
Table of Contents

Chapter 1:	Introduction	1
Chapter 2:	The Concepts of Sovereignty and of Income Tax Sovereignty	5
2.1.	Introduction	5
2.2.	Brief history of the sovereignty concept	8
2.2.1.	Sovereignty: An evolving concept	8
2.2.2.	Preconditions and emergence of the sovereignty concept	10
2.2.2.1.	State, society, segmentation and external authority	10
2.2.2.1.1.	State and society	10
2.2.2.1.2.	The segmentary state and external authority	11
2.2.2.2.	Emergence of “sovereignty” and the sovereignty concept	13
2.2.2.2.1.	“Sovereignty” in the Roman Empire that dared not speak its name	13
2.2.2.2.2.	The prehistory of the sovereignty concept	14
2.2.2.2.3.	The early writers on sovereignty	16
2.2.2.3.	Confirmation by the Peace of Westphalia of the sovereignty of nation-states	28
2.2.2.4.	Thomas Hobbes	32
2.2.2.5.	The further evolution of the Westphalian paradigm of sovereignty	36
2.2.2.5.1.	The internal component of sovereignty: Towards a constitutionally shared concept	36
2.2.2.5.2.	External sovereignty: The classical theory of sovereignty as state independence	47
2.3.	20th and 21st centuries’ concept of sovereignty	54
2.3.1.	The establishment of supranational organizations and the impact on the sovereignty concept	55
2.3.1.1.	The League of Nations and the United Nations as the first globally accepted limitation on sovereignty	55
2.3.1.2.	Economic integration and external sovereignty	57
2.3.1.3.	Human rights and internal sovereignty	58
2.3.2.	The fundamental change of the sovereignty concept and constitutional pluralism	59

Table of contents

2.3.2.1.	Sovereignty questioned and confirmed as functional freedom	61
2.3.2.1.1.	Non-legal instances of authority	62
2.3.2.1.2.	The impact of inter- and supranational law	64
2.3.2.2.	Constitutional pluralism and the concept of function-sovereignty	68
2.3.2.2.1.	“Delegation” of sovereignty by the state to the supranational level	68
2.3.2.2.2.	Division of sovereignty between the supranational level and the state	70
2.3.2.2.3.	Constitutional pluralism and function-sovereignty: Sovereignty over a functionally defined body politic	71
2.3.2.2.4.	Sovereignty, function-sovereignty and competence	75
2.3.2.2.5.	Functions and objectives: The setting of new boundaries	77
2.4.	Conclusion	78
Chapter 3:	Function-Sovereignty in the EC and Income Tax Sovereignty of the Member States	81
3.1.	Introduction	81
3.2.	The Community model: Federation, confederation or constitutional pluralism?	83
3.2.1.	Federalism, federal political systems, federation and confederation	84
3.2.1.1.	<i>Condition 1:</i> The federal legal norms affect both the constituent states as the individual citizens of the federation	87
3.2.1.2.	<i>Condition 2:</i> Do the federal (EC) institutions exercise their own legislative competences independently from the legislative institutions of the constituent level?	88
3.2.1.2.1.	The constitutional level of the legislative process	88
3.2.1.2.2.	The normal level of the legislative process	90
3.2.1.2.3.	Conclusion	97
3.2.1.3.	<i>Condition 3:</i> Have foreign affairs become a predominantly federal competence in which the constituent parts of the federation have ceased to exercise extensive competences?	100
3.2.1.3.1.	The external identity of the EC and the EU	101

3.2.1.3.2.	External competences of the EC and EU	103
3.2.1.3.3.	Conclusion: Foreign affairs has not become a predominantly EU/EC competence	115
3.2.1.4.	<i>Condition 4</i> : The EU/EC holds independent and extensive implementation powers	116
3.2.2.	Conclusion: The EU/EC configuration does not resemble a typical federal nation-state	117
3.3.	The constituting elements of the EC as a body politic	119
3.3.1.	Direct effect	121
3.3.1.1.	Monism and dualism	121
3.3.1.2.	The <i>Van Gend en Loos</i> case	123
3.3.1.3.	Further evolution of the direct effect doctrine	126
3.3.2.	Supremacy	128
3.3.2.1.	The <i>Costa v. ENEL</i> case	129
3.3.2.2.	Further evolution of the supremacy doctrine	134
3.3.2.2.2.	Obligation to set aside national rules of procedure prohibiting application of Community law	136
3.3.2.2.3.	Obligation to comply with Community law extends to administrative authorities	141
3.3.3.	Conclusion	142
3.4.	Acceptance of these self-asserted elements by the Member States	144
3.4.1.	Compliance by the Member States' courts	144
3.4.1.1.	Belgium	146
3.4.1.2.	France	149
3.4.1.3.	Germany	151
3.4.1.4.	Italy	157
3.4.1.5.	The Netherlands	167
3.4.1.6.	The United Kingdom	160
3.4.1.6.1.	The European Communities Act of 1972	161
3.4.1.6.2.	Supremacy of Community law	161
3.4.1.6.3.	Conclusion	163
3.4.2.	The absence of intervention by national political actors	163
3.4.2.1.	Political opposition to the ECJ's doctrines of direct effect and supremacy	165
3.4.2.2.	Incapability of political actors to curtail the ECJ's jurisdiction	167
3.4.2.2.1.	Member States' rights unaffected or traded-off	168
3.4.2.2.2.	The differing time horizon of national political actors	168

Table of contents

3.4.2.2.3.	The institutional constraints to altering Community law	169
3.4.2.2.4.	Member States' political actors stayed within the Community rules for changing Community law	171
3.4.2.3.	Political acceptance of a comprehensive jurisdiction of the ECJ	172
3.4.3.	Conclusion	172
3.5.	The framework of constitutional pluralism and the concept of function-sovereignty	174
3.5.1.	The constitutional pluralist theory and the legal and political system of the EC and its Member States	176
3.5.2.	Function-sovereignty and constitutional pluralism	178
3.5.3.	Constitutional pluralism and the supremacy doctrine of the ECJ	180
3.5.4.	Functions and objectives: The new boundaries	183
3.5.5.	Competence and the boundaries according to functions and objectives	184
3.5.6.	Legislative and interpretative "competence-competence"	186
3.6.	Direct taxation and function-sovereignty of the EC and the Member States	189
3.7.	Normative implications of the theory of constitutional pluralism and function-sovereignty	197
3.7.1.	Functions and objectives of income tax sovereignty	200
3.7.1.1.	Direct taxation as a method of raising government revenue	201
3.7.1.1.1.	Alternative sources of government revenue	201
3.7.1.1.2.	Macroeconomic analysis of the ability to raise government revenue through direct taxation	204
3.7.1.2.	Income redistribution	213
3.7.1.2.1.	Income redistribution as an essential element of the direct taxation policy area	213
3.7.1.2.2.	Income redistribution as a major concern for the establishment of the internal market	214
3.7.1.3.	Stabilization policy	216
3.7.2.	The internal market as part of the function-sovereignty of the EU/EC vs. direct taxation as part of the function-sovereignty of the Member States	218

3.8.	Conclusion	222
Chapter 4:	Free Movement of Goods	229
4.1.	Customs Union (Arts. 23-27 EC Treaty): Customs duties, charges having equivalent effect and a Common Customs Tariff	229
4.2.	Quantitative restrictions and measures having equivalent effect (Arts. 28-29)	232
4.2.1.	Quantitative restrictions	233
4.2.2.	Measures having an equivalent effect to a quantitative restriction (MEQRs)	235
4.2.2.1.	The <i>Dassonville</i> decision and the discrimination-based approach	238
4.2.2.2.	The <i>Dassonville</i> decision and the causal link between the national measure and its restrictive effect	240
4.2.2.3.	The meaning of “trading rules enacted by Member States” in the <i>Dassonville</i> formula	242
4.2.2.3.1.	Trading rules	242
4.2.2.3.2.	”Measures enacted by Member States”	243
4.2.2.4.	The <i>Cassis de Dijon</i> decision: Clarity on the restriction-based approach and the elaboration of the “rule of reason” test	246
4.2.2.4.1.	Indistinctly applicable measures	247
4.2.2.4.2.	The “rule of reason” test	248
4.2.2.4.3.	Confirmation of the <i>Cassis de Dijon</i> case law and minor inconsistencies	251
4.2.2.4.4.	Impact on direct taxation	252
4.2.2.5.	Further expansion of the <i>Cassis de Dijon</i> jurisprudence	253
4.2.2.6.	<i>Keck and Mithouard</i> : A U-turn in the ECJ case law?	259
4.2.2.7.	Further developments following <i>Keck and Mithouard</i>	262
4.3.	Income tax provisions and Arts. 28-31 EC Treaty	266
4.3.1.	The <i>French Newspaper Publishers</i> case	267
4.3.2.	The <i>Krantz</i> case	268
4.4.	Art. 30 EC Treaty [36 TFEU]: Justifications	270
4.5.	Conclusion	270

Chapter 5:	Citizenship Rights, Free Movement of Persons and Capital and the Freedom to Provide Services	275
5.1.	Introduction	275
5.2.	The free movement and citizenship provisions in the general case law of the ECJ	276
5.2.1.	Subjective scope of application	276
5.2.1.1.	Direct effect	276
5.2.1.1.1.	Free movement of persons and the freedom to provide services	276
5.2.1.1.2.	Union citizenship provisions	278
5.2.1.2.	Beneficiaries: Workers and equivalent categories and citizens	280
5.2.1.2.1.	Workers	280
5.2.1.2.2.	Work seekers	282
5.2.1.2.3.	The previously employed	283
5.2.1.2.4.	Other categories and secondary legislation	284
5.2.1.2.5.	Union citizens rights of non-discrimination (Art. 12 EC Treaty) and free movement (Art. 18 EC Treaty)	285
5.2.1.2.6.	Specific Union citizen rights	290
5.2.1.2.7.	Conclusion	290
5.2.1.3.	Beneficiaries: Right of establishment	290
5.2.1.3.1.	Genuine economic activity	291
5.2.1.3.2.	Place of establishment and the intra-Community transfer of a company's seat	292
5.2.2.	The relation of the free movement of capital with other Treaty freedoms	312
5.2.3.	Territorial scope of application	315
5.2.3.1.	Entitlement to Treaty benefits: An intra-Community situation	315
5.2.3.2.	Free movement of capital and third countries	317
5.2.4.	Material scope of application: Non-discrimination and free movement	321
5.2.4.1.	The concept of "discrimination"	323
5.2.4.2.	Overt or direct discrimination	327
5.2.4.3.	Covert or indirect discrimination	328
5.2.4.4.	Most-favoured-nation treatment	332
5.2.4.4.1.	An EC Treaty basis for an MFN obligation?	333
5.2.4.4.2.	MFN treatment in the non-tax case law of the ECJ	337
5.2.4.5.	Non-discriminatory restrictions	342
5.2.4.5.1.	Free movement of persons	343

5.2.4.5.2.	Freedom to provide services	353
5.2.4.5.3.	Free movement of capital	354
5.2.4.5.4.	Union citizenship rights under Art. 18 EC Treaty	356
5.2.4.6.	Effective or potential consequences of a discriminatory or restrictive national measure	362
5.2.4.7.	Justifications	368
5.2.4.7.1.	Treaty-based exceptions: Grounds of public policy, public security and public health and the public service exception	368
5.2.4.7.2.	Treaty-based exceptions: Art. 58 EC Treaty [ex 73d /65 TFEU]	369
5.2.4.7.3.	“Rule of reason”: Mandatory requirements of general interest	370
5.2.4.7.4.	“Rule of reason”: Proportionality	372
5.2.5.	Temporal limitations of the effects of an ECJ judgment	374
5.2.5.1.	Request made by a Member State and temporal limitation in the judgment itself	377
5.2.5.2.	Legal uncertainty and good faith	379
5.2.5.3.	Severe economic consequences	381
5.2.5.4.	Consequences of the temporal limitation	384
5.2.5.4.1.	Exclusions	384
5.2.5.4.2.	Temporal reference point	385
5.2.6.	Conclusion	387
5.3.	Free movement provisions and the direct tax case law of the ECJ	389
5.3.1.	Introduction	389
5.3.2.	Entitlement to Treaty benefits: An intra-Community situation	390
5.3.3.	Non-discrimination and the free movement provisions	396
5.3.3.1.	<i>Avoir Fiscal</i>	398
5.3.3.2.	<i>Biehl (I)</i>	400
5.3.3.3.	<i>Bachmann and Commission v. Belgium</i>	401
5.3.3.4.	<i>Commerzbank</i>	402
5.3.3.5.	<i>Schumacker</i>	404
5.3.3.6.	<i>Wielockx</i>	408
5.3.3.7.	<i>Svensson and Gustavsson</i>	410
5.3.3.8.	<i>Asscher</i>	411
5.3.3.9.	<i>Safir</i>	414

Table of contents

5.3.3.10.	<i>Gilly</i>	417
5.3.3.10.1.	Double taxation	420
5.3.3.10.2.	Allocation of taxing competence	420
5.3.3.10.3.	Credit mechanism and refusal of personal allowances	423
5.3.3.10.4.	MFN clause	424
5.3.3.11.	<i>Royal Bank of Scotland</i>	425
5.3.3.12.	<i>Gschwind and Zurstrassen</i>	426
5.3.3.13.	<i>Saint-Gobain</i>	428
5.3.3.14.	<i>Vestergaard</i>	430
5.3.3.15.	<i>Metallgesellschaft and Hoechst</i>	431
5.3.3.15.1.	The UK system of ACT	431
5.3.3.15.2.	Decision of the Court	433
5.3.3.15.3.	MFN application	435
5.3.3.16.	<i>Danner</i>	436
5.3.3.17.	<i>Gerritse</i>	437
5.3.3.17.1.	The disallowance of business expenses	438
5.3.3.17.2.	The denial of the tax-free allowance	439
5.3.3.17.3.	The deduction at source of 25%	440
5.3.3.17.4.	Discussion	440
5.3.3.18.	<i>Skandia</i>	442
5.3.3.19.	<i>Lindman</i>	443
5.3.3.20.	<i>Wallentin</i>	444
5.3.3.21.	<i>Laboratoires Fournier</i>	447
5.3.3.22.	<i>D.</i> case	448
5.3.3.22.1.	The MFN obligation in preceding income tax cases	448
5.3.3.22.2.	Legal literature on MFN prior to the <i>D.</i> case	450
5.3.3.22.3.	MFN and tax treaties: The distinction between the allocation and the exercise of taxing competence	453
5.3.3.22.4.	Facts of the <i>D.</i> case	456
5.3.3.22.5.	Discrimination vs. the situation of Dutch residents	457
5.3.3.22.6.	MFN-treatment or discrimination vs. the situation of Belgian residents	458
5.3.3.22.7.	Observations on the national treatment issue	460
5.3.3.22.8.	Observations on the MFN issue	461
5.3.3.23.	<i>Blanckaert</i>	468
5.3.3.24.	<i>Bouanich</i>	470
5.3.3.24.1.	Facts	470
5.3.3.24.2.	The judgment	471
5.3.3.24.3.	Observations	473
5.3.3.25.	<i>CLT-UFA</i>	476
5.3.3.26.	<i>Ritter-Coulais</i>	478
5.3.3.27.	<i>Conijn</i>	480

5.3.3.28.	<i>Stauffer</i>	481
5.3.3.29.	<i>Turpeinen</i>	482
5.3.3.30.	<i>Lakebrink</i>	483
5.3.3.31.	<i>Renneberg</i>	484
5.3.3.32.	<i>Commission v. Spain</i>	487
5.3.3.33.	<i>Rüffler</i>	489
5.3.3.34.	<i>Commission v. Greece</i>	490
5.3.4.	Non-discriminatory restrictions	491
5.3.4.1.	The concept of “non-discriminatory restrictions”	491
5.3.4.2.	<i>Daily Mail</i>	494
5.3.4.3.	Avoidance of the NDR issue by the ECJ	497
5.3.4.4.	<i>Futura Participations</i>	500
5.3.4.5.	<i>Imperial Chemical Industries (ICI)</i>	503
5.3.4.6.	<i>X AB and Y AB</i>	505
5.3.4.7.	<i>Baars</i>	507
5.3.4.8.	<i>Verkooijen</i>	509
5.3.4.9.	<i>AMID</i>	511
5.3.4.10.	<i>X and Y</i>	515
5.3.4.11.	<i>De Groot</i>	517
5.3.4.12.	<i>Lankhorst-Hohorst</i>	519
5.3.4.13.	<i>Bosal</i>	521
5.3.4.14.	<i>De Lasteyrie du Saillant</i>	524
5.3.4.15.	<i>Lenz (capital)</i>	527
5.3.4.16.	<i>Manninen (capital)</i>	529
5.3.4.17.	<i>Schempp</i>	531
5.3.4.17.1.	Facts	531
5.3.4.17.2.	Applicable Treaty rights	532
5.3.4.17.3.	Art. 12 EC Treaty: Non-discrimination	534
5.3.4.17.4.	Art. 18 EC Treaty: Free movement rights	536
5.3.4.18.	<i>Marks & Spencer</i>	537
5.3.4.19.	<i>Keller Holding</i>	540
5.3.4.20.	<i>N. case</i>	542
5.3.4.21.	<i>Cadbury Schweppes</i>	544
5.3.4.21.1.	Facts	544
5.3.4.21.2.	Abuse of Community law	547
5.3.4.22.	<i>Kerckhaert-Morres (capital)</i>	549
5.3.4.22.1.	Facts	549
5.3.4.22.2.	The judgment	550
5.3.4.22.3.	Observations: Misunderstanding of the Belgian regime	552
5.3.4.22.4.	Observations: The nature of a withholding tax	553

Table of contents

5.3.4.22.5.	Observations: Potential restrictive effect is acceptable	554
5.3.4.23.	<i>ACT Group Litigation</i>	555
5.3.4.23.1.	The refusal of a tax credit for UK-sourced dividends to non-residents	557
5.3.4.23.2.	MFN with regard to the dividend tax credit	558
5.3.4.23.3.	Limitation of benefits clause	558
5.3.4.24.	<i>FII Group Litigation</i>	560
5.3.4.24.1.	Exemption of nationally sourced dividends versus imputation for foreign-sourced dividends	561
5.3.4.24.2.	No imputation of ACT for foreign-sourced dividends	562
5.3.4.24.3.	The imputation system is the cause of surplus ACT, which cannot be surrendered to non-resident subsidiaries	563
5.3.4.24.4.	The cash flow disadvantage of having to claim back surplus ACT and the denial of a tax credit to the ultimate shareholder	564
5.3.4.24.5.	The free movement of capital and third countries	565
5.3.4.24.6.	Repayment of sums unduly levied or compensation for damages	565
5.3.4.24.7.	Limitation of the temporal effects of the judgment	566
5.3.4.25.	<i>Denkavit (II) Internationaal</i>	566
5.3.4.26.	<i>Meilicke</i>	568
5.3.4.27.	<i>Thin Cap Group Litigation</i>	569
5.3.4.28.	<i>Rewe Zentralfinanz</i>	571
5.3.4.29.	<i>Oy AA</i>	572
5.3.4.30.	<i>Amurta</i>	574
5.3.4.30.1.	Facts and judgment	574
5.3.4.30.2.	Observations	576
5.3.4.31.	<i>Columbus Container Services</i>	578
5.3.4.31.1.	Facts	578
5.3.4.31.2.	Judgment	579
5.3.4.31.3.	Observations	582
5.3.4.32.	<i>Lammers & Van Cleeff</i>	584
5.3.4.33.	<i>Heinrich Bauer Verlag</i>	584
5.3.4.34.	<i>Deutsche Shell</i>	586
5.3.4.35.	<i>Lidl Belgium</i>	588
5.3.4.36.	<i>Orange European Smallcap Fund (capital)</i>	589
5.3.4.36.1.	The refusal of the tax credit for the German and Portuguese withholding taxes	590
5.3.4.36.2.	Horizontal comparison of investments in different Member States	591

5.3.4.36.3.	The reduction of the tax credit proportional to the shares held by non-resident intra-European shareholders	593
5.3.4.36.4.	The reduction of the tax credit proportional to the shares held by non-resident shareholders established or resident in third countries	594
5.3.4.37.	<i>Burda</i>	594
5.3.4.38.	<i>Krankenheim Ruhesitz</i>	596
5.3.4.39.	<i>Papillon</i>	598
5.3.4.40.	<i>Jobra</i>	599
5.3.4.41.	<i>Truck Center</i>	600
5.3.4.41.1.	Facts and the ECJ decision	600
5.3.4.41.2.	Observations	602
5.3.4.42.	<i>STEKO</i> (capital)	603
5.3.4.43.	<i>Passenheim-van Schoot</i>	605
5.3.4.44.	<i>Aberdeen</i>	606
5.3.4.45.	<i>Damseaux</i> (capital)	608
5.3.5.	Free movement of capital and third countries	610
5.3.5.1.	<i>Fidium Finanz</i>	615
5.3.5.2.	<i>FII Group Litigation</i>	617
5.3.5.2.1.	Free movement of capital and third countries	617
5.3.5.2.2.	The “grandfathering” clause of Art. 57(1) EC Treaty: Direct investments	619
5.3.5.2.3.	The “grandfathering” clause of Art. 57(1) EC Treaty: Restrictions existing on 31 December 1993	620
5.3.5.3.	<i>Thin Cap Group Litigation</i>	620
5.3.5.4.	<i>Lasertec</i>	622
5.3.5.5.	<i>A and B</i>	623
5.3.5.6.	<i>Holböck</i>	624
5.3.5.7.	<i>Stahlwerk Ergste Westig</i> (SEW)	627
5.3.5.8.	<i>Skatteverket v. A</i>	628
5.3.5.9.	<i>Orange European Smallcap Fund</i>	633
5.3.5.10.	<i>STEKO</i>	635
5.3.5.11.	<i>KBC Bank</i>	635
5.3.5.12.	Conclusion	638
5.3.6.	The rule of reason: Justification grounds in direct taxation	644
5.3.6.1.	Free movement of capital and Art. 58(1) EC Treaty	650
5.3.6.2.	Loss of tax revenue	654
5.3.6.3.	The need to prevent the abuse of law and tax evasion	656
5.3.6.3.1.	<i>ICI</i>	657

Table of contents

5.3.6.3.2.	<i>Lankhorst-Hohorst</i>	659
5.3.6.3.3.	<i>Cadbury Schweppes</i>	660
5.3.6.3.4.	<i>Thin Cap Group Litigation</i>	664
5.3.6.3.5.	<i>Lammers & Van Cleef</i>	666
5.3.6.3.6.	Observations	667
5.3.6.4.	Effectiveness of fiscal supervision	668
5.3.6.4.1.	<i>Futura Participations</i>	670
5.3.6.4.2.	<i>Manninen</i>	671
5.3.6.4.3.	“R&D” cases	672
5.3.6.4.4.	<i>Passenheim-van Schoot</i>	673
5.3.6.5.	Cohesion of the national tax system	676
5.3.6.5.1.	The <i>Bachmann</i> doctrine	676
5.3.6.5.2.	The progressive restriction on the cohesion justification: <i>Wielockx</i>	679
5.3.6.5.3.	The progressive restriction on the cohesion justification: The “direct link” requirement	683
5.3.6.5.4.	Implementing a restrictive approach	685
5.3.6.5.5.	Innovating and transforming the cohesion defence	690
5.3.6.5.6.	<i>Krankenheim Ruhesitz</i>	695
5.3.6.5.7.	<i>Papillon</i>	696
5.3.6.5.8.	Observations	697
5.3.6.6.	The justificatory aspects of double tax conventions and Community tax directives	699
5.3.6.6.1.	<i>Gilly</i>	700
5.3.6.6.2.	<i>Saint-Gobain</i>	701
5.3.6.6.3.	<i>Gottardo</i>	706
5.3.6.6.4.	<i>De Groot</i>	707
5.3.6.6.5.	<i>Bosal</i>	707
5.3.6.6.6.	<i>D.</i> case and the Community MFN issue	709
5.3.6.6.7.	<i>Bouanich</i>	711
5.3.6.7.	Territoriality and a balanced allocation of taxing competence between Member States	711
5.3.6.7.1.	<i>Gilly</i>	712
5.3.6.7.2.	<i>Bosal</i>	712
5.3.6.7.3.	<i>Marks & Spencer</i>	714
5.3.6.7.4.	<i>N.</i> case	724
5.3.6.7.5.	<i>Cadbury Schweppes</i>	727
5.3.6.7.6.	<i>Rewe Zentralfinanz</i>	728
5.3.6.7.7.	<i>Oy AA</i>	729
5.3.6.7.8.	<i>Amurta</i>	732
5.3.6.7.9.	<i>Deutsche Shell</i>	732
5.3.6.7.10.	<i>Lidl Belgium</i>	733

5.3.6.7.11.	<i>Jobra</i>	736
5.3.6.8.	The precluded national measure can be legally remedied by other means or could easily have been avoided	736
5.3.6.9.	Tax disadvantages on intra-Community situation compensated by tax advantages	738
5.3.6.10.	The Community rules on competition are being infringed	741
5.3.6.11.	Promotion of research and development	742
5.3.7.	Limitation of the temporal scope of ECJ decisions	743
5.3.7.1.	<i>Meilicke</i>	743
5.3.7.2.	<i>FII Group Litigation</i>	747
5.3.7.3.	<i>Thin Cap Group Litigation</i>	748
5.3.7.4.	Observations	749
5.4.	Quantitative analysis of the ECJ case law on direct taxation	751
Chapter 6:	Final Observations	755
6.1.	Member States' function-sovereignty and the function-sovereignty of the EU/EC level	755
6.2.	Internal references: Direct taxation in the ECJ general case law 759	
6.2.1.	Scope of application <i>ratione personae</i>	760
6.2.2.	Scope of application <i>ratione materiae</i>	761
6.2.3.	The status of double tax conventions	764
6.2.4.	The causal link between a national tax measure and infringement of Community law	766
6.2.5.	The late maturity of direct taxation ...	767
6.2.6.	... But now at the vanguard of Community law?	768
6.3.	External boundaries: Self-limitation by the Court of its interpretative autonomy by allowing for non-Treaty justification grounds	771
6.3.1.	Double taxation, NDRs in the strictest sense and redistributive functions	771
6.3.2.	Justification grounds accepted and rejected by the ECJ	778
6.4.	Final conclusions	783

Table of contents

List of abbreviations	789
References	793
Index	901
Other titles in the IBFD Doctoral Series	903