

Handbook of Antitrust Economics

edited by Paolo Buccirossi

The MIT Press
Cambridge, Massachusetts
London, England

© 2008 Massachusetts Institute of Technology

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form by any electronic or mechanical means (including photocopying, recording, or information storage and retrieval) without permission in writing from the publisher.

For information about special quantity discounts, please email special_sales@mitpress.mit.edu

This book was set in Times New Roman and Syntax on 3B2 by Asco Typesetters, Hong Kong.
Printed and bound in the United States of America.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Handbook of antitrust economics / edited by Paolo Buccirossi.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-262-02627-7 (hardcover : alk. paper)—ISBN 978-0-262-52477-3 (pbk. : alk. paper) 1. Consolidation and merger of corporations. 2. Industrial organization (Economic theory) 3. Antitrust law—Economic aspects.

I. Buccirossi, Paolo.

HD2746.5.H3584 2007

338.8—dc22

2007002665

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Index

- Aberdeen Journals Limited v. OFT*, 420, 431n.10
- Abuse of market power (dominance)
and as-efficient competitor test, 427–29
and consumer harm test, 429–30, 432n.31
discounts and rebates, 422–23
EC law and policy toward, 416
vs. facilitating practices, 306
fundamental issue in, 418
law on, 430
in Europe, 416–18
in US, 418
margin squeezes, 421–22
predatory pricing, 419–20, 424, 425
and rules vs. discretion, 430
and sacrifice test, 423–26
selective price cuts, 420–21, 424
- Academics' fallacy, 583, 584
- Accounting data, and marginal costs, 73
- Accounting margins, direct measurement of, 18
- Accounting measures, and economist's concepts, 19
- Addyston Pipe* case, 20, 21
- Aftermarkets
in network industries, 492–93
and vertical restraints, 397
- “Agreement”
explicit, 342
and facilitating practices, 341–43
meaning of, 342
tacit, 342
- AIDS (almost ideal demand system), 78, 80, 81
- Airline computer reservation system (CRS)* case, 146, 165–67, 169, 170, 173–74, 175
- Airline Tariff Publishing Company (ATP)* case, 316
- Airtours* case, 131, 137
- Akso Nobel/Hoechst Roussel Vet* case, 186
- Allocative efficiency, as ultimate goal, xiv
- ALM (antitrust logit model), 75, 83
- Almost ideal demand system (AIDS), 78, 80, 81
- American Airlines* case, 420, 425
- American Tobacco* case, 20, 21
- Anecdotal evidence, about buyer responses, 11, 14
- “Anticompetitive” conduct, xi
and network industries, 485–86
- Antitrust decision-making, design of institutions for, 29–32
- Antitrust Guidelines for Collaborations Among Competitors* (AGCAC), 318
- Antitrust Guidelines for the Licensing of Intellectual Property* (DOJ/FTC), 521, 522, 523
- “Antitrust injury” doctrine, 3
- Antitrust (competition) law
for auctions, 606 (*see also* Auction(s); Bidding markets)
basic paradigm of, 23
and collusion, 305 (*see also* Collusion)
conflicting objectives of, xxin.17
deterrence as success standard of, 264–65
in different jurisdictions, ix–xi
as distributive tool, xv, xxin.17
economic goals of, xiii–xvii
and distributive issues, xv
and economics, ix
as interdisciplinary collaboration, 1–3
elements of, 306, 415
empirical methods growth in, 2, 32n.4
enforcement of
cycles of, 519–21
and generalization about industries, 1
and intellectual property, 519
logic of, 470
and market power, xiv, 305 (*see also* Market power)
and network industries, 511 (*see also* Network industries)
for payment card industry, 572–78 (*see also* Network industries)
and specific recommendations, 3
as worsening economy, 38n.91
- Antitrust lawsuits, limitations on evidence available for, 14–15
- Antitrust logit model (ALM), 75
- Antitrust (competition) policy, xii
on auctions, 608–609
in Europe, 609

- Antitrust (competition) policy (cont.)
 and bidding markets, 586
 and economics, 31–32
 and intellectual property
 current state of, 521–24, 537–38
 cycles in enforcement of, 519–21
 and differences between intellectual property and
 other forms, 524–33
 as political bargain, xvi
Asahi Glass Co., Ltd. v. Pentech Pharmaceuticals, Inc.,
 541
 “As-efficient” competitor test, 422, 427–29
Aspen Skiing case, 503–504
 Assessment methods, for effects of vertical restraints,
 400–407
 Assumptions
 on link between theory and evidence, 4, 34n.40
 and merger simulation, 65
 Asymmetry(ies)
 and collusion, 113, 114, 117–19, 122–23, 135
 in information, 633, 643
Atari Games v. Nintendo, 541
ATR/de Havilland case, 183, 186
 AT&T
 breakup of, 488, 489
 and local leasing, 489
 as monopoly, 488–89, 491
 and net neutrality, 506, 507
 price discrimination attempted by, 505
 and SBC, 506, 508
 and Verizon, 502
 AT&T and Tele-Communications, Inc. (TCI) merger,
 334
 Auction(s), 583, 610. *See also* Bidding markets;
 Procurement auctions
 Anglo-Dutch, 603, 606
 antitrust policy on, 608–609
 in Europe, 609
 ascending, 584–85, 592
 fine-tuning of, 603
 vs. sealed-bid and ordinary markets, 593–97
 sufficient number of bidders for, 597
 vs. bidding-market criteria, 587–89
 bidding rules and procedures in, 592–97
 and bid rigging, 276
 bid-taker power in, 585, 602–608, 610n.6
 and cartel detection, 229, 230, 242, 248
 and common values, 597–602
 compared with “ordinary” markets, 589–92
 first-price sealed-bid, 592–93
 new procedures for, 603–604
 and reduced-form estimation, 95–96
 sealed-bid, 602–603
 simultaneous-ascending, 587
 “split award,” 606
 vs. strategic bargaining game, 62
 Auction markets, detection of price-fixing in, 21
 Auction models
 and “fit” to industry, 72
 mechanics of simulation in, 70
 mergers in, 57–62
 vs. mergers in Bertrand industries, 61–62
 Automatic Teller Machine network, 473
 Background assumptions
 on link between theory and evidence, 4, 34n.40
 and merger simulation, 65
 Bargaining inefficiencies, and standard collusion
 theory, 122–23
 Bargaining theory or models
 and cost of delay, 150
 and “fit” to industry, 72–73
 Nash, 62–63, 179n.45 (*see also* at Nash)
 Barriers to entry. *See* Entry barriers or conditions
 Baxter’s analysis (payment cards), 555–58, 562
Bement v. National Harrow Co., 520, 541
 Bertrand (price-setting) competition, 16, 38n.92
 and bidding markets, 586, 589
 and contingent sales, 199
 and information sharing, 326, 327
 and market share as collusive marker, 245
 and merger simulation, 77
 and partial ownership agreements, 331
 and sealed-bid process, 593
 Bertrand industries or model
 equilibrium margins in, 59
 and “fit” to industry, 73–75
 and marginal-cost reductions, 64
 mergers in, 50–57
 vs. mergers in auctions, 61–62
 Bertrand merger simulation, mechanics of, 68–70
 Bertrand oligopoly, 43, 44
 and leniency experiment, 285–86
 Best-price policies
 cases on, 340
 most-favored customer clause (MFCC), 339–40
 price-matching (PMG) and price-beating (PBG)
 guarantees, 335–39
 “meet the competition” clauses (MCCs), 596
 “Best-response symmetry,” 443, 444–45, 456
 Bidding markets, 583–85, 585–87, 609–10, 611n.15.
See also Auction(s)
 and antitrust policy, 586
 bidding rules and procedures in, 592–97
 and common values, 597–602
 compared with “ordinary” markets, 589–92
 fallacies associated with, 583
 ideal vs. actual, 587–89
 and market structure vs. price formation, 589, 609
 Bid-takers’ power, 585, 602–606, 610n.6
 constraints on, 602, 606–608
 Bilateral bargaining theory, 150. *See also* Bargaining
 theory or models
Blomkest Fertilizer, Inc. v. Potash Corp., 32n.2

- Bottlenecks (network industries)
 one-sided, 487–89
 two-sided, 489–90
- Bounded rationality, and low-price guarantees, 339
- Bright line rules, 25–26, 26, 30
 and Chicago school antitrust commentators, 25
 moving in direction of, 37n.81
- British Airways plc v. Commission*, 423
- British Sugar case (Napier Brown/British Sugar)*, 422
- Broadband internet access, market power in, 505–507
- Brooke Group Ltd. v. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp.*, 419, 431n.9
- Brown Shoe case (Brown Shoe Co. v. United States)*, 44, 65, 103, 147
- Brunotte v. Thys Co.*, 541
- Brunswick Corp. v. Pueblo Bowl-O-Mat, Inc.*, 32n.9
- BSkyB case*, 422
- BSkyB/Manchester merger, 607, 616n.83, 618n.107
- Bundling. *See also* Tying
 and auctions, 605
 and conglomerate effects (EU merger control), 201, 204–207, 208
 discounts on, 450–51
 in *GE/Honeywell case*, 192
 and market power leverage, 492
 in *Microsoft case*, 497, 499, 500
 mixed, 192, 200, 206, 435
 in network industries, 492
 and price discrimination, 443–44, 445–47, 447–48
 and entry, 453–54
 pure, 196–98, 201, 201–202, 206, 435
 in two-sided markets, 550
- Bundling discounts, 435–36, 450–51
- Business to business (B2B) exchanges, 469, 470, 475, 493, 550
- Business to consumers (B2C) exchanges, 469, 493
- Business Electronics case*, 373
- Business executive views, and buyer substitution, 13–14
- “But for” test (sacrifice test), 420, 423–26, 485, 494
- Buyer. *See at* Consumer
- Buyer substitution
 identification of, 5–15
 in residual demand function, 17
- Buyer surveys
 and buyer substitution, 12
 scanner data for, 83–85
- Cartel(s), xviii, 213
 and auctions, 584
 and collusion theory, 111, 127–28
 in demand-substitution experiment, 10
 detection of, 21–22
 vs. facilitating practices, 306
 as organized crime, 260–62, 296n.7
 and rational choice analysis, 271, 298n.23
 through vertical integration, 161
 and vertical price restraints, 373 (*see also* Vertical restraints)
- Cartel(s), dealer, and vertical restraints, 395–96
- Cartel Amnesty Effect, 281, 283
- Cartel breakdown, 126–27, 128–29
 and entry, 221
- Cartel detection, 213
 and activist policy of screening for collusion, 249–52
 and beating collusion test, 248–49, 251–52
 behavioral methods of, 213–14
 through collusive markers, 236–38, 246–48
 market share, 245–46
 price and quantity, 238–45
 and economic analysis, 215
 empirical methods for, 215–17, 233–36
 behavior difference between colluding and competitive firms, 222–26, 233, 234–35, 236
 behavior inconsistent with competition, 217–19, 233–34
 behavior more consistent with collusion than with competition, 227–32, 233, 234, 235–36
 and pitfalls of high price-cost margin as screen for collusion, 232–33
 structural break in firm behavior, 219–22, 233, 249
 and endogeneity, 234
 and explicit vs. tacit collusion, 216, 246–47 (*see also* Tacit collusion)
 through market impact, 214
 and misspecification, 235
 and screening, 216–17, 232–33
 steps in process of, 215
 structural methods of, 213, 214
 and transition vs. stationary phase, 247
- Cartel deterrence
 and bounty scheme, 293–94
 through leniency, 261–62, 269–70 (*see also* Leniency programs)
 in rewards for self-reporting, 278
- CASE (Court Appointed Scientific Experts) program, 38n.99
- Cellophane fallacy*, 6
- CEPI-Cartonboard case*, 319–20
- “Cheap talk,” 312, 315, 344nn.9, 12, 14
 in *ATP case*, 316
- Checklist approach, to coordinated effects of mergers, 132–33
- Chicago School, xvi, 24, 25, 26, 27, 195–96
 and exclusive provisions as entry deterrent, 378
 and monopoly profit, 148–49
 single monopoly profit theory of, 174–75 (*see also* Single monopoly profit theory)
 and vertical integration, 145, 146
 and vertical restraints, 356, 379
- “Choice axiom,” 55
- Chow test, and cartel detection, 220, 223, 251
- “Clarifying experts,” 31, 39n.104

- Clayton Act (1914), xviii
 and stock acquisition, 333, 333–34
 Closeness of substitutes, 55
 CMCs (compensating marginal cost reductions), 53
 Coasian bargaining, in payment card industry, 568, 569
Coca Cola/Amalgamated beverages case, 186, 187, 189
Coca Cola/Carlsberg case, 186, 189
Colgate case (*United States v. Colgate and Co.*), 356, 386n.4
 Collusion, 107. *See also* Cartel(s)
 and anticompetitive effects, 398
 and asymmetry, 113, 114, 117–19, 122–23
 and auctions, 584, 595–97
 and common values, 598–600
 detection of, 608
 and German DCS-1800 auction, 614
 secrecy in, 604
 changes in incentives for, 134
 and coordinated effects of mergers, 112–20, 132 (*see also* Coordinated effects of mergers)
 coordination problem in, 307
 detection of, 213 (*see also* Cartel detection)
 activist policy of screening for, 249–52
 test for, 228–29
 different meanings of, 305
 economic vs. legal notion of, 305
 empirical regularities in, 126–31
 enforcement problem in, 307–11
 exchange of information in, 317–29
 and information sharing without collusion, 322–26
 explicit, 109–11, 216, 222
 facilitating of (vertical integration), 159–61, 169
 and facilitating practices, 305, 341, 343
 and irreversibilities, 119
 in markets with homogeneous goods vs. horizontal product differentiation, 115–16
 merger impact on, 112–20
 and number of competitors, 115, 122
 pre-play communication in, 311–16
 cases on, 316–17
 and price-matching, 448
 problems in, 596
 and R&D, 119–20
 tacit, 125–26, 132, 140, 216, 221–22, 311
 and unilateral vs. coordinated effects, 306, 311
 and vertical integration, 172, 175
 and vertical price restraints, 373
 Collusion theory
 comparative statics of, 107–12
 and coordinated effects, 105
 and market transparency, 116
 Collusion theory, standard, 105, 140
 and bargaining inefficiencies, 122–23
 and complexity, 124–25
 and coordinated effects of mergers, 106–20
 and coordination activities, 120
 and incomplete contracts, 125
 and renegotiation, 121–22
 and tacit conclusion, 125–26
 Collusive markers, 236–38, 244, 246–48
 market share, 245–46
 price and quantity, 238–45
 Collusive model, in cartel detection, 219
 Collusive oligopoly, theory of, 174
 Collusive profits, and deviation profits, 309–10
Columbia Steel case (*United States v. Columbia Steel Co.*), 44, 104
 “Commitment problem” (vertical integration), 151–53, 161
 and vertical restraints, 367–68
 “Common interest,” 641–42, 647, 649
 Common law, and Sherman Act, xi
 Common values
 in auctions or bidding processes, 584, 597–602
 and information exchange, 325, 326
 Communication, and coordination, 312–15, 344n.6
Compagnie Maritime Belge SA v. Commission, 420, 428, 452
 Compatibility
 and European state aid, 627, 629–31, 658
 in network industries, 479–82
 and social welfare, 491–92
 Compensating marginal cost reductions (CMCRs), 53
 Competition
 in absence of complementarity, 196–200
 in bidding market, 586
 in consumer goods industries, 56
 in differentiated products industries, 7
 distortions of, 652–54
 as harm to consumers, 260
 indeterminacy of, xiii
 inter-brand, 369, 386, 396 (*see also* Interbrand competition)
 intra-brand, 364–65
 as means to public good, xiii–xiv
 perfect, xiv, 479
 and price discrimination, 447–49
 question of harm to
 and consumer harm test, 430
 and sacrifice test, 426
 Schumpeterian, 486
 Competition dampening, 369–72
 Competition law. *See* antitrust law
 Competitive acts, vs. exclusionary acts, 418
 Competitive effects, and vertical integration, 174–76.
See also Vertical integration
 Competitive firm conduct, in identification of market power, 21–22
 Competitive harm, theory of, 28–29
 Complementarity(ies)
 in act of exchange, 475
 and compatibility, 480
 of intellectual property, 533
 in networks, 471, 472, 474, 475

- Complementary products, 208n.5
 - EU on, 185
 - competition with, 200–202
 - competition in absence of, 196–200
- Complexity, and standard collusion theory, 124
- Computer reservation system (CRS) case, 146, 165–67, 169, 170, 173–74, 175
- Concord Boat v. Brunswick Corp.*, 72, 103
- Conduct of competitive firms, in identification of market power, 21–22
- Conglomerate mergers and European Union. *See* European Union and conglomerate mergers
- Conglomeration (conglomerate) effects, 185, 451
- Conscious parallelism, 342
- Consultants' fallacy, 583, 584
- Consumer(s). *See also at* Buyer
 - imperfectly informed (payment cards), 568–69
 - as lacking power to influence mergers, xvi
 - sophisticated vs. naïve, 464n.45
- Consumer demand, elastic (payment card industry), 572
- Consumer goods industries, competition in, 45
- Consumer harm test, 429–30, 432n.31
- Consumer loyalty
 - excessive, 445
 - insufficient, 457
 - rebates as inducing, 428–29
- Consumer products, differentiated
 - merger simulation with, 65, 75–85
 - and price effects of entry vs. merger, 94
- Consumer welfare
 - meaning of, 429
 - as ultimate goal, xiv
 - as European policy standard, 642–46
 - vs. total welfare, xiv–xvii, xxin.14
- Continental T. V., Inc. v. GTE Sylvania, Inc.* (Sylvania case), 356, 397, 398
- Contingent sales
 - and conglomerate mergers, 186, 189–93
 - possible approach toward, 204–207
- Coordinated effects, 306
 - and auctions/bidding processes vs. “ordinary” markets, 590
- Coordinated effects of mergers, 22, 36n.67, 105
 - direct tests of, 130–31
 - empirical regularities in, 126–31
 - policy approaches to, 131–40
 - simulating of, 140
 - and standard collusion theory, 106–20
 - theoretical results on, 112–14
- Coordination problem, 307
 - and as-efficient competitor principle, 428
 - communication in, 312–15, 344n.6
 - and information on costs, 345n.31
 - and markets, 633–34
 - and vertical coordination, 360
- Corporate crime, and leniency programs, 260
- Cost functions, and horizontal mergers, 48
- Costs of rivals, raising of. *See* Raising rivals' costs
 - theory or strategy
- Cournot effect, in “reverse,” 202
- Cournot industry or model, 46
 - and contingent sales, 198
 - and entry, 93
 - equilibrium margins in, 59
 - and “fit” to industry, 71
 - and marginal-cost reductions, 64
 - and vertical coordination, 368
- Cournot merger simulation, mechanics of, 66–68
- Cournot oligopoly, 43, 44
 - mergers in, 46–50
 - in two-part tariff solution, 151
- Courts. *See also* Supreme Court, US
 - and economic expertise, 29, 30–31
 - and standards of proof, 295–96
 - in US vs. European Union, x
 - C.R. Bard v. M3 Systems, Inc.*, 525, 541
- Credit cards. *See* Payment card industry
- Criminal Penalty Enhancement and Reform Act (2004), 267
- “Critical loss analysis,” 34n.29
- Critical mass (network industries), 477–78
- Cross-border externalities, 638–40
- Cross-licensing arrangements (patents), 533
- Cross-sectional assessment, 400–401
- CRS proceeding, 165–67, 169, 170, 173–74, 175
- CSU, L.L. C. v. Xerox Corp.*, 524, 525, 542
- Curvature, of demand (mergers), 52–53
- “Customer foreclosure,” 170–71
- DaimlerChrysler A.G.* case, 358
- Dealer cartels, and vertical restraints, 395–96
- Dealer ex ante investment incentives, 395
- Dealer services, and free riding, 394–95
- Defector Amnesty Effect (“protection from fines” effect), 273, 281
- Demand
 - law of, 474
 - rotations in, 19
- Demand curvature, and mergers, 52–53
- Demand elasticities, estimation of, 8–10
- Demand function, 16
 - estimation of, 17–18
- Demand shifts, 94
- Demand shocks, 36n.69
 - and cartel breakdown, 128–29
- Demand specifications
 - higher order properties of, 79–81
 - parameter parsimony in, 81–83
- Demand substitution, for market definition, 27
- Department of Justice (DOJ), US, x, xxn.3, 29, 134
 - and *Antitrust Guidelines for Collaborations Among Competitors*, 318
 - and AT&T breakup, 489
 - and AT&T/TCI case, 334
 - and auction, 609

- Department of Justice (DOJ), US (cont.)
 and collusion, 316
 in *Georgia-Pacific* case, 68
 in *GE-Westinghouse* case, 340
 and intellectual property, 520, 521, 525, 533–35
 leniency policies of, 259, 263, 266, 289, 290, 292 (*see also* Leniency programs)
 on breakdowns in trust among wrongdoers, 274
 and Microsoft, 496, 497–98, 500, 513n.25
 and partial ownership agreements, 333, 334
 and predatory pricing, 420
 in *Premdor* case, 146, 167, 168–69, 171–72, 173, 174
 procurement auction reports by, 250
 and sacrifice test, 425
 and vertical restraints, 357, 397
 and WorldCom/Sprint merger, 508
Department of Justice Guidelines for international Operations, 521
 Department of Transportation (DOT), and CRS proceeding, 146, 165–67, 174
 Deterrence
 against cartels, 261–62, 264–65
 as law enforcement success standard, 264–65
 Deviation profits, and collusive profits, 309–10
 “Differences-in-differences” estimator, 94
 Differentiated consumer products
 merger simulation with, 65, 75–85
 and price effects of entry vs. merger, 94
 Differentiated product industries, competition in, 7
 Discounts
 as abuse of market power, 422–23
 bundling, 435–36, 450–51
 quantity, 354, 435, 449–50, 496, 497, 500
 Discrimination
 in auctions, 604–605
 dilemma over, 428
 from low-price guarantee, 337
 price, 19, 36n.60, 148, 176n.4, 395, 433, 460 (*see also* Price discrimination)
Divide et impera (divide and rule), 297n.10, 428
 Dominance
 and auctions/bidding processes vs. “ordinary” markets, 590
 joint, 612n.28
 Dominance, abuse of. *See* Abuse of market power
 Double marginalization, 360–62, 365, 385, 393–94
 and interlocking relationships, 375
 and patent pools, 535
 in *Premdor-Masonite* case, 168
 for vertical integration, 154, 155, 157, 158
 in *News Corp.* case, 165
Dr. Miles case, 355
Dyestuffs case, 316
 Dynamic efficiency issues, in network industries, 493
 Dynamic price discrimination, 454–58

Eastman Kodak Co. v. Image Technical Services, Inc., 492, 525, 541

E. Bement & Sons v. National Harrow Co., 520, 541
 EC competition policy, shift in emphasis of, 415
Echostar case (*United States v. Echostar Communications Corp.*), 78, 104
 ECJ. *See* European Court of Justice
 EC Law
 and selective price cuts, 428
 and UK law, 419
 EC Merger Regulation, 415–16
 Econometric issues
 with variation across local markets, 91–93
 with variation over time, 94–95
 Economic goals, of antitrust law, xiii–xvii
 Economics. *See also* Industrial organization economics and antitrust law, ix
 and antitrust policy, xii, 3, 31–32
 and experts in antitrust judicial process, 29–32, 38n.99, 39n.104
 in cartel detection, 214, 231
 and interpretation of substantive antitrust rules, xi
 and “new economy,” 511
 and rules on abuse of market power, 430
 and state aid control, 625, 631–38, 660
 and jurisdiction, 628–29
 Economics research literature, and industry as unit of analysis, 1
 Economic theory, and equity, 634
 Economies of scale, 91
 EC Treaty
 Article 81 of, xvii, xxi, 305, 312, 3017, 319, 334–35, 341–42, 345n.25, 355–59, 386n.11, 387n. 12, 411n.24, 429, 522, 538nn.10, 11, 539n.17, 642, 665n.63
 Article 82 of, xvii, 208n.4, 306, 355, 359, 416–18, 428–29, 458, 461nn.2, 6, 647
 and collusion, 305
 and efficiency benefits, 429
 and facilitating practices, 306
 and state aid control, 626–27
 supremacy of, xiii
 “Effect-on-rivals” standard, 646–47
 Efficiency
 and antitrust or regulation policies, 663–64
 as state-aid rationale, 632–34
 as politically neutral, 634
 and trade-off with equity, 635–36
 as political judgment, 642
 Efficient components pricing rule (ECPR), 489
 Efficient lobbying equilibrium, 666n.74
 Efficient prices, from price discrimination, 437–39
 Eliminating markups (vertical integration), 146, 153–55
 e-mail address of editor, xx
Emile M. LaPeyre et al. v. Federal Trade Commission, 520, 542
Empagran case, 294–95
 Empirical economic methods, 2, 3–5, 34n.40
 and cartels, 215–17, 233–36

- and collusion, 126–31
- and estimation of residual demand elasticities, 32n.4
- increase in reliability of, ix
- and leniency programs, 285–90
- and vertical restraints, 391–92, 399–409
- Empirical modeling, reduced-form, 45, 86
- Endogeneity problem (assessment of effects of vertical restraints), 400–401
- Enforcement of antitrust law, xii. *See also* Sanctions
- Enforcement problem (collusion), 307–11
- English common law, and Sherman Act, xi
- Entry
 - for ascending auctions vs. sealed-bid and ordinary markets, 594
 - in auction, 586, 588
 - and cartel collapse, 221
 - following merger in Bertrand industries, 56
 - following merger in Cournot industry, 50
 - and levels of prices and profits, 92
 - in network industries, 485–86
 - and price discrimination, 449–54
- Entry barriers or conditions
 - application barrier, 29
 - and collusion, 129–30
 - exclusive dealing, 378, 380–81
 - and raising-rivals'-costs strategy, 157
 - SCP vs. strategic approach to, 24, 37n.74
 - variation in across industries, 23
 - and vertical integration, 159
 - vertical restraints as, 384
- Environmental aid, as state-aid example, 649–50
- Equilibrium reports, and leniency programs, 280–81
- Equity
 - as state-aid rationale, 634–36
 - and trade-off with efficiency, 635–36
 - as political judgment, 642
- Ethyl* case, 340
- European Commission (EC), x, 95, 183, 316–17. *See also at EC*
 - and as-efficient test, 427
 - and best-price policies, 341
 - and bidding market, 585–86, 609
 - and exchange of information, 319, 345n.25
 - merger guidelines of, 596
 - and merger squeeze, 422
 - and patent pools, 534–35
 - policy standard of, 642
 - and rebate/discount scheme, 423
 - on state aid, 641, 644
 - and technology transfer agreements, 521–22
 - and vertical restraints, 358, 359
- European Communities Treaty, 357
- European Court of Justice (ECJ), 183
 - and abuse of dominance, 416
 - predatory pricing, 419
 - selective price cuts, 420
 - and *Compagnie Maritime Belge* case, 452
 - and *Dyestuffs* case, 316–17
 - and EC Treaty, xiii
 - and *Philip Morris* case, 334–35
 - and *UK Agricultural Tractor Registration Exchange* case, 319
- European state aid control, xx, 625–26. *See also* State aid
 - conditions constituting state aid, 627
 - and economics, 625, 631–38, 660
 - and jurisdiction, 628–29
 - effects-based approach for (balancing test), 626, 647–56, 660
 - precision and predictability in, 656–60
 - legal framework of, 626–31
 - policy standard for assessing, 641–47
 - rationale for, 638–41
- European Union, ix–xi
 - collusion found by, 214
 - control of mergers in, xvii–xviii
 - and coordinated effects of mergers, 131
 - and intellectual property, 537
 - leniency programs in, 259
 - change in (2002), 285, 290
 - econometric studies on, 287–88
 - and *Empagran* case, 294–95
 - evolution of, 267–68
 - and information requirements, 282
 - vs. Microsoft, 501
 - on partial ownership agreements, 334
 - and price announcements, 316
 - and vertical restraints, 399, 523
 - and WorldCom merger proposals, 508
- European Union and conglomerate mergers, 183–86, 208
 - and contingent sales, 186, 189–93, 204–207
 - and competition in absence of complementarity, 196–200
 - and competition with complements, 200–202
 - and economies of scale, 186–87
 - and spillover benefits, 187, 193
 - and standards of proof, 202–207
- Event studies, on effects of vertical restraints, 402–403
- Evidence. *See also* Empirical economic methods
 - assumptions necessary in conjunction with, 34n.40
 - limitations on in particular cases, 14–15
 - quantitative and qualitative, 4, 6, 8–11, 15, 19
- Exchange of information, in collusion, 317–29
- Exchange networks, and network externalities, 475
- Exclusivity practices, 355, 392, 397, 417
 - and anticompetitive effects, 398
 - vs. competitive acts, 418
 - exclusive territory, 355
 - inter-brand competition reduced by, 370
 - vs. opportunistic behavior, 369
 - and foreclosure, 377–84
 - vs. free riding, 394
- Experiment
 - implicit, 5
 - natural, 36n.68, 401–402, 411n.33

- Experts, in antitrust judicial process, 29–32, 38n.99, 39n.104
 in cartel detection, 231
- Explanation
 of extreme inequality, 482
 of monopoly (Coase on), 417, 424
- Explicit agreement, 342
- Explicit collusion, 109–11, 216, 222
- Exposure problem, in auctions, 605
- Externalities, 633
 cross-border, 638–40
 membership and usage (two-sided markets), 544–49, 554
 network, 472, 478, 511n.1 (*see also* Network externalities)
 in payment card industry, 553–55
 in vertical structure, 360, 362, 369
 and horizontal externalities, 362
 in virtual network, 474
- Facilitating of collusion, in vertical integration, 159–61
 in *Premdor-Masonite* case, 169
- Facilitating practices, 305–306
 and “agreement,” 341–43
 and antitrust law, 341
 best-price policies, 335–41
 and collusion, 305, 341, 343
 information exchange, 317–29
 information sharing without collusion, 322–26
 partial ownership arrangements, 329–33
 pre-play communication, 311–17
- False Claim Act, US, 278, 291–92
- Federal Communications Act (1934), 488–89
- Federal Communications Commission (FCC)
 and local leasing, 489
 and *News Corp-DirectTV* case, 146, 161–65, 171, 173, 175
 regulatory rules changed by, 506
 technical advice from, 495
- Federal Trade Commission (FTC), x, xxn.3
 and *Antitrust Guidelines for Collaborations Among Competitors*, 318
 in *Ethyl* case, 340–41
 and generic drugs, 528
 and intellectual property, 520, 525, 530–31, 532
 market power identified by, 250
 and Microsoft, 496
 and Pitofsky, 356
 and *Staples* case, 45, 88, 93
- Federal Trade Commission Act, Section 5 of, 342–43
Federal Trade Commission v. H.J. Heinz Co., 78–79, 103
- Federal Trade Commission. In re CIBA-Geigy Limited, 542
- Federal Trade Commission. In re Intel Corporation, 542
- Federal Trade Commission. In re Rambus Inc., 530, 532, 542
- Federal Trade Commission. In Re Union Oil Co., 530, 531, 532, 542
- Federal Trade Commission v. Staples, Inc.*, 10, 11, 20, 32n.1, 45, 86, 87–88, 93, 103
- Federal Trade Commission vs. Swedish Match*, 103
- Fees, usage vs. membership, 543
- First-come-first-served rationing, 50
- First-degree price discrimination, 435, 438–39
- Forchheimer oligopoly, 43
- Foreclosure, 377–84, 396–97, 409
 by AT&T, 488
 “input foreclosure,” 170, 171
 in Michelin case, 423
 through two-sided bottlenecks, 490
- Franchising, 392–93
 and double marginalization, 393–94
- Free-riding problems
 and exclusive dealing, 394
 and vertical coordination, 362
 and vertical restraints, 365, 368–69
- FTC v. H.J. Heinz Co.*, 78–79, 103
- FTC vs. Staples, Inc.*, 10, 11, 20, 32n.1, 45, 86, 87–88, 93, 103
- Fulfilled expectation demand, in network industry, 476–77
- Full line forcing, 200, 367
- General Electric
 in cartel, 21
 licensing practices of, 525
- General Electric/Honeywell* case, xxin.10, 183, 186, 189, 191–93, 195, 201, 204, 205, 208, 208n.4, 451
- General Electric/Instrumentarium* case, 86, 95–96, 96, 104
- General Electric/Westinghouse* case, 340
- Generalization(s)
 based on related industries, 4, 26–29
 broadly across industries, 24–26
 about industry structures, 30
- Genzyme Limited v. OFT*, 422
- Georgia-Pacific* case (*United States v. Georgia-Pacific Corp.*), 68, 104
- German ordo-liberal school, xi, 417–18
- Giffen good, 512n.3
- Governance problem (organized crime), 260
- GTE Sylvania* case (*Continental T.V. Inc. vs. GTE Sylvania Inc.*), 356, 397, 398
- Grain cartel (late 19th century), 227
- Grundig-Consten* case, 358, 359
- Guidelines on the Application of Article 81(3) of the Treaty*, 345n.25
- Guidelines on Horizontal Cooperation Agreement*, 345n.25
- Guidelines for International Operations*, DOJ, 521
- Guidelines on Vertical Restraints (Vertical Restraints Guidelines)* (EU), 397–98, 399
- Guinness/Grand Med (Metropolitan)* case, 183, 186, 187, 189

- “Harm to competition in the absence of the license” principle, 523
- Hart-Scott-Rodino Act (1976), xviii
- “Hassle” costs, and price guarantee, 336–37, 338
- Heary Bros. Lightning Protection Co., Inc. vs. Lightning Protection Institute*, 104
- Heinz case (FTC v. H.J. Heinz Co.)*, 78–79, 103
- Herfindahl-Hirschman index, 17, 47, 89, 130, 131
- High Fructose Corn Syrup* antitrust litigation, 38n.99
- High-technology industries, and networks, 469
- Holdup problem, 369
- Homogeneous goods markets, vs. markets with horizontal product differentiation, 115–16
- Horizontal Merger Guidelines, US Department of Justice and Federal Trade Commission, 7, 33nn.14,19, 43
- Horizontal mergers, 43. *See also* Merger(s) in auction models, 57–62
- vs. mergers in Bertrand industries, 61–62
- in bargaining models, 62–64
- in Bertrand industries, 50–57
- in Cournot industries or markets, 46–50, 332
- unilateral effects of, 43–45, 75–85
- Horizontal product differentiation, vs. homogeneous goods markets, 115–16
- Hospital Corp. v. Federal Trade Commission*, 32n.1
- Identification (problem), 1, 33n.13
- of buyer substitution in market definition, 5–15
- and empirical economic methods in antitrust, 3–5
- and limitation on experiment, 5
- of market power, 15–19
- and unobservable marginal cost, 19–23
- IIA (independence of irrelevant alternatives), 55, 76, 77, 82
- Image Technical Services, Inc. et al. v. Eastman Kodak Co.*, 492, 525, 541
- Incentive compatibility constraint (ICC), 238, 261
- Incentive effect, 630, 646, 648, 650–51, 652
- Increasing firm marginal costs, and market power, 35n.50
- Independence of irrelevant alternatives (IIA), 55, 76, 77, 82
- Industrial organization economics, xvii, 1, 2, 23
- game-theoretic tools of, 26–27
- industry case study methodology of, 26
- and marginal cost as unobservable, 19
- and Nash equilibrium, 44
- and standard collusion theory, 120
- structure-conduct performance project in, 25
- Industry differences, 23
- and limited generalizations across related industries, 26–29
- and unsuccessful generalizing broadly across industries, 24–26
- Industry experts, in cartel detection, 231
- Industry structures, creation of generalizations about, 30
- Industry as unit of analysis, 1
- Inequality, in network industries, 482–83, 485–86
- “Informational economies of scope,” 450
- Information asymmetries, 633, 643
- Information exchange
- in collusion, 317–29
- unilateral revelation (individual incentives for), 326–28
- Information technology, and dynamic price discrimination, 454
- Innovation, intellectual property’s role in stimulating, 526–27
- and proper disclosure requirements, 531
- Innovation issues, in network industries, 493–94
- “Input foreclosure,” 170, 171
- Input-substitution problems, 410n.12
- Institutions for antitrust decision-making, design of, 29–32
- Intellectual property, 519. *See also* Patent licensing and antitrust laws or policy, 519
- current state of, 521–24, 537–38
- cycles in enforcement of, 519–21
- and differences between intellectual property and other forms, 524–33
- uncertain boundaries of, 527–29
- Inter-brand competition, 369, 386, 396
- and collusion, 373
- and competition dampening, 369–72
- and foreclosure through exclusive dealing, 377–84
- interlocking relationships in, 373–77
- Interconnection
- and bottlenecks, 487–88
- mandating of, 489
- Interlocking relationships, in retail channels, 373–77, 388n.37
- Internal market rationale (European state aid control), 641
- Internal market standard, 646, 647
- International Competition Network (ICN), xxin.9
- Internet, 505–11
- fee for, 512n.8
- government definition of standards for, 480
- government subsidization of, 479
- as network-industry service, 469
- as two-sided market, 546
- Internet service provider (ISP), consumers “locked in” to, 492
- Interstate Bakeries case (United States v. Interstate Bakeries Corp.)*, 74, 75–76, 104
- Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC), 151
- Intertemporal price discrimination, 436
- Intra-brand competition, 364–65
- Investment risk, and unrevealed patents, 530
- Irreversibilities, and collusion, 119
- Johnson&Johnson/Guidant case*, 186
- Joint dominance, 612n.28

- Joint-profit maximization, 361, 363–64, 365–66
and exclusive dealing, 383
Justice Department. *See* Department of Justice, US
- Kali* decision, 131
- Kaplow ratio test, for intellectual property, 527, 537
- Kimberly-Clark* case (*United States v. Kimberly-Clark Corp.*), 78, 104
- Kodak (*Eastman Kodak Co. v. Image Technical Services, Inc.*), 492, 525, 541
- Korea (South Korea), rewards for whistleblowers in, 291
- Kraft* case (*New York v. Kraft General Foods, Inc.*), 38n.99, 64, 78, 104, 124, 136
- “Lack of commitment effect,” 160
- Laqardère/Natexis/VUP* case, 193, 194
- Law enforcement, deterrence as success standard of, 264–65
- Lear, Inc. v. Adkins*, 520, 542
- Leniency programs, xix, 259, 262–63, 292. *See also* Whistleblowers
in anti-cartel programs, 415
change in
in European Union, 290
in US, 289
counterproductive side effects of, 275–77
and *Divide et impera*, 297n.10
EC measures against, 415
economic theories of, 269–72
on asymmetrically informed co-conspirators, 281–82
and cartel prosecution, 271–72
and direct deterrence, 272–75
on equilibrium reports, 280–81
and firm size or reputation, 284
on individual vs. corporate leniency, 284–85
on minimum information requirements, 282–83
on optimal fines or imprisonments, 285
on prices, 283
on rewards to whistleblowers, 277–79
on self-reporting as threat, 275–77
on timing, 283–84
empirical/experimental evidence on, 285
from econometric studies, 287–88
laboratory experiments, 285–87
from natural experiments (US and EU), 288–90
evolution of, 265–66
in EU, 267–68
in US, 266–67
good design of, 293–94
“winner take all” approach, 293, 297–98n.21
issues for further research on, 294–96
and “qui tam,” 291, 299n.41
and ringleaders, 268
and strategic risk, 274
and 10% of revenue rule, 286, 299n.38
US–EU differences in, 268–70
LePape Inc. v. 3M Co., 357, 423, 431n.18
- Lerner index, 7, 18, 19, 33n.23, 35nn.56,57, 130, 131
- Leverage, dynamic theory of, 202
- “Limits of antitrust,” Easterbrook on, 30
- “Lincoln law,” 299n.41
- Lobbying process, xvi, 645, 666nn.74,78
- Logit demand, Bertrand mergers with, 53–55
- Logit model, 75, 77–78, 83
- Logit model, antitrust (ALM), 75
- Low price guarantees, 335–39
- Loyalty of consumer
excessive, 445
insufficient, 457
rebates as inducing, 428–29
- Marginal cost, measurement of, 19, 36n.58
and observability, 19
- Margin squeeze, 421–22, 461, 464n.49
- Market characteristics, and state aid, 655
- Market concentration screen, 170
- Market definition, 33n.20
and *Brown Shoe*, 44
and identification problem, 1
identifying buyer substitution in, 5–15
in implementation procedures, 7
and price discrimination, 451, 463n.36
and vertical integration, 148
- Market division, in bidding processes, 597
- Market economy investor principle (MEIP), 628
- Market failures. *See also* Externalities
correcting of, 633
measurability of, 637
and state aid, 648, 650
- Market power, xiv, 15
and antitrust law, xiv, 305
and auctions, 61
as efficient, 35–36n.57
and exclusion, 429
identification of, 1, 15–19
with unobservable marginal cost, 19–23
for industries with high fixed and low marginal costs, 35n.57
and industry differences, 23–29
measurement of, 2, 15–19
and networks, 491–92
and patent rights, 531
and public good, xvii
of service providers (two-sided markets), 549–50
and state aid, 634
threshold of concern with, xxin.13
and vertical integration, 175
welfare gains from instances of, xiv
- Market power, abuse of. *See* Abuse of market power
- Market share
of cartel, 129
as collusive marker, 245–46
inequality of (network industries), 483
and market power, 15, 667n.90
- Market structure, and price, 10–11, 11–12

- Market transparency. *See also* Transparency and collusion theory, 116–17, 137, 139
- Markups, eliminating of (vertical mergers), 153–55, 175
- Maverick firms
and collusion, 117, 141n.10
and coordinated effects analysis, 22, 36n.67, 133–34, 136, 141–42n.15
and partial ownership agreements, 332
- Maximization of consumer welfare, xxin.14
- “Maximum game,” 598, 599
- Measurement, of market power, 2, 15–19
formal framework for, 16
- “Meet the competition” clauses (MCCs), 596. *See also* Best-price policies
- Membership externalities, 544, 548–49, 554
- Merger(s)
and auctions, 584
and competition incentives, 6
EC revision in regulation of, 415–16
vs. facilitating practices, 306
GE/Honeywell, xxin.10
horizontal (unilateral effects of), 43–62 (*see also* Horizontal mergers)
impact of on collusion, 112–20
legislation on, xviii
and rule of reason, 346n.41
vertical, 145 (*see also* Vertical integration)
as violating economic goal vs. antitrust per se, xiv
in winner-take-all market, 608
- Merger Guidelines (EC), 642
- Merger Guidelines (US), 7
Horizontal, 7, 33nn.14,19
Non-horizontal, 159, 160
- Merger policy, 44
- Mergers, conglomerate. *See* European Union and conglomerate mergers
- Mergers, coordinated effects of. *See* Coordinated effects of mergers
- Merger simulation, 44–45, 64–66
and auctions, 70, 608
Bertrand merger simulation mechanics, 68–70
Cournot merger simulation mechanics, 66–68
with differentiated consumer products, 75–85
and “fit” between oligopoly model and industry, 70–75
and mergers with power-related distributions, 58
and normality assumption, 82
quantitative analysis underlying, 34n.29
and reduced-form estimation, 85–96
simulation of coordinated effects of mergers, 140
- Methods of assessment, for effects of vertical restraints, 400–407
- Michelin case (Manufacture Française des Pneumatiques Michelin v. Commission)* 359, 423
- United States v. Microsoft Corp.*, 28–29, 32nn.2,9, 38n.88, 357, 359, 497–501, 511, 513n.25, 525, 542
- Microsoft Corp., licensing arrangements of, 532
- Miles Medical Co. v. John D. Park & Sons Co.*, 542
- Mixed bundling, 192, 200, 206, 435
- Mixed-logic model, 78, 82–83
- Monitoring
and cartel breakdown, 128, 129
in collusion, 308–309
vs. punishment, 310–11
imperfect, 321–22
- Monopolist, and adjacent market, 449–51
- Monopolist manufacturer, 367
- Monopolization
law against, 415 (*see also* Antitrust law)
in network industries, 470
- Monopolized market, incentive to enter, 451–54
- Monopoly
and dynamic price discrimination, 454–56, 460
as maximizing total surplus (network industries), 484–85
natural, 666n.75
and price-discrimination effect, 442, 442–44
- Monopoly explanation, Coase on, 417, 424
- Monopoly first-degree price discrimination, 438–39
- Monopoly model, for information sharing without collusion, 322–24
- Monopoly platform, in payment card industry, 565–66
- Monopoly power, 15, 499
in aftermarket, 397
and market power, 34n.45
in monopolization, 418
“restoring” of (vertical integration), 151–53
and vertical restraints, 395–96
- Monopoly power theory, single. *See* Single monopoly power theory
- Monopsonistic power, of bid taker, 602
- Monsanto Co. v. Homan McFarling*, 542
- Moral hazard, and organized crime, 260
- “Most favored customer” clauses, 148, 152, 339–40
- Multi-homing, 510, 547, 550, 561, 566, 567, 576
- Multiple pricing regimes, and market-power identification, 22–23
- Multi-product manufacturer, and vertical coordination, 365–67
- Multi-product pricing, and two-sided markets, 543
- Multi-sided markets. *See* Two-sided markets
- Nash bargaining theory, 62–63, 179n.45
- Nash equilibrium(a)
selection of, 312
static, 237, 238, 239, 310, 608
subgame perfect, 310
- Nash noncooperative equilibrium, 44, 45, 51
- Nash reversion or reversal, 111, 116, 121, 141n.11, 310, 311
- National Association of Attorneys General (NAAG), on *Vertical Restraints Guidelines*, 397
- National Collegiate Athletic Association v. Board of Regents*, 32n.2

- National commitment problems, for European state aid control, 640–41
- National Harrow* case, 520, 541
- Natural experiments, 36n.68, 86, 411n.33
on effects of vertical restraints, 401–402
- Natural monopolies, 666n.75
- Natural oligopoly, 495
- Nestlé/Coca Cola* case, 189
- Nestle Perrier* case, 140
- Net neutrality, 506
abolition of, 506, 507
- Network effects, 472, 475, 478, 484–85, 495, 506–507, 511n.1
- Network externalities, 472, 478, 511n.1
in exchange or financial networks, 475–76
and inequality, 482
perfect competition as inefficient with, 479
and two-sided markets, 543, 576, 578n.1
and VHS over Beta, 487
- Network industries, 469–70
competition policy issues in
and B2B exchanges, 493
of dynamic efficiency, 493
of innovation, 493–94
of intervention criteria, 494–96
one-sided bottlenecks, 487–89
recent cases in, 496–511
of remedies criteria, 494–96
and technical standards as market power creation, 491–92
two-sided bottlenecks, 489–90
of vertical integration and control, 492–93
legal system inadequate to, 511
and markets with network effects, 471–87
and competition, 486
and critical mass, 477–78
and inequality of market shares and profits, 483, 485–86
and monopoly as maximizing total surplus, 484–85
and path dependence, 486–87
and standards wars, 479–83
natural equilibrium in, 486, 498–99
and free entry, 485–86
- Networks, virtual, 469, 473
- Neutral economic experts in litigation. *See* Experts, in antitrust judicial process
- “New economy,” 472
and Microsoft case, 511
- Newell/Rubbermaid* case, 189
- News Corp./DirectTV acquisition* case, 146, 161–65, 169, 171, 173, 175
- New York v. Kraft General Foods, Inc.*, 38n.99, 64, 78, 104, 124, 136
- New York State Department of Transportation (DOT), and bidding ring, 223
- Nonanonymous price discrimination, 434–35
- Noncooperative games, pre-play communication in, 312
- Non-horizontal Merger Guidelines, 159, 160
- Observable cost components, in market-power identification, 20–21
- OECD Roundtable on subsidies and state aid, 644
- Office of Fair Trading (OFT), 419–20
- Oligopoly
Cournot model of, 46
and dynamic price discrimination, 456–58
natural, 495
and price-discrimination effect, 442
sharing information in, 324–25, 328
- Oligopoly conduct, and firm behavior, 18–19
- Opel Netherlands B.V.* case, 358
- Opportunism
exclusive dealing against, 394
and organized crime, 260
- Opportunism, free-riding as. *See* Free-riding problems
- Optimal punishment strategies, 126, 310
- Oracle case (United States v. Oracle Corp.)*, 55, 70, 104
- Orbitz* case, 357
- Ordo-liberal school of law and economics, xi, 417–18
- Organized crime
cartels as, 260–62, 296n.7
and leniency programs, 260
- “Outlets effect,” 160
- Pareto efficiency, 632, 663nn.29,31
- Partial ownership arrangements (POA), 329–33
antitrust treatment of, 333–35
“solely for investment” exemption, 333, 346n.44
“controller’s POAs” vs. “firm POAs,” 330–31
“Participation constraint,” 261
- Patent licensing, 520–21, 523, 524, 532. *See also*
Intellectual property
and patent pools, 520, 536–37
and technology transfer, 540n.39
- Patent pools, 533–37, 538
and *National Harrow* case, 520
- Patents
great numbers of, 527
and strategic conduct, 529–32
validity of, 528
- Patent and Trademark Office, US, 529
- Path dependence, and network industries, 486–87
- Payment card industry, 544, 553–58. *See also* Two-sided markets
balancing act of, 570–71, 573
compared with other industries, 577–78
determinants of price structure in, 561–68
and elastic consumer demand, 572
excessive interchange fees in, 567–68
fixed fees in, 570
and imperfectly informed consumers, 568–69
model of (Rochet-Tirole extended), 558–61
no-discrimination rule in, 557, 573–75
as open and not for profit, 573
and proprietary systems, 570–71
regulatory and antitrust policies for, 572–78
“steering” of consumer in, 561, 567

- and system fees, 578n.5
 - and unobservable merchant heterogeneity, 569–70
 - Payment schemes, 354
 - PCAIDS (proportionately calibrated AIDS) model, 78, 79
 - Perfect competition, xiv
 - as inefficient (network externalities), 479
 - Performance competition, 418
 - Pernod Ricard/Diageo/Seagram* case, 186, 189
 - Pharmaceutical markets
 - and generic drugs, 28, 30, 94
 - and Napp Pharmaceutical case, 419–20
 - Philadelphia National Bank* case (*United States v. Philadelphia National Bank*), 44, 104
 - Philip Morris* case, 334–35
 - Piracy, and *Microsoft* case, 499, 532
 - Plea bargaining, 262, 263, 270–71
 - Point-of-sale scanner data, 6
 - estimation issues with, 83–85
 - Policy. *See* Antitrust policy
 - Political background, x, x–xi
 - “Portfolio effects,” 185, 451
 - Power-related distributions
 - families of, 59–60
 - mergers with, 58–59
 - Precision, in state aid control, 656–60
 - Precision effect, of information exchange 324, 325
 - Predation, and common values in auctions, 600–602
 - Predatory pricing, 419
 - modification of rules concerning, 37n.80
 - Predictability, in state aid control, 656–60
 - Premdor/Masonite* case, 135, 146, 167–69, 169, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175
 - Pre-play communication, in collusion, 311–17
 - Price(s), and pricing
 - and abuse of market power
 - predatory pricing, 419–20, 424, 425
 - selective price cuts, 420–21, 424
 - in auctions and bidding processes, 592–93
 - collusive, 227
 - and leniency, 283
 - in markets with network effects, 478
 - and market structure, 10–11, 11–12
 - Ramsey, 439, 526, 551
 - in two-sided markets, 506, 547–48, 549–51, 576
 - payment card industry, 561–68
 - and unobservable characteristics, 12
 - unusual movements in, 22–23
 - Price coherence, 557
 - Price discrimination, 19, 36n.60, 148, 176n.4, 395, 433, 460
 - in auctions, 604–605
 - for card payments, 557
 - competition relaxed by, 447–49
 - dilemma over, 428
 - dynamic, 454–58
 - efficient prices from, 437–39
 - and entry, 449–54
 - and fixed fees, 551
 - forms of, 434–37
 - good economic understanding needed for, 460
 - intense competition from, 444–47
 - Internet access providers attempt, 505, 506
 - and low-price guarantees, 337
 - and market definition, 451, 463n.36
 - in network industries, 492
 - as opening or shutting markets, 439–41
 - and output, 441–42, 507
 - in patent licensing, 527
 - price rise and fall caused by, 442–44
 - reasons for concern with, 433–34
 - in vertically related markets, 458–60
 - Price-matching contracts
 - “meet the competition” clauses (MCCs), 596
 - as price discrimination, 448
 - price-matching (PMG) and price-beating (PBG) guarantees, 335–39
 - Price squeeze, 464n.49. *See also* Margin squeeze
 - Prisoner’s Dilemma, 263, 269, 270, 279, 297n.10, 445, 638
 - Private enforcement, in US vs. European Union, x
 - Procter&Gamble/Gillette* case, 186, 187, 189, 208
 - Procurement auctions
 - and bid rigging, 276
 - and cartel detection, 217, 218–19, 222, 223, 225
 - mergers in, 60–61
 - Product differentiation, 36n.60
 - and buyer substitution, 11
 - and cost-based measures of market power, 18
 - and market boundaries, 6
 - and residual demand curve approach, 18
 - structure of, 12
 - Profit, inequality of (network industries), 483
 - Pronuptia* case, 358, 359
 - Proof, standards of (European Commission on conglomerate mergers), 202–207
 - Prosecution, as cost to society, 265
 - “Protection from fines” effect (Defector Amnesty Effect), 273, 281
 - Public goods, 633
 - firms’ behavior as jeopardizing, xvii
 - Public intervention in industries, steps required in, 577
 - Public policy, and social interest vs. special interest, 575
 - Punishment (in collusion), 310–11
 - Punishment (legal), x, xxin.5
 - “Punishment effect” of vertical integration, 160
 - Punishment strategies, optimal, 126
 - Pure bundling, 196–98, 201, 201–202, 206, 435
 - Pure usage externalities, 547–48
-
- Quantitative and qualitative evidence, 4, 6, 8–11, 15, 19
 - Quantity discounts, 354, 435, 449–50
 - in *Microsoft* case, 496, 497, 500
 - Quantity fixing, 354

- Quasi-supply function, 16
 estimation of, 16–17
- Questions
 about antitrust policy, xii
 central to antitrust law, xii
- Raising rivals' costs (RRC) theory or strategy, 378, 396–97
 and sacrifice test, 426
 in *Verizon* case, 502, 504, 504–505
 and vertical integration, 146, 155–59
 and CRS proceeding, 166–67
- Ramsey prices, 439, 526, 551
- Range effects, 451. *See also* “Portfolio effects”
- Rational choice analysis, and cartels, 271, 298n.23
- Rationing, first-come-first-served, 50
- Ratio test, Kaplow, for intellectual property, 527, 537
- R&D
 and collusion, 119–20
 and costs of innovation, 526–27
 in European state aid, 630, 658, 667n.94
 externalities from, 633
 and patent pools, 535
 and patent validity, 528
- “Reaction effect,” 160
- Reasonableness analysis, market definition in, 1
- Reasonableness standards. *See also* Rule of reason
 and industry as appropriate unit of observation, 27
 move toward, 25
- Rebates
 as abuse of market power, 422–23
 “loyalty-inducing,” 428–29
 target, 461n.7
- Redistribution, 634–36
- Reduced-form empirical modeling, 45
- Reduced-form estimation, 85–87
 and variation across auctions, 95
 and variation across local markets, 87–93
 and variation within markets over time, 93–95
- Regional development scheme, as state-aid example, 651–52
- Regulation. *See also* Antitrust law
 criteria for, 495–96
 for payment card industry, 572–78
- Regulators' fallacy, 585
- Related industries
 generalizations based on, 4
 limited generalizations across, 26–29
- Renegotiation, and standard collusion theory, 121–22
- Repositioning, 51, 56
 and merger simulation, 66
- Resale, and auctions, 605–606
- Resale price maintenance (RPM), 354
 in collusion, 373
 as illegal, 356, 358, 398
 and interbrand competition, 371
 in interlocking relationships, 375, 377
 and two sided markets, 579n.20
 in vertical coordination, 363, 365
- Research agenda, xii
 on consumer welfare standard, xvii
 on leniency program, 294–96
- Reserve prices, and bid-takers power, 604
- Residual demand, and market definition, 7
- Residual demand function, 17–18, 33n.21
- Restoring monopoly power or profit theory, 146, 151–53, 175
 and CRS proceeding, 167
 in *News Corp* case, 164–65
- Retailer power, 200
- Retail scanner data. *See* Scanner data
- Retail services, and vertical coordination, 362–65
- Revealed preference strategy, 36n.68
- Risk aversion, of bidder, 605
- Risk capital, in European state aid, 630–31
 as example, 651–52
- Risk of investment, and unrevealed patents, 530
- Rival reactions, in residual demand function, 17
- Robinson-Patman Act, 614n.49
- Rome, Treaty of (1957), 661n.2. *See also* EC Treaty
- Rotations in demand, 19
- RPM. *See* Resale price maintenance
- Rule of reason. *See also* Reasonableness standards
 and mergers, 346n.41
 and vertical restraints, 398
 in *GTE Sylvania* case, 356
- Sacrifice test, 420, 423–26, 504, 515n.61
- Salz* decision, 131
- Sanctions, in US vs. European Union, x, xxin.5
- Sarbanes-Oxley Act, 291
- Scanner data, 6
 estimation issues with, 83–85
 in *Interstate Bakeries* case, 76
Schering-Plough Corp v. FTC, 528–29, 542
- Schumpeterian competition, 486
- Schwinn* case, 356
- Scottish/Newcastle* case, 189
- SCP (structure-conduct performance) approach, 24–25, 26
- Screening, for cartel detection, 216–17
 activist policy of screening for collusion, 249–52
 pitfalls of high price-cost margin as, 232–33
- Sealed-bid auctions, mergers in, 60–61
- SEB/Moulinex* case, 183, 186, 189
- Second-degree price discrimination, 435
- Secrecy, in sealed-bid auction, 604
- Sectoral economic regulation, 495
- Securities and Exchange Commission, US, 215
- Selective price cuts, 420–21
- Self-committing and self-signaling messages, 313
- “Self-enforcing constraint,” 261
- Sherman Act, xviii, 418
 and antitrust law, 341
 and collusion, 305

- and English common law, xi
- and facilitating practices, 306
- and grain cartel, 227
- on monopoly or market power, 15
- and predatory pricing, 419
- punishments for violation of, x
 - and *Microsoft*, 498, 501, 503
 - and Verizon, 502
- Section 1 of, xviii, 161, 305, 341–42, 344n.24, 355, 411n.20, 489.
- Section 2 of, xviii, 355, 418, 426, 498, 501–503
 - and vertical integration, 161
- Simulation of mergers. *See* Merger simulation
- Single market, and price discrimination, 433
- Single monopoly profit theory, 146, 148–51, 174–75
 - and contingent sales, 196
 - and CRS market, 167
 - and eliminating markups, 154
 - in News Corp case, 164
 - and restoring monopoly power, 151
- Size of firm, and leniency, 284
- SMEs, state aids for, 627, 630, 633
- Socially optimal interchange fees (payment card industry), 562–63
- Social welfare function, 641–42
- South Korea, rewards for whistleblowers in, 291
- Specification, 5, 9, 33n.12
 - of demand, 79–81
- Spectrum auctions, 591–92
- Stag Hunt Game, 313, 344n.13
- Standard collusion theory. *See* Collusion theory, standard
- Standard Oil* case, 356
- Standard Sanitary Manufacturing v. US*, 520, 542
- Standards wars, 479–83
- Staples* litigation (*FTC v. Staples, Inc.*), 10, 11, 20, 32n.1, 45, 86, 87–88, 93, 103
- State aid. *See also* European state aid control
 - limits of, 636–38
 - operational vs. investment, 656
 - rationale for, 632–36
- State Aid Action Plan* (European Commission), 57
- Statutes, language and interpretation of, x, xi
- Strategic bargaining theory, 62
- Strategic conduct, as motivated by intellectual property, 529–32
- Strategic delegation, 396
- Strategic trade policy, 638–39
- “Structural estimation,” 87
- Structural models, for assessment of effects of vertical restraints, 403–404
- Structure-conduct performance (SCP) approach, 24–25, 26
- “Submarine patents,” 529
- Substitutes, closeness of, 55
- Successive monopolies (succession-of-monopoly), 360, 362–64, 393
- Supply-side factors, and market definition, 27, 38n.92
- Supply-side shocks, and output effects of price increases, 14
- Supply substitution, and market definition, 33n.20
- Supreme Court, US. *See also specific cases*
 - on antitrust statutes, xiii
 - and merger policy, 44
 - on nonprice vertical restraints, 2
- Surveys, buyer
 - and buyer substitution, 12
 - scanner data for, 83–85
- Switching cost markets, 590
- Sylvania* case (*Continental T. V. Inc. v. GTE Sylvania Inc.*), 356, 397, 398
- Tacit agreement, 342
- Tacit collusion, 125–26, 132, 140, 216, 221–22, 311
- Target rebates, 461n.7
- Technical standards, in network industries, 491, 492
- Technology transfer agreements
 - and European Commission, 521–22
 - and patent licensing, 540n.39
- Telecommunications Act (1996), 489, 490, 502, 514–15n.43
- Telecommunications industry
 - regulation of, 577
 - as two-sided market, 546
- Temporary price reductions (TPRs), and scanner data estimation, 84–85
- Termination restrictions, and vertical restraints, 405
- Tetra Laval/Sidel* case, 183, 185, 186, 188, 189, 189–91, 195, 203, 205, 208, 208n.4
- Tetra Pak/Alfa-Laval* case, 183, 186
- Tetra Pak International SA v. Commission (Tetra Pak II)*, 419
- The Coca Cola Company (TCCC)* case, 359
- Theory of competitive harm, 28–29
- 3M case (*LePage Inc. v. 3M Co.*), 357, 423, 431n.18
- Tie-in provisions, 355
- Time series assessment, 401
- Todd v. Exxon* case, 319, 344–45n.24
- Total welfare, as ultimate goal, xiv, xxin.14
 - vs. consumer welfare, xiv–xvii, xxin.14
- Total welfare standard 641–42, 642–43, 644, 645, 665n.62
- Trade associations, and cartels, 220
- Transaction costs economics, and vertical integration, 145
- Transparency, xvi. *See also* Market transparency
- Treaty of Rome (1957), 661n.2. *See also* EC Treaty
- Trinko* case (*Verizon Communications Inc. v. Law offices of Curtis V. Trinko*), 426, 432, 501–505, 515n.50
- Two-part tariffs
 - in double marginalization, 393
 - in interlocking relationships, 375, 377, 388n.37
 - and price discrimination, 438, 439, 463n.32
 - in vertical coordination, 363, 365, 367, 368
 - in vertical integration, 157

- Two-sided markets, 543
 memberships vs. usage externalities in, 544–49
 model of (Rochet-Tirole extended), 558–61
 multi-homing in, 510, 547, 550, 561, 566, 567, 576
 payment card industry, 553–58
 balancing act of, 570–71, 573
 compared with other industries, 577–78
 and elastic consumer demand, 572
 excessive interchange fees in, 567–68
 fixed fees in, 570
 and imperfectly informed consumers, 568–69
 no-discrimination rule in, 557, 573–75
 as open and not for profit, 573
 and proprietary systems, 570–71
 regulatory and antitrust policies for, 572–78
 “steering” of consumer in, 561
 and system fees, 578n.5
 and unobservable merchant heterogeneity, 569–70
 and platform of competition authority, 553
 price level vs. price structure of, 547
 pricing strategies for various platforms in, 549–51, 576
 regulation of end-user interactions, 551–52
 screening of members in, 552
 and “steering” of sellers, 550
 Two-sided pricing, 506
 Tying. *See also* Bundling
 and European Commission, 200–201, 204–207, 208
 by Microsoft, 498
 and price discrimination, 395
- UK Agricultural Tractor Registration Exchange* case, 319
 UK Competition Commission, 606
 UK Monopolies and Mergers Commission, 601–602, 608
 “Unequal marginal utilities” effect, 441
 Unilateral competitive effects, formal definition of, 45–46
 Unilateral competitive effects of horizontal mergers, 43–46
 vs. coordinated effects, 106–107
 Unilateral effects, 306, 337
 and auctions/bidding processes vs. “ordinary” markets, 591–92
 Unilateral effects theory, 5–6
 Unilateral revelation of information, individual incentives for, 326–28
 United States. *See* Department of Justice, US; Federal Communication Commission; Federal Trade Commission; Sherman Act; Supreme Court, US
 United States vs. European Union, ix–xi, xxin.10
United States v. Alcoa, 147
United States v. Brown Shoe Co., 44, 65, 103, 147
United States v. Columbia Steel Co., 44, 104
United States v. EchoStar Communications Corp., 78, 104
United States v. Ford Motor Co., 147
United States v. General Electric Co., 542
United States v. Georgia-Pacific Corp., 68, 104
United States v. Gillette Co., 104
United States v. Interstate Bakeries Corp., 74, 75–76, 104
United States v. Kimberly-Clark Corp., 78, 104
United States v. Long Island Jewish Medical Center, 104
United States v. Microsoft Corp. 28–29, 32nn.2,9, 38n.88, 357, 359, 497–501, 511, 525, 542
United States v. Oracle Corp., 55, 70, 104
United States v. Philadelphia National Bank, 44, 104
United States v. Pilkington, 542
United States v. Premdor and Masonite, 135, 146, 167–69, 169, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175
United States v. Singer Manufacturing Co., 520, 542
United States v. Studiengesellschaft Kohle, MBH, 520, 542
United States v. Vail Resorts, Inc., 104
United States v. Waste Management, Inc., 32n.1
United States v. WorldCom, Inc., 76–77, 80, 104
- Variation across auctions, and reduced-form estimation, 95
 Variation across local markets, and reduced-form estimation, 87–93
 Variation within markets over time, and reduced-form estimation, 93–95
 Verizon
 and net neutrality, 506, 507
 price discrimination attempted by, 505
Verizon Communications Inc. v. Law offices of Curtis V. Trinko, 426, 432, 501–505, 515n.50
 Vertical control, in network industries, 492–93
 Vertical coordination, 360
 and double marginalization, 360–62, 365, 385, 393–95
 and multi-product manufacturer, 365–67
 and retail services, 362–65
 Vertical integration, 145, 146, 174
 anticompetitive effects from, 185
 cases on, 161–69
 and double marginalization, 154, 155, 157, 158, 165
 economic analysis of, 146–61
 exclusive dealing as, 397
 framework for evaluating of, 169–74
 in merger analysis, 118
 in network industries, 492–93
 Vertical leveraging, in *Verizon* case, 503, 504
 Vertically related markets, price discrimination in, 458–60
 Vertical merger, 145, 184–85
 Vertical restraints, xix, 353, 365, 391
 and commitment problem, 367–68
 competition policy toward, 384–86
 and dealers cartels, 395–96
 and dealers ex ante investment incentives, 395
 and dealer services, free riding on, 394–95

- effects of (empirical findings), 391–92, 399–408
 - assessment methods for, 400–404
 - results, 408–409
 - and intellectual property, 533
 - and inter-brand competition, 369, 386
 - and collusion, 373
 - competition dampening, 369–72
 - and foreclosure through exclusive dealing, 377–84
 - interlocking relationships in, 373–77
 - legal situation of, 355
 - in Europe, 357–59
 - in US, 355–57
 - and patents, 523
 - payment schemes, 354
 - private motives for, 392–93
 - anticompetitive, 395–97
 - of efficiency, 393–95
 - provisions limiting the parties' rights, 354–55
 - public policy toward, 397–99, 409
 - rule-of-reason approach to, 398
 - as socially desirable, 367
 - and vertical coordination, 360
- Vertical Restraints Guidelines* (DOJ), 356, 397
- Vertical Restraints Guidelines* (EU), 397–98
- Virtual networks, 469, 473
- Volkswagen A.G.*, 358
- Volvo/Scania* merger, 78, 104
- Walker Process Equipment, Inc. v. Food Machinery & Chemical Corp.*, 520, 542
- “Wallet game,” 598–99
- Webb-Pommerene Export Trade Act, 127
- Welfare. *See also* Total welfare
- Welfare standard, in interpreting antitrust law, xv. *See also* Social welfare function
- Westinghouse, in cartel, 21
- Whistleblowers, xix. *See also* Leniency programs
- economic/social costs faced by, 278, 291, 298n.32
 - and optimal fines or imprisonment, 285
 - rewards to, 260, 277–79, 290–92
- White Motors* case, 356
- “Winner’s curse,” 584, 597–98, 600–601, 609
- Wireless cellular and PCS markets, consumers “locked in” to, 492
- Wirtschaftsvereinigung* case, 320
- WorldCom* case (*United States v. WorldCom, Inc.*), 76–77, 80, 104
- WorldCom/Sprint merger proposal, 508, 513n.24
- World Wide Web, as network-industry service, 469
- Zenith Radio Corp. v. Hazeltine Research, Inc.*, 520, 532, 542

