

Recht und Gesellschaft
Law and Society

14

Luiz Felipe Rosa Ramos

Antitrust and the Multivalued Function of Competition



HART
PUBLISHING



Nomos

Vereinigung für Recht und Gesellschaft
Law and Society

– vormals Vereinigung für Rechtssoziologie –

Edited by

Prof. Dr. Susanne Baer, Prof. Dr. Kai-D. Bussmann,
Prof. Dr. Galf-Peter Calliess, Prof. Dr. Susanne Karstedt
and Prof. Dr. Matthias Mahlmann

Volume 14

Luiz Felipe Rosa Ramos

Antitrust and the Multivalued Function of Competition



Nomos



Onlineversion
Nomos eLibrary

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>

ISBN: HB (Nomos) 978-3-8487-8313-7
 ePDF (Nomos) 978-3-7489-2703-7

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN: HB (Hart) 978-1-5099-5605-0

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Ramos, Luiz Felipe Rosa

Antitrust and the Multivalued Function of Competition

Luiz Felipe Rosa Ramos

306 pp.

Includes bibliographic references.

ISBN 978-1-5099-5605-0 (hardcover Hart)

1st Edition 2021

© Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, Baden-Baden, Germany 2021. Overall responsibility for manufacturing (printing and production) lies with Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft mbH & Co. KG.

This work is subject to copyright. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage or retrieval system, without prior permission in writing from the publishers. Under § 54 of the German Copyright Law where copies are made for other than private use a fee is payable to "Verwertungsgesellschaft Wort", Munich.

No responsibility for loss caused to any individual or organization acting on or refraining from action as a result of the material in this publication can be accepted by Nomos or the author.

Para Malu.

“In this manner, they endeavored to endow the market system with economic legitimacy. But, by the same token, they sacrificed the sociological legitimacy (...)” Albert O. Hirschmann, 1982.

“My rules for research: 1. Listen to the Gentiles (...)” Paul Krugman, 2008.

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	11
FOREWORD	15
PREFACE	17
INTRODUCTION	20
I – ANTITRUST GOALS AND COMPETITION	26
i.i. Three snapshots of the “Antitrust Goals” debate	26
i.i.i. Antitrust goals in the origins of antitrust	26
i.i.ii. A “paradox”, a “windy city” and a meaning of “competition”	36
i.i.iii. A contemporary debate	49
i.ii. Antitrust and competition in Brazilian legal discourse	61
i.ii.i. Is there an antitrust dogmatics? Three challenges	61
i.ii.ii. Goals and competition in Brazilian antitrust doctrine.	71
i.ii.iii. Goals and competition in CADE’s case law	84
i.iii. “External” sources	94
i.iii.i. Wealth maximization: from political philosophy to economic analysis	94
i.iii.ii. Scarcity: from economic analysis to law and economics	102
i.iii.iii. Competition: from law and economics to law and society	112
II – COMPETITION AS A SOCIAL FORM	122
ii.i. A concurrent discourse about competition	122
ii.i.i. Classics of political economy and pioneers of a sociology of competition	122
ii.i.ii. The 1940s: one “missing link” and two influential works	134
ii.i.iii. The last forty years: sociological approaches to economics	143

Table of Contents

ii.ii. Competition in the Brazilian social thought	152
ii.ii.i. Since colonial times? monopolies and the “other side”	152
ii.ii.ii. The phenomenon of competition: a “myth” in the tropics?	160
ii.ii.iii. Social forms in Brazilian self-descriptions	168
ii.iii. Functional method and triadic competition	178
ii.iii.i. Causality, functional approach and systems theory	178
ii.iii.ii. From the environment’s structure to the multivalued function	186
ii.iii.iii. Triadic competition, indirect audience and the Brazilian mirror	198
III - BRINGING COMPETITION TO ANTITRUST	208
iii.i. Three cases: bread, hospital and taxes	208
iii.i.i. Collusion and triadic competition	208
iii.i.ii. Mergers and intermediates	217
iii.i.iii. Exclusionary conduct and the state-third	228
iii.ii. Theoretical implications	239
iii.ii.i. For antitrust: protecting competitive behavior beyond psychology	239
iii.ii.ii. For legal doctrine: producing socially adequate differences	249
iii.ii.iii. For legal sociology: the laughing third in nobody’s land	261
FINAL REMARKS	269
REFERENCES	279

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

One of the learnings from writing this book on competition was that significant things cannot be done without cooperation and exchange. Any list containing the names of those who cooperated and exchanged thoughts with me would be incomplete. I hope to be fair at least with the ones who were directly relevant for completion of this book. Errors that remain are, of course, my sole responsibility.

When I first presented, in 2015, the research proposal that originated this book, my supervisor Professor Celso Campilongo said I had a “rough diamond” in my hands. I thank him not only for helping me lapidating it in so many ways, but also for that shine in his eyes that decisively stimulated my research. I am not sure I have arrived at the precious stone Professor Campilongo was looking for, but his support surely gave me the energy of a digger.

My co-supervisor Professor Tobias Werron was crucial for the definition of the methods and several references used in this work. Regarding Professor Tobias, I could only update the words someone else has written about a very different character: *“he depends for his results not all upon pedagogical fireworks but rather upon a quiet manner and a remorseless logic. He gives the impression of absolute intellectual integrity, a very rare quality and so immensely impressive when encountered”*¹.

In São Paulo, Professor Vicente Bagnoli, Professor Laurindo Minhoto, Professor Elizabeth Farina, Professor Juliano Maranhão and Professor Calixto Salomão Filho made inspiring comments and suggestions during the doctoral committee. I also discussed a former version of the present ideas with Professor Nadya Guimarães, Professor Calixto Salomão Filho, Professor Roberto Pfeiffer, Professor Philip Steiner, Professor Samuel Barbosa and Professor Rodrigo Broglia Mendes. I am thankful to all participants of the Nucleus of Studies on Competition and Society (NECSO-USP) and to its co-founder Guilherme Misale. An embryo of the thesis was discussed with Carlos Eduardo.

In Bielefeld, I had inspiring discussions with Professor Elena Esposito, Professor André Kieserling, Jelena Brankovic and Leopold Ringel. I am

1 Adapted from Robert H. Bork, *The Antitrust Paradox: a Policy at War with Itself* (1978; 1993), New York, The Free Press, xv (about Aaron Director).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

also indebted to all participants of the *Recht und Regulierung Kolloquium*, especially to Professor Alfons Bora and Professor Michael Huber, who opened the doors of the colloquium to debate one chapter of the thesis that originated this book. I also need to thank Linda Heiken, Karsten Pieper and Katharina Brauns mann for the generous welcome at Bielefeld University. I was supported by a scholarship from CAPES during the months of studies in Germany.

In New Haven, I have benefitted from meetings and/or classes with Professor George Priest, Professor Henry Hansmann, Professor Monica Bell, Professor Calixto Salomão Filho, Professor Fiona Scott, Professor Bruce Ackerman, Professor Daniel Markovits, Professor Douglas Melamed and Professor Guido Calabresi. I am in debt to Gilad Abiri and to all participants of the Doctoral Workshop at Yale Law School for reading a shorter version of these ideas. I am also thankful to the Fox International Fellowship at Yale University and to the 2017-2018 Fox Fellows.

I have also benefitted immensely from comments and criticism received at several conferences where I presented parts of this work. Such conferences include Abrasd (Fortaleza, 2016), Law and Society (New Orleans, 2016), IVR World Congress (Lisbon, 2017), Law and Society (Toronto, 2018) and Abrasd (São Paulo, 2018). I especially thank Edvaldo Moita, Marco Loschiavo, Gabriel da Fonseca and Lucas Amato for commenting on my work in such events and in other moments.

I am glad to have had a group of colleagues and friends reading and commenting an advanced version of the thesis that originated this book: Ademir Pereira Júnior, Mario Cabral, Osny da Silva Filho and Yan Vieira. I also had stimulating conversations in the final moments with Guilherme Palu and Fabricio Rocha. Francisco Cruz and Lilian de Melo helped me adjusting the formal aspects of the thesis before submission. I thank Eva Rocha for pushing me to improve my English writing in some passages. I am also thankful to Adriano Oliveira for the English classes years ago and for reviewing grammar mistakes in chapters I to III. Finally, thanks are due to members of Advocacia José Del Chiaro (AJDC).

Family and friends were important in different moments of my life, including those periods of a Ph.D. candidate's existence that only resemble a life. I will just add here those who were closer in a special moment: Amadeus Orleans, Arthur Marim, Bianca Tavorari, Igor Rolemberg, Lais Sangalo, Marcelo Almeida, Murilo Vannucci and Vitoria Croda. Without the love and support from Eliana, Luiz Roberio, Ana Beatriz and João Gabriel this work would just have been impossible.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

More than academically elevating, the last years were quite transformative. I can only feel blessed to have had my great love, Eva, walking by my side all along.

FOREWORD

True interdisciplinary work at the intersection between sociology and law is rare. Sociologists usually focus on how law works; legal scholars are more interested in making law work. And while there is certainly exchange of knowledge between both camps, the actual conceptual work is usually pursued separately from each other. Yet, once in a while a scholar comes along who, well-versed in both disciplines and equally interested in how law works and how to make it work, manages to transcend this polite-but-distant relationship. Luiz Felipe Rosa Ramos is such a scholar. His book “Antitrust and the Multivalued Function of Competition” develops a socio-legal approach to antitrust law that combines the interests and strengths of both disciplines. Elegantly organized around three guiding questions, “What has been tried?” (to establish competition as a central goal in antitrust law), “What has been missing?” (introducing sociological ideas on competition) and “What could be tried?” (testing these concepts in the main areas of antitrust law: cartels, mergers and exclusionary conduct), the book shows that it is indeed possible to transform sociological theorizing into legal thinking if the research question is well-defined and the author is able to pull it off.

From a sociological perspective, the book’s most obvious achievement is how it succeeds, in chapter two (“Competition as a social form”), in reconstructing the history of sociological thinking about competition and in advancing the author’s conceptualization of functions of competition in antitrust law. The whole story, of course, cannot be repeated in detail here. Suffice it to say that the second chapter treats the reader to what to my knowledge is the most comprehensive and perceptive review of sociological reasoning on competition to date. Not only does it justice to the writings on competition in the Western tradition, from the late 18th century to today, which would be an achievement in its own right. It also connects this tradition to Brazilian social thought. In so doing, it offers an important reminder that the history of Western sociology is only part of a much broader global history of social thought. Transferring conceptual ideas from the Western tradition to other areas of the world, therefore, requires respect for and knowledge of non-Western traditions. In this case, this contextual sensitivity leads to important insights into the (post-) colonial history of Brazil, which has shaped, among other things, the specific role of per-

FOREWORD

sonal relationships and the perception of competition in Brazilian society. Indeed, the creativity evident in this book is to no small part due to the ability of its author to juggle ideas from various historical periods and sociocultural contexts.

Last not least, the author also demonstrates the maturity of judgment necessary to select specific ideas from the wealth of these traditions to integrate his arguments and re-define competition as a goal of Brazilian antitrust law (in particular, he adopts a specific version of functionalist reasoning proposed by the German sociologist Niklas Luhmann in a truly creative way). The result is a great piece of scholarship on all counts that suggests an openness of mind and independence of thought on a level that would be impressive for any scholar, let alone an early career one like Luiz Felipe Rosa Ramos. And as if that was not enough, the book is also well-written, elegantly conceived and a real pleasure to read. May it find many open-minded readers among sociologists and legal scholars alike!

Tobias Werron

Professor of Sociological Theory and General Sociology at Bielefeld University

PREFACE

The originality of Luiz Felipe Rosa Ramos's book is multiple. Therefore, the publication of this work ought to be celebrated. It is far from trivial or usual to reconstruct or even attempt to build a sociology of antitrust law. The Author is bold. He attempts to do just such. Illustratively, I highlight three points with regards to such boldness. First of all, Rosa Ramos outlines a rigorous historical-evolutionary panorama of the sociological and legal-sociological literature regarding competition and antitrust. Subsequently, he establishes refined comparisons between, on the one hand, the antitrust theorized and practiced in central countries and, on the other hand, the peculiarities concerning a sociology of competition in society and market such as in Brazil. Eventually, he combines - with the utmost competence - solid theoretical knowledge of the doctrine of antitrust law and the sociology of competition with extensive professional experience as a lawyer in an important firm specialized in the area of his study. All in all, Rosa Ramos brings together authorized academic credentials and professional experience enabling him to examine the links and incompatibilities between law and the sociology of competition.

The rationality, concepts and objectives with regards to antitrust, despite the endless and well-presented controversies on the matter in the present book, are shared internationally. Such is true that there are local peculiarities, but nothing which authorizes watertight distinctions among the antitrust logic in Brazil, Germany or China. Procedures, the speed of investigations, the quality of case law and the intensity of penalties in each jurisdiction may vary; however an international cartel, for example, when identified and proven, has a good chance of being punished in all affected markets.

The Brazilian Antitrust Authority (CADE) enjoys recognized international prestige. Quite possibly, CADE ranks among the most mature and consolidated administrative antitrust courts in emerging countries. The exchange regarding confidential information, collusion, exclusionary conduct and other typical international antitrust figures possess uniform characteristics and effects across the planet. None the less, the local business culture, the degree of the State presence in the economy, the effectiveness of corruption control, the territorial extent of markets, the degree of technological autonomy, monetary stability, international, regional and social

PREFACE

inequalities, for example, may overlay competition and also specific competition law, from one country to another. Rosa Ramos's work seeks to analyze some of these particularities.

Economists, sociologists and lawyers, from all over the world, will find in Rosa Ramos's work precious findings in order to deepen comparisons and, in such way, to better understand not only Brazilian Antitrust, but Competition Law and the functioning of society in their own countries. Here lies an outstanding merit of Rosa Ramos's book. It was written bearing Brazil in mind, but its analyses are valid for scholars from anywhere. If we admit that modern society is strongly competitive and that the functioning of the economic system has in competition an environment which reproduces that of the market, competition becomes a fundamental concept for describing the communicative operations of current life, in all spaces in the global world.

In addition to such, innumerable anticompetitive behaviors translate sociologically into interactions, that is, into common systems of communicative symbols which operate as prerequisites for reciprocity or complementarity of expectations. *Alter* and *ego* interpret veiled actions, expressions and surreptitious intentions, often - as in the parallel behavior or in the exchange of secrets -, in the hope of enjoying favorable activities and avoiding unfavorable ones, one in relation to the other. In communicative terms, here lies a fundamental aspect of sociology of competition: the way of communication or coordinated silence among rivals, with regards to things which cannot be said. Again, the pattern undergoes cultural variations, but such tends to reproduce itself so that not only jurists and economists, but also social theorists can contribute to the understanding of anticompetitive practices. Rosa Ramos - with the eyes of a lawyer with sociological sensitivity or the sociologist specialized in antitrust legislation - is attentive to these details.

The present work takes as one of its theoretical references the Theory of Systems, of the sociologist Niklas Luhmann. Rightly, it seeks to acclimate it to the "tropical mirror", an expression which appears in the title of the Thesis whose rise was given to this book. For Luhmann, the unity of world society does not lie in ethical or political demands, but in the emergence of comparative conditions among functionally disparate systems, such as law and economy. This requires the demarcation of boundaries between the legal system and the economic system. Would the specifics of the "tropical mirror" reside here? I suppose not. Rosa Ramos does not dismiss or refuse such specificities, nonetheless, situates them in further areas. He seeks to understand how, in modern society, antitrust law processes and in-

ternalizes competitive economic operations and, conversely, how the economic system presupposes antitrust law as a purifier of its internal environment: competition.

Rosa Ramos counted on the decisive guidance of Tobias Werron when it came to the elaboration of his work. Admittedly one of the greatest scholars in the sociology of competition today, Werron received Rosa Ramos at the University of Bielefeld for a fruitful and decisive period of study. The international dimension of the work was complemented by a successful passage of studies at Yale University and dialogues with relevant scholars in this area. The result of such is the work the reader presently has at hand. An extremely important contribution to the sociological description of competition law.

Celso Fernandes Campilongo

Professor of the Faculties of Law at the University of São Paulo and the Pontifical Catholic University of São Paulo; ex-Commissioner of the Brazilian Antitrust Authority (CADE).

INTRODUCTION

In 2016, the Nucleus of Studies on Competition and Society (NECSO-USP) conducted an exploratory research on the perception of competition in the Brazilian case of society. Questionnaires were applied to entrepreneurs, executives and employees related to companies of various sizes in different business sectors. The professionals were asked about their understandings regarding competition, their knowledge on antitrust and the specificities of competition in Brazil. The answers obtained by the group, among which we now pick a few examples, anticipated some of the issues that will be discussed in the present book².

Competition came out of the responses as a multifaceted and ambiguous phenomenon. A bakery owner expressed his view on competition as “the other bakeries in the neighborhood that sometimes make a point of coming here to see the price of products and lower a few cents”. “The problem”, he said, “is that some shopkeepers make unfair competition, fighting over cents in the price of some products and selling goods that have nothing to do with their store”. For example, “a clothing store on the street started selling ice cream, which is disloyal to my bakery that also sells ice cream because it sells other food products but does not sell clothes”.

The partner of a medium-sized food retail chain, in turn, described competition as “a much broader concept than mere rivalry between firms”, as it is determined by “the strength of buyers, the strength of suppliers, the potential for new entrants into the [market] sector, and the number of substitute products to this sector”. Competition would be beneficial both for consumers, “because it could create a price war and the consequent collapse of prices”, and firms, which will always have to “maintain the quality of their products and services, so as not to lose market presence”.

The managing partner of a high-income financial consultancy also responded to our questionnaire. In his answer, competition means “the freedom to dispute the market with the main existing players, as long as in an

2 See <https://necsousp.wordpress.com/> Although such responses were used only for internal discussion, they served as a prototype for a further research project whose results were presented at the 23rd International Seminar of the Brazilian Institute for Competition, Consumer and International Trade Studies (IBRAC, 2017).

ethical and fair manner”. A firm that “wins the competition” shows that it is “alive” in the market and can become a “reference” in its activity. Nonetheless, in order to “beat its competitors by conquering the market”, there will be need for “investments in the company (in people, method and process)”.

The level of knowledge regarding antitrust regulation also varied among the responses. The bakery owner had on the counter a placard from a cigarette manufacturer saying that it “supports competition” – an obligation resulting from an antitrust investigation – but he does not know what competition compliance policies “are about”. The partner of the food retail chain argued that law has an important role in the “merger of two companies that can greatly alter competition in a sector, even turning it into a monopoly”, but his business does not have formal policies for competition compliance either. The partner of the financial consultancy said that his company “follows the rules required by regulatory agencies (...), in addition to internal policies of good practices” that maintain “excellent internal relationship and enormous credibility with customers”.

With regards to the specificities of competition in Brazil, the bakery owner alleged that “small shopkeepers already have a lot of competition to face” and do not need further incentive to compete, whereas the culture of competition is necessary for big firms, “such as Car Wash’s [a Brazilian corruption investigation] constructors”. The food retail entrepreneur also stated that “sectors involving smaller enterprises are mostly characterized by extreme competition, while sectors with large firms are characterized mostly by duopolies”, but he added that competition has no need “to become cultural in society”, since it is a “concept of the business world” whose distance to “disunity” is “very small”. The investment partner declared that there is “monopoly of some sectors” which prevents “development” of the nation, because of “protectionism and accommodation”. As to the “culture of competition”, he complemented, “we need to learn a lot from the big ones in each sector”.

In our small sample, there seems to be no consensus around what competition actually means and on who benefits from it. There is also doubt about which parties would need a greater culture of competition in Brazil: whether only large firms, the entire economic sector, or even other spheres of society beyond the business world. Finally, the impact of the notions of competition as constructed by the Brazilian antitrust agency (the CADE) seems to remain limited, although it apparently varies by company size. Even if they are intended to make no empirical proof, such results are a

INTRODUCTION

fine illustration of the problems and the hypothesis addressed by the present work.

The main problem from which our research stems is that competition has not been semantically consolidated as a goal of antitrust. People usually know antitrust as a “competition policy”, antitrust agencies claim to foster a “competitive process”, antitrust attorneys call themselves “competition lawyers” – but only a few scholars have dedicated their works to decrypt what competition could possibly mean as an autonomous drive for antitrust³. As far as one can see through the tropical mirror, this is an international issue. “*Both judicial and non-judicial writing manipulates the terminology and concepts*”, argue the authors of an eminent treatise, “*often without penetrating the underlying substance*”. As to competition, the same treatise observes:

*“In passing the antitrust laws, ‘Congress was dealing with competition, which is sought to protect, and monopoly, which it sought to prevent’. While rhetorically reassuring, this simple formulation is hardly self-defining, and it conceals a diversity of possible objectives”*⁴.

Indeed, such “rhetorically reassuring” formulation has not prevented the concern with competition in antitrust from overflowing to the broader public discourse in the last few years. The media⁵, the political system⁶ and

3 Thus, this is not a book that deals directly with the notion of power. For a brief review on antitrust history through this perspective, see Eleanor Fox, *Power: Trust and Distrust* (2020), Concurrentialiste, Journal of Antitrust Law; examining legislation and court decisions in the US and in Europe, Giuliano Amato, *Antitrust and the Bounds of Power: The Dilemma of Liberal Democracy in the History of the Market* (1997); for a perspective from Brazil, see Calixto Salomão Filho, *A Legal Theory of Economic Power: Implications for Social and Economic Development* (2011), Edward Elgar, Cheltenham.

4 Phillip E. Areeda, Herbert Hovenkamp, *Antitrust Law: An Analysis of Antitrust Principles and Their Application* (2013), New York, Wolters Kluwer, xix and 3. Referring to the disagreement among antitrust practitioners and theorists on the meaning of competition as a “scandal”, Oliver Black, *Conceptual foundations of antitrust* (2005), Cambridge, University Press, 6.

5 See “The Economist”, *The University of Chicago worries about a lack of competition* (Apr 12, 2017). Before, “The Economist”, *Too much of a good thing* (Mar 26, 2016).

6 See Democrats, *A Better Deal: Cracking Down on Corporate Monopolies and the Abuse of Economic and Political Power* (2017), available at <https://www.democrats.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/2017/07/A-Better-Deal-on-Competition-and-Costs-1.pdf>. See also the so-called “Big Tech hearing” before the US Senate Commerce Committee in October 2020: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sWla3OLOhhk>.

non-specialized publications⁷ have been reflecting the call for “more competition”. Antitrust scholars have taken the problem seriously and different nuances of the debate are showing up⁸. In Brazil, two of the most important antitrust scholars have recognized a “disappointment” or even a “paralysis” in the realm of antitrust⁹.

This book is not directly concerned with the current competitive structure of Brazilian markets, nor does it deliver a critique of a comprehensive set of CADE’s decisions. We are interested in such topics as long as they help us better assessing our main research object: antitrust doctrine. Antitrust doctrine is a privileged arena for observing the discussion on antitrust goals, including competition, and the concepts thereby associated. Scholars have been discussing the goals of antitrust without the need to defend a specific party nor the pressure to decide a singular case. Although our primary focus is Brazilian antitrust, we accept it as being deeply tangled with the international debate.

Our fundamental hypothesis is that antitrust doctrine has not consolidated a concept of competition that is both (i) legally coherent (with antitrust statutes and decisional criteria) and (ii) socially adequate (to competition empirical manifestation and its modern imaginary). Despite the efforts and advances, they have not resulted in a concept of competition that is consistently applied by agencies and perceived by the public as a specific antitrust goal. We also suppose that the supremacy of economic theory as a

7 For instance, Jonathan Tepper, Denise Hearn, *The myth of capitalism: monopolies and the death of competition* (2019), New Jersey, Hoboken.

8 See, among many, Joshua Wright and Aurelien Portuese, *Antitrust Populism: Towards a Taxonomy* (2020), Stanford Journal of Law, Business, and Finance, vol. 21, n. 01 (arguing that antitrust populism, conceived as rejection of rigorous economic analysis and suspicion of experts and independent agencies, “is legitimized because it has entered the antitrust community more than ever before”); Carl Shapiro, *Antitrust in a Time of Populism* (2018), International Journal of Industrial Organization, available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3058345>; Lina Khan, *Amazon’s Antitrust Paradox* (2017), 126 Yale Law Journal 710; and generally the debate on the “New Brandeis School”. In the European context, see Oles Andriychuk, *The Normative Foundations of European Competition Law* (2017), Cheltenham, Edward Elgar (arguing that the main constitutional importance of competition lies in the ethical value it represents for society).

9 See Calixto Salomão Filho, *A paralisia do Antitruste*, in *Revista do IBRAC – Direito da Concorrência, Consumo e Comércio Internacional* (2009), vol. 16, 305-323 (referring to a loss of “theoretical density” in antitrust) and Paula Forgioni, *Os Fundamentos do Antitruste* (1998; 9th ed. 2017), São Paulo, Revista dos Tribunais, 128 (identifying, despite the advances, that Brazilian antitrust agency has focused almost exclusively on mergers, which rarely present relevant competition problems).

INTRODUCTION

source of antitrust doctrine has contributed to such failure. If we are right in such outlooks, the supporters of competition as an antitrust goal could benefit from a socio-legal approach which incorporates other sources, such as the sociology of competition. As much as presumptions and definitions are made explicit, critics will also gain from enhanced transparency in the debate.

The strategy chosen to address such issues is essentially three-phased, each phase corresponding to one chapter of this book. The first step asks: “*What has been tried?*”. It retrieves important moments of the debate on antitrust goals to understand how competition has been differentiated from other goals. The same concern illuminates our assessment of Brazilian antitrust doctrine and its eventual impacts in CADE’s practice. Closing the first chapter, we explore non-dogmatic sources of antitrust, such as political philosophy, economic analysis, law and economics and a promising law and society approach.

The second step asks: “*What has been missing?*”. It tells an alternative story about competition that is centered on sociological works. Essentially, we look at social forms and potentially addressed social problems. The Brazilian nuances of such story are also outlined, as well as imbrications with the country’s economic structure. The purpose of this chapter is to build a concept of competition that corresponds to its modern imaginary and emergence in places like Brazil. Such task is ultimately endeavored based on the works of Niklas Luhmann, Tobias Werron, Harrison White and classics of Brazilian social thought.

Finally, the last step inquires: “*What could be tried?*”. It thoroughly analyzes three antitrust cases in Brazil so as to identify the criteria used by the antitrust agency. We test whether the concept built in the precedent chapter could be compatible with antitrust reasoning in each of its main branches: cartels, mergers and exclusionary conducts. Such exercise is made with a view of current tendencies of antitrust analysis, so as to cope with its evolution. The chapter ends with theoretical considerations on the possible impacts of such an approach for antitrust, for legal doctrine and for legal sociology.

The method underlying our strategy is unavoidably multiple and cannot be coupled with a single theory. It is only so because of the complexity of our research object and due to the paths implied in the problems here addressed. As it happened to come out of the responses to NECSO’s questionnaires, competition can be seen as a mere rivalry between bakeries, as investing to “win the market” or as a structure that includes buyers, suppliers, potential entrants and substitute products. Competition’s effects are

often ambiguously evaluated, and though there seems to be a tendency of its dissemination, one can still cast doubts at its real extension in the economy and at its need “to become cultural in society”. Agencies maintain the job of spreading the competitive word, but placards supporting competition do not necessarily lead to compliance with antitrust-specific views, and even those who follow the policies of “good practice” are eager to learn with the “big ones”.

All things considered, this book is partially a history of ideas’ enterprise, as we are concerned with the historical construction of competition both in antitrust and in sociology. Partly, it is also sociological work, since we develop a second-order observation of the legal system and outline a social form of competition in the Brazilian context. Finally, and mostly in the last chapter, we will take a step that is usually done by legal doctrine: working on a concept based on distinctions adopted in antitrust decisions. The work that derives from the above-mentioned problems, hypothesis, strategies and methods is nothing but *another* story about antitrust. It can nevertheless interest someone who is not only longing to see oneself in the other, but prone to find “*the other in oneself*”¹⁰.

10 Viveiros de Castro, *Prefácio* in Beatriz Azevedo, *Antropofagia: Palimpsesto selvagem* (2016), São Paulo, Sesi SP, 16.