coverage of, Tests of Illegality Promulgated by, and Defenses Recognized by U.S. Antitrust Law	73

A. The Sherman Antitrust Act	74
B. The Clayton Antitrust Act	86
2. The Actor-Coverage of, Conduct-Coverage of, Tests of Illegality Promulgated by, and Defences Recognized by E.C./E.U. Competition Law	99
A. Article 101 of the 2009 Lisbon Treaty	99
B. Article 102 of the 2009 Lisbon Treaty	128
C. The E.C./E.U. Merger Control Regulation (EMCR)	140
3. The Differences Between the Actor-Coverage of, Conduct-Coverage of, Tests of Illegality Promulgated by, and Defenses Recognized by U.S. and E.C./E.U. Competition Law	143
5 Categories of Economic-Efficiency Gains That Are and Are Not Relevant to Conduct’s Antitrust Legality	155
1. Categories of Economic Inefficiency That Business Conduct and Antitrust Policies Can Affect	155
2. Categories of Economic-Efficiency Effects Whose Generation Is Irrelevant Under U.S. and E.C./E.U. Competition Law	157
3. Categories of Economic-Efficiency Gains Whose Generation Favors Conduct’s Legality Under U.S. and E.C./E.U. Competition Law	161
6 The Inevitable Arbitrariness of Market Definitions and the Unjustifiability of Market-Oriented Antitrust Analyses	165
1. The Inevitable Arbitrariness of Classical (Ideal-Type) Market Definitions	167
2. The Inevitable Arbitrariness of Antitrust (Functional) Market Definitions	171
7 Economic (Classical) and Antitrust Markets: Official and Scholarly Proposals	183
1. The Definition of “Economic Markets” and “Antitrust Markets”	184
2. The 1992 (U.S.) Horizontal Merger Guidelines’ Abstract Definition of and Protocol for Identifying an Antitrust Market	190
A. The Poor Draftsmanship of the 1992 Guidelines’ Abstract Definition of an Antitrust Market	193
B. The Protocol’s Assumption That No Market Outsider Will React to Any Hypothetical-Combinant-Group Price-Increases	199
C. Peculiarity of the 1992 Guidelines’ Abstract-Market- Definition-Generated Market Definitions	200
D. The Inconsistency of the 1992 Guidelines’ Concrete-Market- Definition Protocol and Abstract Definition of an Antitrust Market	201
E. The Cost-Ineffectiveness of the 1992 Guidelines’ Abstract Definition of an Antitrust Market	204
3. Various Economist-Proposals for Delineating Concrete Classical or Antitrust Markets	210

4. The U.S. Courts’ Handling of the Task of Delimiting Relevant Antitrust Markets	220
5. The EC’s and the E.C./E.U. Courts’ Approaches to Delimiting Relevant Antitrust Markets	235
8 The Operational Definition of a Firm’s Monopoly, Oligopoly, and Total Economic (Market) Power in a Given ARDEPPS	249
1. The Definition of a Firm’s Monopoly, Oligopoly, and Total Power Over Price, QV Investment, and Price and QV Investment Combined in a Given ARDEPPS	250
A. The Definition of a Firm’s Monopoly, Oligopoly, and Total Power Over Price in a Given ARDEPPS	252
B. The Definition of a Firm’s Monopoly, Oligopoly, and Total Power over QV Investment in a Given ARDEPPS	259
C. The Definition of a Firm’s Monopoly, Oligopoly, and Total Power Over Price and QV Investment Combined in a Given ARDEPPS	263
2. The U.S. Courts’ Definitions of a Firm’s Market Power and the EC’s and the E.C./E.U. Courts’ Definitions of a Firm’s Market Dominance	265
A. The U.S. Courts’ Abstract and Operational Definitions of a Firm’s Market Power	265
B. The EC’s and the E.C./E.U. Courts’ Abstract and Operational Definitions of a Firm’s Market Dominance	267
3. The Connection Between a Firm’s Market Share and Its Various Types of Economic (Market) Power	275
A. The Inaccuracy of Any Market-Share-Oriented Approach to Estimating a Firm’s Power Over Price	275
B. The Inaccuracy of any Market-Share-Oriented Approach to Estimating a Firm’s Power Over QV Investment	288
Conclusion	299
9 The Need to Analyze Separately the Monopolizing Character, “Abusiveness,” Competitive Impact, and Economic Efficiency of Business Choices	301
1. The Need to Analyze Separately the Monopolizing Character, Competitive Impact, and Economic Efficiency of a Business Choice	301
2. The Need to Analyze Separately the Abusiveness of the Conduct of a Dominant Firm	306
Conclusion to Part I	309
Part II Introduction to Part II: Applications	
1. The Roles and Powers of U.S. and E.C./E.U. Antitrust-Law-Enforcement Actors	311

A. The Roles, Remedial Powers, and Entitlements of U.S. Antitrust-Law-Enforcement Actors	311
B. The Roles, Remedial Powers, and Entitlements of E.C./E.U. Competition-Law-Enforcement Actors	315
2. A Chapter-by-Chapter (Section-by-Section) Summary of Chaps. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15	321
10 Oligopolistic Conduct	343
1. The Legality of Natural and Contrived Oligopolistic Conduct (by Sellers) Under U.S and E.C./E.U. Competition Law	345
2. The Determinants of the Feasibility of Natural Oligopolistic Pricing and the Profitability of Contrived Oligopolistic Pricing	349
A. The Determinants of the Feasibility of Natural Oligopolistic Pricing and of the Size of the NOM a Seller Can Secure	349
B. The Determinants of the Profitability of Contrived Oligopolistic Pricing and the Magnitude of the COM That Is Most Profitable for a Firm to Attempt to Contrive	352
3. Contrived-Oligopolistic-Pricing Evidence, Proposed “Tests” for Illegal Price-Fixing, and Relevant U.S. and E.C./E.U. Case-Law	367
A. The Types of Evidence That Can Help Prove Contrived Oligopolistic Pricing	367
B. The Types of Evidence That Richard Posner and Other Scholars Argue Can Establish Illegal Oligopolistic Pricing	387
C. The U.S. Courts’, the EC’s, and the E.C./E.U. Courts’ Positions on Oligopolistic Pricing, Horizontal Oligopolistic Output-Restricting Conduct, and “Market”-Dividing Conduct	414
4. Oligopolistic Decisionmaking on Non-Price Terms in Contracts of Sale or Product-Attributes Whose Alteration Should Not Be Said to Entail the Creation of a QV Investment	460
A. The Non-Price Contract Terms That Oligopolistic Interactions Can Affect and the Actual and Buyer-Perceived Product-Attributes That Can Be Affected by Oligopolistic Interactions That Do Not Alter Any QV-Investment-Creating Decision	460
B. Seven Functional Categories of Oligopolistic Conduct That Affect Terms and Conditions of Sale or Product-Attributes, Buyer-Perceived Product-Attributes, or Product Images Without Altering Any QV-Investment-Creation Decision	461
C. The Legality of Oligopolistic Conduct of the Types This Section Considers That Perform the Seven Functions Just Described Under U.S. Antitrust Law and E.C./E.U. Competition Law, Correctly Interpreted and Applied	466

D. The U.S. and E.C./E.U. Case-Law on Oligopolistic Conduct That Is Directed at Non-Price Contract-of-Sale Terms, Product-Attributes That Can Be Changed Without Making a QV Investment, or Image-Creating or Educative Advertising	470
5. QV-Investment-Focused Natural and Contrived Oligopolistic Conduct	472
A. The Economic Analysis of QV-Investment-Focused Natural and Contrived Oligopolistic Conduct	472
B. The Legality of QV-Investment-Focused Oligopolistic Conduct Under Correctly-Interpreted-and-Applied U.S. Antitrust Law and E.C./E.U. Competition Law	476
C. The U.S. and E.C./E.U. Case-Law on QV-Investment-Focused Oligopolistic Conduct	481
6. PPR-Related Oligopolistic Conduct	483
A. The Similarity of and Differences Between Economic Analyses of PPR-Related and QV-Investment-Related Oligopolistic Conduct	484
B. The Legality of PPR-Focused Natural-Oligopolistic and Contrived-Oligopolistic Conduct Under U.S. Antitrust Law and E.C./E.U. Competition Law, Correctly Interpreted and Applied	487
C. The Legality of PPR-Focused Oligopolistic Conduct Under U.S. and E.C./E.U. Antitrust Law	488
D. U.S. Case-Law, EC Positions, and E.C./E.U. Case-Law	488
7. Contrived Oligopolistic Pricing by Economic Actors in Their Capacities as Buyers: Buyer “Price-Fixing”	488
A. The Determinants of the Profitability of Contrived Oligopolistic Pricing by Buyers	489
B. The Legality of Buyer Price-Fixing Under U.S. Antitrust Law and E.C./E.U. Competition Law, Correctly Interpreted and Applied	490
C. The U.S. Case-Law and DOJ/FTC Position on Buyer Price-Fixing and the EC Position and E.C./E.U. Case-Law on Buyer Price-Fixing	495
11 Predatory Conduct	501
1. The Definition of Predatory Conduct and Its Legality Under U.S. and E.C./E.U. Antitrust Law, Correctly Interpreted and Applied	501
2. Predatory Pricing	503
A. The Determinants of the Profitability of Predatory Pricing	503
B. The Argument That, at Least in Some Circumstances, Established Firms Will Find It Profitable to Practice Predation by Reducing Their Prices to Deter Entry	517
C. Arguments That Economists or Economically-Literate Legal Academics Have Made for the Unprofitability of Predatory Pricing: Statements and Critiques	519

D. The Evidence That Can and Cannot Be Used to Prove Predatory Pricing	531
E. The U.S. Case-Law, EC Position, and E.C./E.U. Case-Law on Predatory Pricing	562
3. Predatory QV Investments	582
A. The Definition of a Predatory QV Investment	582
B. The Legality of Predatory QV Investments Under U.S. and E.C./E.U. Antitrust Law, Correctly Interpreted and Applied	595
C. The Evidence That the State or a Private Plaintiff Should Be Required to Introduce to Establish a <i>Prima Facie</i> Predatory-QV-Investment Claim and the Evidence That a Defendant Should Be Allowed to Use to Exonerate Itself	596
D. The U.S. Case-Law, EC Position, and E.C./E.U. Case-Law on Predatory QV Investments	601
4. Predatory Cost-Reducing Investments	605
A. The Definition of a Predatory Cost-Reducing Investment	605
B. The Legality of Predatory Cost-Reducing Investments Under U.S. Antitrust Law and E.C./E.U. Competition Law, Correctly Interpreted and Applied	609
C. The Evidence That the State or a Private Plaintiff Should Be Required to Introduce to Establish a <i>Prima Facie</i> Predatory-Cost-Reducing-Investment Claim and the Evidence That a Defendant Should Be Allowed to Use to Exonerate Itself	610
D. The U.S. Case-Law, EC Position, and E.C./E.U. Case-Law on Predatory Cost-Reducing Investments	610
5. Predatory Buying	611
A. The Definition of Predatory Buying	611
B. The Legality of Predatory Buying Under U.S. Antitrust Law and E.C./E.U. Competition Law, Correctly Interpreted and Applied	612
C. The U.S. Case-Law, EC Pronouncements, and E.C./E.U. Case-Law	613
6. Predatory Advertising	614
A. The Definition of Predatory Advertising and the Conditions Under Which Advertising Is Predatory	614
B. The Legality of Predatory Advertising Under U.S. Antitrust Law and E.C./E.U. Competition Law, Correctly Interpreted and Applied	614
C. The U.S. Case-Law, EC Pronouncements, and E.C./E.U. Case-Law	615
7. Predatory “Unfair Competition” and Predatory Unfair or Improper Participation in Government Decision-Processes	616
A. Predatory “Unfair Competition”	616
B. Predatory Participation in Legislative, Administrative, and Adjudicative Decisionmaking	621

8. Predatory Efforts to Raise Rivals’ Costs (in Various Ways Not Yet Covered)	633
A. The Definition of Predatory Efforts to Raise Rivals’ Costs and Some Additional Variants of This Type of Conduct	633
B. U.S. and E.C./E.U. Law, Correctly Interpreted and Applied	634
C. The U.S. Case-Law, EC Position, and E.C./E.U. Case-Law on These Variants of Rival-Cost-Raising Conduct	635
9. Predatory “Refusals to Deal,” Broadly Understood	636
A. Two Categories and Numerous Subcategories of Predatory and Non-Predatory Refusals to Deal	637
B. The Legality of Predatory Refusals to Deal Under U.S. Antitrust Law and E.C./E.U. Competition Law, Correctly Interpreted and Applied	649
C. The Way in Which Predatory Refusal-to-Deal Cases Should Be Structured	654
D. The U.S. Case-Law, EC Position, and E.C./E.U. Case-Law on Refusals to Deal	655
10. Allegedly-Predatory Systems Rivalry and Functionally-Identical Types of Aftermarket Conduct	694
A. The Functions of Systems Rivalry	695
B. The Legality of Systems Rivalry Under U.S. Antitrust Law and E.C./E.U. Competition Law, Correctly Interpreted and Applied	706
C. The U.S. Case-Law, the EC Position, and the E.C./E.U. Case-Law on Systems Rivalry	710
Index	723