



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

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

Antonaki, I.

Citation

Antonaki, I. (2019, September 3). *Privatisations and golden shares : bridging the gap between the State and the market in the area of free movement of capital in the EU*. Meijers-reeks. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/77343>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/77343>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/77343> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

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

© 2019 I. Antonaki

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm or any other means without written permission from the author.

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

© 2019 I. Antonaki

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm or any other means without written permission from the author.

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 H el ene 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 par-nymphs 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

