

EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE, FLORENCE  
DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY AND CIVILIZATION

EUI WORKING PAPER No. 86/215

ITALY AND THE SCHUMAN PLAN  
NEGOTIATIONS

by

Ruggero RANIERI



April 1986

BADIA FIESOLANA, SAN DOMENICO (FI)

This paper should not be reproduced in whole or in part  
without prior permission of the author.



(C) Ruggero Ranieri

Printed in Italy in April 1986

European University Institute

Badia Fiesolana

I - 50016 San Domenico (FI)

Italy



## ITALY AND THE SCHUMAN PLAN NEGOTIATIONS

This paper analyses the role played by the Italian delegation in the Paris Conference which took place between the 20th of June 1950 and the 17th of April 1951 and during which the Treaty establishing the European Coal and Steel Community was drafted.

A few preliminary notes will deal with how Italy came to join the Schuman Plan and with her negotiating standpoint; that is to say mainly with the interests of her small steel industry.

The main part of the paper is devoted to the negotiating sessions. In fact the starting point is the so-called Document de Travail released by the French at the beginning of the Conference, in which the ideas behind the Plan finally materialized. The work of the principal committees elaborated on its provisions. Thus one section deals with the institutional questions worked out by the most important committee in which the heads of delegation took part. Subsequently the shaping of the Common Market, measures concerning wages and labour migration, and the questions of liberalization and of a common commercial policy are discussed.

In the last section a few questions on the overall significance of Italy's participation in the Conference are

raised.

The whole account is based on original documents coming mainly from Italian archives. The subject of the Paris negotiation has been dealt with very superficially by the literature. In fact most books on the Coal and Steel Community consider the Treaty merely as an extension of the original French proposals, albeit with some correction due to the preoccupations of the smaller countries. For the same reason the role of the Italians has been examined nearly exclusively in relation to some of the particular points they raised - such as Algerian iron ore and labour migration - whereas the part they took in shaping the Treaty has been overlooked.(1)

a) Italy joins the Schuman Plan

According to the conventional account Italy was the first European country to endorse the Schuman proposal of the 9th of May. Sforza is credited for having given a prompt and enthusiastic welcome to the initiative. However, a more careful examination of the facts casts more than one shadow on this shining picture.(2)

On the 9th of May Quaroni, the Italian ambassador in Paris, was summoned by Schuman and briefed on the significance of the announcement that was about to be made. He seems to have reacted rather sharply. An "entente" between France and Germany seemed



to him a clear departure from the policy embodied in the Franco-Italian Customs Union. Not surprisingly, Schuman's main concern seems to have been to reassure the Italians that their interests were not going to be neglected.(3)

The endorsement first given by Sforza to the Plan was thus of a very general nature. Of course there was Italy's much publicized commitment to European unification and also its support for speeding up Germany's reintegration into the West. Moreover it was not clear what Italy's position would actually be. At first the French had spoken of the possibility of some kind of association with the new supranational Community. At that stage their only preoccupation seems to have been to secure a binding agreement with West Germany in the shortest possible time. Thus, Italian diplomacy took no part in the first important talks in Paris, London and Bonn, nor were the details of the Plan clearly explained to it .(4)

It was only after the French changed their strategy and demanded the calling of a conference of all the countries that could be seen as accepting the full scope of their proposals that Italy was brought back into the picture. Its response was again a positive one, but a good number of doubts troubled the minds of the negotiators as they approached the Conference table.

For the same reasons, economic circles began discussing the plan only at the end of May and their reactions were possibly

even more cautious and uneasy. A wary attitude was common to the the Ministry of Industry and both the private industrialists - Fiat Falck and the smaller firms in the North - and the State holding company, Finsider, which accounted for about 50% of the country's steel production.(5)

Italian steel output was comparatively very small, although ambitious development plans, financed mainly by the ERP, were being carried out. Production in 1949 amounted to about 2 million tons, compared to the 11 million of France and the Saar the 9 million of West Germany and the 6 million of Belgium and Luxembourg . Consumption was higher and imports had grown considerably in respect to the prewar years. (Half a million tons in 1949, including pig iron). The biggest suppliers were Austria and France for pig iron, Belgium and Luxembourg for semi-finished products and sections. The Italian engineering industry, although it had not wholly recovered from postwar reconversion difficulties (especially in the public sector) was quite active and accounted for 20% of the country's exports in 1949.

The Italian market had traditionally been very protected and was also known to be tightly cartelized. Prices were established by the producers' association, although occasionally there were direct interventions by the State. It is difficult to calculate the difference from the prices of the other countries in the pool. There was however a wide gap; in 1949 for sheet, section,



bars and plates the Italian internal price was about 50% higher than French and Belgian export prices. Figures were even higher for pig iron.(6)

Protection was provided by a tight system of quotas, and this explains the heavy opposition on the part of the steel industrialists to OEEC liberalization measures. Tariffs provided a second barrier; at the GATT Conference at Annecy, specifically against Belgian pressures, Italy had fixed a tariff ranging from 10% to 23%. It was the highest among the Six, particularly for semi-finished products and pig iron.

There were different opinions as to the best means of protection. Public sector managers were in favour of maintaining a system of quotas that called for heavy governmental interference in the allocation of raw materials and the exploitation of capacity. The private industrialists preferred tariff protection and were supported by the government's cautiously liberal economic policy. The Pella Plan, presented to the OEEC in July 1950, advocated an extremely gradual process of integration, to be achieved by means of multilateral tariff reductions. This should have been followed by the free flow of labour and capital goods, allowing the Italian economy to resume its position on an open international market.(7)

The costs of raw materials bore heavily on the final price of steel. Italy imported most of her coal including all her coking coal, as well as a large part of the scrap needed for the

electric furnaces in the North. Iron ore from Algeria was needed for the blast furnaces along the Tyrrhenian coast, particularly for the new ones that were being built at Cornigliano near Genoa. On the whole it was estimated that double pricing for raw materials accounted for something like 11% of the final steel price. Transport costs constituted a further burden. In addition there were other disadvantages such as high fiscal and social charges for the producers and a very low level of productivity, partly counterbalanced by low wages. Surplus manpower, deriving from the strict regulations imposed upon the employers in the postwar years, was considered one of the main obstacles to modernization.

b) The structure of the Community

If any doubts remained on the political significance of the Schuman Plan, Monnet's opening speech at the Paris Conference helped to dispel them. According to Monnet the task of the Conference was to create a High Authority that would embody the idea of a United Europe and at the same time mark a new epoch in relations between nation states. He particularly stressed the importance of building a Franco-German bloc. The High Authority would dispose of enough powers not only to merge coal and steel production - no small matter in itself - but eventually to



reshape the economies of the participant countries.(8)

The Italians were rather prompt in realizing what was at stake and they were the only country to entrust the leadership of their delegation to an important political figure. The choice fell on Taviani, a prominent Christian Democrat, closely connected with De Gasperi.

The Document de Travail shortly and effectively spelled out the features of the new allegedly "supranational" body. On a closer look its independence appeared a somewhat far-fetched assumption. The governments were to elect its members as well as its President, who was have a casting vote. What is more, the votes of the countries were to be weighted, and this meant that France, supposedly with the backing of Germany, would be in a dominant position. Members of the H.A were to be renewed, in lots, every two years - a very strange way of supporting their freedom of judgement. Hardly any control on the High Authority was envisaged except for an Assembly, whose actual powers were however very weak indeed.(9)

The Italians seemed ready to follow. According to Santoro of the Ministry of Industry, the French document implied the end of national sovereignty, but Italy would not oppose it as long as France would grant her effective representation and acknowledge her vital interests. And basically this was the attitude of the Italian delegation throughout the Conference. (10)

The debate on institutional arrangements was very lively, and at one point endangered the very success of the Schuman Plan. To the delight of Spierenburg, leader of the Dutch delegation, and the dismay of Monnet and Hallstein, the issue at stake was bluntly recalled by Venturini, an Italian official from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs: in case of war was a national government allowed to push up steel production and move some of its plants? Probably Monnet at this point deeply regretted not having been able to confine the pool to France and Germany, as had been his original intention. Clearly the Benelux countries had no intention of relinquishing their national sovereignty, nor, as it were, their industry, to an omnipotent High Authority . (11)

A compromise was reached by creating two more bodies: a Council of Ministers and a Court of Justice, whose powers, especially those of the former, questioned the central role of the High Authority. The problem of rearmament was dealt with in the context of emergency situations requiring allocation of scarce resources and fixation of quotas. Decisions on plant transfers and priority assignments (civilian against military needs) were left in the hands of the Council of Ministers, with the provision, in the second case, that it act unanimously. The Italians would have preferred majority voting by the Ministers, fearing heavy High Authority interference, but they met with firm opposition from the French and Germans. On the whole,



however, the agreement seemed to lean more towards the national than the supranational side.(12)

The Italians were vaguely uneasy with the High Authority but they were not at all sure that their influence would be greater in a Council of Ministers where the strength of national economies was bound to be felt more heavily. They did however come out in favour of widespread rights of appeal to the Court of Justice.

The main dispute was over whether single firms could challenge High Authority decisions. In fact after the creation of the Council of Ministers, which took care of matters affecting national policies, the High Authority had been left in charge of decisions (mainly on prices and investment) previously emanating from single firms, sometimes under the supervision of business associations. It proposed to enforce them through a far-reaching system of sanctions. This was exactly what had led the Belgian head of delegation to say that his government could not negotiate on capacities it did not possess. No wonder then that especially Belgian, German and Italian business representatives - and the French would no doubt have supported them had they been admitted to the Conference -took an active part in trying to check what they defined as the High Authority's "dictatorial powers".

On the face of things the question was left unresolved. Firms were allowed to appeal against any measures affecting them directly, but the Court should not judge the rulings of the High

Authority in their own merit. Again this compromise went some way in meeting the demands of the industrial interests, inasmuch as it seemed possible to circumvent the legalistic framework established by the Treaty.(13)

In the end Italian support for the French bid to shape German reconstruction turned out to be half-hearted. In fact the Italians made it clear that they believed any European arrangement should be firmly linked to the Atlantic Pact. Taviani, on first arriving in Paris, had attacked "third-force" tendencies, clearly hinting at the views held in leading French circles. Monnet, whom Italian Christian Democrats considered to be a dangerous socialist, went out of his way to reassure him during his inaugural speech at the Conference.

Soon after, the Korean War brought up the question of German rearmament. The Italians were in favour of it, believing that it would help to build a better, more eastward, line of defence in central Europe. Thus, in September 1950 at the New York Conference, when the United States demanded the immediate creation of a number of German divisions, the only countries to express immediate support were Italy and Portugal.(14)

About one month later the French counterproposal for a European Defence Community was greeted very skeptically by Sforza. He repeated that Italy was in no way opposed to German



rearmament and that, were the French ideas to prove too difficult to implement, they would have to be postponed to a better time. In the meantime it was important to pursue the American plan to build an integrated Nato force in Europe under the command of general Eisenhower. (15)

The attitude of the Italians strained their relations with the French. De Gasperi, however, knowing how difficult it had been to secure parliamentary approval for the Atlantic Pact one year earlier, feared that the French Plans would compel his government to face another debate on military policy, in which the Left, possibly with the backing of a part of the majority coalition, could cause serious trouble.

It was only at the Franco-Italian summit in Santa Margherita in February 1951, after the French had very heavily insisted on seeking a solution in the framework of the countries that had joined the Schuman Plan, that Italian diplomacy began to show a more favourable attitude toward the Plevin Plan. By that time the French proposals had been considerably watered down, in order to achieve a compromise with American views. Moreover, the European Army was now presented as a long-term solution to be negotiated in a Conference, following the one on the Schuman Plan, which had reached its final stage. The French were also prepared to meet Italy's claims for Algerian ore - which had proved one of the most divisive issues at the Conference. Thus, Santa Margherita

seemed to mark the beginning of a new stage in the Franco-Italian "special relationship".(16)

How deeply the European commitment was entangled with motivations of national prestige was revealed once more by the last round of negotiations that took place in April 1951 between the six Ministers for Foreign Affairs, in which the final provisions of the Treaty were fixed. Sforza came forth with two basic requests: that at least one Italian should be appointed on the High Authority and that Italy's position should be recognized as similar to that of the two bigger countries.(17)

The first request was hardly original considering that it was raised in exactly the same terms by Luxembourg. Nevertheless it clashed with the French idea that the High Authority should be composed of only five members. The way was open for an even wider enlargement than the Italians had asked for, and a compromise was reached on the figure of nine members. This was due mainly to German pressures to obtain a solution that would grant them maximum weight. (They obtained two members, as did the French and the Belgians).

Following Schuman's request, the agreement to appoint at least one member for each country was framed in terms of a "gentlemen's agreement", not different from the longstanding one that Monnet was to be placed at the top of the new body. The



President, however, though still important, did not enjoy the extended powers the Document de Travail had sought.(18)

On the other main issue -the nature of the weighted vote in the Council of Ministers - the Italian standpoint was bound to coincide with that of the smaller countries, who feared a Franco-German hegemony. After some wrangling a solution was devised whereby the most important decisions had to be agreed upon by at least one of two major producing countries. Italy's desire to be represented on the same footing as France and Germany was met only for the distribution of seats in the Assembly, not a fundamental achievement but enough for Sforza to maintain that the Italian role had been decisive in promoting the Franco-German "rapprochement".(19)

c) The nature of the Common Market

The economic part of the Document de Travail expounded a strange brand of liberalism according to which competition was to be "normal", prices "reasonable" and production "satisfactory". The final judgement rested completely with the High Authority, which was endowed with a vast array of powers on investment, prices, wages and foreign trade, and even covered other areas of economic policy that might in any way affect the functioning of the pool, such as transport, monetary and fiscal policy.

In particular the High Authority was to channel financial resources, and service its loans from a levy on coal and steel products. It would also have been able to allocate raw materials and intervene in the daily life of the firm, a power far beyond that of the Commissariat au Plan in France, not to mention Italy where no central planning mechanism existed.

Behind these proposals lay the idea that, given the highly regulated character of European coal and steel markets, a particularly powerful and enlightened kind of dirigisme was needed in order for an effective alternative to develop.

In other words, according to Monnet, the power of cartels was to be curbed not by free competition, but by more control albeit in keeping with a long-term liberal perspective. Whether this would be enough to dispel American suspicions against European restrictive practices was another matter, but Monnet was rightly confident of winning their approval mainly on foreign policy grounds.

On the whole the construction turned out to be slightly artificial, and this may explain the somewhat incredulous greeting it received from the other delegations.(20)

The Italians were prepared to take a rather limited perspective. Basically they were looking for two points: provisions for investment and adequate transitional measures to protect their steel plants.



As far as investments were concerned the Italian delegation was bent on securing approval for the Finsider Sinigaglia Plan, which had very recently and with much difficulty passed a severe cross-examination by ECA and OEEC authorities. The Plan was very coolly received by the French and the Germans. A useful ally under the circumstances turned out to be the Dutch, who had the same problem with Ijmuiden, a coastal integrated steel plant in which the government had taken a large stake. And on the issue finally the Italians scored a success, it being decided that plans already being implemented were not to be submitted to the High Authority.(21)

The one other affair for which the Italians were not prepared to leave Monnet's High Authority a free hand was the period of adjustment for their steel production. They wanted a precise definition of its length and its other terms to be included in the Treaty. Again they were not alone. Belgium, taken account of the difficult position of its coal pits, was willing to go much further. It was asking to extend transitional measures over an indefinite period of time.

The compensation measures contained in the Document de Travail in fact offered a ground of confrontation between Italian and Belgian demands for tighter economic safeguards, French rationalizing impetus and German, and sometimes also Dutch, resistance to what was seen as a dangerous and ever-increasing burden on efficiency and low costs.

The High Authority was to manage two funds: perequation and reconversion. Perequation was a price equalization mechanism whereby the most efficient firms would pay for the others to bring down their costs. It was held by the Italians to belong to the "mythological area of the Schuman Plan", it being difficult to imagine for example German producers dispatching "kindly cheques to Falck or Finsider". And in fact very soon in the course of the discussion it became clear that at least part of the subsidizing would take place on a national basis.(22)

Reconversion funds were meant mainly for workers of firms unable to withstand Common Market competition and were also designed to encourage inter-sectorial shifts. They were modeled on the schemes put forth in the OEEC, by, among others, Stikker, which may explain Dutch support for them. On their part the Belgians made a case for diverting these funds to their high-cost coal production, whereas the Italians claimed that they should be given to steelworks compelled to discharge a number of workers in order to maintain competitive costs. This amounted to an unemployment allowance, a measure the other delegations didn't seem ready to envisage. On the occasion Uri kindly advised the Italians to concentrate on labour-intensive activities, leaving steel matters in more competent hands. (23)

The irritation of the French could not conceal the fact that the discussion on social and equalizing measures was gaining



a momentum of its own and at the same time arousing German doubts as to the economic feasibility of the whole venture. The second phase of negotiations, starting from September 1950, was divided between writing the final economic provisions of the Treaty and drafting a separate Convention for transitional measures.

Belgian coal proved to be the biggest stumbling block, requiring complex equalization surgery involving the Belgian government and the German and Dutch coal industries. A very minor arrangement was worked out along the same lines for the Sardinian Sulcis coal mines.

At the same time plans to subsidize Italian steel were ruled out, and it was instead decided to maintain a degressive tariff protection for five years. This decision damaged the Italian consumer industries, by preventing them from lowering their costs, but it pleased the European partners, who were quite unwilling to pay another bill, amounting to about one third of the Belgian one; as, for the same reason, it did the Italian budget authorities. The Minister of the Treasury, Pella, was confirmed in his view that tariffs remained the best safeguard against the hardships of integration.(24)

The final arrangements on production and prices contained in the Treaty marked a great change from the original French ideas. On the whole the emphasis now lay more on the the High

Authority's role of supervision -information, orientation of the market - and on its negative powers - prohibition of discrimination, etc - than on its initial assignment of unifying production costs through the Common Market. Although the High Authority still commanded considerable influence, for example on investment, it could not, without strict governmental control, deal with matters outside the coal and steel sectors. Basically this was the result of the restraints on supranationalism imposed by the small countries and of a largely shared decision to rely more on current market practice.

Already in one of the opening sessions the German delegation had it made quite clear that the High Authority should encourage efficiency and low prices, that it should move as little as possible and take account of the advice of governments, firms and business associations. Thus the stiffening of the German attitude towards price unification, though it is seen in the literature as a consequence of the better bargaining position of the Germans after the Americans had begun to ask for their rearmament, could not have come as a surprise. Furthermore the painful discussion during the winter of 1951 on the issue of German decartelization seriously pointed to the fact that some of the High Authority's powers might remain highly hypothetical.(25)

Finally it was decided to introduce a flexible pricing system which, while still leaving some powers to the High Authority - for example that of setting maximum prices - would



basically allow for differences and leave producers free to adjust.

The Italians had pinned their hopes on the French initial proposal of a "starting point" price, ex-mine or ex-mill, for both steel and coal. However, under the pressure of the exporting countries, a rather different basing-point system emerged allowing absorption of freight in the final price. This meant that transport costs would still weigh on the price of raw materials, while at the same time partly ceasing to protect finished products. The Italian delegation had to recognize the fact that regional prices would have placed too heavy a burden on producers in the crowded industrial zones of Central Europe - especially Luxembourg and Belgium - relying heavily on sales in different sections of the market. It had to be content with the exemption of the Italian market from the new pricing system during the transitional period.(26)

#### d) Wages and labour

The interest of the Schuman Plan negotiation on wages seems to lie primarily in its highly fictitious character. Around a table were seated together civil servants and representatives of non-communist trade unions of the six countries to discuss, for the first and possibly the last time in European history,

complete equalization of wage structures.

That was in fact the thrust of the French proposal. In the Document de Travail the parification vers l'haut was essentially designed to cut the advantages of producers relying on low salaries. Its purpose was therefore not so much a social as a productive one, and it was conceived as yet one more instrument in the hands of the High Authority, together with price and quota fixing and investment control.

The role played in the discussion by the trade union representatives is not wholly clear. In fact it seems that, while they were bound by a common interest in gaining some influence over the new Community, on most economic issues they supported the view of their own country's employers. This was all the more true in the Italian case, where the only union participating in the talks was the CISL, a Catholic grouping which had only recently broken away from the Communist-inspired CGIL and was in a very weak position. (27)

The sessions were dominated by a certain amount of incredulity. Common sense suggested that wages were the responsibility of trade unions and employers; nor was it clear how the High Authority could operate without seriously interfering with the whole industrial wage-structure. (28)

The Italian case was an ambivalent one. The industry enjoyed low salaries, by far the lowest among the six countries,



but it was also burdened by high social charges, comprising indirect wages such as paid holidays, overtime pay etc, and extra provisions such as family allowances. In this respect it was in about the same position as the French industry. In any case, whereas it stood much to lose from higher wages resulting from parification, it seemed to have little to gain from extending its cumbersome social apparatus to the other countries.(29)

This was the situation which led the Italian delegates to take the most logical stand: they declared that low wages were an asset that could not be given up by an industry deficient in raw materials and undergoing modernization. They added that if any equalization had to take place it should concern wage-costs related to a given amount of product, a proposition that could hardly have been taken seriously given the fact that it would have resulted in penalizing productivity gains and encouraging low wages, exactly the opposite of what had been set out by the Document de Travail.

In fact French ideas, which had been cut to meet Franco-German cost differentials, proved incapable of coping with the wide array of different situations in the six countries of the Community. It was clear for example that the Belgian coal mines intended to substitute equalization of salaries for government subsidies. Italy's trade unions, on the other hand, were willing to encourage a social policy but they wanted it to concentrate on the problem of unemployment.(30)

Most of these plans were gradually shelved under the pressure of Germany and Holland, the two low-cost low-wage countries. The final drafts, therefore, focused on a few measures by which the High Authority could prevent wage-cutting as a means of competition. Some general statements on parification were retained, mostly with the purpose of enticing the trade unions to involve themselves further in the problems of the Community, but on the whole it appeared that the burden of readjustment would rest on high-cost producers, an outcome the Italians, both employers and trade unions, had feared from the beginning.(31)

In September, as the outcome of the discussion on social policies was becoming clear, Taviani raised the point of free labour migration across Community frontiers. The free flow of goods, he maintained, should, in a truly liberal framework, entail the end of all restriction on labour. (32)

As far as the economics of integration were concerned, this sounded a sensible proposition, certainly more sensible than ideas of firms charging the same price in countries with different factor endowment, and different levels of productivity. In practice, however, as the previous experience of Italian negotiators in OEEC and in the Franco-Italian Customs Union indicated, it had proved difficult to implement. Very little



had been achieved. The Italians presented migration requests for large numbers of unskilled workers and had been confronted in return with limited offers for skilled labourers in specific sectors, such as farming and mining.

In the coal and steel industries, however, Italy's claims seemed to be supported by the fact that it already exported a large number of workers to Northern Europe. Most of them were unskilled labourers employed -often in dangerous conditions- in the coal pits of Southern Belgium and Northern France or in the ore mines in Lorraine, but there were also skilled steel workers in Lorraine and in Luxembourg. Their number ranged between 70,000 and 80,000, which was little less than those working in Italian coal and steel plants. Thus the Italian negotiators argued that failing labour mobility on a general scale, it should surely have been possible to work out some specific sectorial arrangement.(33)

As it turned out however the labour-importing countries - at the time Belgium, Luxembourg and France, with Holland figuring as an exporter and Germany not yet in the picture - took a very restrictive attitude. They were prepared to accept liberalization on a very limited scale and only for highly skilled workers. In fact this meant that only about one fifth of the workforce would benefit from the agreement, and it would be precisely that section least likely to ask for job transfers. For the rest migration would still have to undergo strict

national control. In particular it would have to adapt to seasonal shifts in demand in the coal sector.

A further Italian suggestion to allow for inter-sectorial deployment to other industries, or even between the coal and steel sectors, was turned down (although with the possibility of some exception for particular shortages in labour demand). This was hardly a friendly gesture considering the fact that at the time a large number of the unprofitable Belgian and French coal mines, which employed Italian labour, were expected to close as a result of the Common Market.

The French delegation finally proceeded to further cut down the significance of the little mobility that had actually been agreed upon, by assigning its enforcement to an intergovernmental committee. Obviously this was not in keeping with the French overall commitment to the High Authority and its supranational powers.

#### f) Liberalization

The exact definition of the terms coal and steel involved complex technical issues, and for this reason the work of the committee on nomenclature has commanded very little attention in the history of the negotiations. But it was there that the extent of the actual measures of liberalization was eventually



decided.

The Italian delegates fought hard, and with partial success, to exclude from the pool some of the country's high-cost productions such as lignite, coke, various breeds of ferro-alloys and high quality special steels. On the side of finished products they joined the Belgians and, occasionally, the Germans in successfully trying to keep a number of cold-rolled products, such as seamless tubes (of which the Italian firm Dalmine was a major producer), thin sheet and the like, out of the pool. (34)

The vital issue for the Italian steel industry was however the provision of basic raw materials: coal, iron ore and scrap. ||

In the case of coal it was not easy to say precisely what liberalization would come to mean and how it would affect practices of traditional suppliers in the Ruhr. Decartelization of the Ruhr industry was achieved by the French with active American intervention during the first months of 1951. Its enforcement was left with the High Authority. (35)

While the Italians took no part in these discussions, clearly their interest lay on the same side as the French; in fact access to Ruhr mines had been listed from the beginning, especially by the managers of Finsider, as one of the main Italian objectives. Surely the fact that the High Authority was to take over some of the functions hitherto held by the International Ruhr Authority in which Italy had no voice was an

encouraging result. But that this could entail a policy of liberalization must have been difficult to believe in a country in which coal imports had been only partially and very recently released from state monopoly, and prices were kept firmly under government control.

Further advantages for the Italian industry could be seen in the elimination of double pricing and possibly in the reduction of transport costs by the harmonization of rates. Primarily this was to affect rail transport, but rail regulations turned out to be deeply embedded in national discriminatory practices, and it was tacitly agreed to leave them out of the negotiations, and in fact partly out of the High Authority's field of action.

The inclusion of coke in the pool, on the other hand, endangered the small high-cost Italian production, which had developed during the "autarkic period", and its chemical extensions in the field of by-products. In fact, while blast-furnace coke production stood in little danger from German competition owing to its high transport costs, the same was not true for coke used for gas and chemical production.

The demand to keep these types of coke out of the pool was not accepted and this led the Italian producers, under the guidance of Montecatini, to wage a fierce campaign against the Schuman Plan. In the end the other countries were compelled to grant Italy a temporary tariff during the transition period. After steel and Sulcis coal, this was a third case of special



treatment for Italy. (36)

Access to the high-quality Algerian iron ore from the mines of Ouenza had been repeatedly requested by the Italian steel industry. The claim had been actively supported by the government on various occasions, as during the Armistice Conference with France in the summer of 1940, or at the Franco-Italian Customs Union talks after the war. On this last occasion the French had failed to be impressed by Finsider's arguments, according to which the ore was vital for the success of the Sinigaglia Plan.(37)

In the first weeks after the 9th of May the French had hinted that their Overseas Territories would be included in the pool. Although we know very little on the subject from the French side, probably this was an attempt to lure German investors. Adenauer himself is reported to have told McCloy, the US High Commissioner in Germany, that Africa was one of the main attractions of the Schuman Plan for the Federal Republic.(38)

As soon as the Conference began, however, the French made it clear to the Italians that Algeria would have nothing to do with the Common Market. Sforza and Taviani reacted very angrily. They declared that Italy was seriously considering abandoning the talks, and that, in any case, the Italian Parliament would never

ratify a treaty clearly damaging to Italian interests. On the diplomatic line they turned to many countries, including the United States, for help, but apparently only succeeded in securing very lukewarm German support.(39)

The French had no intention of reversing their decision on the exclusion of the Overseas Territories, but as it became clear that the Algerian issue was seriously endangering the Conference, they began contacts to settle the matter bilaterally.

Algerian ore was exported in fairly big quantities. Export licences were issued by the French authorities and were in fact difficult to obtain. The Italians were asking for over one million tons per year, a high quantity considering their past purchases - a little over 100,000 tons in 1949 -but not exceedingly so when compared to the two million tons that were shipped each year to Great Britain. In fact the British steel industry seems to have watched over the whole Franco-Italian dispute with an anxious eye.(40)

An agreement for five years was finally reached at the Santa Margherita Conference. The French government was to issue licences for increasing quantities of ore, reaching a maximum of 830,000 tons in the fifth year. The actual purchases would have to be negotiated directly with the mining company, but it was understood that the Italians would get the same treatment as the British.

The agreement was included in a foreign policy package which



included, among other things, Italian support for the European Defence Community. It did not, however, satisfy the industrialists, who complained loudly with Sforza and De Gasperi especially about the unsafe terms for delivery. An undertaking on the French side not to invest in coastal steelworks on North African territory was, on the other hand, warmly welcomed by Sinigaglia.(41)

The last major point was scrap, of which Italy was by far the largest importer, and a main consumer among the Six. In fact a very high proportion of Italian steel - about 35% in 1949 - was produced from scrap in electric furnaces. Martin Siemens production and even blast-furnaces relied heavily on scrap as well. The biggest scrap consumers were the two main private-owned steel factories, Falck and Fiat, followed by a number of smaller firms, also located in Northern Italy, often specializing in special steels. Thus, the views of scrap consumers were well represented in the Italian delegation.

In the Twenties and early Thirties practically all the scrap had been supplied by France. When the French introduced heavy export controls, the Italian firms turned to the United States. Imports of scrap ranged from 600,000 to 900,000 tons in the late Thirties, and in 1949 they had again attained 350,000 tons.

After the war the United States, whose steel production had

enormously increased, temporarily turned into scrap importers. Germany, whose production, on the other hand, was still lagging far behind prewar levels, had become the main source of supply. The British, who were also important scrap buyers, were largely exploiting it. Not surprisingly, therefore, the Italian industrialists hoped to be able through the Schuman Plan to gain freer access to the West German market as well as to other markets in continental Europe. (42)

Monnet had accepted the inclusion of scrap in the pool. All the first official French drafts listed scrap among the raw materials to be fully liberalized. However, the Memorandum sur les dispositions transitoires of the 21 of November surprisingly established that scrap collected inside the steelworks should be left at the firms' complete disposal. This meant keeping out of any common arrangement more than half of the available scrap supply. Moreover, according to the new draft, the rest of the scrap was to be subject to a special regime. Each government was to draw up a list of its own steel industry's requirements and of its home market's availability. The High Authority would then fix the quantities to be delivered to the countries who were in short supply. Export licences between the Six would be retained. (43)

This set of proposals amounted to a firm denial of Italy's demands and, in fact, the Italians reacted very sharply, and were able to appeal to the original spirit of the Monnet proposals. It



was absurd, they argued, to consider scrap as being in permanent short supply at the same time distorting all price calculations by restricting its trade. It was in fact easy to show how closely the price of scrap was linked with that of the other raw materials that were going to be pooled.

All this was perfectly sound, but it made little impact on the set of national interests determined to ensure that the scrap market should remain a tightly cartelized business. Moreover, the French, together with the Germans and the Dutch, made it clear in the course of the discussions that they wanted to limit the possibility of large scrap exports to Italian firms, maintaining that they would have the effect of raising the price in their domestic markets by diminishing the supply. The Belgians were on the same side as the Italians, but their scrap requirements were considerably lower.

As an outcome the High Authority was allowed to take over a vast number of controls. Thereupon, as a second choice, the Italians asked that single firms regardless of nationality should be taken into account by the High Authority, both for their scrap requirements and for scrap deliveries to other firms. This would at least have extended the agreement to the whole supply of scrap, at the same time preventing its enforcement along purely national lines.

The French and the others, however, refused to go so far, preferring a solution whereby only the scrap collected outside

steel plants would be allocated, while the rest would be used by the High Authority merely as a basis for calculating the needs of each country.

Clearly what was achieved was a most "uncommon" market, and one which would in any case have to rely heavily on existing private cartels, operating, as they always had, in conjunction with national governments.(44)

Finally there were the discussions concerning the Community's commercial policy. The original French ideas had envisaged a single price for Community steel sold inside and outside the pool. Such a solution, however, soon appeared to be highly unrealistic, given the different value each country placed on exports and given the high degree of competition on third markets. Belgian and Luxembourgian industries in particular opposed attempts by the High Authority to tamper with export cartels.

As soon as the discussion in the committee on tariffs, chaired by the Frenchman Alphand, began, a difference of opinion arose over the degree of protection the Community should afford. The Dutch, followed by their Benelux colleagues, strongly opposed the protectionist solution sought by the French, claiming that it would jeopardize their commerce and endanger their balance of payments. Tariffs, they argued, should be set from the beginning



and by no means rest with the High Authority. Moreover, there should, possibly, be one single external tariff for the Six. In any case the Low countries made it perfectly clear that they were not going to raise their own tariffs by any considerable amount. (45)

The Italians appear to have attended this phase of the discussion with considerable anxiety. Italy was in the position of a reluctant importer; it had the least competitive industry and most protected market of the Six. Like France, it obviously opposed the creation of anything resembling a free-trade area.

A crucial factor in the second phase of the discussion, starting from September, was the change in attitude of the German delegats, who came out firmly against aligning tariffs on the Benelux level. Given the very low transport costs along the waterways from Rotterdam and Antwerp into the German market, the Germans argued that their trade would be severely damaged, if too low a tariff should be set. Harmonisation - the French word for gradual tariff alignment - would, therefore, have to take place on the basis of the German tariff, which was closer to the French and Italian ones than to that of the Low Countries. (46)

As an outcome, the meaning of harmonisation became ever more vague. Basically it was agreed that, over the years, low tariffs would be slightly raised, and higher tariffs lowered, allowing for a difference more or less equal to the transport

costs between low and high tariff Community countries. This task however was consigned to further negotiations with Great Britain - the major commercial partner of the Six - and with GATT.

On the Italian part this solution was considered reasonably safe inasmuch as it left things more or less as they stood. The Italians, in fact, were preoccupied lest their market be swamped with cheap steel products from Britain and Sweden imported through Belgium and Luxembourg, and they were also concerned to protect themselves from Austrian dumping.

Inside the pool, however, Italy could now rely on the temporary protection afforded by the tariff agreed upon for the transitional period, whereas for goods coming from outside the pool a complex mechanism of quotas was superimposed on Benelux trade in order to prevent re-exportation in the Common market. This did not wholly satisfy the Italians, for it still left open the possibility of circumventing their tariffs by importing through a low-tariff country on the basis of the French tariff, the second most protective one. However, in view of the restrictive framework that was being created, all this seemed highly hypothetical. Furthermore, the treaty did not rule out the imposition of quotas in respect to third countries, thereby leaving governments firmly in charge of commercial policy. (47)



Some final remarks

This brief account of the Schuman Plan negotiations shows the extent to which the French initial proposals were modified. Though we would like to know more about the way in which the Plan was originally drafted, there is enough to be able to say that its aims were extremely ambitious, reaching far beyond sectorial integration. In this respect coal and steel were instrumental to a "spill-over" designed to generate a wider economic and political merger.

How far Monnet and his group could go in realizing their own idea was probably a matter unknown to themselves at the beginning of the Conference, particularly since it was taking place on a much wider basis than they would have liked it to. In retrospect it is easy to say that vested interests were bound to be successful in opposing precisely those aspects of the Plan which seemed to command the greatest political momentum. All the more so if one considers that none of the other countries, with the exception of Germany - hardly enjoying full sovereignty at the time - had shown any willingness to surrender their national independence. This was apparent in the case of the Benelux countries, but Italy's reaction proves no less enlightening. In fact Italy's commitment to the Europe of the Six proved to be a cautious one. The Italians were eager to participate in any new arrangement, they were ready to recognize a measure of French

leadership, but they never thought of abandoning the standpoint of national interest.

It would be wrong however to draw the conclusion that nothing was achieved by the Conference. The Treaty in fact laboriously installed a new machinery, revolving around the High Authority, and endowed it with a number of powers formerly held by firms, cartels and national bureaucracies. Certainly if the French were just seeking a substitute for the International Ruhr Authority to allocate supplies of coking coal to their steelworks they could have devised something less complex.

One might argue, on the other hand, that the nature of the new undertaking was far from clear. A Community was undoubtedly taking shape, but what exactly was its relation with the alleged Common Market for coal and steel? The very definition of a common market implied that separate markets were being brought closer together. Clearly the talks on commercial policy had revealed that even a Customs Union was a very distant goal. Moreover it is rather doubtful that eliminating a few restrictions in two industries could by itself be considered as a positive step towards the creation of a single free market.

From the point of view of the planners the outcome was equally questionable. It is true that the High Authority could exercise some influence on prices and investment, exceptionally even on production levels, but was this enough to give it any



effective control?

However tangled the theoretical implications of the compromise between dirigistic and free market views, it soon became apparent that the new arrangements would not be of such a nature as to reshape the pattern of heavy industry. Even given the fact that its political implications were quite exceptional, this was not after all the first agreement on coal and steel between European countries. Each country's achievements could therefore be measured against a more traditional background of economic advantages.

In Italy, after the Treaty had been signed, opinions on what had been gained differed highly. Measured against the three main requests raised by Taviani at the start of the Conference - safeguards for investment plans, transitional measures, and iron ore supplies - it is hardly questionable that the Italians scored a success. Whatever misgivings they might have had on some other provisions contained in the Treaty, for example the pricing system, they could rely on a comfortable period of five years for adjustment.

Other important points, such as better access to coal and scrap, still awaited practical solutions. A traditional argument points to the successful performance of the Italian steel industry in the Fifties and Sixties as ultimate proof of the advantages it gained from joining the Coal and Steel Community. There must be some truth in this argument, but a safe historical

assessment would have to deal with how matters discussed during the Conference were then worked out in practice - a task that goes beyond the scope of this paper.

What the minutes of the negotiating sessions do reveal is the extent to which a complex pattern of transactions between national interests succeeded in reshaping the original French proposals. Even the minor actors played quite a significant role, sometimes by merely advancing their requests. How much, for example, did the emergence of a less "dirigiste" and more flexible Community owe to the reactions to Italian and Belgian pressures on the social resources of the Community, or to the insistence on national controls by the Benelux countries and on investment safeguards by the Dutch and the Italians?

On the whole Monnet's statement that the delegations operated in a European spirit cannot be completely dismissed. The Governments had committed themselves to a Plan from which it would have been no simple matter to retreat. The French having shown the way, the delegations - certainly the Italian one - took good care to present their demands as something more than just nationalistic claims. This helped to promote reasonable compromises.

The initial standpoints were very different, but soon delegations found themselves in contradiction with their



original aims; the Belgians for example seem to have become fervent supporters of supranational compensation measures and the French retreated more than once to a national approach. New areas were introduced into the discussion or outgrew their original scope - scrap policy and labour readaptation are two good examples.

The new Community took over the task of carrying out the agreements sketched in the Treaty. The Conference had shown that this could be done through slow and patient discussion. Thus the High Authority, far from embodying the idea of Europe, could probably command barely enough influence to promote a new working relationship between the industries of the Six.

NOTES

- 1) The minutes of the meetings of the committees of the Paris Conference are mostly in Archivio Storico del Ministero degli Affari Esteri (MDAE), Direzione Generale degli Affari Economici, Piano Schuman - 1950 (AE). An important unpublished work on the Conference is Francois Fontaine, Chronologie des travaux preparatoires du Plan Schuman (du 9 Mai au 28 Aout 1950), etablie par Francois Fontaine, dattyloscrit conserve' au Bureau des C.E. -Paris. Very useful for understanding French views is La Communaute' Europeenne du charbon et de l'acier - Rapport de la delegation francaise sur le Traite' et la Convention signe' a Paris le 18 Avril 1951 - Traite' instituant la Communaute' Europeenne du charbon et de l'acier - Convention relative aux dispositions transitoires, 1951. The literature on the subject is vast; one of the best contributions is still William Diebold Jr. , The Schuman Plan - A Study in Economic Cooperation 1950-1959, Published for the Council of Foreign Relations by F. Praeger, New York, 1959. On negotiations also useful is Raymond Racine, Vers une Europe nouvelle par le Plan Schuman, Editions de la Baconniere, Neuchatel, 1954. The relevant articles of the Treaty Establishing the Coal and Steel Community (TREATY) are mentioned. I have been able also to read the drafts by Alan Milward, Belgium and the Schuman Plan, an by Richard Griffiths The Schuman Plan negotiations, both to be read at the Aachen Conference on the Schuman Plan in May 1986. This paper is an abridged version of the central chapter of my thesis on Italy and the Coal and Steel Community.
- 2) The traditional account of Italy's response to the Schuman Plan is given in Bino Olivi, "L'Italia e il Mercato Europeo", in AAVV, La politica estera della Repubblica italiana, Milano, 1967, pp. 492-3
- 3) MDAE, Ambasciata di Parigi, 478, f.1, da Parigi, t(elegramma) 164-5, 9-5-50.
- 4) FRUS (Foreign Relations of the United States), 1950, v.iii, pp.702-703, Harriman to the Secretary of State, Paris, May 20, 1950.
- 5) On the Italian steel industry in the Reconstruction Ruggero Ranieri, "The Italian Iron and Steel Industry and European Integration" E U I Working Papers No 84-109, Badia



Integration" E U I Working Papers No 84-109, Badia Fiesolana, San Domenico, Firenze, 1984.

- 6) Price differentials are given in PRO (Public Record Office), CAB, 134,293 Schuman Proposals For An International Coal and Steel Authority in Western Europe, 16 of June 1950.
- 7) On the Pella Plan see Giuseppe Pella, La Comunita' Europea del Carbone e dell'Acciaio - Risultati e prospettive, Cinque Lune, Roma, 1957; MDAE, AE 1, f.1, "Appunto per il Ministro", Roma, 15-6-50.
- 8) MDAE, AP (Affari politici), Francia n.30, "Dichiarazione del Signor Monnet", Parigi 21-6-50.
- 9) MDAE, Ambasciata di Parigi, 478, f.2, "Document de Travail".
- 10) MDAE, AE 3, f.2, "Appunto sulla Riunione della Delegazione Italiana alla Conferenza del Piano Schuman presso il Ministero degli Esteri", Giovedi' 29-6-50.
- 11) MDAE, AE 5, f.1, "Conferenza per il Piano Schuman, Ia Commissione, 3a riunione, giovedi 20 luglio 1950".
- 12) MDAE, AE 1, f.3, "Breve nota ai comptes rendus delle riunioni del 14 e 15 ottobre".
- 13) MDAE, AE 1, f.3, "Proposition on vue de mettre au point les dispositions relatives aux pouvoirs de la Haute Autorite' au role su Conseil spcial des Ministres et de la Court de Justice", 10-10-50.
- 14) FRUS, 1950, v.iii, n.309-11, The Secretary of State to the Acting Secretary of State, New York, September 16,1950. Paolo Emilio Taviani, "Breve storia del tentativo della Ced", CIVITAS, luglio 1957, ora in AAVV, Comunita' Europea - Antologia di Civitas, Roma, 1969,p. 134. MDAE, Affari Politici, Francia 29, tel. n. 691, Missione diplomatica in Germania, Bad Godesberg, 30 luglio 1950, "Partecipazione francese alla difesa dell'Occidente".
- 15) FRUS 1950, v.iv, n.418-421, The Secretary of State to the Embassy in France, Washington, October 30, 1951; Edward Fursdon, The European Defence Community: a History, Macmillan Press Lmt, London, 1980, pp. 70 ff.

- 16) PRO, FO 371, 96236, 19th of February, "Summary of conversation between Italian and French Prime Ministers at Santa Margherita".
- 17) ACS (Archivio Centrale dello Stato), Fondo Sforza, S. 6, f.4, Appunto "Questioni riservate alla Conferenza finale dei Ministri degli Esteri".
- 18) ACS, Fondo Sforza, S.vi, f.4., "verbale delle sedute".
- 19) Carlo Sforza, Cinque anni a Palazzo Chigi - La politica estera italiana dal 1947 al 1951, Atlante, Roma, 1952, pp.315-318.
- 20) MDAE, AE 1, f.1, "Ricapitolazione del documento di lavoro francese per il pool del carbone e dell'acciaio" di Armando Frumento, Milano, 3-7-50.
- 21) FONTAINE (n.1), p. 27; MDAE, Ambasciata di Parigi, 478, f.2, "Rapport sur les travaux poursuivies a Paris, par les delegations des six pays du 20 juin au 19 aout"; TREATY, Convention on Transitional Provisions, art.2.
- 22) MDAE, AE 1, f.1 "Alcune osservazioni del gruppo di lavoro per gli aspetti economici del Piano Schuman" Roma 30-6-50.
- 23) MDAE, AE 1 f.2, "Verbale delle riunioni del Gruppo n.4 su Prezzi, produzione e investimenti".
- 24) MDAE, AP, Francia 30, Il Ministro del Tesoro al Ministro dell'Industria e al Capo della Delegazione Italiana per il Piano Schuman, Roma, 29-11-50
- 25) MDAE, AE1, f.1, "Riunione del giorno 3 Luglio ore 16"; on the German attitude Jean Monnet, Mémoires, Fayard, Paris, 1976 pp. 401-407 and DIEBOLD (n.1), pp.71-2.
- 26) MDAE, AE 1, f.4, telesspresso 14585-c, "Conversazioni sul Piano Schuman, Parigi, 6-11-50; Armando Frumento, Novero dei diritti e dei doveri previsti per gli organi e pei soggetti della Comunita' Europea del Carbone e dell'Acciaio, Ufficio Studi Falck, Milano, 1951.
- 27) On trade unions in the Schuman Plan, Ernst B. Haas, The Uniting of Europe - Political, Social and Economic Forces 1950-1957, Standford University Press, Standford California



- 1969 ( 1st ed. 1958),pp.361-5 ; Frank Roy Willis, Italy Chooses Europe, Oxford University Press, New York, 1971, pp.237-245.
- 28) MDAE, AE 5, f.3, "Verballi del gruppo di lavoro n.5, Questione dei salari e della mano d'opera".
- 29) The structure of wages in the various countries is measured in "Elementi di valutazione comparata del costo del lavoro su alcuni paesi" Rassegna di Statistica del Lavoro, quaderno 4 , maggio 1950.
- 30) On French- German costs Alan S. Milward, The Reconstruction of Western Europe 1945-51, Methuen and Co. Lmt, London, 1984, pp.371-380.
- 31) TREATY, art. 68.
- 32) Archivio Taviani, Civitas Roam, "Promemoria per l'onorevole Taviani", Parigi, 7-9-50; AE 1,f.4, "Conversazioni sul Piano Schuman", Parigi, 21-9-50; Paolo Emilio Taviani, Solidarieta' atlantica e Comunita' Europea, Le Monnier, Firenze, 1967 (Ia ediz. 1954), p.172.
- 33) MDAE, AE 5, f.1, "Conversations sur le Plan Schuman - Reponse au questionnaire relatif aux mouvements du main d'oeuvre, octobre 1950"; DIEBOLD (N.1) pp. 437 ff.
- 34) MDAE, Ambasciata di Parigi, 478,f.2, "Lavori dei gruppi di studio della Conferenza di Parigi per il Piano Schuman" 25-7-50.
- 35) On German decartelization MILWARD (n.30) p.411; Frank Roy Willis, France, Germany and the New Europe 1945-1963, Stanford University Press, Stanford California, Oxford U.P. London, 1965, pp.119 ff; on the Italian reactions TAVIANI (n.32),pp.156-7.
- 36) Paolo Emilio Taviani, Il Piano Schuman, seconda edizione, Roma, 1954,pp.41-2; MDAE, AE 2, f.4, "Rapportino sui risultati delle discussioni finali concernenti le disposizioni transitorie sul carbone per l'Italia", 24-2-50.
- 37) DDI (Documenti Diplomatici Italiani), ix, v.5, n.114, Ciano

- al capo dell'ufficio armistiziale, Roma, 26-6-40; on Franco-Italian Customs Union, RANIERI (n.5).
- 38) FRUS, 1950, v.iv, n.639, The US High Commissioner for Germany to the Acting Secretary of State, Frankfurt, May 17, 1950.
- 39) MDAE, Amb. Parigi, 478, f.2, t.358 da Parigi a Roma, 2-9-50; t. 423, da Roma (Grazzi) a Parigi (Taviani), 13-9-50
- 40) PRO, FO 371, 85861, Foreign Office Minute, "Discussion of the Schuman Plan by Mr. Michael Layton (Iron and Steel Federation) and R.B. Stevens, 14th of December 1950.
- 41) MDAE, AE 2, f.5, "Fornitura Minerali per il Nord Africa", Roma, 15-2-51.
- 42) Duncan Burn, The Steel Industry 1939-1959 - A Study in Competition and Planning, Cambridge U.P., 1961, pp.422-423; Assider Ufficio Studi, "Il problema del rottame tedesco", La Metallurgia Italiana, 1951, n.7.
- 43) MDAE, AE 2, f.4, "Aide memoire sur la situation des debats en ce qui concerne la ferraille", Delegation italienne, Paris 8-12-50,
- 44) MDAE, AE 2, f.5, t.124 e t.140 da Roma a Parigi, 9-2 e 20-2-1950; FRUMENTO (n.26), p.86.
- 45) MDAE, AE 5, f.2, "Verbali delle riunioni del Gruppo di Lavoro n.2 per la politica commerciale".
- 46) MDAE, AE 1 f.4, tel. 23, Parigi, 21-9-50, "Conversazioni sul Piano Schuman".
- 47) AE1, f.4, tel. 23, Delegazione italiana alla Conferenza di Parigi, "Lavori del gruppo di studio per la politica commerciale e tariffaria della Conferenza di Parigi", Roma, 25-7-50; J. Van der Mensbrugge, "La politique commerciale de la Communaute' Europeenne du Charbon et de l'Acier" Economia Internazionale v. VI, n.3, agosto 1953, pp.177-191.



Working Papers published within the research project Challenge and Response in Western Europe: The Origins of the European Community (1945-1950):

- Working Paper no.76  
Project Paper no.1  
Richard GRIFFITHS, ECONOMIC RECONSTRUCTION POLICY IN THE NETHERLANDS AND ITS INTERNATIONAL CONSEQUENCES, MAY 1945-MARCH 1951
- Working Paper no.77  
Project Paper no.2  
Scott NEWTON, THE 1949 STERLING CRISIS AND BRITISH POLICY TOWARDS EUROPEAN INTEGRATION
- Working Paper no.78  
Project Paper no.3  
Giorgio FODOR, WHY DID EUROPE NEED A MARSHALL PLAN IN 1947?
- Working Paper no.79  
Project Paper no.4  
Philippe MIOCHE, THE ORIGINS OF THE MONNET PLAN
- Working Paper no.80  
Project Paper no.5  
Werner ABELSHAUSER, THE ECONOMIC POLICY OF LUDWIG ERHARD
- Working Paper no.81  
Project Paper no.6  
Helge PHARO, THE DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL IMPLICATIONS OF NORWEGIAN RECONSTRUCTION
- Working Paper no.82  
Project Paper no.7  
Heiner R. ADAMSEN, INVESTITIONSPOLITIK IN DER BUNDESREPUBLIK DEUTSCHLAND 1949-1951
- Working Paper no.83  
Project Paper no.8  
Jean BOUVIER, LE PLAN MONNET ET L'ECONOMIE FRANÇAISE 1947-1952
- Working Paper no.84  
Project Paper no.9  
Mariuccia SALVATI, INDUSTRIAL AND ECONOMIC POLICY IN THE ITALIAN RECONSTRUCTION
- Working Paper no.85  
Project Paper no.10  
William DIEBOLD, Jr., TRADE AND PAYMENTS IN WESTERN EUROPE IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE: A PERSONAL VIEW BY AN INTERESTED PARTY
- Working Paper no.86  
Project Paper no.11  
Frances LYNCH, FRENCH RECONSTRUCTION IN A EUROPEAN CONTEXT
- Working Paper no.84/109  
Project Paper no.12  
Ruggero RANIERI, THE ITALIAN IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRY AND EUROPEAN INTEGRATION
- Working Paper no.84/117  
Project Paper no.13  
Richard T.GRIFFITHS & Frances M.B. LYNCH, THE FRITALUX/FINEBEL NEGOTIATIONS, 1949/1950

Working Paper no.84/124	John FARQUHARSON, THE MANAGEMENT OF
Project Paper no.14	AGRICULTURE AND FOOD SUPPLIES IN
	GERMANY, 1944-47
Working Paper no.85/159	Pier Paolo D'ATTORRE, ERP AID AND THE
Project Paper no.15	PROBLEMS OF PRODUCTIVITY IN ITALY
	DURING THE 1950S
Working Paper no.85/168	Philippe MIOCHE, LES DIFFICULTES DE LA
Project Paper no.16	MODERNISATION DANS LE CAS DE
	L'INDUSTRIE FRANÇAISE DE LA MACHINE
	OUTIL, 1941-1953
Working Paper no.85/193	Federico ROMERO, POSTWAR RECONVERSION
Project Paper no.17	STRATEGIES OF AMERICAN AND WESTERN
	EUROPEAN LABOR
Working Paper no.85/199	Richard T. GRIFFITHS & Alan S.MILWARD,
Project Paper no.18	THE BEYEN PLAN AND THE EUROPEAN
	POLITICAL COMMUNITY
Working Paper no.86/215	Ruggero RANIERI, ITALY AND THE SCHU-
Project Paper no.19	MAN PLAN NEGOTIATIONS





# **EUI WORKING PAPERS**

EUI Working Papers are published and distributed by the European University Institute, Florence.

Copies can be obtained free of charge -- depending on the availability of stocks -- from:

The Publications Officer  
European University Institute  
Badia Fiesolana  
I-50016 San Domenico di Fiesole(FI)  
Italy

Please use order form overleaf.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE

To :The Publications Officer  
European University Institute  
Badia Fiesolana  
I-50016 San Domenico di Fiesole(FI)  
Italy

From : Name.....  
Address.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

Please send me the following EUI Working Paper(s):

No.:.....  
Author, title:.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

Date:.....

Signature:  
.....





PUBLICATIONS OF THE EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE

EUI WORKING PAPERS

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1: Jacques PELKMANS                            | The European Community and the Newly Industrialized Countries *   |
| 2: Joseph H.H. WEILER                          | Supranationalism Revisited - Retrospective and Prospective. The European Communities After Thirty Years * |
| 3: Aldo RUSTICHINI                             | Seasonality in Eurodollar Interest Rates  |
| 4: Mauro CAPPELLETTI/<br>David GOLAY           | Judicial Review, Transnational and Federal: Impact on Integration   |
| 5: Leonard GLESKE                              | The European Monetary System: Present Situation and Future Prospects *                                    |
| 6: Manfred HINZ                                | Massenkult und Todessymbolik in der national-sozialistischen Architektur *                                |
| 7: Wilhelm BURKLIN                             | The "Greens" and the "New Politics": Goodbye to the Three-Party System? *                                 |
| 8: Athanasios MOULAKIS                         | Unilateralism or the Shadow of Confusion *  |
| 9: Manfred E. STREIT                           | Information Processing in Futures Markets. An Essay on the Adequacy of an Abstraction *                   |
| 10:Kumaraswamy VELUPILLAI                      | When Workers Save and Invest: Some Kaldorian Dynamics *   |
| 11:Kumaraswamy VELUPILLAI                      | A Neo-Cambridge Model of Income Distribution and Unemployment *   |
| 12:Kumaraswamy VELUPILLAI/<br>Guglielmo CHIODI | On Lindahl's Theory of Distribution *   |
| 13:Gunther TEUBNER                             | Reflexive Rationalitaet des Rechts *  |
| 14:Gunther TEUBNER                             | Substantive and Reflexive Elements in Modern Law *  |
| 15:Jens ALBER                                  | Some Causes and Consequences of Social Security Expenditure Development in Western Europe, 1949-1977 *    |

- 16:Ian BUDGE Democratic Party Government: Formation and Functioning in Twenty-One Countries \*
- 17:Hans DAALDER Parties and Political Mobilization: An Initial Mapping \*
- 18:Giuseppe DI PALMA Party Government and Democratic Reproducibility: The Dilemma of New Democracies \*
- 19:Richard S. KATZ Party Government: A Rationalistic Conception \*
- 20:Juerg STEINER Decision Process and Policy Outcome: An Attempt to Conceptualize the Problem at the Cross-National Level \*
- 21:Jens ALBER The Emergence of Welfare Classes in West Germany: Theoretical Perspectives and Empirical Evidence \*
- 22:Don PATINKIN Paul A. Samuelson and Monetary Theory
- 23:Marcello DE CECCO Inflation and Structural Change in the Euro-Dollar Market \*
- 24:Marcello DE CECCO The Vicious/Virtuous Circle Debate in the '20s and the '70s \*
- 25:Manfred E. STREIT Modelling, Managing and Monitoring Futures Trading: Frontiers of Analytical Inquiry \*
- 26:Domenico Mario NUTI Economic Crisis in Eastern Europe - Prospects and Repercussions
- 27:Terence C. DAINTITH Legal Analysis of Economic Policy \*
- 28:Frank C. CASTLES/  
Peter MAIR Left-Right Political Scales: Some Expert Judgements \*
- 29:Karl HOHMANN The Ability of German Political Parties to Resolve the Given Problems: the Situation in 1982 \*
- 30:Max KAASE The Concept of Political Culture: Its Meaning for Comparative Political Research \*

\* :Working Paper out of print



- 31:Klaus TOEPFER  
Possibilities and Limitations of a  
Regional Economic Development Policy  
in the Federal Republic of Germany \*
- 32:Ronald INGLEHART  
The Changing Structure of Political  
Cleavages Among West European Elites  
and Publics \*
- 33:Moshe LISSAK  
Boundaries and Institutional Linkages  
Between Elites: Some Illustrations  
from Civil-Military Elites in Israel \*
- 34:Jean-Paul FITOUSSI  
Modern Macroeconomic Theory: An  
Overview \*
- 35:Richard M. GOODWIN/  
Kumaraswamy VELUPILLAI  
Economic Systems and their Regulation
- 36:Maria MAGUIRE  
The Growth of Income Maintenance  
Expenditure in Ireland, 1951-1979 \*
- 37:G. LOWELL FIELD/  
John HIGLEY  
The States of National Elites and the  
Stability of Political Institutions in  
81 Nations, 1950-1982
- 38:Dietrich HERZOG  
New Protest Elites in the Political  
System of West Berlin: The Eclipse of  
Consensus? \*
- 39:Edward O. LAUMANN/  
David KNOKE  
A Framework for Concatenated Event  
Analysis
- 40:Gwen MOOR/  
Richard D. ALBA  
Class and Prestige Origins in the  
American Elite
- 41:Peter MAIR  
Issue-Dimensions and Party Strategies  
in the Irish republic 1948-1981: The  
Evidence of Manifestos
- 42:Joseph H.H. WEILER  
Israel and the Creation of a Palestine  
State. The Art of the Impossible and  
the Possible \*
- 43:Franz Urban PAPPI  
Boundary Specification and Structural  
Models of Elite Systems: Social  
Circles Revisited
- 44:Thomas GAWRON/  
Ralf ROGOWSKI  
Zur Implementation von  
Gerichtsurteilen. Hypothesen zu den  
Wirkungsbedingungen von Entscheidungen  
des Bundesverfassungsgerichts \*

\* :Working Paper out of print

- 45:Alexis PAULY/  
René DIEDERICH Migrant Workers and Civil Liberties \*
- 46:Alessandra VENTURINI Is the Bargaining Theory Still an  
Effective Framework of Analysis for  
Strike Patterns in Europe? \*
- 47:Richard A. GOODWIN Schumpeter: The Man I Knew \*
- 48:J.P. FITOUSSI/  
Daniel SZPIRO Politique de l'Emploi et Réduction de  
la Durée du Travail
- 49:Bruno DE WITTE Retour à Costa. La Primauté du Droit  
Communautaire à la Lumière du Droit  
International\*
- 50:Massimo A. BENEDETTELLI Eguaglianza e Libera Circolazione dei  
Lavoratori: Principio di Eguaglianza e  
Divieti di Discriminazione nella  
Giurisprudenza Comunitaria in Materia  
di Diritti di Mobilità Territoriale e  
Professionale dei Lavoratori
- 51:Gunther TEUBNER Corporate Responsibility as a Problem  
of Company Constitution \*
- 52:Erich SCHANZE Potentials and Limits of Economic  
Analysis: The Constitution of the Firm
- 53:Maurizio COTTA Career and Recruitment Patterns of  
Italian Legislators. A Contribution of  
the Understanding of a Polarized  
System \*
- 54:Mattei DOGAN How to become a Cabinet Minister in  
Italy: Unwritten Rules of the  
Political Game \*
- 55:Mariano BAENA DEL ALCAZAR/  
Narciso PIZARRO The Structure of the Spanish Power  
Elite 1939-1979 \*
- 56:Berc RUSTEM/  
Kumaraswamy VELUPILLAI Preferences in Policy Optimization and  
Optimal Economic Policy \*
- 57:Giorgio FREDDI Bureaucratic Rationalities and the  
Prospect for Party Government \*
- 59:Christopher Hill/  
James MAYALL The Sanctions Problem: International  
and European Perspectives \*

\* :Working Paper out of print



- 60:Jean-Paul FITOUSSI            Adjusting to Competitive Depression.  
The Case of the Reduction in Working  
Time
- 61:Philippe LEFORT            Idéologie et Morale Bourgeoise de la  
Famille dans le Ménager de Paris et le  
Second Libro di Famiglia, de L.B.  
Alberti \*
- 62:Peter BROCKMEIER           Die Dichter und das Kritisieren
- 63:Hans-Martin PAWLOWSKI       Law and Social Conflict
- 64:Marcello DE CECCO           Italian Monetary Policy in the 1980s \*
- 65:Gianpaolo ROSSINI           Intraindustry Trade in Two Areas: Some  
Aspects of Trade Within and Outside a  
Custom Union
- 66:Wolfgang GEBAUER           Euromarkets and Monetary Control: The  
Deutschemark Case
- 67:Gerd WEINRICH            On the Theory of Effective Demand  
under Stochastic Rationing \*
- 68:Saul ESTRIN/  
Derek C. JONES            The Effects of Worker Participation  
upon Productivity in French Producer  
Cooperatives \*
- 69:Berc RUSTEM  
Kumaraswamy VELUPILLAI       On the Formalization of Political  
Preferences: A Contribution to the  
Frischian Scheme \*
- 70:Werner MAIHOFFER           Politique et Morale \*
- 71:Samuel COHN            Five Centuries of Dying in Siena:  
Comparison with Southern France \*
- 72:Wolfgang GEBAUER           Inflation and Interest: the Fisher  
Theorem Revisited
- 73:Patrick NERHOT            Rationalism and the Modern State \*
- 74:Philippe SCHMITTER        Democratic Theory and Neo-Corporatist  
Practice \*
- 75:Sheila A. CHAPMAN          Eastern Hard Currency Debt 1970-83. An  
Overview \*

- 76:Richard GRIFFITHS Economic Reconstruction Policy in the Netherlands and its International Consequences, May 1945 - March 1951
- 77:Scott NEWTON The 1949 Sterling Crisis and British Policy towards European Integration \*
- 78:Giorgio FODOR Why did Europe need a Marshall Plan in 1947? \*
- 79:Philippe MIOCHE The Origins of the Monnet Plan: How a Transitory Experiment answered to Deep-Rooted Needs \*
- 80:Werner ABELTSHAUSER The Economic Policy of Ludwig Erhard \*
- 81:Helge PHARO The Domestic and International Implications of Norwegian Reconstruction \*
- 82:Heiner R. ADAMSEN Investitionspolitik in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland 1949-1951 \*
- 83:Jean BOUVIER Le Plan Monnet et l'Economie Française 1947-1952 \*
- 84:Mariuccia SALVATI Industrial and Economic Policy in the Italian Reconstruction \*
- 85:William DIEBOLD, Jr. Trade and Payments in Western Europe in Historical Perspective: A Personal View By an Interested Party
- 86:Frances LYNCH French Reconstruction in a European Context \*
- 87:Gunther TEUBNER Verrechtlichung. Begriffe, Merkmale, Grenzen, Auswege \*
- 88:Maria SPINEDI Les Crimes Internationaux de l'Etat dans les Travaux de Codification de la Responsabilité des Etats Entrepris par les Nations Unies \*
- 89:Jelle VISSER Dimensions of Union Growth in Postwar Western Europe \*
- 90:Will BARTLETT Unemployment, Migration and Industrialization in Yugoslavia, 1958-1982

\* :Working Paper out of print



- 91:Wolfgang GEBAUER                      Kondratieff's Long Waves
- 92:Elisabeth DE GHELLINCK/  
Paul A. GEROSKI/  
Alexis JACQUEMIN                      Inter-Industry and Inter-Temporal  
Variations in the Effect of Trade on  
Industry Performance
- 93:Gunther TEUBNER/  
Helmut WILLKE                      Kontext und Autonomie.  
Gesellschaftliche Selbststeuerung  
durch Reflexives Recht \*
- 94:Wolfgang STREECK/  
Philippe C. SCHMITTER                      Community, Market, State- and  
Associations. The Prospective  
Contribution of Interest Governance  
to Social Order \*
- 95:Nigel GRIFFIN                      "Virtue Versus Letters": The Society  
of Jesus 1550-1580 and the Export of  
an Idea
- 96:Andreas KUNZ                      Arbeitsbeziehungen und  
Arbeitskonflikte im oeffentlichen  
Sektor. Deutschland und  
Grossbritannien im Vergleich 1914-1924  
\*
- 97:Wolfgang STREECK                      Neo-Corporatist Industrial Relations  
and the Economic Crisis in West  
Germany \*
- 98:Simon A. HORNER                      The Isle of Man and the Channel  
Islands - A Study of their Status  
under Constitutional, International  
and European Law
- 99:Daniel ROCHE                      Le Monde des Ombres \*
- 84/100:Gunther TEUBNER                      After Legal Instrumentalism? \*
- 84/101:Patrick NERHOT                      Contribution aux Débats sur le Droit  
Subjectif et le Droit Objectif comme  
Sources du Droit \*
- 84/102:Jelle VISSER                      The Position of Central Confederations  
in the National Union Movements
- 84/103:Marcello DE CECCO                      The International Debt Problem in the  
Inter-War Period\*
- 84/104:M. Rainer LEPSIUS                      Sociology in Germany and Austria 1918-  
1945. The Emigration of the Social  
Sciences and its Consequences. The

- 84/105:Derek JONES      Development of Sociology in Germany after the Second World War, 1945-1967
- 84/106:Philippe C. SCHMITTER      The Economic Performances of Producer Cooperations within Command Economies: Evidence for the Case of Poland \*
- 84/107:Marcos BUSER      Neo-Corporatism and the State \*
- 84/108:Frans van WAARDEN      Der Einfluss der Wirtschaftsverbände auf Gesetzgebungsprozesse und das Vollzugswesen im Bereich des Umweltschutzes\*
- 84/109:Ruggero RANIERI      Bureaucracy around the State: Varieties of Collective Self-Regulation in the Dutch Dairy Industry
- 84/110:Peter FARAGO      The Italian Iron and Steel Industry and European Integration
- 84/111:Jean-Paul FITOUSSI/  
Kumuraswamy VELUPILLAI      Nachfragemacht und die kollektiven Reaktionen der Nahrungsmittelindustrie\*
- 84/112:Anna Elisabetta GALEOTTI      A Non-Linear Model of Fluctuations in Output in a Mixed Economy \*
- 84/113:Domenico Mario NUTI      Individualism and Political Theory \*
- 84/114:Saul ESTRIN/Jan SVEJNAR      Mergers and Disequilibrium in Labour-Managed Economies \*
- 84/115:Saul ESTRIN/Jan SVEJNAR      Explanations of Earnings in Yugoslavia: The Capital and Labor Schools Compared
- 84/116:Alan CAWSON/John BALLARD      A Bibliography of Corporatism \*
- 84/117:Reinhard JOHN      On the Weak Axiom of Revealed Preference Without Demand Continuity Assumptions \*
- 84/118:Richard T.GRIFFITHS/  
Frances F.B.LYNCH      The FRITALUX/FINEBEL Negotiations 1949/1950
- 84/119:Richard T.GRIFFITHS/  
Frances F.B.LYNCH      Monopolistic Equilibrium and Involuntary Unemployment \*
- 84/119:Domenico Mario NUTI      Economic and Financial Evaluation of Investment Projects; General

\* :Working Paper out of print



- Principles and E.C. Procedures
- 84/120:Marcello DE CECCO Monetary Theory and Roman History
- 84/121:Marcello DE CECCO International and Transnational Financial Relations
- 84/122:Marcello DE CECCO Modes of Financial Development: American Banking Dynamics and World Financial Crises
- 84/123:Lionello F. PUNZO/  
Kumuraswamy VELUPILLAI Multisectoral Models and Joint Production
- 84/124:John FARQUHARSON The Management of Agriculture and Food Supplies in Germany, 1944-47
- 84/125:Ian HARDEN/Norman LEWIS De-Legalisation in Britain in the 1980s \*
- 84/126:John CABLE Employee Participation and Firm Performance. A Prisoners' Dilemma Framework
- 84/127:Jesper JESPERSEN Financial Model Building and Financial Multipliers of the Danish Economy
- 84/128:Ugo PAGANO Welfare, Productivity and Self-Management \*
- 84/129:Maureen CAIN Beyond Informal Justice
- 85/130:Otfried HOEFFE Political Justice - Outline of a Philosophical Theory
- 85/131:Stuart J. WOOLF Charity and Family Subsistence: Florence in the Early Nineteenth Century \*
- 85/132:Massimo MARCOLIN The Casa d'Industria in Bologna during the Napoleonic Period: Public Relief and Subsistence Strategies \*
- 85/133:Osvaldo RAGGIO Strutture di parentela e controllo delle risorse in un'area di transito: la Val Fontanabuona tra Cinque e Seicento
- 85/134:Renzo SABBATINI Work and Family in a Lucchese Paper-Making Village at the Beginning of the

\* :Working Paper out of print

- Nineteenth Century \*
- 85/135: Sabine JURATIC Solitude féminine et travail des femmes à Paris à la fin du XVIIIème siècle
- 85/136: Laurence FONTAINE Les effets déséquilibrants du colportage sur les structures de famille et les pratiques économiques dans la vallée de l'Oisans, 18e-19e siècles
- 85/137: Christopher JOHNSON Artisans vs. Fabricants: Urban Protoindustrialisation and the Evolution of Work Culture in Lodève and Bédarieux, 1740-1830
- 85/138: Daniela LOMBARDI La demande d'assistance et les réponses des autorités urbaines face à une crise conjoncturelle: Florence 1619-1622 \*
- 85/139: Orstrom MOLLER Financing European Integration: The European Communities and the Proposed European Union. \*
- 85/140: John PINDER Economic and Social Powers of the European Union and the Member States: Subordinate or Coordinate Relationship \*
- 85/141: Vlad CONSTANTINESCO La Repartition des Competences Entre l'Union et les Etats Membres dans le Projet de Traite' Instaurant l'Union Europeenne. \*
- 85/142: Peter BRUECKNER Foreign Affairs Power and Policy in the Draft Treaty Establishing the European Union. \*
- 85/143: Jan DE MEYER Belgium and the Draft Treaty Establishing the European Union. \*
- 85/144: Per LACHMANN The Draft Treaty Establishing the European Union: Constitutional and Political Implications in Denmark. \*
- 85/145: Thijmen KOOPMANS The Judicial System Envisaged in the Draft Treaty. \*



- 85/146:John TEMPLE-LANG           The Draft Treaty Establishing the European Union and the Member States: Ireland \*
- 85/147:Carl Otto LENZ            The Draft Treaty Establishing the European Union: Report on the Federal Republic of Germany \*
- 85/148:David EDWARD/  
Richard MCALLISTER/  
Robert LANE                    The Draft Treaty establishing the European Union: Report on the United Kingdom \*
- 85/149:Joseph J. M. VAN DER VEN   Les droits de l'Homme: leur universalite' en face de la diversite' des civilisations \*
- 85/150:Ralf ROGOWSKI           Meso-Corporatism and Labour Conflict Resolution \*
- 85/151:Jacques GENTON           Problemes Constitutionnels et Politiques poses en France par une eventuelle ratification et mise en oeuvre du projet de Traite d'Union Europeenne \*
- 85/152:Marjanne de KWAASTENIET   Education as a verzuijing phenomenon Public and independent education in the Netherlands
- 85/153:Gianfranco PASQUINO  
and Luciano BARDI            The Institutions and the Process of Decision-Making in the Draft Treaty \*
- 85/154:Joseph WEILER  
and James MODRALL            The Creation of the Union and Its Relation to the EC Treaties \*
- 85/155:François DUCHENE        Beyond the first C.A.P.
- 85/156:Domenico Mario NUTI       Political and Economic Fluctuations in the Socialist System
- 85/157:Gianfranco POGGI        Niklas Luhmann on the Welfare State and its Law \*
- 85/158:Christophe DEISSEBERG    On the Determination of Macroeconomic Policies with Robust Outcome
- 85/159:Pier Paolo D'ATTORRE     ERP Aid and the Problems of Productivity in Italy during the 1950s
- 85/160:Hans-Georg DEGGAU        Ueber einige Voraussetzungen und Folgen der Verrechtlichung

- 85/161:Domenico Mario NUTI            Orwell's Oligarchic Collectivism as an  
Economic System
- 85/162:Will BARTLETT                 Optimal Employment and Investment  
Policies in Self-Financed Produce  
Cooperatives
- 85/163:Terence DAINTITH             The Design and Performance of Long-  
term Contracts \*
- 85/164:Roland BIEBER                 The Institutions and Decision-Making  
Process in the Draft Treaty  
Establishing the European Union \*
- 85/165:Philippe C. SCHMITTER         Speculations about the Prospective  
Demise of Authoritarian Regimes and  
its possible Consequences
- 85/166:Bruno P. F. WANROOIJ         The American 'Model' in the Moral  
Education of Fascist Italy \*
- 85/167:Th. E. ABELTSHAUSER/  
Joern PIPKORN                        Zur Entwicklung des Europaeischen  
Gesellschafts- und Unternehmensrechts
- 85/168:Philippe MIOCHE               Les difficultés de la modernisation  
dans le cas de l'industrie française  
de la machine outil, 1941-1953 \*
- 85/169:Jean GABSZEWICZ  
Paolo Garella                        Assymetric international trade
- 85/170:Jean GABSZEWICZ  
Paolo Garella                        Subjective Price Search and Price  
Competition
- 85/171:Hans-Ulrich THAMER            Work Practices of French Joiners and  
Cabinet-Makers in the Eighteenth  
Century \*
- 85/172:Elfriede REGELSBERGER  
Philippe DE SCHOUTHEETE  
Simon NUTFALL, Geoffrey  
EDWARDS                             The External Relations of European  
Political Cooperation and the Future  
of EPC
- 85/173:Kumaraswamy VELUPILLAI  
Berc RUSTEM                         On rationalizing expectations \*
- 85/174:Leonardo PARRI               Political Exchange in the Italian  
Debate \*



- 85/175:Michela NACCI  
Tra America e Russia: Viaggiatori francesi degli anni trenta \*
- 85/176:J.LOUGHLIN  
The Corsican Statut Particulier: A Response to the Problem Corse\*
- 85/177:Alain DIECKHOFF  
L'Europe Politique et le Conflit Israelo-Arabe \*
- 85/178:Dwight J. JAFFEE  
Term Structure Intermediation by Depository Institutions \*
- 85/179:Gerd WEINRICH  
Price and Wage Dynamics in a Simple Macroeconomic Model with Stochastic Rationing
- 85/180:Domenico Mario NUTI  
Economic Planning in Market Economies: Scope, Instruments, Institutions\*
- 85/181:Will BARTLETT  
Enterprise Investment and Public Consumption in a Self-Managed Economy\*
- 85/182:Alain SUPIOT  
Groupes de Societes et Paradigme de l'Entreprise \*
- 85/183:Susan Senior Nello  
East European Economic Relations: Cooperation Agreements at Government and Firm Level \*
- 85/184:Wolfgang WESSELS  
Alternative Strategies for Institutional Reform \*
- 85/185:Ulrich BAE LZ  
Groups of Companies - the German Approach: "Unternehmen" versus "Konzern" \*
- 85/186:Will BARTLETT and Gerd WEINRICH  
Instability and Indexation in a Labour-managed Economy \*
- 85/187:Jesper JESPERSEN  
Some Reflections on the Longer Term Consequences of a Mounting Public Debt
- 85/188:Jean GABSZE WICZ and Paolo GARELLA  
Scattered Sellers and Ill-informed Buyers: A Model for Price Dispersion
- 85/189:Carlo TRIGILIA  
Small-firm Development, Political Subcultures and Neo-localism in Italy \*
- 85/190:Bernd MARIN  
Generalized Political Exchange. Preliminary Considerations \*

\* :Working Paper out of print

- 85/191:Patrick KENIS Industrial Restructuring  
The Case of the Chemical Fibre  
Industry in Europe \*
- 85/192:Lucia FERRANTE La Sessualita come Ricorsa. Donne  
Davanti al Foro Arcivescovile di  
Bologna (sec. XVII) \*
- 85/193:Federico ROMERO Postwar Reconversion Strategies of  
American and Western European Labor \*
- 85/194:Domenico Mario NUTI The Share Economy:Plausibility and  
Viability of Weitzman's Model \*
- 85/195:Pierre DEHEZ and Wage Indexation and Macroeconomic  
Jean-Paul FITOUSSI Fluctuations
- 85/196:Werner HILDENBRAND A Problem in Demand Aggregation: Per  
Capita Demand as a Function of Per  
Capita expenditure
- 85/197:Thomas RAISER The Theory of Enterprise Law and the  
Harmonization of the Rules on the  
Annual Accounts and on Consolidated  
Accounts in the European Communities\*
- 85/198:Will BARTLETT/  
Milica UVALIC Bibliography on Labour-Managed Firms  
and Employee participation
- 85/199:Richard T. GRIFFITHS The Beyen Plan and the European  
Alan S. MILWARD Political Community
- 85/200:Domenico Mario NUTI Hidden and Repressed Inflation in  
Soviet-type Economies: Definitions,  
Measurements and Stabilisation
- 85/201:Ernesto SCREPANTI A model of the political-economic  
cycle in centrally planned economies
- 85/202:Joseph H.H. WEILER The Evolution of Mechanisms and  
Institutions for a European Foreign  
Policy: Reflections on the Interaction  
of Law and Politics \*
- 85/203:Joseph H.H. WEILER The European Court, National Courts  
and References for Preliminary Rulings  
- The Paradox of Success: A  
Revisionist View of Article 177 EEC. \*
- 86/204:Bruno P. F. WANROOIJ Progress without Change

\* :Working Paper out of print



- The Ambiguities of Modernization in Fascist Italy \*
- 86/205: Antonio MUTTI,  
Nicolò ADDARIO,  
Paolo SEGATTI
- THE ORGANISATION OF BUSINESS INTERESTS  
The Case of the Italian Textile and  
Clothing Industry \*
- 86/206: Volker DEVILLE
- The European Monetary System and the  
European Currency Unit
- 86/207: Gunther TEUBNER
- Gesellschaftsordnung durch  
Gesetzgebungsalarm?  
Autopoietische Geschlossenheit als  
Problem für die Rechtssetzung \*
- 86/208: P. Nikiforos DIAMANDOUROS/  
Pilar RIVILLA/  
Joaquín LOPEZ NOVO/  
Huri TURSAN/  
Philippe C. SCHMITTER
- A Bibliographical Essay on Southern  
Europe and its recent Transition to  
Political Democracy \*
- 86/209: Renaud DEHOUSSE
- E Pluribus Unum?  
Éléments de confédéralisme dans les  
relations extérieures des Etats  
fédéraux
- 86/210: Pauline JACKSON
- Industrialisation and Reproductive  
Rights \*
- 86/211: Gunther TEUBNER
- Hyperzyklus in Recht und  
Organisation: zum Verhältnis von  
Selbstbeobachtung, Selbstkstitution  
und Autoipoiese
- 86/212: Emil CLAASSEN  
and Melvyn KRAUSS
- Budget Deficits and the Exchange Rate
- 86/213: Gunther TEUBNER
- Autoipoiese im Recht:  
Zum Verhältnis von Evolution und  
Steuerung im Rechtssystem
- 86/214: Albert CHILOSI
- The Right to Employment Principle and  
Self-Market Socialism: A Historical  
Account and an Analytical Appraisal of  
some Old Ideas by Alberto Chilosi
- 86/215: Ruggero RANIERI
- Italy and the Schuman Plan  
Negotiations
- 86/216: Diana PINTO
- The Presence of an Absence:

The Ambiguity of the American  
Reference in the French and Italian  
Intellectual Renewal of the Late  
1950's



