

*Hitoshi Suzuki*

## The High Authority of the ECSC, the European Network of Trade Unions and the DGB: Ideas, Strategies and Achievements

### Introduction<sup>1</sup>

In a so-called globalised world, one could not take it for granted that workers in developed countries would support policies of further international competition or regional integration which could, in workers' views, lower the working standards of workers or endanger their employment. It is equally difficult to estimate how and why workers and trade unions had supported European integration after the Second World War ended. When the Schuman Plan was proposed in 1950, European countries were yet to reconstruct themselves and unemployment rate was high elsewhere. How and why would workers support European integration, if few people were able to provide evidence that integration could boost the economy and therefore improve the working and living standards of the workers? This contribution reviews the history of why the German Trade Union Federation (DGB) came to support the Schuman Plan, how they participated and promoted the intergovernmental negotiations in Paris, and how they cooperated for (or halted) the policies of the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC).

Academic works have analysed both the history of European integration<sup>2</sup> and the history of labour movements.<sup>3</sup> Few have, however, bridged the both and analysed how and why

- 1 This chapter is based on my Ph.D. thesis submitted to the European University Institute. Hitoshi Suzuki: *Digging for European Unity. The Role Played by the Trade Unions in the Schuman Plan and the European Coal and Steel Community from a German Perspective 1950–1955*, Ph.D. Thesis, Department of History and Civilization, Florence, December 2007. I thank Wilfried Loth, Alan Milward, Bo Stråth, Colin Crouch, Gérard Bossuat, Marina Bourgain, Pascaline Winand (as supervisor), Robert Hanke and Thomas Fetzner for improving my knowledge on this topic. The usual disclaimer applies.
- 2 For examples of historical research of European integration see Andreas Wilkens (ed.): *Le Plan Schuman dans l'Histoire. Intérêts nationaux et projet européen*, Brussels 2004; Wilfried Loth (ed.): *Die deutsche Frage in der Nachkriegszeit*, Berlin 1994. Dirk Spierenburg/Raymond Poidevin: *The History of the High Authority of the European Coal and Steel Community*, London 1994; Alan Milward/Frances M. B. Lynch/Ruggero Ranieri/Federico Romero/Vibeke Sørensen: *The Frontier of National Sovereignty*, London 1993; Klaus Schwabe (ed.): *Die Anfänge des Schuman-Plans 1950/51*, Baden-Baden 1988; Alan Milward: *The Reconstruction of Western Europe, 1945–51*, London 1984.
- 3 For the history of trade unionism in the post-war era, see for example Denis MacShane: *International Labour and the Origins of the Cold War*, Oxford 1992. MacShane emphasised the role played by the British, French and Dutch trade union leaders in the process of launching the ICFTU, which had previously been understood as an American initiative. For works on American support towards the trade unions in Europe see Anthony Carew: *Labour under the Marshall Plan: the Politics of Productivity and the Marketing of Management Science*, Manchester 1987. For the German case see Michael Fichter: *HICOG and the Unions in West Germany*, in: Jeffrey M. Diefendorf/Alex Frohn/Hermann-Josef Rupieper (eds.): *American Policy and the Reconstruction of West Germany, 1945–1955*, German Historical Institute, Washington DC 1993. For the Italian case see Federico Romero: *The United States and the European Trade Union Movement, 1944–1951*, Chapel Hill 1992.

trade unions have supported European integration since its beginning. German historians Lipgens and Loth were one of the first to carry out historical research about European integration and introduced the affirmative position of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) towards the Schuman Plan.<sup>4</sup> The DGB, which was a member of the ICFTU since its launch in 1949, also supported the Schuman Plan.<sup>5</sup> German historians Thum and Müller went further to analyse German domestic debates by connecting the Schuman Plan, Allied occupation policies in Germany and the German trade unionism idea of *Mitbestimmung* (co-determination).<sup>6</sup> Müller tends to emphasise the German unions' support for socialisation of German coal and steel industry. Her explanation does not, however, agree with Hans Böckler and his unions' solid support for free economy, the Marshall Plan and the Schuman Plan. On the other hand, Thum makes an interesting argument that the debates of the Schuman Plan and the German Federal law of *Mitbestimmungsgesetz* (*Mitbestimmungsgesetz* of 1951 applied to the German coal and steel industry) were combined together: German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer asked the DGB to support the Schuman Plan, and the DGB leaders asked Adenauer for the *Mitbestimmungsgesetz* in exchange. Thum's hypothesis stands on its own, though requires further examination about several points. Why was the DGB satisfied with the *Mitbestimmungsgesetz*, even if the Federal law failed to provide what the unions were seriously campaigning for: parity rights for union representatives in management boards of the coal and steel industry?<sup>7</sup> What made the DGB satisfied instead? Why did DGB's support for the Schuman Plan continued and got strengthened, regardless of the shortcoming of the *Mitbestimmungsgesetz*? I argue that the DGB was satisfied because they aimed to achieve *Mitbestimmung* in the High Authority of the ECSC, and that they were successful in their European campaign.<sup>8</sup> *Mitbestimmung* at the European level helped

- 4 Wilfried Loth: The World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU) and the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU), in: Walter Lipgens/Wilfried Loth (eds.): Documents on the History of European Integration 4, Transnational Organisations of Political Parties and Pressure Groups in the Struggle for European Union, 1945–1950, Berlin/New York 1991.
- 5 This episode was swiftly reviewed by Bühner. Werner Bühner: Les syndicats ouest-allemands et le Plan Schuman, in: Wilkens (eds.): Le Plan Schuman dans l'Histoire, pp. 303–322.
- 6 Gloria Müller: *Mitbestimmung in der Nachkriegszeit*. Britische Besatzungsmacht, Unternehmer, Gewerkschaften, Düsseldorf 1987; Horst Thum: *Mitbestimmung in der Montanindustrie*. Der Mythos vom Sieg der Gewerkschaften, Stuttgart 1982.
- 7 For the debates in Germany concerning *Mitbestimmung* see Klaus Schönhoven/Hermann Weber (eds.): Quellen zur Geschichte der deutschen Gewerkschaftsbewegung im 20. Jahrhundert, Bd. 11: Josef Kaiser: Der Deutsche Gewerkschaftsbund 1949–1956, Köln 1996; Karl Dietrich Bracher/Rudolf Morsey/Hans-Peter Schwarz (eds.): Quellen zur Geschichte des Parlamentarismus und der politischen Parteien. Band 1: Gabriele Müller-List: Montanmitbestimmung, Düsseldorf 1984.
- 8 Suzuki: "Digging for European Unity," pp. 17–28. The archival materials used in this chapter are from the following archives. BA: Bundesarchiv (Federal Archive of Germany), Koblenz, Germany. DGB-Archiv: German Trade Union Federation Archive in the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (Friedrich Ebert Foundation), Bonn, Germany. HAEU: Historical Archives of the European Union, Florence, Italy. IISG: Internationaal Instituut voor Sociale Geschiedenis (International Institute of Social History), Amsterdam, the Netherlands. JMFE: Jean Monnet Foundation for Europe, Lausanne, Switzerland. NARA: National Archives and Record Administration, Maryland, United States; TPL: Truman Presi-

the DGB obtain crucial information about German industry more than at the national level. This made the DGB, at least the leaders, into a solid supporter of European integration.

For the German unions, the Schuman Plan had three crucial aspects. The first was the Plan's proposal of solving the Ruhr problem. The Schuman Plan was the first to propose an effective and pragmatic international plan of delivering coal resource from the Ruhr to other locations in Germany and also to the neighboring European countries, therefore enabling post-war reconstruction. Finding a solution to the Ruhr problem was not only a problem for Germany alone but a *European* problem. The second reason was because the Schuman Plan, besides functioning as a Franco-German reconciliation between the two countries, worked as a Franco-German reconciliation at the trade union level as well. German union leaders were still kept out of international organisations after the Second World War, due to their cooperation for the Nazi occupation in France. German union leaders were welcomed back on equal status, thanks to the friendship between French leader Léon Jouhaux and the German leader Hans Böckler. The third and final reason was specifically a German one. Lobbying the Paris negotiations and participating in the decision-making process of the High Authority agreed with the German trade union idea of *Mitbestimmung*, and in fact the German union leaders viewed their participation as *Mitbestimmung* practiced at the European level. Participation at the European level not only influenced the policies of the ECSC but also provided the DGB with crucial information about the coal and steel industry and therefore strengthened their influence at the national level.

This chapter consists of three sections and a conclusion. The first section reviews the history of the Schuman Plan negotiations. This section shows why the German trade unions, together with the unions of the neighboring countries, decided to support the Schuman Plan. It also shows the initial steps of how the unions built their liaison network at the European level, intended specifically to influence the Paris negotiations. The second section looks into the policies of the ECSC carried out by the High Authority and the role the trade union leaders played in the European decision-making. German union leader Heinz Potthoff and Belgian leader Paul Finet became members of the High Authority, which consisted of nine members, and influenced the coal cartel policy. In the third section we focus on the negotiations which led to the Rome Treaties of 1957 and see how the unions responded to proposals of further integration. The unions found themselves close to Jean Monnet's claims that Euratom should be used to prevent nuclear armament of European countries, though found disagreement in integration of transportation and free movement of labour. It is also remarkable that some sector unions openly spoke against integration during this period.

## The Paris negotiations: From the International Ruhr Authority to the Schuman Plan

Four months before the German Basic Law came into force, the German trade unions launched their national Federation, the DGB, in January 1949. Unions of the American and British occupation zones elected Hans Böckler as their first chairperson. Böckler was a steel worker from Trautskirchen, a young union leader in the steel workers' union and became a prominent leader in Rhineland before Hitler came to power. Böckler and Adenauer were friends as parliamentarians in Cologne. Böckler played an indispensable role in developing German trade unionism in the post-war era,<sup>9</sup> thanks to his strong leadership and also to his "clean" carrier of refusing cooperation for the national socialists.

The DGB under Böckler had to face severe tasks in the immediate post-war period. The DGB's immediate task was to improve living and working standards of German workers. *Mitbestimmung* was the core idea to achieve this task, which would enable the German unions to negotiate and influence any decision, be it at industry level or national policy level, concerning workers' living and working standards. In the immediate post-war era, *Mitbestimmung* was also a political goal to achieve: *Mitbestimmung* was to be embedded into German Federal laws. It was a question of how to end the Allied occupation policies and how the German industry would be organised in the post-war period.

The question of German industry and its post-war order was, however, not only a problem for the Germans alone but also a serious concern of the neighboring European countries. France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg and Italy, which all became the original six members of the ECSC with Germany, required access to the Europe's largest coal supplier in those days: the Ruhr in Rhineland. The Ruhr problem had been a significant factor of causing the First World War, and was still not solved by the Second World War. It required a European solution, so that war among European countries would be made economically unnecessary and politically impossible. It was the Schuman Plan which provided the right answer to this complex question.

How did the German trade union leaders voice themselves in the intergovernmental negotiations of the Schuman Plan? Moreover, how did Germany respond to the Plan? Germany had to regain national sovereignty if it were to reconstruct its national economy, but this required two crucial political deals. The first was to convince the American occupying power that Germany would be firmly integrated into Europe and would never become a threat. The second was a political guarantee for the neighboring European countries, especially France, that those countries would be guaranteed access to coal from the Ruhr and that the German market would be open for their export. Whether the neighboring countries could reconstruct or not was a question of whether Germany would become member of European integration. For the Germans, it was a question of whether Germany could regain its sovereignty and was assured equal status or not. Two Frenchmen were the key to this. The first was Léon Jouhaux, a prominent leader of the French Social Democratic union, the *Force*

9 Karl Lauschke: Hans Böckler. Vol. 2: Gewerkschaftlicher Neubeginn 1945–1951, Frankfurt am Main 2005; Ulrich Borsdorf: Hans Böckler. Arbeit und Leben eines Gewerkschafters 1875–945, Köln 1982.

*Ouvrière* (FO). The second was Jean Monnet, who was the French Planning Commissar. He was the first to propose equal German status in the Schuman Plan which he drafted in early 1950.

Léon Jouhaux was a trade union leader before the Second World War broke out, but was sent to concentration camps under the Nazi occupation in France. Unlike many French in the immediate post-war period, Jouhaux did not expose hatred against the Germans. Instead, he made efforts to nominate German trade unions into the international trade union organisations in the immediate post-war period.<sup>10</sup> Moreover, Jouhaux and Böckler were friends. After German trade unions joining the launch of the ICFTU, efforts of promoting and participating in the Schuman Plan negotiations became a shared task between the FO and the DGB. The Schuman Plan functioned as a Franco-German reconciliation at the trade union level.

Jean Monnet also provided a crucial breakthrough for the German trade unions. Although union leaders were not invited to Monnet's personal and secretive drafting meetings,<sup>11</sup> Monnet's proposal indicated that the unions would be given chances of participating in the European decision-making. The Schuman Plan proposed to place Franco-German (and other countries if they wished to join) production of coal and steel under a common higher authority (which later on became the High Authority of the ECSC), and stated that a pooling of coal and steel production should be achieved.<sup>12</sup> Its aim was to set up a common foundation for economic development by securing modernisation of production and improving its quality. The Plan stated that such accomplishment would contribute to the rising of living standards of workers. The higher authority would consist of independent persons appointed by the governments and be provided *equal* representation *regardless of one's backgrounds* and nationality. The final point was the niche where the trade unions found possibilities of parity participation. If union leaders were provided permanent participation based on equal status, this was an achievement not gained enough at national level. The Schuman Plan was declared by Robert Schuman late in the afternoon of 9 May 1950 in Paris.

## The Paris negotiations and trade unions' network at the European level

Following Schuman's declaration, Adenauer immediately held a press conference and announced his support. He then prepared the German Delegation for the negotiations.<sup>13</sup> The negotiations were to start on 20 June in Paris under the chair of Jean Monnet. Adenauer proposed at the cabinet meeting of 12 May that the German Delegation should be accompanied by two to four representatives from industry and trade unions.<sup>14</sup> The DGB proposed to

10 Georg Reuter's speech in memory of Hans Böckler death, in: DGB Protokoll: außerordentlicher Bundeskongress des deutschen Gewerkschaftsbundes, Essen, 22./23. Juni 1951, pp. 5–11.

11 Jean Monnet: *Memoirs*, Collins, London 1978, pp. 293–298.

12 "Declaration of 9 May 1950" in: Pascal Fontaine: *Jean Monnet. A grand design for Europe*, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg 1988, pp. 44–46.

13 Hans-Peter Schwarz: *Konrad Adenauer*, Oxford 1995, p. 515.

14 Kabinettsprotokolle 2, 1950, p. 381, p. 390.

Adenauer on 12 June that they would recommend Hans vom Hoff, Franz Grosse, Ludwig Rosenberg and Kuno Brandel.<sup>15</sup> Vom Hoff and Rosenberg were Federal executives of the DGB. Vom Hoff was in charge of economic policies and Rosenberg of foreign relations. Grosse was an academic working for the coalminers' union (IG Bergbau), and Brandel was a leader of the steel workers' union (IG Metall). Adenauer chose Hans vom Hoff.<sup>16</sup> Another DGB academic member, Rolf Wagenführ, also joined the Delegation in June 1950.<sup>17</sup> On 15 June, Adenauer met Walter Hallstein for the first time. Hallstein was a lawyer working for the Frankfurt University. Adenauer, receiving an excellent impression of Hallstein, immediately named him as the leader of the German Delegation.<sup>18</sup> The German Delegation was sent to Paris on 20 June.

The DGB, thanks to Adenauer's proposal, successfully sent their attaché to the Paris negotiations. Hans vom Hoff participated in the negotiations together with Franz Grosse.<sup>19</sup> It was mainly vom Hoff who reported the proceedings of the negotiations to the Federal executive meetings of the DGB. The DGB collected information of the Schuman Plan negotiations independently from the SPD.<sup>20</sup> Hans vom Hoff reported the first proceedings of the Paris negotiations at the Federal executive meeting of the DGB on 18 and 19 July, shortly after the first meetings in Paris had ended.<sup>21</sup> He positively approved of the atmosphere in Paris. Vom Hoff reported that the political meaning of the Schuman Plan was to make warfare impossible, and that the economic meaning was to unify coal and steel industry with the goal of achieving full-employment by raising the purchasing power of the workers. Vom Hoff criticised, however, the attitudes of the ICFTU and the trade unions of the other participating countries for not sending their attaché to Paris.<sup>22</sup>

The initial argument inside the DGB was whether or not to further commit themselves to the Schuman Plan negotiations. It soon became clear that the German union leaders feared that their absence from the negotiations would lead to giving the industrialists a free-hand in economic issues. DGB leaders agreed that the German unions should continue their participation in the negotiations, and that they should be informed of the proceedings. If the unions were absent from the negotiations, they would fall into the same situation as they did

15 Kaiser: *Der Deutsche Gewerkschaftsbund 1949–1956*, Dokument 10, 18./19.7.1950, p. 77.

16 Schwarz: Konrad Adenauer, p. 515.

17 The DGB was asked to send specialists, besides sending their Federal executives. Letter from Herbert Blankenhorn to Hans Böckler, in: DGB-Archiv, Best. 21.1, 99, 19.6.1950. The DGB proposed Heinz Porthoff, Heinrich Deist, Hans Korsch and Rolf Wagenführ. Letter from Hans Böckler to Konrad Adenauer, in: DGB-Archiv, Best. 21.1, 99, 23.6.1950.

18 Schwarz: Konrad Adenauer, p. 515.

19 Kaiser: *Der Deutsche Gewerkschaftsbund 1949–1956*, Dokument 10, 18./19.7.1950, p. 77; Kabinettsprotokolle 2, 1950, p. 463.

20 The SPD under Kurt Schumacher was against the Schuman Plan. If the DGB were to support the Schuman Plan, it had to make its own efforts independently.

21 DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 438, 17./18.7.1950, Sitzung des Bundesausschusses.

22 Léon Jouhaux from the FO was consulted by the French national Delegation, though was not included as a regular member. See Monnet, *Memoirs*, pp. 322–323.

under the Hitler regime, when trade unions were not able to halt Hitler's rearmament policies and the Ruhr industry's cooperation to such.

Because the German unions were the only regular participants of the Paris negotiations, the unions of the other countries had to coordinate efforts at the European level in order to monitor and influence the negotiations. The response of European member unions of the ICFTU was declared at the Executive Board meeting held in May 1950.<sup>23</sup> The ICFTU declared its full support for the Schuman Plan at the Economic Committee of the United Nations on 12 June 1950.<sup>24</sup> The unions of the six European countries defined their common position to support the Schuman Plan at the European Regional Office (ERO) of the ICFTU. The unions agreed that they must actively participate in the decision-making of the future ECSC, and that they would make joint efforts to convince Monnet of their participation.<sup>25</sup> An executive meeting of the ICFTU was held from 9 to 11 November 1950,<sup>26</sup> where the unions agreed upon four points concerning the Paris negotiations. The first was that the trade unions would continue sending its members into the government Delegates in order to influence the Paris negotiation. The second was to send an ICFTU delegate into the future ECSC institution. The third was that the Secretary Generals of the ICFTU would prepare the list of candidates to be sent into the High Authority of the ECSC. The fourth was that all representatives from international trade union organisations should be elected according to the number of membership of each union. This meant that the German unions would be able to represent themselves most among the six countries.

The DGB was not, however, fully convinced by the Schuman Plan. Hans vom Hoff stated in September 1950 that the future economic difficulties of the Schuman Plan, especially the costs which Germany would have to pay, was not discussed enough in Paris.<sup>27</sup> While he was with the political idea of the Schuman Plan, vom Hoff was concerned with the rise of coal prices in Germany after the ECSC entered into operation. The economic cost for Germany to join the ECSC was calculated as too high. Hans Böckler, who was most keen on supporting the Schuman Plan, stressed that the interest of the German unions must be secured through approval of European ideas.<sup>28</sup> Vom Hoff carefully added a remark and stressed that the new European institution should not be realised by the cost paid by the Germans alone. Vom Hoff's obvious concern was overall price increase (or inflation) in Germany caused by price increase of coal. He was trying to avoid this problem by his direct

23 Loth: WFTU and ICFTU, pp. 566–568.

24 JMFE, AMG 1/5/6.

25 Report by Hans vom Hoff to members of the Bundesausschuss of the DGB, in, DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 438, 26./27.9.1950, Sitzung des Bundesausschusses.

26 The report was prepared by Gust de Muynck, a Belgium trade union leader and the Under Secretary General of the ICFTU. Report of the ERO meeting of the ICFTU held in Brussels from 29 to 31 January 1951, in, DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 60, 29.–31.1.1951.

27 Interview answered by Hans vom Hoff in Paris, in, DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 438, 26./27.9.1950, Sitzung des Bundesausschusses.

28 DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 438, 26./27.9.1950, Sitzung des Bundesausschusses.

participation in the Paris negotiations. Decisions made at the European level were never to threaten the living standards of German workers.

Another concern of the German unions was the anti-cartel rules of the Schuman Plan. Robert Bowie, who was John McCloy's special adviser in occupied Germany, prepared the articles of the Schuman Plan.<sup>29</sup> Similar American laws were the model. Due to American fear that the Schuman Plan would function as an international cartel of European heavy industry,<sup>30</sup> Monnet had to reinforce the anti-cartel tone of his draft: Pierre Uri, a French economist who became Monnet's advisor, added a new sentence to the draft in response to Dean Acheson's anxiety:<sup>31</sup> "The proposed organisation is in every respect the very opposite of a cartel – in its aims, its methods, and its leadership."

The Schuman Plan was to become a European anti-cartel law, but this was exactly what the trade unions feared. Prices and supply of coal in Germany and Belgium were controlled by cartels, and this sustained price stability and regular supply of coal. If coal cartels were to be suddenly abolished, marginal coalmines would have to face rationalisation and be closed down. This would result in coalminers being unemployed in massive numbers, because each coalmine employed thousands of workers. The unions were therefore against anti-cartel articles of the Schuman Plan.

### What was agreed in Paris

In December 1950, the Schuman Plan negotiations entered into the most difficult debates concerning decartelisation of German heavy industry: the coal sales organisation, the *Deutscher Kohlen-Verkauf* (DKV) and its abolition was in question. DGB leaders were disappointed with the fact that Germany was forced to admit decartelisation. The coal cartels were seen as a stabiliser, not only for the German coal industry but for the whole German economy, and most of all for the employment of coalminers. It was the view of German union leaders that without the DKV, the German coal economy could not ease the social tension.<sup>32</sup>

Contrary to the views of the unions, John McCloy, the American Allied High Commissioner in Germany, warned the DGB leaders that the German coal cartels should be dismantled, because the French steel cartels were also scheduled to be decartelised. The German unions argued back that the French and German organisations in question were two different issues, and that the DKV was a private organisation playing a more public role than the French organisations, functioning in the wider interest of the overall German economy.

McCloy promised the German unions to discuss the issue with Monnet, but the result did not change. Monnet refused to include the admission of cartels into the Treaty but

29 Duchêne: Jean Monnet, pp. 213–215; Monnet: Memoirs, pp. 352–353.

30 Dean Acheson, the US Secretary of State, first read the draft of the Schuman Plan on 7 May in Paris before the declaration and suspected that it would become a gigantic coal and steel cartel. Dean Acheson: Present at the Creation, Hamish Hamilton, London 1969, pp. 382–384.

31 Monnet: Memoirs, pp. 301–302.

32 DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 528, 11./12.3.1951, Sitzung des Bundesvorstandes.



merely admitted a transition period of decartelisation. The DGB leaders saw this method meaningless, because the DKV would face decentralisation after the transition period had ended. The DGB changed tactics and turned to persuade Adenauer instead. Hans vom Hoff, together with Walter Freitag (IG Metall) and Heinrich Imig (IG Bergbau), met Adenauer and stressed that the unions were against Monnet and McCloy in the issue. Vom Hoff made it clear that whether the German unions stood for or against the Schuman Plan would first of all depend on decartelisation. Considering the social consequence of decartelisation, which was the sudden massive unemployment of the coalminers, decartelisation of the DKV was not acceptable. This view was firmly backed up by August Schmidt, the Chairperson of the IG Bergbau, stating that the IG Bergbau could not support the Schuman Plan, should the Treaty article of decartelisation remained.<sup>33</sup> The IG Bergbau also sent its appeals to the American coal miners' union, who went to lobby the State Department.<sup>34</sup> They expected that the State Department would persuade McCloy to listen to the German unions. The American High Commission's attitude relatively eased. McCloy stated that the abolishment of the DKV would be suspended, given that the new coal distribution system would not function effectively. McCloy, however, was not satisfied with the compromise he made with the German unions and bitterly criticised the attitudes of August Schmidt and Hans vom Hoff.<sup>35</sup>

The debate on decartelisation held in Paris were concluded by McCloy forcing Adenauer to admit decartelisation in early March 1951, using his power as Allied Commissioner.<sup>36</sup> Historical evidence indicates a somewhat different story, however. The article of the Paris Treaty ended up in providing the High Authority with little definition of what power it had in the issue and how the cartels would be abolished. Thanks to trade unions' lobbying, the cartel issue and concrete details of the policy were to be decided only after the ECSC started its operation. The High Authority would make a decision after it consulted the Consultative Committee of the ECSC, which later on became today's Economic and Social Committee (ECOSOC) of the EU. The trade unions were to be represented in the Consultative Committee, and therefore would be able to influence the decisions before the High Authority draw a conclusion. If a consensus was not reached at the Consultative Committee, the High Authority would not adopt a policy but search for alternatives or compromises. The Paris Treaty was signed by the six governments on 18 April 1951 in Paris.

33 DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 528, 11./12.3.1951, Sitzung des Bundesvorstandes.

34 DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 528, 7.5.1951, Sitzung des Bundesvorstandes.

35 Letter from McCloy to Adenauer on 27 August 1951, in, DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 528, 7.5.1951, Sitzung des Bundesvorstandes.

36 John Gillingham: *Coal, Steel, and the Rebirth of Europe, 1945–1955*, Cambridge University Press, New York 1991, pp. 274–280. For Adenauer's response, see, JMFE, AMG 13/27/10; Gillingham: *Coal, Steel and Rebirth*, p. 280.

## The ECSC in operation

The DGB adopted a resolution concerning the Paris Treaty on 7 May 1951, showing their support for ratifying the Treaty with reservations. The resolution was prepared by Hans vom Hoff.<sup>37</sup> Pessimism and hesitation against European integration, however, had existed among the DGB leaders. Such view came from the understanding that the Schuman Plan would bring about unemployment and poverty to the Ruhr.<sup>38</sup> The unions would be blamed for their responsibility of cooperating for the Schuman Plan. What was more, if the living standards in the Ruhr were to drop, it would provide the possibility for the communists to win support among the German workers.<sup>39</sup>

## Ratifying the Paris Treaty

There was also difference in opinion among the pro-European leaders. Franz Grosse, an IG Bergbau academic, proposed an international control of the Ruhr and called for a European wide socialisation of the coal industry.<sup>40</sup> There was a split among the pro-Europeans in how the industry should be organised under the new European institution. Majority of the DGB leaders saw that there was no other solution other than the Schuman Plan which would enable Germany to stay in the international free economy. If the German trade unions did not cooperate, the Allied regulations and restrictions against German economy would remain, and this would further prevent Germany from reconstruction.<sup>41</sup> Therefore the resolution stated that the DGB was for the Schuman Plan, though under certain conditions. Amongst the conditions was to abolish the Allied regulations before Germany ratified the Paris Treaty. Accordingly, the new European institution should adjust and regulate the coal demand in a way which would fulfill the demands of German economy.<sup>42</sup> Furthermore, regulations of steel production should be abolished so that German economic reconstruction would be guaranteed. Given that the rise of German production and living standards were taken into account, the DGB would support the Treaty. A sentence stating that the trade unions would not intervene into the Bundestag debates was deleted from the resolution draft and was adopted by only one vote against. The German unions stressed that their demands were partly not fulfilled by the Schuman Plan, and therefore they should influence the policy of the ECSC, making efforts to expand their representation. The unions also

37 DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 438, 7.5.1951, Sitzung des Bundesausschusses; JMFE, AMH 6/3/66.

38 DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 528, 7.5.1951, Sitzung des Bundesvorstandes.

39 This concern was showed more by the American occupying power, criticising the DGB leaders for underestimating the growing influence of the communists in Germany. HICOG Staff Conference of August 8, 1950 and October 31, 1950, File 250/68/10/2, Extracts from HICOG Staff Conference Meetings, Office Executive Secretary, Records of the Office of the U.S. High Commissioner, Record Group 466, NARA.

40 Westfälische Rundschau, 30 March 1951; JMFE, AMG 20/7/14.

41 DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 438, 7.5.1951, Sitzung des Bundesausschusses.

42 JMFE, AMH 6/3/66.

decided that demanding wage increase was not possible for the time being because it was sensible for coal production.

For the DGB, another issue had entered into its highly crucial phase. The Bundestag passed the *Mitbestimmungsgesetz* by majority on 10 April 1951, merely a week before the Paris Treaty was signed. Thanks to this Federal law, the German unions achieved a nearly parity participation right in the management boards of the German coal and steel industry. This meant that the German unions could voice themselves whenever decisions concerning social issues, be it wage increase, closure of factories or personnel management, were to be made. The DGB was fortunate enough to enjoy a double win, achieving both the *Mitbestimmungsgesetz* and the Paris Treaty in April 1951. DGB's charismatic Chairperson, Hans Böckler, had died in February 1951, and the DGB was in confusion without a leader and reduced its direct influence towards Adenauer. Because the *Mitbestimmungsgesetz* failed to provide exact parity for the German unions, and also because the union leaders of the chemical industry and Federal railway were critical against the lack of efforts of the DGB leaders in their overall *Mitbestimmung* campaign, the leaders had to *decide to see* their achievement of 1951 as a success.<sup>43</sup> Satisfaction of the overall unions had to be supplemented by other achievements both at the European level and domestic level: the Paris Treaty had to be ratified in the Bundestag, trade union members were to be nominated for the ECSC institutions, and the German domestic law of *Mitbestimmung* for sectors other than coal and steel had to be achieved.

The DGB's role played in the ratification debates were a modest and pragmatic one. Because the SPD was against Adenauer's ratification bill and submitted its own bill to the Bundestag,<sup>44</sup> the DGB leaders kept away from political debates. Moreover, the DGB had to take care of their workers' strikes in which farmers in Hessen went on in late August 1951. The metal workers in Frankfurt, Hanau, Offenbach, Darmstadt,<sup>45</sup> Kassel, and the Opel plant in Rüsselsheim also went on strikes in the following September. Economic conditions in Germany were getting from bad to worse,<sup>46</sup> which could have given a negative impact to the ratification debates. Nearly 10 % of German workers were unemployed, and the International Ruhr Authority was hindering coal supply in Germany. Germany was forced to export German coal, while also being forced to import coal from foreign countries by more expensive prices than German coal. Germany was obliged to import 40 % of bread grains and 50 % of sugar. The shortage of food supply was mainly due to Germany loosing agricultural lands in the East after the war,<sup>47</sup> and was also a consequence of Allied occupation rules which kept

43 DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 438, 16.4.1951, Sitzung des Bundesausschusses.

44 PA, BD I 294 A, Drucksache Nr. 2401, Entwurf eines Gesetzes betreffend den Vertrag über die Gründung der Europäischen Gemeinschaft für Kohle und Stahl vom 18. April 1951, 29. Juni 1951; PA, BD I 294 A, Drucksache Nr. 2484, Antrag der Fraktion der SPD betr. Fortgang der Beratungen über den Gesetzesentwurf betreffend den Vertrag über die Gründung der Europäischen Gemeinschaft für Kohle und Stahl, Ollenhauer und Fraktion, 10. Juli 1951.

45 Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, 21. August 1951; Kabinettsprotokolle 4, 1951, p. 624.

46 Memorandum of conversation between Dean Acheson and Ludwig Erhard, 5 July 1951, Papers of Dean Acheson, MC, TPL.

47 Ibid.

German consumption under the levels of European neighboring countries, with the exception of Britain and the Soviet Union, in order to utilise materials for improving the living standards of other European countries.<sup>48</sup> There was no time to lose for Germany to ratify the Paris Treaty and enter into immediate reconstruction.

The first session was held in the Bundestag on 12 July 1951. The ratification bills were sent to the Committees of the Bundestag: the Committee of Economy and the Committee of Foreign Relations and Occupation Status. Rolf Wagenführ from the DGB participated in the sessions of the Committee of Economy.<sup>49</sup> The Committee discussed the issues of cartels and the transition period methods, in which Wagenführ contributed by providing statistic calculation of the gains and losses of Germany in the future ECSC. He concluded that forbidding the combined ownership of coalmines and steel firms would almost mean discrimination against Germany.<sup>50</sup> Wagenführ also contributed to the debate on harmonising wages,<sup>51</sup> in which he re-stated the DGB's view that harmonisation, which would have meant too rapid a wage increase in Germany, was technically impossible. He emphasised that the production cost in Germany should be kept relatively lower than other countries, and that benefits of social policies should come from expanding demand. In order not to reveal the split between the DGB and the SPD, however, Wagenführ kept away from political statements and contributed from purely technical views.<sup>52</sup> He quietly picked up the materials and information and carried them back to the DGB.

Apart from DGB's pragmatic attitude, the SPD insisted on the French occupation of the Saar and criticised Adenauer that he had given way to French power politics.<sup>53</sup> The SPD also raised arguments that the German text of the Treaty had serious mistranslation, and that only the French text was available when the Treaty was discussed in the Bundestag Committees.<sup>54</sup> Concerning socialisation and ownership of the firms, the French Treaty text read that the Treaty would not influence the ownership of the firms, though the German text almost read as if it would. The SPD cited the debates in the French parliament, in which the French openly stated, "there is only one binding text, and that is the French text," which continued, "and therefore we have a great advantage that the French ideas and interpretation would become the standard." Adenauer's cabinet did apologise that there was not enough time to prepare an official German translation of the Treaty in time, and that the translation was somehow inadequate. The SPD's argument was, however, merely picking on technical errors

48 "Directive to Commander in Chief of US Forces of Occupation regarding the Military Government of Germany," 10 May 1945, US Policy in Occupied Germany, B File, TPL.

49 PA, BD I 294 A, Protokoll Nr. 91, BT-13, Ausschuss, 4. September 1951.

50 PA, BD I 294 A, Protokoll Nr. 93, BT-13, Ausschuss, 6. September 1951.

51 PA, BD I 294 A, Protokoll Nr. 94, BT-13, Ausschuss, 7. September 1951.

52 PA, BD I 294 A, Protokoll Nr. 92, BT-13, Ausschuss, 5. September 1951.

53 Schoettle (SPD) referred to the debates in the French Parliament and put it as "the British used to say 'god and my cotton,' while the French are saying 'Europe and my coal' in the Parliament." The SPD criticised that the French were merely interested in purchasing German coal as cheap as possible and that the debate was not a European one. PA, BD I 294 A, Deutscher Bundestag, 183. Sitzung, Bonn, 10. Januar 1952.

54 Speech by Kreyszig (SPD). Ibid.

and failed to provide a concrete alternative of European integration. The communist party went far as to claim that Adenauer's cabinet and the DGB were a "coalition" and that Adenauer "sold the Saar" for the Schuman Plan.<sup>55</sup> It did not have an impact on the votes.

On 11 January 1952, the Bundestag passed the ratification bill of the Paris Treaty. Jean Monnet regarded the day as a victory for the Schuman Plan and sent a telegram to Adenauer, stating "the Community is born: long live Europe."<sup>56</sup> In the triumphant success, Monnet regarded the German trade unions as providing one of the greatest opportunities for the Schuman Plan and for the future of European unity.<sup>57</sup> Three months later, the French Parliament also ratified the Paris Treaty on 1 April, and therefore all the six countries had ratified the Treaty.

### Trade union members in the High Authority

Already in early 1951, the trade unions of the six countries have decided on the numbers of trade union members to be sent into the ECSC institutions. The International Federation of Christian Trade Unions (IFCTU) proposed to the ICFTU that the both organisations should coordinate efforts and hold a joint conference.<sup>58</sup> IFCTU's aim was to reach an agreement with the ICFTU in order to enable their members to participate in the ECSC institutions.

Joint meetings between the ICFTU and the IFCTU were held on 28 December 1950 and 4 January 1951.<sup>59</sup> During the meetings, both organisations agreed upon their burden sharing: the ICFTU would send its members to the High Authority of the ECSC, while the IFCTU would send its member to the Court.<sup>60</sup> The ICFTU was to consult the IFCTU before it officially declared its candidates to be sent to the High Authority. This was to make the candidacy a joint proposal from the ICFTU and the IFCTU. It was also decided that the 15 seats provided for the trade unions in the Consultative Committee would be divided among the two: ICFTU would send 11 members and the IFCTU send 4 members.

At the ERO meeting held from 29 to 31 January 1951, the unions decided that the ICFTU would propose a list of candidates of its members to be sent to the European institutions, and the governments of the six countries would name its national Delegates from the list. The unions won the right to name one person from the ICFTU as a member of the High Authority. The Belgian leader Paul Finet was later on named, while Heinz Potthoff from the DGB was also named by the Federal government as one of the two German members.

Nomination of the first German member was discussed by Adenauer's cabinet at a cabinet meeting held on 16 June 1952. The members came to an agreement to name Franz Etzel

55 PA, BD I 294 A, Deutscher Bundestag, 183. Sitzung, Bonn, 10. Januar 1952; PA, BD I 294 A, Deutscher Bundestag, 184. Sitzung, Bonn, 11. Januar 1952.

56 Monnet: *Memoirs*, p. 364.

57 *Ibid.*

58 Letter from the IFCTU to the ICFTU, 2 December 1950, in, DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.I, 60, 29.–31.1.1951.

59 DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.I, 60, 29.–31.1.1951.

60 *Ibid.*

as the first Delegate to the High Authority. He was the cabinet attaché sent to the Paris negotiations and was the Chair of the Bundestag Committee of Economy discussing the Paris Treaty. There were few objections among the cabinet members. Etzel had close ties with industrialists in the Ruhr and mostly spoke in the interest of them.

Adenauer's intention to name one of the two German members from the DGB was first reported as early as 7 May 1951 to the DGB,<sup>61</sup> shortly before the ratification debate started in the Bundestag. Twelve days after the ratification of the Paris Treaty, the DGB decided on 23. January 1952 to recommend Heinrich Deist, a member of the IG Metall.<sup>62</sup> A portion of members of the IG Bergbau showed a move to recommend its own member, Franz Grosse, to Adenauer independently from the DGB's decision,<sup>63</sup> but failed. The DGB recommended Deist to Adenauer on 29 April.<sup>64</sup> Adenauer did accept the recommendation, but with hesitation. The cabinet members also claimed that Deist had had relations with the Nazi regime since 1937.<sup>65</sup> Adenauer decided to make Robert Schuman, the French Foreign Minister, refuse the DGB's recommendation. Schuman did.<sup>66</sup> At the end, Deist himself resigned from candidate.<sup>67</sup>

But the DGB was not duped. The DGB continued to insist on recommending Heinrich Deist and took a resolution once more.<sup>68</sup> The DGB leaders sharply criticised Adenauer for using foreign pressures as an excuse to reject the DGB's formal recommendation. There was, however, not enough time left.<sup>69</sup> If the DGB failed to propose a suitable candidate, the cabinet would no longer consider trade union participation, and the DGB would lose their chance of sending someone into the High Authority. Moreover, the DGB leaders were not against sending Heinz Potthoff to the High Authority as much as the SPD was.<sup>70</sup> Potthoff had a carrier in the International Ruhr Authority. The Ruhr Authority was to expire once the ECSC had been launched, and therefore Potthoff was to resign his post and participate in any possible post in the ECSC. Furthermore, Potthoff's idea about European integration and cartel issue agreed with the majority of the DGB leaders. Potthoff saw the cartel issues in terms of securing employment of the workers. He saw the cartels in the inter-war period as harmful, because it had stopped the flow of goods and capitals and caused stagnation.

61 DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 528, 7.5.1951, Sitzung des Bundesvorstandes.

62 DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 439, 23.1.1952, Sitzung des Bundesausschusses.

63 Letter from the Deutsche Kohlenbergbau-Leitung to Konrad Adenauer, BA, B 136/1243, 10. April 1952, Bundeskanzleramt.

64 Letter from the Bundesvorstand of the DGB to Konrad Adenauer, 29. April 1952, BA, B 136/1243, Bundeskanzleramt.

65 BA, B 136/1243, Bundeskanzleramt; DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 528, 30.7.1952, Sitzung des Bundesvorstandes.

66 Letter from Konrad Adenauer to Christian Fette, 25 July 1952. BA, B 136/1243, Bundeskanzleramt.

67 BA, B 136/1243, Bundeskanzleramt.

68 DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 528, 30.7.1952, Sitzung des Bundesvorstandes.

69 Ibid.

70 The SPD showed its hostility on the nomination of Heinz Potthoff, indirectly showing its preference of supporting Deist. They suspected that Adenauer chose Potthoff instead of Deist. Kaiser: *Der Deutsche Gewerkschaftsbund 1949–1956*, Dokument 50, 30.7.1952, pp. 360–362.

Such protectionist approach would keep the welfare of the workers in poor condition. On the other hand, what Potthoff considered desirable was that the flow of goods and capitals be promoted by an international framework, and as a consequence trade would boom inside Europe.<sup>71</sup> Cartels which would increase trade but sustain its current employment could be admitted by the unions, as long as *Mitbestimmung* was respected in decision-making. Once massive unemployment was to rise in one of the key energy sectors, the confusion would expand to all the other sectors in Germany.<sup>72</sup>

As the Chairperson of the IG Metall, Walter Freitag voiced his support for Heinz Potthoff. He proposed that the IG Metall would publish their support for Potthoff in order to counter SPD's suspicion against him. The DGB leaders reached a consensus on recommending Potthoff to the cabinet. Shortly after Franz Etzel was officially named in the Bundestag on 16 July, Potthoff was also named as the German member in the High Authority. The ICFTU and the IFCTU also declared on 17. July that they would send Paul Finet to the High Authority as a trade union member.<sup>73</sup> It was only three weeks after that the High Authority was established in Luxembourg on 10 August 1952 with nine members from the six member states, with Jean Monnet as the first President.

Heinz Potthoff studied economics in Switzerland during the Second World War and was called "the planning department trade unionist." He was sent to the High Authority as a counterpart of Franz Etzel.<sup>74</sup> While Paul Finet kept a modest attitude, Potthoff was more active. He made use of every chance to represent the interests of the trade unions, therefore appearing as a trade unions' spokesman.<sup>75</sup> It must also be noted that Potthoff was not merely a spokesman of the trade unions in the High Authority, but also acted as a spokesman of the High Authority whenever he was back in the trade union meetings. His role to explain the merits of cooperating with the High Authority's policies was crucial for the trade unions in order to understand what the Authority was up to, and for the unions to decide what actions they should take. It was also significant for the High Authority in order to promote trade unions' cooperation towards the Authority, and to gather information about what the trade unions demanded. Potthoff worked for both sides, hence being needed by both sides. His role was best utilised by the unions in the coal cartel issue.

Besides Potthoff's membership, it must be remembered that Hans vom Hoff, the DGB leader who regularly participated in the Paris negotiations, also joined the High Authority as a tenth member in late 1952, thanks to an agreement between Jean Monnet and the DGB.<sup>76</sup> It was remarkable that the trade unions achieved one-third membership in the High Author-

71 Heinz Potthoff, *Vom Besatzungsstaat zur europäischen Gemeinschaft*, Verlag für Literatur und Zeitgeschehen, Hannover, 1964, pp. 28–36.

72 Spierenburg/Poidevin: *History of the High Authority*, p. 96.

73 Letter from the ICFTU and the IFCTU to the Ministers of the Schuman Plan countries, 17. Juli 1952, BA, B 136/1243, Bundeskanzleramt.

74 Spierenburg/Poidevin: *History of the High Authority*, p. 53; Monnet, *Memoirs*, p. 374.

75 Spierenburg/Poidevin: *History of the High Authority*, p. 53.

76 Letter from the IG Bergbau to Heinz Potthoff, DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 2331, 21.10.1952; Letter from Heinz Potthoff to the Bundesvorstand, DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 2331, 17.11.1952..

ity by vom Hoff's membership, which was a symbolic goal for a *Mitbestimmung* campaign. Vom Hoff's status was, however, a special and informal member of the High Authority. Moreover, his membership suffered criticism in Germany and Luxembourg due to his past cooperation for the national socialists. Vom Hoff left his post in 1956, shortly after Jean Monnet resigned his presidency in 1955.

## Coal cartel policy of the ECSC

The High Authority first announced its intentions to dismantle coal cartels in June 1953. The enforcement of the Treaty articles 65 and 66 was mentioned. The most significant issues were the German and Belgian coal sales organisations and the French coal industry under government ownership. In these countries, coal sales, though in different ways, were unified and controlled under organisations. Such business customs conflicted with the idea of the Schuman Plan towards free trade and promotion of competition. The cartels made 60 requests of their activities to be officially authorised by the High Authority,<sup>77</sup> which the High Authority was not able to admit. The High Authority's definition of maximum coal price, however, merely followed that of the cartels.<sup>78</sup> Monnet was hostile against cartels and, at the beginning of his presidency, sought to adopt an active policy to break them up. The first cartel targeted was the *Gemeinschaftsorganisation Rubrikohle* (GEORG) in the Ruhr,<sup>79</sup> which was the successor of the single coal sales cartel, the DKV. The GEORG was the largest coal cartel in the six Member States.

After the High Authority declared its intentions to reform the cartels, Walter Freitag, who had been elected as the Chairperson of the DGB in October 1952, directly wrote to Jean Monnet in order to persuade him to halt the break-up of coal cartels.<sup>80</sup> Freitag requested that Monnet consider the coal matter with more caution, because it deeply concerned the life of German people. He did not claim the issue as solely a problem for German workers, but instead tried to persuade Monnet by placing his claim as representing the German people, because the issue would have impact on the German economy as a whole. The coal industry was one of the core energy sectors.

In his letter, Freitag also requested that the High Authority carry out an inquiry into the relations between production costs and sales prices.<sup>81</sup> He hoped that such research would show that the relatively low wages in Germany were not a consequence of social dumping, and that the coal prices in Germany were at adequate level. The research would show that wages in Germany were kept under a certain level so as not to cause inflation, but that this level was not low enough for being claimed as social dumping. The research would confirm the legitimacy of the German wages by a European authority. Freitag also requested that the

77 Report on the ECSC prepared by Heinz Potthoff, in, DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 529, 8.7.1954.

78 Spierenburg/Poidevin: History of the High Authority, pp. 89–100.

79 Monnet feared the German industrialists affecting French steel production by controlling coke supplies from the Ruhr. Monnet, Memoirs, pp. 350–352.

80 Letter from Walter Freitag to Jean Monnet, DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 91, 4.9.1953; JMFE, AMG 28/4/14.

81 Ibid.



documents of such research be published by respecting the idea of economic democracy. He firmly requested that *Mitbestimmung* be exercised by the European authorities in social issues.

Apart from Freitag's efforts as the DGB's Chairperson, the IG Bergbau also lobbied Monnet directly in coal cartel issues. Monnet and August Schmidt, the Chairperson of the IG Bergbau, already knew each other personally<sup>82</sup> and kept a close relationship in order to discuss the organisation issues of the German coal industry. In such cases, Monnet's letters to Schmidt were usually translated by Heinz Potthoff from French to German.<sup>83</sup> The IG Bergbau rightly used the connection and lobbied Monnet. The IG Bergbau also prepared a report on the history of coal cartels in Germany and aimed to make a European consensus among the unions not to dismantle the coal cartels. Therefore it was highly crucial for the German unions that the European trade union network had developed enough after the High Authority was launched.

On 8 October 1952, the ICFTU member unions in Europe held a meeting and decided that they would launch a liaison office in Luxembourg.<sup>84</sup> On 15 October, the office was located in *rue Dicks* in Luxembourg and was named the *Bureau de Liaison*. The main tasks of the *Bureau* were to keep permanent contact with the High Authority, especially with Paul Finet and Heinz Potthoff. The *Bureau* was in charge of collecting information from the High Authority and other institutions of the ECSC, and also circulating the information to the member unions. The *Bureau* was run by a Luxembourgian trade union leader Antoine Krier, who was bilingual in French and German.<sup>85</sup> Walter Freitag soon evaluated the works of the *Bureau* as fruitful for the German unions.<sup>86</sup>

At the same meeting on 8 October 1952, the trade unions also discussed the issue of how to include a representative from the unions in the Saar.<sup>87</sup> Based on the invitation by the DGB and the IG Metall, a widened trade union committee was prepared in Dortmund on 18 March, at the Hôtel Heidekurg which was owned by the IG Metall.<sup>88</sup> The agenda was to decide how European trade union organisations should expand their memberships and functions. This was how the launch of the Committee of 21 came into debate. It was decided that the new Committee would consist of six representatives from the coalminers' unions in each Member State, six from the steel workers' unions, six from the national Federations,

82 JMFE, AMH 28/4/22.

83 Letter from Jean Monnet to August Schmidt to greet the birthday of Schmidt's wife. JMFE, AMH 28/4/24.

84 DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 72, 15.12.1952, Sitzung des Fünfhnerausschusses, 15. Dezember 1952; IISH, Contact Office of Miners' and Metalworkers' Free Trade Unions in the European Communities Collection 2, Sitzung des Fünfhnerausschusses, 15. Dezember 1952.

85 DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 91, 5.7.1954, Sitzung des Exekutiv-Ausschusses des 21er-Ausschusses.

86 Letter from Walter Freitag to the Bureau de Liaison, DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 72, 3.12.1952.

87 DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 72, 15.12.1952, Sitzung des Fünfhnerausschusses, 15. Dezember 1952; IISH, Contact Office of Miners' and Metalworkers' Free Trade Unions in the European Communities Collection 2, Sitzung des Fünfhnerausschusses, 15. Dezember 1952. After the Committee of 21 was launched, Richard Rauch joined the Committee as the representative of the Saar.

88 Letter from Antoine Krier (Bureau de Liaison) to Walter Freitag, DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 72, 25.2.1953.

and one each from the ICFTU and the Internationals of coal and steel unions.<sup>89</sup> All together, there would be twenty-one representatives in the Committee.

At the enlarged trade union committee held in Dortmund on 18 March 1953, Walter Freitag raised the question of the *Bureau de Liaison*: its budget and the *Bureau's* relations with the Committee of 21.<sup>90</sup> Freitag stressed that the Committee of 21 should replace all the European trade union organisations and stated that the members should be as the same members of the trade union representatives in the Consultative Committee of the ECSC. All participants agreed to this proposal. The Committee of 21 would meet the day before meetings of the Consultative Committee were held, thereby functioning as a preparation meeting for the trade union representatives in the Consultative Committee. The meetings of the Committee of 21 were to be prepared by the *Bureau*, which would contact all participating unions and coordinate the agenda.

The most serious debate of the Committee of 21 was its budget.<sup>91</sup> It was first proposed that the ICFTU, the International Metalworkers' Federation and the Miners' International Federation should each contribute. Freitag opposed this proposal and stressed that the Committee must be run only by the six countries, and not by American, British or Scandinavian money. Krier concurred Freitag's opinion, though the question was not solved at this point. The participants also agreed that the *Bureau de Liaison* must be equipped with further technical research skills, because the High Authority was about to look into implementing Treaty articles 60 and 61 concerning cartels. If the trade unions did not participate in the debates, the industrialists would make the ECSC into their cartel, with a silent approval by the trade unions.<sup>92</sup> This had to be avoided, though employing academics required considerable money. Still, the Committee of 21 decided on 1 December 1953 that they would employ two specialists under the *Bureau de Liaison* and would prepare for the cartel debates.<sup>93</sup> The budget of the *Bureau* was estimated as 4.000.000 Francs, of which three million was to be paid by the Germans, and one million by the Belgians, joined by contributions from the French and the Italian unions. For the Committee of 21, German unions would pay 80.000 Francs, France and the Saar pay 50.000 Francs together, Belgium 40.000 Francs, the Netherlands 30.000 Francs, and Luxembourg 20.000 Francs.<sup>94</sup>

Now that the organisational questions of their European network had been settled, the trade unions entered into concrete debates concerning the High Authority's policies on cartels. André Renard, who was a Belgian union leader and also the head of the trade union representatives to the Consultative Committee, led the debate. Renard proposed a resolution in the Consultative Committee, proposing that the High Authority would not implement

89 Tätigkeitsbericht von 1. Oktober 1952 bis 1. Juni 1954, ERO, ICFTU, DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 95, 28./30.9.1954.

90 DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 72, 14.4.1953, Sitzung des 21er-Ausschusses.

91 DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 91, 20./21.9.1953, Sitzung des 21er-Ausschusses.

92 DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 72, 14.4.1953, Sitzung des 21er-Ausschusses.

93 DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 91, 1.12.1953, Sitzung des 21er-Ausschusses; Letter from Antoine Krier (Bureau de Liaison) to members of the Committee of 21, DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 91, 5.12.1953.

94 DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 91, 31.8.1954, Sitzung des Exekutiv-Ausschusses des 21er-Ausschusses.

the anti-cartel article 60, and tackle the question of production costs instead.<sup>95</sup> The trade union representatives were already notified on 2 December that a committee in charge of article 60 would be launched under the Consultative Committee on 12 December.<sup>96</sup> The trade unions had to unify their opinion at the European level in the cartel issue. Renard obligated his colleagues to agree with the principle of his proposal,<sup>97</sup> which meant that the member unions were forbidden to speak against the existence of coal cartels. From the beginning, the debate viewed the existence of coal cartels as a de facto, and discussed how they should be used for workers' interests in individual cases. As the President of the High Authority, Jean Monnet carefully persuaded the unions that the coal industry was in a phase of decline, and warned that necessary decisions must be taken.<sup>98</sup> He did not forget to show his concerns on the tendency of coal prices going up, which had been a serious concern of the trade unions. The trade unions did start to show signs of compromise that the coal industry should face reform.<sup>99</sup> The High Authority's first decisions on cartels were to be made in September,<sup>100</sup> and therefore the unions had to come up with a consensus at the European level.

The DGB quickly prepared for the cartel debates. In June 1954, Heinz Potthoff prepared a report on the activities of the ECSC,<sup>101</sup> and presented his report at the executive meeting of the DGB on 8 July.<sup>102</sup> He pointed out that the lobbying by the trade unions had been thoroughly successful, and that the dismantlement of cartels would never take place without trade unions' approval. This was because the cartel issue depended on agreements made at the Consultative Committee, and because the High Authority would not decide on a policy contrary to the opinions of the Consultative Committee where the unions were represented. Potthoff, being proud of his achievements, announced that *Mitbestimmung* had now received international recognition.

Closely following Potthoff's advice, the IG Bergbau rightly made use of the opportunity to voice themselves in the European network of trade unions. The IG Bergbau prepared a research report of the German coal cartels and submitted it to the Committee of 21.<sup>103</sup> The

95 Erklärung des Mitgliedes der Arbeitnehmergruppe des Beratenden Ausschusses auf der 7. Tagung des Beratenden Ausschusses am 14. Dezember 1953, DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 91, 14.12.1953.

96 Meeting of trade union representatives to the Consultative Committee, 2 December 1953, DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 91, 2.12.1953.

97 Informationsblatt (Bureau de Liaison), 17. Dezember 1953, DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 91, 17.12.1953.

98 Jean Monnet's speech, IISH, Contact Office of Miners' and Metalworkers' Free Trade Unions in the European Communities Collection 1, Erklärung des Präsidenten Monnet, 18.3.1954.

99 Bericht der Industriegewerkschaft Bergbau an den Ausschuss für Kartelle und Zusammenschlüsse, innerhalb des 21er Ausschusses der Gewerkschaften, DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 91, 28.8.1954.

100 Jean Monnet's speech, IISH, Contact Office of Miners' and Metalworkers' Free Trade Unions in the European Communities Collection 1, Erklärung des Präsidenten Monnet, 18.3.1954.

101 DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 529, 8.7.1954.

102 Walter Freitag wrote to Heinz Potthoff on 21 June 1954 and informed him that the report would be taken to the Bundesvorstand meeting. Letter from Walter Freitag to Heinz Potthoff, DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 2332, 21.6.1954.

103 Bericht der Industriegewerkschaft Bergbau an den Ausschuss für Kartelle und Zusammenschlüsse, innerhalb des 21er Ausschusses der Gewerkschaften, DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 91, 28.8.1954.

aim was to make IG Bergbau's claims clear and precise on opposing the dismantlement of coal cartels. After reviewing the history of German coal cartels since 1893, the report explained the functions and structures of the GEORG. The report stressed that the GEORG was not a cartel controlling the distribution of coal, but was merely controlling the demand of coal. It reviewed the world wide structural change of energy resource, and stressed that the dismantlement of the GEORG must be followed by sufficient compensation by the High Authority. The IG Bergbau did start to admit the reform of the GEORG, though strongly requested that current employment of the German miners must be secured. This was the precondition to admit any form of reform. The report ended with a closing remark that the idea of *Mitbestimmung* should be respected in every process. The IG Bergbau's report was circulated by the *Bureau de Liaison* to the other unions and the international organisations of trade unions.

The trade unions of the six Member States held an international trade union conference organised under the ERO which took place from 28 to 30 September 1954. One of the main issues was coal cartels. The trade unions supported the view of the IG Bergbau and confirmed that unity among its members was necessary.<sup>104</sup> The majority agreed that the cartel issue was the most significant, and that compensation for the coalminers was strongly required for any kind of reform of the cartels. Compensation meant launching an institution which would take over the functions of cartels in order to maintain employment. This would have led to cartels keeping the same operation merely under a different institutional disguise. The executive meeting of the Committee of 21 was held on 20 December 1954 and confirmed the conclusions. The union leaders agreed that cartels could be admitted, although on condition that they accepted participation of trade unions into its decision-making process.<sup>105</sup> The French unions complained that harmonisation of social policy at the European level was not discussed enough at the meeting,<sup>106</sup> indirectly criticising the Germans for dominating the debate. The majority, however, agreed upon the German and Belgian claims, and the executive meeting made a resolution, concluding that there was no difference in opinion between the High Authority and the trade unions concerning cartels.<sup>107</sup>

### Negotiations for Euratom, the Action Committee for the United States of Europe and the trade unions

Exactly five years after the Schuman declaration, Germany joined the NATO on 9 May 1955. Germany regained its full sovereignty, ten years after combat of the Second World War ceased in Europe. Because the limits of partial integration of coal and steel were becoming clear, European integration entered into the next stage of expanding its policy fields. The

104 DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 95, 28./30.9.1954.

105 DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 91, 20.12.1954, Sitzung des Exekutiv-Ausschusses des 21er-Ausschusses.

106 Ibid. On the French views of harmonisation, see Lise Rye Svartvatn: In Quest of Time, Protection and Approval: France and the Claims for Social Harmonization in the European Economic Community, 1955–56, in: *Journal of European Integration History* 1 (2002), pp. 85–102.

107 DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 91, 20.12.1954.

Council of the ECSC Foreign Ministers was held on 1 and 2 June in Messina. The Council took a resolution, and the Spaak Committee was launched on 9 June. The proposals to create a European economic community and a European atomic energy community were studied and prepared by the Committee. Paul-Henri Spaak was the Chair, and Pierre Uri, who was also Monnet's closest advisor, was the main engineer of drafting the new proposal. The Spaak Report was submitted to the Council of Ministers on 21 April 1955, and the intergovernmental negotiations for the Rome Treaties started.

### **Trade unions opposing European integration?**

The trade unions immediately responded to the new initiative. At the World Congress of the ICFTU, member unions agreed that the trade unions should launch a European initiative under the ERO in order to promote further integration. The executive meeting of the ERO decided on 24 June 1955 that the unions would hold an international trade union conference scheduled from 25 to 27 August in Brussels.<sup>108</sup> The aim was to unify the opinions of the unions before the Council of Ministers would discuss the issue on 1 October. The trade unions decided to invite Paul-Henri Spaak, Paul Finet, Heinz Potthoff, Dutch Minister Beyen and other prominent politicians to the international conference.<sup>109</sup> The core issues for the trade unions were the integration of transportation, energy, atomic energy, and the common market.<sup>110</sup>

Trade unions basically agreed to the launch of a common market, though held strong reservations against free movement of labour and integration of transportation. Already in 1952, the two issues had come on the agenda. In the spring of 1953, the High Authority discussed the issue of discrimination of international transportation of coal resources. Discriminatory national train fees were seen as hindering international transportation of coal. At the same time, the High Authority launched a committee in order to study the possibilities of reallocating workers across national borders.<sup>111</sup> The aim of the High Authority was to promote the mobility of workers out from a declining industry into other industry sectors.<sup>112</sup>

The member unions of the Committee of 21 discussed the free movement of workers on 24 January 1954,<sup>113</sup> where Paul Finet and Heinz Potthoff were invited as guests from the High Authority. Finet explained to his colleagues that the High Authority had prepared a working group to study article 69 concerning the free movement of workers. The working

108 Letter from Schevenels (ERO) to the trade unions of the ECSC, the International Metalworkers' Federation and the Miners' International Federation, DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 95, 12.7.1955.

109 Ibid.

110 Ibid.

111 Letter from Paul Finet to Antoine Krier, transferred to the trade unions by the Bureau de Liaison, DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 91, 31.3.1953.

112 High Authority, Second General Report on the Activities of the Community (from 13 April 1953 to 11 April 1954), 11 April 1954.

113 DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 91, 24.1.1954, Sitzung des 21er-Ausschusses.

group had been preparing proposals for the intergovernmental conference scheduled in February 1954. Because the economic boom was on and the national economies needed more workers, the High Authority aimed to promote free movement of trained workers, mostly unemployed Italians who sought jobs in other Member States.

Due to trade unions' fears, however, the immigration of unemployed workers was to be excluded. The unions feared that such unemployed workers would cast a downward pressure on the wages in their countries. In order to exclude unemployed workers, those who were permitted immigration within the ECSC were to be limited to workers who already had sufficient job carrier in the coal and steel industry of their own country. Finet, who was supposed to speak for the High Authority, showed his concerns toward the negative effects that might be caused by the implementation of article 69.

The participants did not agree to Finet's persuasion but more agreed to his concerns about the negative impacts.<sup>114</sup> The fear was that foreigners would grab away employment and cause a lowering of working standards. It was also pointed out that the management side could take advantage of accepting foreign workers in order to cut down current wages of native workers. Finet hurriedly tried to defend the High Authority's policy, explaining that the acceptance of foreign workers would be carried out by respecting the international standards defined by international labour organisations. The unions were still not convinced, however, and stressed that sufficient education, be it vocational, social or overall education, should be provided for the foreign workers. Fears ran high.

Fortunately for the European trade union network, the influential Italian communist trade union was not represented in the network. They were against the Schuman Plan in the early 1950s. Such "absence" in the European trade union network saved the network from falling into a serious split.<sup>115</sup> The consensus among the network members was that immigrants should be kept to a minimum. It was the Italian government, however, who negotiated with the other ECSC Member States to accept Italian workers. Because the other governments accepted, due to shortage of workers during the high rate of economic growth, free movement became a consensus among the governments. The German unions gradually turned down their hesitations and turned to help educate the Italian workers who immigrated to Germany.<sup>116</sup>

What caused further serious debate among the German trade unions was integration of transportation. For the German railway union, integration of transportation was merely unfruitful. The railway union claimed that a sudden drop of railway business income and mass unemployment in the Federal railway would be caused.<sup>117</sup> Furthermore, unions of the

114 Ibid.

115 The Italian Christian unionists were active participants of the network, though were absent from the meetings when the participants discussed the issue of free movement of labour.

116 Hitoshi Suzuki: Trade Unions as an Actor of "Europeanisation" of Workers: welcoming Italian immigrants into Germany and integrating them into German trade unions 1954–1960, paper presented at: Fourth HEIRS Conference, European integration without integration of European societies?, Free University of Brussels, 11 April 2008, Brussels.

117 DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 529, 8.7.1954, Sitzung des Bundesvorstandes.

railway sector, transportation, public officials and the chemical industry had been concentrating on their domestic campaigns in order to achieve a Federal law of parity *Mitbestimmung* in their sectors. The railway union had already been critical against the leaders of the IG Metall and IG Bergbau for not making enough efforts in their *Mitbestimmung* campaign in 1950 and 1951.<sup>118</sup> Too many resources of the DGB, both time and human recourse, had been used solely for the coal and steel sectors. This conflict was one of the factors that caused the change of the DGB's Chairperson in October 1952 from Christian Fette to Walter Freitag, in which the railway union played a crucial role.<sup>119</sup>

Regardless of trade unions' concerns, the High Authority saw integration of transportation highly necessary. After the ECSC's coal and steel market opened, it soon became clear that the transportation of coal was not expanded to its maximum potential. Coal resources from the Ruhr were transferred to the German industry at normal domestic freight rates. It became a problem, however, when the neighboring countries imported the same coal from the Ruhr. In this case, a steel firm outside Germany would have to pay for the domestic German freight rate up to the German border. It would then have to pay another fee in order to transfer the coal inside their country to their firms. In short, foreign firms had to pay two different freight rates, and the High Authority saw this as national discrimination.

Because the issue was a complex one, disagreement among the trade unions also occurred at the European level. The French and Luxembourg unions tended to criticise the German train fee and favoured integration of transportation. The unions barely agreed to state that they were cautious towards the integration of transportation, and that their condition for support was to admit trade unions' participation in the High Authority and the intergovernmental conferences where the issue was negotiated.

Disappointing enough, trade union representatives were not invited to the negotiations. The *Bureau de Liaison* reported to the unions in October 1954 that the High Authority had launched a committee in charge of transportation, without including any trade union specialists.<sup>120</sup> The trade unions therefore had to lobby the national governments in order to include trade union specialists into the committee, and had to decide on possible candidates. The Committee of 21 held a meeting on 19 February 1955,<sup>121</sup> and tried to build a consensus on the transportation issue. The Dutch unions, who were one of the keenest on the issue, stressed for trade union unity in the case of transportation, just as it was the case of coal cartels. The unions found difficulty in unifying their voice this time. Such disagreement led the unions to decide that they should improve their research ability so that the debates could be concluded. It was agreed that the Committee of 21 should take more contact with the transportation workers' International, and that the *Bureau de Liaison* in Luxembourg should

118 See section 1–3 of this chapter.

119 Suzuki, *Digging for European Unity*, pp. 207–215.

120 Report prepared by Antoine Krier on 13 October 1954, in response to requests raised by the Dutch trade unions, DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 72, 13.10.1954.

121 DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 91, 19.2.1955, Sitzung des 21er-Ausschusses.

expand its functions. The industry, on the other hand, already had 17 liaison offices in Luxembourg and suffered no financial difficulties.

### Jean Monnet, the Action Committee and the trade unions

Although showing firm unity in the cartel issue, the European network of trade unions was seriously split in the case of free movement of labour and transportation policy. Except for the Italians, majority of the unions were against free movement of workers. In the case of transportation, the Dutch were eager to promote integration, and the French and Luxembourg partially agreed. The network did not, however, decline. It was further unified by a new integration plan which supported the idea of the Euratom.

While the Spaak Committee was in operation, Jean Monnet, who had just resigned from his post as the President of the High Authority of the ECSC, also launched a new initiative. He launched the Action Committee for the United States of Europe on 14 October 1955.<sup>122</sup> The Action Committee was a lobby group for the promotion of European integration, consisting of representatives from democratic political parties and trade union leaders. Monnet's initial priority was to control atomic energy at the European level, using similar frameworks of the ECSC.<sup>123</sup>

The trade unions responded positively to Monnet's new initiative, and prominent union leaders soon became members of his Action Committee. Walter Freitag, Ludwig Rosenberg and Heinrich Sträter joined from the DGB.<sup>124</sup> From the SPD, which had stood against the Schuman Plan a few years previously, Erich Ollenhauer, Willy Brandt and Helmut Schmidt joined the Action Committee. As the previous sections have shown, Freitag's personal connection with Monnet and his participation in the European network of trade unions had taught him that European integration had much to contribute for German trade unionism back home. The Action Committee held its first meeting on 18 January 1956 in Paris and discussed the issues of the Committee's organisation and integration of atomic energy.<sup>125</sup>

The member unions of the Committee of 21 agreed with Monnet's idea that atomic energy should be used only for peaceful purposes, which meant using atomic energy only for economic purposes and not for the production of weapons and missiles, especially in the case of German rearmament.<sup>126</sup> The unions stressed that such control should be exercised at

122 On the Euratom and the Jean Monnet's Action Committee, see, Pascaline Winand, *avec le concours de la Fondation Jean Monnet pour l'Europe: 20 ans d'actions du Comité Jean Monnet (1955-1975)*, *Notre Europe*, Paris 2001; Pascaline Winand: *European Insiders Working inside Washington: Jean Monnet's Network, Euratom, and the Eisenhower Administration*, in: Kathleen Burk/Melvyn Stokes (eds.): *The United States and the European Alliance since 1945*, Oxford/New York 1999; Michel Dumoulin/Pierre Guillen/Maurice Vaïsse (eds.): *L'énergie nucléaire en Europe. des origines à Euratom*, Bern/New York 1994.

123 Monnet: *Memoirs*, pp. 399-400.

124 Monnet: *Memoirs*, p. 444.

125 IISH, *Comité d'Action pour les Etats Unis d'Europe Collection*, 18.1.1956.

126 Hitoshi Suzuki: *Trade Unions as a Peace Movement?. The Ideas of Euratom, the European Trade Union Network, and Debates of how to Exclude Nuclear Armament from German Rearmament*



the European level. They claimed that atomic energy should never be put under the control of private firms, because the technology might then be sold and used for military purposes. The trade unions also claimed that atomic energy should not be put under government ownership, and that it should be kept under the ownership of a European organisation like the High Authority. During a time when the French and German governments were considering the possibility of using Euratom for developing a European nuclear weapon, Monnet and trade unions' idea of atomic integration shows more than an interesting story. Euratom did not, however, become such an ambitious institution, because the Suez Crisis revealed that European countries should use Euratom for coordinating energy policy rather than high politics of nuclear armament.<sup>127</sup>

Being convinced that Monnet's new initiative was valid, the executives of the DGB decided to actively participate and support the Action Committee. The issue was discussed on 7 August 1956,<sup>128</sup> where Ludwig Rosenberg gave a report on the Action Committee's activities. The DGB leaders agreed that they would support the proposals for Euratom, and not to support integrations of atomic energy and a general common market both together. In order to promote Monnet's new initiative, the DGB discussed the financial issues of the Action Committee, which annual budget was 20 million Francs. It was to be paid half by the political parties and half by the trade unions. The DGB decided that the German union would pay 4,605,000 Francs, among which the DGB, the IG Metall and the IG Bergbau would pay one-third each. The German unions were prepared to pay nearly a quarter of the annual budget alone, which was much more than a symbolic gesture in supporting Monnet. Thanks to the successful negotiations, the Rome Treaties were signed by the six Member States on 25 March 1957, and both the EEC and Euratom were successfully launched in the next year.

## Conclusion

What did support and direct participation to European integration mean for the trade unions? The Committee of 21 clearly summarised this point and concluded that the purpose of trade unionism in the framework of the ECSC is to prepare and coordinate trade union activity at the European level and to make this process into a permanent one,<sup>129</sup> hence making policies of the ECSC respect workers' interests. Such policies both helped national economies to reconstruct and increased the living standards of the workers. The trade unions were successful in their efforts in both defining trade unions' common interest at the European level and lobbying the ECSC institutions.

1950–1960, paper presented at: International Conference, Peace Movements in the Cold War and Beyond, London School of Economics, 2 February 2008, London.

127 Ibid.

128 Kaiser: *Der Deutsche Gewerkschaftsbund 1949–1956*, Dokument 109, pp. 863–864.

129 DGB-Archiv, Best. 24.1, 91, 21.3.1955.

The trade unions constructed a European network in order to carry out their lobbying: the unions used the ERO of the ICFTU during the Paris negotiations. After the ECSC was launched, the unions created another European institution, the Committee of 21, which functioned as a preparation meeting of trade union representatives sent to the Consultative Committee of the ECSC. The unions also launched the *Bureau de Liaison* which coordinated activities of both the ERO and the Committee of 21. All three functioned together and constructed a network at the European level.

By using the European network, the trade unions successfully secured their interest in opposing the High Authority's policy of dismantling the coal cartels. This prevented mass unemployment of coalminers. Decartelisation was not carried out under Jean Monnet's Presidency, regardless of the articles of the Paris Treaty. The German trade union leaders had the intention to practice the German idea of *Mitbestimmung* in the ECSC institutions and made full use of their representation in the High Authority. Heinz Potthoff played a crucial role in this aspect. On the other hand, Potthoff also contributed for the High Authority when he represented the Authority in trade union conferences and meetings, persuading the merits for the unions to cooperate for the policies of the ECSC. Potthoff advised the claims and warned the complaints raised by the trade unions back in the High Authority. This sustained the day-to-day activities of the new born High Authority.

What was the gain for the German trade unions? It was remarkable that the German unions played an almost indispensable role for the European network of trade unions, in terms of human resource, its connections, information, and money. Running the network itself was a gain for the German trade unions. They enjoyed primary access to information concerning coal and steel industry in the High Authority and the Consultative Committee, which was useful not only at the European level but also back home in Germany. In wider perspectives, the German unions' gains were in three points: thanks to the fact that the Ruhr problem was solved by the Schuman Plan, German economy recovered and German workers' living standards improved. The second point was that joint efforts to support the Schuman Plan and the ECSC functioned as a Franco-German reconciliation at the trade union level, which enabled German union leaders to return to international trade union organisations. The third was that *Mitbestimmung* was achieved at the European level as well as at the German domestic level, which helped the DGB and its activity in the post-war era. In this sense, Hans Böckler's strong support for European integration was a right choice for the DGB, a legacy which still appears to survive today. How strongly has it survived over the Cold War era and afterwards could be, however, a debate of its own.