Author: Antonaki, I.

Title: Privatisations and golden shares : bridging the gap between the State and the market in the area of free movement of capital in the EU

Issue Date: 2019-09-03

Privatisations and golden shares

Bridging the gap between the State and the market in the area of free movement of capital in the EU

PROEFSCHRIFT

ter verkrijging van
de graad van Doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,
op gezag van Rector Magnificus prof. mr. C.J.J.M. Stolker,
volgens besluit van het College voor Promoties
te verdedigen op dinsdag 3 september 2019
klokke 16.15 uur

door

Ilektra Antonaki

geboren te Heraklion, Griekenland

in 1990

Promotor: prof. dr. S.C.G. Van den Bogaert
Co-promotor: dr. M. Jesse

Promotiecommissie: prof. dr. R.C. Tobler
prof. dr. S.M.M. Garben (College of Europe, Bruges, Belgium)
prof. dr. H.E.G.S. Schneider (Maastricht University)
prof. dr. P. van Cleynenbreugel (University of Liege, Belgium)

Omslagontwerp: Primo!Studio, Delft
Opmaak binnenwerk: Anne-Marie Krens – Tekstbeeld – Oegstgeest

Privatisations and golden shares

Privatisations and golden shares

Bridging the gap between the State and the market in the area of free movement of capital in the EU

PROEFSCHRIFT

ter verkrijging van
de graad van Doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,
op gezag van Rector Magnificus prof. mr. C.J.J.M. Stolker,
volgens besluit van het College voor Promoties
te verdedigen op dinsdag 3 september 2019
klokke 16.15 uur

door

Ilektra Antonaki

geboren te Heraklion, Griekenland

in 1990

Promotor: prof. dr. S.C.G. Van den Bogaert
Co-promotor: dr. M. Jesse

Promotiecommissie: prof. dr. R.C. Tobler
prof. dr. S.M.M. Garben (College of Europe, Bruges, Belgium)
prof. dr. H.E.G.S. Schneider (Maastricht University)
prof. dr. P. van Cleynenbreugel (University of Liege, Belgium)

Omslagontwerp: Primo!Studio, Delft
Opmaak binnenwerk: Anne-Marie Krens – Tekstbeeld – Oegstgeest

Acknowledgements

Writing a PhD in law can be a very lonely process. And yet, having now completed my thesis, I realise how many people have contributed to it. I cannot but feel eternally grateful to them for their intellectual and emotional support!

The first and biggest thank you goes to my two supervisors Stefaan Van den Bogaert and Moritz Jesse for their immense support, help and motivation throughout these four years of research. Their extensive and constructive feedback and their warm words of encouragement, in all phases of the writing process, have been truly instrumental in developing, progressing and finalising this project. It is not an exaggeration to say that this book would never have been possible without them.

Secondly, I would like to thank Carel Smith and the Meijers Research Institute and Graduate School for offering me a four-year research grant and for providing me with the necessary guidance and support throughout my research.

Thirdly, I would like to thank the members of the PhD Committee, Prof. Christa Tobler, Prof. Pieter Van Cleynenbreugel, Prof. Sacha Garben and Prof. Hildegard Schneider. I am deeply honoured they invested the time and effort to review my manuscript and I am grateful for their insightful comments.

Fourthly, I would like to thank Prof. Stefan Grundmann and the European University Institute for giving me the opportunity to spend two months in beautiful Florence as a visiting researcher. Furthermore, I would like to express my deepest respect and gratitude to the Principal Legal Adviser Vittorio Di Bucci and the Legal Adviser Hélène Tserepa-Lacombe for their truly inspiring mentorship and trust during my traineeship at the Legal Service of the European Commission.

A very special and warm thank you goes to my dearest friends and paranymphs Kristel van Kruisbergen and Daniel Carter for generously offering me their friendship and love all these years and for being my Leiden family upon which I could rely at any moment. I would never have made it without you!

I would also like to very warmly thank all my other colleagues at the Europa Institute – Pauline, Nathan, Darinka, Frederik, Barbora, Vicky, Armin, Jorrit, Timothy, Jet, Melanie, Daniel M., Alison, Vestert, Freya, Maarten, Ben, Richard, Rick, Pavlos, Petra, Valentine, Merinda, Jasmina, Agis, Barbara, Marijke and Narin for creating the best working environment and for making my homesickness more bearable.

To my friends Anna, Charitini, Evi, Maria, Ioulia, Katerina, Aurélie and Vittoria: we may be scattered all over Europe, but you always remain my source of strength, motivation and courage!

To my parents, my sister, my aunts and my grandparents: I cannot find the words to express my deepest gratitude for creating all the necessary conditions for a genuinely happy and carefree childhood and for offering me your unconditional love and unwavering emotional support throughout my life.

Finally, I would like to thank the two protagonists of my life, Marios and Antigoni. My dear Marios, thank you for spending the last 13 years of your life with me, travelling from Crete to Athens, Paris and Leiden, sharing ideas and dreams. Your love, care and devotion have been the cornerstones of my life. My little Antigoni, with you I have discovered a whole new world full of true happiness, immeasurable love, loads of hugs and kisses, dancing, singing and playing! And although sometimes I would appreciate a few hours of uninterrupted sleep, when I look at you I feel like I am the luckiest person in the world! My little Antigoni, 'love of my life', thank you for giving me hope and for making my life beautiful. This thesis is dedicated to you.

Overview of contents

INTRODUCTION 1

1 Setting the scene: The international debate about capital liberalisation 1
2 Scope of the thesis: bridging the gap between the State and the market in the area of free movement of capital in the EU 4
3 Research question and sub-questions 6
4 Academic relevance and method 9
5 Negative integration versus positive integration 13
6 Societal relevance 16
7 Structure of the thesis 19

PART I: Regulatory framework governing capital liberalisation 25

1 FREE MOVEMENT OF CAPITAL AT THE INTERNATIONAL LEVEL 27

1 Introduction 27
2 The theoretical controversy surrounding capital liberalisation 28
3 The historical evolution of capital liberalisation 40
4 Conclusion of Chapter 1 57

2 FREE MOVEMENT OF CAPITAL IN THE EU 61

1 Introduction 61
2 A historical overview 63
3 The current legal framework 71
4 Conclusion of Chapter 2 127

PART II: Implementation in the context of privatisations and golden shares 131

3 FREE MOVEMENT OF CAPITAL AND PRIVATISATIONS 133

1 Introduction 133
2 The theoretical underpinnings of privatisation 134
3 Privatisation and EU law 144
4 Conclusion of Chapter 3 165

4 FREE MOVEMENT OF CAPITAL AND GOLDEN SHARES 169

1 Introduction 169
2 Understanding the theoretical controversy surrounding golden shares 172
3 Legal issues arising from the golden shares case law 188
4 Conclusion of Chapter 4 264

Overall conclusion 269
Samenvatting (Dutch summary) 275
Bibliography 277
Curriculum vitae 321

Table of contents

INTRODUCTION		1
1	Setting the scene: The international debate about capital liberalisation	1
2	Scope of the thesis: bridging the gap between the State and the market in the area of free movement of capital in the EU	4
3	Research question and sub-questions	6
4	Academic relevance and method	9
5	Negative integration versus positive integration	13
6	Societal relevance	16
7	Structure of the thesis	19
PART I – Regulatory framework governing capital liberalisation		25
1	FREE MOVEMENT OF CAPITAL AT THE INTERNATIONAL LEVEL	27
1	Introduction	27
2	The theoretical controversy surrounding capital liberalisation	
2.1	Defining capital liberalisation	28
2.2	Neoclassical economic theory v Keynesianism	30
	2.2.1 Arguments in favour of capital liberalisation	31
	2.2.2 Arguments critical of capital liberalisation	34
	2.2.3 Capital controls	37
3	The historical evolution of capital liberalisation	40
3.1	The Gold Standard	40
3.2	The Bretton Woods system	43
	3.2.1 Fixed exchange rate	45
	3.2.2 Restrictions on capital flows	47
3.3	The ambivalent standpoint of international institutions and the rediscovery of capital restrictions as a legitimate policy tool	50
3.4	The current legal framework	54
4	Conclusion of Chapter 1	57
2	FREE MOVEMENT OF CAPITAL IN THE EU	61
1	Introduction	61
2	A historical overview	62
2.1	Treaty of Rome: the early tentative steps	63
2.2	The Council Directives	65
2.3	The Maastricht Treaty	69
3	The current legal framework	71

3.1 The scope of Article 63 TFEU 71
3.1.1 Difference between 'capital movements' and 'payments' 71
3.1.2 Territorial scope 73
3.1.3 Material Scope 75
3.1.3.1 Investments in real estate 76
3.1.3.2 Direct and portfolio investments 77
3.1.3.3 Loans, mortgages and commercial credits 78
3.1.3.4 Receipt of dividends 78
3.1.3.5 Resale of shares 78
3.1.3.6 Inheritances 79
3.1.3.7 Gifts and endowments 79
3.2 Relationship with the other freedoms 79
3.2.1 Capital v goods 79
3.2.2 Capital v Establishment 80
3.2.2.1 The theory of parallelism 80
3.2.2.2 The exercise of definite influence as the test to determine which freedom has priority 81
3.2.2.3 The distinction between direct and portfolio investments 84
3.2.2.4 The distinction between capital and establishment in legal literature 85
3.2.2.5 The distinction between capital and establishment in tax law 88
3.2.3 Capital v Services 90
3.2.4 Capital v Workers 93
3.3 Direct effect of Article 63 TFEU 95
3.3.1 Vertical Direct effect 95
3.3.2 Horizontal direct effect 96
3.4 Restrictions 97
3.4.1 Discriminatory measures 97
3.4.1.1 Direct discrimination 97
3.4.1.2 Indirect discrimination 98
3.4.2 Non-discriminatory measures 99
3.4.2.1 Direct investments 99
3.4.2.1.1 Golden shares 99
3.4.2.1.2 Authorisation requirement 99
3.4.2.1.3 Qualification requirement 100
3.4.2.2 Investments in real estate 100
3.4.2.3 Mortgages 101
3.4.2.4 Financial loans and credits 101
3.4.2.5 Taxation 101
3.4.2.5.1 Taxation of profits from the sale of shares 102
3.4.2.5.2 Taxation of dividends 102
3.4.2.5.3 Corporate tax 102
3.4.2.5.4 Taxation of gains from movable and immovable property 103
3.4.2.5.5 Inheritance tax 103

3.5 Derogations 104
3.5.1 Express derogations 104
3.5.1.1 Derogations for capital movements between Member States and between Member States and third countries 104
3.5.1.1.1 Article 65 (1) (a) TFEU (specific derogation – tax differentiation) 105
3.5.1.1.2 Article 65 (1) (b) TFEU (general derogation) 108
3.5.1.1.2.1 Prevention of infringements of national law and regulations in particular in the field of taxation and the prudential supervision of financial institutions 108
3.5.1.1.2.2 Procedures for the declaration of capital movements for purposes of administrative or statistical information 110
3.5.1.1.2.3 Public policy or public security 110
3.5.1.2 Derogations applicable only to capital movements to/ from third countries 112
3.5.1.2.1 Article 64 (1) TFEU ('grandfather clause') 112
3.5.1.2.2 Article 64 (2) and (3) TFEU and Article 65 (4) TFEU 113
3.5.1.2.3 Article 66 TFEU (safeguard measures) 115
3.5.1.2.4 Article 75 TFEU (freezing of funds to prevent and combat terrorism) 115
3.5.2 Case law-made derogations (overriding reasons in the public interest/ emergency break) 119
3.6 Proportionality 121
4 Conclusion of Chapter 2 127

PART II – Implementation in the context of privatisations and golden shares 131

3 FREE MOVEMENT OF CAPITAL AND PRIVATISATIONS 133
1 Introduction 133
2 The theoretical underpinnings of privatisation 134
2.1 Definition of privatisation 134
2.2 Difference between privatisation and liberalisation 137
2.3 The case in favour of privatisation 139
2.4 The case against privatisation 142
3 Privatisation and EU law 144
3.1 The politico-economic context: The impact of the German theory of Ordoliberalism and the French theory of 'service public' on the European Economic Constitution 144
3.2 The legal framework: The principle of neutrality under Article 345 TFEU 149
3.2.1 The 'maximalist shield' interpretation 151
3.2.2 The 'reductionist shield' interpretation 153
3.2.3 The 'sword' interpretation 156
3.2.4 Assessment of the three interpretations 158
3.2.4.1 Criticism of the 'sword' interpretation and the legal consistency of the 'reductionist shield' interpretation 158
3.2.4.2 The compromise: the use of Article 345 TFEU as a justification 160

4 Conclusion of Chapter 3 165

4 FREE MOVEMENT OF CAPITAL AND GOLDEN SHARES 169
1 Introduction 169
2 Understanding the theoretical controversy surrounding golden shares 172
2.1 Definition of golden shares 173
2.2 Golden shares as Control Enhancing Mechanisms 173
2.3 The principle of proportionality between ownership and control 174
2.4 Varieties of capitalism: liberal market economies v coordinated market economies 178
2.5 Corporate governance and EU law 180
2.6 The Takeover Directive and the golden shares case law 184
2.7 Provisional conclusion 188
3 Legal issues arising from the golden shares case law 188
3.1 The horizontal application of Article 63 TFEU in the golden shares case law 189
3.1.1 The concept of 'horizontality' in constitutional law 190
3.1.2 Horizontal effect in EU law 194
3.1.2.1 Defrenne: horizontality of equal pay 196
3.1.2.2 Walrave & Koch and Bosman: horizontal application of the free movement of workers to federation exercising regulatory powers 196
3.1.2.3 Angonese: horizontal application of the free movement of workers to discriminatory private conduct 198
3.1.2.4 Viking and Laval: horizontal application of the freedom of establishment and the free movement of services to trade unions 199
3.1.2.5 Dansk Supermarked, Van de Haar and Fra.bo: horizontal effect of the free movement of goods 201
3.1.2.6 AMS and Egenberger: horizontal application of the Charter of Fundamental Rights 203
3.1.3 Horizontal effect of Article 63 TFEU 207
3.1.3.1 The case law regarding the horizontal effect of Article 63 TFEU 208
3.1.3.2 Scholarly opinions on the horizontal effect of Article 63 TFEU 212
3.1.3.3 Suggested solution: Granting horizontal effect to Article 63 TFEU for reasons of legal consistency and equality between the State and private parties as market participants 217
3.2 Public interest objectives as justification grounds in the golden shares case law 219
3.2.1 The objective of safeguarding energy supplies in the event of a crisis as covered by public security under Article 65 (1) (b) TFEU 220
3.2.2 The objective of ensuring availability of the telecommunications network in the event of a crisis as covered by public security under Article 65 (1) (b) TFEU 221

3.2.3 The objective of guaranteeing a service of general interest as an overriding reason in the public interest 221
3.2.4 Article 106 (2) TFEU 222
3.2.5 Protection of workers and of minority shareholders 222
3.2.6 Economic rule 223
3.3 Proportionality in the golden shares case law 224
3.4 The definition of 'capital restrictions' in the golden shares case law 234
3.4.1 The concept of 'restrictions' in the free movement of goods 235
3.4.1.1 The pre-Keck case law on MEEQRs 235
3.4.1.2 The Keck ruling and the introduction of the concept of 'selling arrangements' 237
3.4.1.3 The post-Keck 'market access' test 341
3.4.2 The application of Keck in the other freedoms (workers, services and establishment) 242
3.4.3 'Selling arrangements' in the golden shares case law 245
3.4.4 In search of a refined test for 'capital restrictions' 249
3.4.5 The 'positive effect' criterion 261
3.5 National responses 263
4 Conclusion of Chapter 4 264

OVERALL CONCLUSION 269
SAMENVATTING (DUTCH SUMMARY) 275
BIBLIOGRAPHY 277
CURRICULUM VITAE 321