

Naves, Marie-Cecile; Crowley, John

Working Paper

Anti-Racist Policies in France. From Ideological and Historical Schemes to Socio-Political Realities

Nota di Lavoro, No. 98.2003

Provided in Cooperation with:

Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei (FEEM)

Suggested Citation: Naves, Marie-Cecile; Crowley, John (2003) : Anti-Racist Policies in France. From Ideological and Historical Schemes to Socio-Political Realities, Nota di Lavoro, No. 98.2003, Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei (FEEM), Milano

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/118114>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

**Anti-Racist Policies in France.
From Ideological and Historical
Schemes to Socio-Political Realities**

John Crowley and Marie-Cecile Naves

NOTA DI LAVORO 98.2003

NOVEMBER 2003

KNOW – Knowledge, Technology, Human Capital

Marie-Cecile Naves and John Crowley, *the Interdisciplinary Centre for Comparative
Research in the Social Sciences (ICCR), Paris*

This paper can be downloaded without charge at:

The Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei Note di Lavoro Series Index:

http://www.feem.it/web/attiv/_wp.html

Social Science Research Network Electronic Paper Collection:

http://papers.ssrn.com/abstract_id=XXXXXX

The opinions expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect the position of
Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei

The special issue on *Economic Growth and Innovation in Multicultural Environments (ENGIME)* collects a selection of papers presented at the multidisciplinary workshops organised by the ENGIME Network.

The ENGIME workshops address the complex relationships between economic growth, innovation and diversity, in the attempt to define the conditions (policy, institutional, regulatory) under which European diversities can promote innovation and economic growth.

This batch of papers has been presented at the third ENGIME workshop:

Social dynamics and conflicts in multicultural cities.

ENGIME is financed by the European Commission, Fifth RTD Framework Programme, Key Action Improving Socio-Economic Knowledge Base, and it is co-ordinated by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei (FEEM).

Further information is available at www.feem.it/engine.

Workshops

- **Mapping Diversity**
Leuven, May 16-17, 2002
- **Communication across cultures in multicultural cities**
The Hague, November 7-8, 2002
- **Social dynamics and conflicts in multicultural cities**
Milan, March 20-21, 2003
- **Governance and policies in multicultural cities**
Rome, July 2003
- **Trust and social capital in multicultural cities**
Athens, November 2003
- **Diversity as a source of growth**
Milan, April 2004

Partners of the ENGIME network:

- Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Milano, Italy
- Psychoanalytic Institute for Social Research, Roma, Italy
- Institute of Historical, Sociological and Linguistic Studies, University of Ancona, Italy
- Centre for Economic Learning and Social Evolution, University College London, UK
- Faculty of Economics and Applied Economics, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium
- Idea Consult, Bruxelles, Belgium
- Maison de la Recherche en Science Humaines, Laboratoire d'Analyse Socio-Anthropologique du Risque, Maison de la Recherche en Sciences Humaines, Université de Caen, France
- Centre for Economic Research and Environmental Strategy, Athens, Greece
- Institute of Higher European Studies, The Hague University of Professional Education, The Netherlands

Anti-Racist Policies in France. From Ideological and Historical Schemes to Socio-Political Realities

Summary

In France, since the 1980s, imaginaries derived from decolonization have played a major role in the elaboration of anti-racist policies. Simultaneously, because of the universalistic conception of the French Republic, the use of ethnic categories has been taboo and systematically replaced, in political schemes, by socio-economic criteria. Multiculturalism, in the Anglo-Saxon meaning, has therefore not been a traditional political analysis framework. Nevertheless, since the 1990s, the French model of integration, which was based on the individual, has been more and more accused of giving way to inequalities and racism. For ten years, the rise of the concept of the «ethnicization» of cultural groups in public debate has thus inspired political demands that require concrete answers, notably against urban violence and education.

Keywords: Anti-racist policies, French model of integration, Multiculturalism, Ethnicization, Urban violence, Education

Address for correspondence:

Marie-Cecile Naves
The Interdisciplinary Centre for Comparative Research in the Social Sciences (ICCR)
41, rue Amilcar Cipriani
F-93400 Saint Ouen
France
Phone : + 33 1 49212083
E-mail : mariececilenaves@free.fr

***Anti-racist policies in France.
From ideological and historical schemes
to socio-political realities.***

John CROWLEY, Marie-Cécile NAVES¹

Multiculturalism has been a major issue in the European social sciences for twenty years. It is commonly assumed to be the template within which analysis of racism and of possible responses to it should be conducted. Racism, to phrase things in a very generic way, supposedly involves problematic relations to “otherness” embedded in hegemonic narratives of nationhood that deny diversity and difference. Multiculturalism, conversely, promotes openness to “the Other” by pluralizing the historical narratives and destabilizing the privilege of nationhood. Our proposal here is that this does not quite work, and furthermore that it is the awkward relationship between antiracism and multiculturalism that best reveals how and why.

Despite the theoretical and political significance multiculturalism has achieved, it often seems to lack sociological focus precisely to the extent that it presupposes a normative theory of culture, and in so far as it tends to be framed at a high level of generality, it tends to hinder comparability. Specifically, if various countries have adopted or failed to adopt multiculturalism regarded as a policy frame of reference and/or toolbox, it is hard to see how multiculturalism can simultaneously serve as an analytical reference for understanding responses in different national, regional and local contexts to post-migratory dynamics. The same difficulty follows if, as many critics have suggested, the whole theoretical vocabulary of multiculturalism is premised upon some kind of unanalysed essentialism. This is sometimes taken to imply that the category of culture – and, even more so, that of identity – are suspect. Yet, the fact that normative multiculturalism has an often weak sociological grounding does not mean that more sophisticated understandings of culture necessarily make the subject matter of multiculturalism disappear. Culture, understood in terms of the inherent limits of social actors’ reflexivity, occupies a crucial position in social science explanation, at the intersection of structural and actor-centred perspectives. “Cultural groups” are analytically defined by identity, and normatively by respect

¹ The Interdisciplinary Centre for Comparative Research in the Social Sciences (ICCR), Paris.

or recognition. As a consequence, the existence and actions of such groups depend strongly on the main orientations of national politics and public policies. In France, any mention of “ethnic” categories encounters deep suspicion, since both conceptualization and administrative codification embody, often in rather non-reflexive ways, the French universalistic conception of equality and the fear that the ethnicization of politics tends to favour xenophobia; as a result, the idea that the individual is the sole normative bearer of rights is granted profound normative significance.

One would expect multiculturalism and antiracism to be very closely related to each other. They have after all, at a superficial level, the same aims and the same enemies. Both demand a degree of self-consciousness about nationhood that is generally felt, by those required to achieve it, to be uncomfortable or even unpleasant. Yet, as anyone familiar with the political and ideological history of the UK or the US will have noted, multiculturalism and antiracism have tended, in practice, to be competitive or even antagonistic; and furthermore what is at stake goes to the very heart of the analysis of social inequality. French anti-racism is, broadly speaking, either hostile or indifferent to multiculturalism. How much of a paradox is this? Theoretically, not as surprising as one might think, but the practical distinction also proves strikingly unstable.

French public and academic debate is exemplary of the wholesale dismissal of even the forms of multiculturalism that would be fairly trivial in the English-speaking world – only since the mid-1990s, and only in a marginal, tentative and rather apologetic way, has a distinctively French approach to multiculturalism begun to emerge. Focusing on anti-racism public discourses and policies in France since the 1980s may help understand this situation. As a matter of fact, a series of rather simplistic assumptions about French conceptions of racism and anti-racism emerged in the late 1980s, in the context of the electoral rise of the *Front National*, the Commission on Nationality, and the Muslim “headscarves” affairs in some secondary schools. Such debates, and to a lesser extent policies, had contribute to the theoretical and ideological development of a “French model of integration” opposed to the so-called “model of minorities” (supposedly illustrated by Anglo-American, Dutch or Swedish multiculturalism). This “French model” is often taken at face value by the French themselves. Yet, quite apart from its rather simplistic character even at the time, there have been major and as yet imperfectly acknowledged shifts since the mid-1990s. New policy agendas – and to some extent practical policies – have emerged, and theories and the tone of public debate have begun to evolve, particularly with respect to

racism and antiracism. Moreover, comparative research used this perception of France and gave wide credence to it, especially perhaps when dismissing its “assimilationist” bias. The question thus arises: given the relation between the “French model of integration” and the situation of French theoretical debates and policies in the field of anti-racism, how are the emergence of multiculturalism *à la française* and the changes in anti-racism policies connected? They seem to derive from the same general climate – the breakdown of an ideologically hegemonic model –, while being in a sense opposite – at least if Anglo-American experience of the tensions between multiculturalism and antiracism can be taken as an indication. What might connect them in principle is the capacity of the symbolic violence and tangible inequalities of racism to give rise to an identity of victimhood which provides the basis for the formation of a reflexive social group. This was indeed the basis of what was called, in UK antiracist language in the 1970s and 80s, the “political conception of blackness” – in which to be Black was definitionally to be a victim of racism. It is true that identities of victimhood are perceptible, and indeed massive, in contemporary France. But “blackness” in this sense was understood, for very strong theoretical reasons, as necessarily a *political* achievement. In the absence of political consciousness, victimhood is a source of fragmentation: what is now called in French debate “ethnicization” – regarded now, unlike c. 1990, as something that concerns France and not just other countries. The language of “consciousness” is old-fashioned, and in many ways deservedly discredited. But the underlying sociology continues to make a mot of sense. The pragmatic tone of current French anti-racism policies, which adopt a reformist focus on socio-economic opportunities, makes them superficially compatible with ethnicization – although perhaps not indefinitely.

The uses of “ethnicization”, and the nature of the phenomena to which the phrase purports to refer, are in many respects the key to an improved comparative understanding of recent changes in French conceptions of racism and antiracism. “Ethnicization” is neither a synonym of multiculturalism, nor its opposite. Normative multiculturalism, which combines institutional practices and kinds of mobilization, is in one respect a positive theory of ethnicization; but ethnicization is simultaneously the sociological basis for multiculturalism as a set of practical political demands that require answers of some kind simply because of the scale of resources that they command. This circular relationship makes it very difficult to clarify the normative questions involved. As a matter of fact, since 1995, empirically, France has become less different from Anglo-American conceptions of “racial” relationships than in the previous period, because

public debate has taken the ethnicization of cultural groups more into account, reflecting changes both in tangible social dynamics and the collective “imaginary” of French politics. Ethnicization is among other things the name for a set of urgent practical problems, which have cried out for political solutions at least at the rhetorical level, given the failure of traditional urban policies and the growing sense of crisis, at least at the ideological level, in the French education system.

In this paper, after giving some general information on the history and perceptions of immigration and on immigration policies in France, we offer some views on French antiracist policies, which in recent years have, for the first time, stressed victimhood along with some aspects of what is, often with reluctance, called the “ethnicization” of social relationships. For illustration, we focus mainly on two examples: urban violence and education.

Since the beginning of the 1980s, French anti-racist policies have formulated “ethnic issues” in socio-economic rather than cultural terms, notably in the form of a search for a coherent and comprehensive “urban policy” (*politique de la ville*). The connection is that urban violence, which is a recurrent issue of both the media and political agenda, often hits underprivileged suburbs and is generally said to be attributable to children of immigrant parents. The specific conceptual and legal frameworks of contemporary France are inscribed within its distinctive history, which is linked to decolonisation, notably in North Africa, and especially in Algeria.²

Caricatures of republicanism

In considering the French “republican” model, the issue is not so much what “republicanism” properly understood might entail, but how the supposed description fits. In view of the prevailing caricature of France with respect to immigration vs. racism issues, one needs emphasize the fact that it suits many in France to subscribe to the often misleading perception of a hegemonic and uniform “assimilationist” Republican model. In France, where policy and politics have long been very closely intertwined, the initial policy framework sometimes addresses itself solely to immigration in the narrow sense (*i.e.* rules on entry and residence and mechanisms for their application) or to issues, such as urban decay, that are linked to immigration in political

² The impact, in French urban areas, of President Chirac’s recent visit to Algeria shows how much the relationships between the two countries have remained very much linked to the situation of (former) North African immigrants in France, not to mention the fact that many Algerians expected Chirac to promote democratic values in Algeria – which, in a way, is a historical irony, Chirac being a neo-Gaullist.

discourse. Besides, in the sociology of racism, there are two major paradigms (which may be complementary but tend in practice to be contrasted): racism as prejudice, based on psychological and “pulsional” criteria; and racism as everyday discrimination, which is often violent, since racism is above all a concrete social practice. For instance, some groups are stigmatized by derogatory modes of designation or by spatial or socio-economic discrepancies. Contemporary racism is multifaceted and constantly changing. The evolution of the stereotypical “foreigner” shows the inter-penetration of racism and broader social phenomena. Over the past decade or so, suburban unrest (in most French cities, contrary to some other European countries, inner-city areas have a generally favourable socio-economic profile) has framed everyday racism in terms of a rejection of “otherness”, which is amplified by media sensationalism. In this respect, during the presidential and legislative campaigns of 2002, various events were highlighted by the media, and especially television, which contributed heavily to putting the issue of crime (in French: *insécurité*, which is both a vague term and a euphemism) at the top of the political agenda.³

Since racism is closely linked to the French colonial past and to the various waves of immigration, which have moulded the collective and racialized perception of immigrants, it is undoubtedly true – as shown by a wealth of empirical research – that prejudice plays a significant role in social relations. The collective burden of the colonial past has given rise to an adversarial relationship between the “French” and (some of) the “others”, who are considered socially and culturally inferior, who are to be dominated, and who cannot integrate easily. Historical research has shown, in particular, why and how Islam has become a central feature of racism in France. Yet an approach to racism exclusively focused on prejudice leads to some serious difficulties. Racial violence, in particular, is not solely a matter of perception of others – still less “otherness” or “the Other” (singular and capitalized: a common usage that carries more theoretical baggage than is often realized). Spatial segregation also makes some groups of people feel excluded. Immigrants who live in underprivileged suburbs are likely to have adversarial relationships with other members of society, and especially with the French – or, more precisely, the so-called “French natives” (*Français de souche*) –, who often perceive them as foreigners, because they

³ Crime has very often, but not always, been linked to underprivileged suburbs; although young people have burnt cars or fought with the police regularly in some suburbs for many years, it became last year the major theme of the campaign, at the expense of other major issues, such as unemployment or pensions. In the eyes of many observers, it could even partly explain the score of the radical right, the *Front National* and its leader, Jean-Marie Le Pen.

feel frustrated and insecure, and because they fear they cannot achieve high social status. Coexistence, and sometimes promiscuity, with the French can give rise to day-to-day conflicts, and even to sporadic violence. But should one talk about cross-cultural conflicts, as some researchers in Northern Europe do? The French state, as well as French academic researchers, are reluctant to do so, because the topic seems to be illegitimate within the ideological and legal parameters of the “one and indivisible” French Republic. As a consequence, observers, analysts and policy-makers prefer to talk about spatial segregation in its socio-economic context as providing in itself an adequate causal framework.

Moreover, the French approach to racial violence – as to discrimination more broadly – has long focused on racist intentions, to the detriment of victims. This is due to the influence of the legal approach to racism, and the emphasis on criminal law, since offences are defined by the intention of the alleged culprits, although victims do not always consider they have suffered from racism. There is no presumption that the status of the victim (in terms of skin colour, religion, “origin”, nationality, etc.) *in itself* creates a presumption of “racial” or “ethnic” violence. This is partly common sense, partly a reflection of the French ideological climate, which is hostile to “racial” or “ethnic” categorization. Indeed, even today, vulnerable groups are still inadequately taken into account. Nevertheless, the fact that racial discrimination has recently entered public debate and the academic agenda has made the traditional approach to racial violence change gradually. And a qualitative survey of victims is bound to improve the schemes that are designed to help them, for example when they need to be listened to, advised, or helped with legal proceedings.

In this respect, France now has a comprehensive legislative and legal framework against racism, but civil society is also a main actor, perhaps because anti-racism and anti-discrimination policies do not define “vulnerable groups” as an official administrative category.⁴ Academic research and press articles both confirm this sociological statement, insisting for example on the absence of official statistics on racial violence. In recent years, some organizations have developed actions to raise public awareness and to increase mobilization for the integration of “visible minorities”.

As a matter of fact, over the past dozen years, the bases, legitimacy and efficiency of antiracism and its strategies have been strongly questioned. This began with the crisis of antiracism in the 1980s, which was due to the decline – or perhaps more accurately the fragmentation – of the

⁴ Although this naturally remains speculative. In the quite different cases of the US and the UK, mobilization remains central to the use of legal remedies against racism, even though categories are defined in such a way that it is not inherently impossible to appeal to the law on a purely individualistic basis.

identity claims of children of immigrant parents, most of whom came from North Africa (*le mouvement beur*.) Subsequently, over the past ten years, the French perception of racism has gradually moved from a perpetrators/ideologies scheme to a victims/practices configuration – although the ideological conception of anti-racism has not completely disappeared. On the contrary, high-profile court cases, deriving from criminal prosecution of politicians such as Jean-Marie Le Pen, writers such as Michel Houellebecq, and personalities such as Brigitte Bardot, continue to reaffirm the principle that racism is first and foremost a matter of discourse, and antiracist organizations such as the MRAP, the LICRA and SOS-Racisme continue to devote considerable resources to such action. For what ideological reasons did this shift, which makes a lot of sense, theoretically *and* in terms of public policies, take place? The rhetorical and administrative construction of “racism” is something for policy to address and change. Policies and some actions of organizations, especially in the framework of the 114 help-line – a toll-free number for victims of discrimination implemented in 2000 – and the Departmental Commissions for Access to Citizenship (CODAC), that were created in 1999, have improved the description of racial violence and assistance to victims, notably when they wish to lodge complaints. Anti-racist organizations have also recently tried to improve awareness of discrimination in public opinion and to implement dynamic and attractive educational programmes that avoid classic forms of moralizing. Yet, French public policies had often been timid, focusing on cultural diversity rather than on racism or inequality. This has had unintended consequences since the celebration of diversity is suspected in France of giving rise to “multiculturalism”, “communitarianism”, of what the French media sometimes call “ghettos”, the United States being a negative mirror. On the one hand, the French republican conception of citizenship is still based on the individual and insists on secularism (in French, *laïcité*). On the other hand, as the debate on immigration entered the political sphere in the 1980s, and as the radical right party, the *Front National*, has had a larger and larger audience since the mid-1980s, racist speech, which is punished by the law, had systematically been replaced by commentaries on racism based on the origin, culture or religion of the victims. Thus, the French conception of racism had long been limited to intentional racism, and not to contextual, institutional or symbolic racism. Moreover, French public debate and academic research on racial and xenophobic violence have historically focused on ideologies, which have been expressed by several trends of the extreme right and traditionally been based on various arguments such as the pre-eminence of western civilisation, ethnocentrism, nationalism,

the supremacy of “White people” and so on.

True, collective perceptions are at stake; there are vulnerable groups, most of them composed of people who were born – or whose parents or grand-parents were born - in the former colonies or abroad, whether they are French or not. Africans and people from the West Indies suffer particularly from stereotypes about former French colonies. In other words, they suffer from anonymous symbolic violence. Besides, current international affairs may create xenophobic, racist or anti-Semitic attitudes in French society, insofar as they are directly aimed at some groups of people. This was particularly true in the contexts of the Gulf war, the massacres in Algeria, the rise of fundamentalism, especially in Europe and in France after the 1995 bomb attacks in Paris underground, and, more recently, the conflict in Israel and Palestine.

But punishment now tends to be less based on the analysis of the act itself than on the situation of the victim, and repression is a key concept. As a matter of fact, in the scope of decisions taken by the Council of the European Union, an anti-discrimination law was voted on November 16 2001 and a law on workers’ rights, which was voted on January 17 2002, introduced further profound changes. The French government gave priority to the fight against discrimination on the whole and particularly against racial discrimination, which entered the French public agenda rather recently. As there used to be many obstacles to integration, the former – left-wing – government⁵ took a series of measures against all kinds of discrimination, the fields of employment and housing being two priorities. Moreover, in 1998, the Human Rights Commission brought to light discrimination in the employment field in its annual report and the High Council for Integration invited authorities to carry on a policy which would guarantee foreigners their right to equality. The CODAC, which are also to help children of immigrant parents find work and a place in society, are supervised by departmental prefects and composed of representatives of the judicial system, of administrative departments of the state, of chambers of commerce and of civil services. Employees’ and employers’ trade unions, and representatives of anti-racist organizations are also partners of the CODAC.

The Study Group on Discrimination (GED), a Public Interest Group, was created in May 1999 and has provided France with a national observatory on racism and discrimination. It has also had the mandate *to fight against* discrimination since October 2 2000. Furthermore, the 114, an anti-discrimination toll-free number, was implemented in May 2000, in order to gather the complaints

⁵ Socialist leader Lionel Jospin was French Prime Minister between 1997 and 2002.

and testimonies of people who experienced or witnessed discrimination. Descriptions are followed up, and sometimes give rise to complaints.

Finally, in the context of decentralization, most urban contracts insist on the fight against discrimination, in order to complete the action of public authorities at a departmental and local level. They have given way to a set of precise actions, which have notably improved the general public's awareness of discrimination, trained people and encouraged mediation with firms, for example through youth support system.

Organizations fight against racism and discrimination, too. Historically, French civil society has put much effort into the protection of human rights, tolerance and the respect of human dignity. For instance, the MRAP (Movement Against Racism and for Friendship between Peoples) and SOS Racisme have high visibility and national coverage. They often organize debates, implement information campaigns and write brochures, which in France is called "good practices". Organizations also lodge complaints after investigations in firms, night clubs and even real estate agencies which may have discriminatory attitudes or practices. Now, the increasing number of complaints is suspected to take precedence over educational programmes. Besides, some people wonder if culprits are really sentenced and if the judicial system is able to make racial violence decrease.⁶

Voluntary bodies play of course a great role in promoting new policy agendas. Indeed, they have strategic significance in the internal reconfiguration of policy frameworks. Furthermore, it is interesting to see that many anti-racism and anti-discrimination programmes are now local. The state, through national systems, defines and gives impetus to major initiatives; local authorities have to apply them according to local situations, which is often efficient. Nevertheless, public actions target groups of people that are not considered as vulnerable according to precise criteria. Most of the time, they fit in fixed administrative categories, which were defined in terms of social or economic integration. On the other hand, the objectives that are defined often have little operational content and take a short-term perspective, which cannot make social perceptions change durably. Finally, each programme has its own evaluation system: such a heterogeneity prevents public authorities from measuring the results of their actions and from adapting them

⁶ Notably because institutional racism remains taboo. With the dominance of the republican model, civil servants do not take racial discrimination sufficiently into account. As a matter of fact, they too often consider that immigrants are simply not integrated enough, even when public services are explicitly said to be discriminatory.

whenever it is necessary. As a consequence, interventions are often compartmentalized into various fields.

Urban violence and racism at school

Violence and education are aspects of “ethnicization” understood both as an aspect of social phenomena that disprove the Republican caricature that France is “different”, and as something which contributes to the rise of new fears and stereotypes. New issues and actors demand recognition or/and solutions, not least because the climate of violence is in itself a political resource.

Urban violence seems to be a French specificity, insofar as, in France, the abstract and homogeneous form of “the city” is a key issue. But, practically, “the city” is the place where the imaginary perception of a united, homogeneous and individualized French community collapses. It corresponds in some respects to what is called elsewhere “youth violence”, and there is a widespread perception that current problems in France have something to do with a broader crisis of “the city” (*la ville*). Some researchers think that spatial and social exclusion is more striking than in other countries, because of architecture and town planning. Relations with the police also crystallize many aspects of violence in racialized contexts in French society, because of a range of social and economic factors. Conversely, the police are routinely accused of racism both in language and in practices, such as profiling. The adversarial relationships between young people, who often live in underprivileged suburbs, and the police thus seem to be at the heart of the issue of urban violence. Identity checks, police custody, and sometimes police misconduct tend to make young people think that French police are racist. The issue remains taboo, as it deals both with the ethics and practices of the police, although some people try to separate institutional culture from racism strictly speaking. Nevertheless, urban violence also refers to collective protests, and even to the destruction of goods which symbolize the consumer society (car burnings, for example) or the state (buses, public phones, not to speak about violence against firemen). The media and institutions talk about violent and *ad hoc* reactions against youth stigmatization and exclusion. However, urban violence feeds debates which link criminality, immigration and juvenile delinquency together. In the end, one can notice that urban riots are studied as social phenomena which derive from spatial segregation and social exclusion. As compared to other European countries, they are never considered as “racial” conflicts between

representatives of the state or of civil society, and youths of foreign origin. One can then wonder if such statements do not tend to undermine anti-racist public policies.⁷

In the educational field, violence is officially considered only as a symptom of hardened patterns of social inequality, as the classroom is said to be simply an extension of the street. Among other things, the territorial basis of the French school is in principle strictly defined by a compulsory catchment areas system (*la carte scolaire*). This obviously means that the school system tends to reproduce social segregation in so far as it exists.

In France, discrimination in education has traditionally received relatively less attention than, for example, discrimination in labour. Furthermore, where policy decisions and research have focused on education, the scope of their interest has been especially limited to primary and secondary public education, and has almost entirely excluded tertiary education (be it in university or technical training colleges), and education in the private sector (be it state-sponsored or not). This may in part be attributed to the ideological premises upon which National Education in France was founded – uniform (universal), equal and secular education for all children – and the denial or repression of any and all references to differential treatment. The law of 28 March 1882 defined schooling as compulsory “for children of both sexes, between the ages of 6 and 13” and entrenched the principle of equal treatment, thus defining the schooling system as the primary locus of integration for children, *i.e.* individuals.⁸

The republican model of schooling as hierarchical inclusion (meritocracy) is thus in tension with a society within which horizontal exclusion seems to be of increasing significance. The new significance of diversity as educational issue must also be taken into account. As a matter of fact, contrary to the ideal of schools as havens of equality within an unequal society, far removed from

⁷ In recent months, moreover, the media have highlighted the mobilization of female immigrants against violence, and particularly violence against women. Most of them are of North African origin and live in French suburbs. As a matter of fact, for several years, there have been many collective rapes, often committed by very young men – sometimes below 15 – against very young girls ; and also discrimination against girls within the suburbs, which is said to be due to Muslim traditions. That is why some of the women who demonstrate to denounce such offences insist on the fact that racism is not the only problem in underprivileged suburbs: according to them, sexual discrimination and even misogyny have become major issues but have never been taken into account by public authorities, who have rather focused on discrimination in general, and against young men in particular. Some people also observe that public policies have especially aimed at fighting against hiring discrimination or discrimination in leisure activities (access to night clubs, for instance) against children of North African parents (*les beurs*), which, while aiming at neutrality, made them forget other serious kinds of discrimination.

⁸ As a matter of fact, the Republican definition of the school has acquired its value from the fact that it symbolizes a model that articulates access to citizenship and access to nationality.

the social, economic, political and “racist” tensions that traverse society, it is true that school has become increasingly permeable to these tensions. The school has become a place where pupils and teachers grapple with the complexity of broader social problems of inequality, social but also racial discrimination and violence, produced and re-produced in its midst.⁹

Despite the official tendency to portray France as a country of immigration since the 19th century with a long history of dealing with the presence and schooling of immigrant children or the children of migrants within its National Education System, certain authors maintain that until the 1970s France “ignored itself as a country of immigration”. The question of schooling immigrant children only appeared in the sociological literature in France as late as the 1970s. In the 1960s, sociologists of education were primarily concerned with evaluating the effects of the then recent “democratisation” of the education system through the extension of compulsory schooling to the age of 16. At that time, because of the dominant Marxist paradigm in French social sciences, socially-entrenched economic inequalities constituted the overarching factor to which inequalities in education were attributed, and children of immigrants were subsumed within the larger working-class group. Once immigration was constructed as a “social problem”, in the context of the economic crisis which began in the 1970s, and later, the ideological and moral crisis heralded by the 1980s, the integration of migrant populations and their children and the role of school in this process were placed high on scientific and political agendas. At the same time, renewed debates concerning the definition of the French nation in the context of both globalization and European-Union building, the aggravation of the economic crisis and its exclusionary effects on vulnerable populations, and the increase in urban segregation and violence re-awakened public, political and scientific interest in the integrative role of the French Republican schooling system. Thus, educational policies implemented within the public schooling system over the past 30 years have changed a lot. Since the 1970s, various national programmes have been implemented to enhance the disadvantaged educational position of children of so-called ethnic minority origin, in relation to the different waves of immigration to France. Since World War II, France has encouraged and relaxed its national borders at different times, primarily in response to its changing economic and demographic need. From 1945 to 1974, immigration was actively encouraged from Southern Europe, Algeria, Morocco and Tunisia, guided by the necessity to provide inexpensive labour. Economic migration officially ended in 1974 and was replaced in the

⁹ See Bourdieu, for example, as long ago as the 1960s and the 1970s.

1980's with what is commonly referred to as "family immigration". This term designates the immigration of migrant labourers' next of kin for the purposes of reuniting families separated through economic migration.

The French schooling system is, in principle, indifferent to "difference": pressure is placed on individuals to assimilate vertically into secular meritocratic society as individual citizens – defined in terms of differential qualification as much as (and inseparably from) equal status. This entails renouncing all external manifestations of religious or 'cultural' affiliation within the public sphere. This assimilationist policy has been criticised because the Republican model of integration is based on a clear distinction between public and private spheres, which implies both the refusal of proselytizing and respect for the diversity of personal convictions, be they religious or other.¹⁰ The role of the school system, viewed from the perspective of diversity, is to organize and facilitate the peaceful coexistence of differences within the public sphere of civil society. That is why, in recent years, the position of "ethnic" minorities in education has become a cause for increasing concern in most European countries. Their position has often been associated with low performance levels, absenteeism and truancy, drop-out and unqualified school-leaving, disciplinary problems and violence. The disadvantaged position of so-called ethnic minorities is compounded by the vulnerability of these groups to racism, racial discrimination, ethnicization, segregation, and marginalization. Some public measures thus aimed at taking cognizance of the specific schooling needs of these scholars. It was the beginning of the implementation of a system for the "ethnic management" of the schooling of children of immigrants. Initiation classes (Cln) were created in primary schools in 1975, and adaptation classes (Cla) were implemented in secondary schools, for the purpose of teaching French as a foreign-language to pupils who were simultaneously schooled in regular classes. The anthropological orientation of intercultural education at the time encouraged the belief that schooling these children required a non-judgmental understanding of their home cultures and of the issues at stake for their acculturation within the schooling system. But while such measures officially aimed at facilitating the integration of foreign scholars, these in fact sometimes reinforced the child's affiliation to a country other than France, and formed part of an overall strategy aimed at facilitating their re-integration within their parents' countries of origin.

¹⁰ For example, since a number of private schools are in fact affiliated to a religious body (dispensing secular and religious education), the lack of Muslim private schools, as compared to the historical presence of Catholic and

The 1980s saw a further shift in the orientation adopted within National Education, as it made the choice of a policy of positive discrimination in favour of priority areas, in order to reduce the impact of social inequality on educational achievement. Educational Priority Areas (ZEP) were created in 1981 for the benefit of all pupils – schooled in primary, junior high and senior (mainstream and vocational) high schools – living in socio-economically and culturally disadvantaged environments. Such schools have been allotted additional staff, teaching and financial resources. However, the Republican injunction regarding the provision for differential treatment on the basis of “ethnic” or other origins meant that the policy had to be formulated in general terms¹¹.

Today, the polarisation of schooling publics, the politicisation of identities and the growing expression of “Islamophobia” in public discourse since September 11 2001 have re-kindled debates on the supposed “irreconcilability” of Muslim and secular Republican values within education in France. These debates highlight the urgent needs to go on addressing the causes and consequences of structural (segregation) and implicit (ethnicization) forms of discrimination in France and re-define the approach adopted in dealing with diversity in education. Although, in official education policy documents, the issue of discrimination is still not necessarily addressed directly, political realism made authorities take *pragmatic measures*, as social polarisation of schools is said to be mainly due to residential segregation, especially in urban agglomerations, and as some parents have adopted a consumerist-type behaviour, avoiding sending their children to the schools for which they are zoned.

The lack of official statistics about “minority” pupils in France mirrors the weak statistical basis for analysis of racial violence, and is replicated in other areas such as housing, employment and health. As one would expect, the principle that France recognizes only French nationals and foreigners is based on a combination of good and bad reasons. Among the good reasons are concerns about the arbitrary nature of ascriptive categories – even if purely statistical, and especially if used for administrative purposes –, and the suspicion to which, as a consequence, group processes that operate in terms of them are exposed. The question who is (say) a Corsican

Jewish schools (which are in part sponsored by the state) suggests that religious discrimination exists.

¹¹ A recent polemic was raised when a prestigious tertiary institution in Paris, *Sciences-Po*, implemented a positive discrimination policy in an endeavour to make the establishment accessible to school-leavers from Priority Education Areas. The official argument was based on socio-economic criteria.

– to take just one high-profile issue – is not a straightforward one that France perversely refuses to take into account, but on the contrary a hugely complex one that admits no simple sociological answer. Among the bad reasons, symmetrically, is the rather laughable, but surprisingly common, idea that ethnicization cannot emerge spontaneously – because social processes naturally tend towards mixing and assimilation – but must be traced to perverse policies or misguided forms of social mobilization. Such is the template for the familiar French opposition to “Anglo-American”, or as the French rather absurdly prefer to say “Anglo-Saxon”, multiculturalism. Processes of ethnicization within French society may be inadequately studied, but their existence is clear enough, as is their close connection with forms of social exclusion (and, as always, self-exclusion) that combine spatial segregation, inequality of incomes, opportunities and institutional access (e.g. to education), self-destructive sub-cultures, and normative rejection of and by the mainstream models of social integration. The question is what to do about them – which involves both a research agenda, a set of feasible policy responses, and a general template for social mobilization. In France as elsewhere, multiculturalism constitutes a fairly natural answer, especially as it operates explicitly and *prima facie* coherently on all three levels. By putting its main emphasis on normative rejection (via consideration of issues of respect and recognition as embedded in the symbols and narratives of nationhood), it offers a view on how to understand identity politics (as a struggle against misrecognition), how policies should respond (by heightened sensitivity to the symbolics of inclusion), and how to mobilize for recognition (by putting the finger on the gaps and inconsistencies between official stories and the realities they skate over – by playing on liberal guilt, as one might more crudely phrase it). The trouble is that, as noted, many of the French criticisms of multiculturalism are correct, which is quite compatible with a critique of the limits of traditional French anti-racism. Social groups do not act, mobilize, formulate demands, receive apologies or grant forgiveness; these things are done, trivially, by those who speak and act on their behalf, and thereby, in a very real sense, create them. We recognize, correctly, the role of political entrepreneurship in nation-building; there is a curious reluctance to apply the same arguments to the political entrepreneurship of multiculturalism. The point is not to discredit community leaders because they contribute powerfully to shaping the community they speak for and the identity they claim to defend. Simply, their claims can no more be taken at face value than nationalistic claims about culture, homogeneity and continuity. Although it is commonly suggested that pluralism is a basic fact about the modern political

condition, it is worth underlining the point that diversity as a fact is devoid of normative significance, and that pluralism – like “-isms” in general – is inherently normative. Pluralism requires an independent normative grounding that is unattainable without a more sophisticated understanding of identities and group processes in contemporary societies.

It follows that there is much more to be said for antiracism as an *alternative* to multiculturalism than seems to be realized – not least in France, where a strong tradition of universalistic antiracism rooted in critique of socio-economic inequality is currently rather anaemic. As discussed in this paper, there are probably three main reasons for the current lack of dynamism. *First*, the pervasive use of psychological categories to analyze racism impedes consideration of its connection with power structures. This is partly a matter of paradigms – psychoanalysis has a degree of influence within French social science that is not really matched in the English-speaking world – and partly a reflection of a framework for antiracist policy that, as discussed earlier, tended until recently to circumscribe it to criminal punishment of public expressions of prejudice. Only with the new emergence of discrimination, which is naturally victim- rather than perpetrator-centred, as a policy priority has this paradigm started to change. *Secondly*, antiracism is no less dependent than multiculturalism on forms of statistical categorization that are still generally rejected in France. No doubt the categories are different, and no doubt they are explicitly as arbitrary as the racist categories they necessarily reflect (think, to return to an example discussed earlier, of the “political” usage of “blackness” in the UK). But they are nonetheless powerful, and there is ample evidence that victimhood can be the basis for stable and strongly articulated identities. The good and bad reasons for French officials and academics to be suspicious about such identities therefore operate here as well. *Thirdly*, in France as elsewhere, multiculturalism is a natural response to pervasive socio-economic inequalities that no longer fit within egalitarian perspectives of (social-democratic) inclusion or (revolutionary) emancipation. In the final analysis, multiculturalism and antiracism are inseparably and dynamically connected, in so far as both are ultimately about welfare, the former stressing difference, the latter equality.

References

- BAKER J. (ed.), *Group Rights*, Toronto, Toronto University Press, 1994.
- BARRY B., *Liberty and Justice Essays in Political Theory 2*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1991.
- BRENNER E. (dir.), *Les territoires perdus de la République : antisémitisme, racisme et sexisme en milieu scolaire*, Paris, Mille-et-une-nuits, 2002.
- CROWLEY J., « The Adjudication of Ethnic Claims », *Questions de recherche*, n° 3, CERI, IEP Paris, novembre 2001.
- GREVEN-BORDE Hélène, TOURNON Jean (dir.), *Les identités en débat : intégration ou multiculturalisme ?*, Paris, L'Harmattan, 2000.
- Institut des Hautes Etudes de la Sécurité Intérieure (SIMON P.), *Les discriminations ethniques dans la société française*, Paris, IHESI, 2000.
- KYMLICKA W., *Multicultural Citizenship. A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1995.
- POUTIGNAT P. *Théories de l'ethnicité*, Paris, PUF, 1995.
- RENAUT A., MESURE S., *Alter Ego. Les paradoxes de l'identité démocratique*, Paris, Aubier, 1999.
- TAGUIEFF P.-A., *La couleur et le sang : doctrines racistes à la française*, Paris, Mille-et-une-nuits, 2002.
- TAGUIEFF P.-A., *La force du préjugé. Essai sur le racisme et ses doubles*, Paris, La Découverte, 1987.
- TAYLOR C., *Multiculturalism and 'the Politics of Recognition'*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1992.
- TODD E., *Le destin des immigrés. Assimilation et ségrégation dans les démocraties occidentales*, Paris, Seuil, 1994.
- WALZER M., *Spheres of Justice*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1983.
- WIEVIORKA M., *L'espace du racisme*, Paris, Seuil, 1991.
- WIEVIORKA M. (dir.), *Racisme et modernité*, Paris, La Découverte, 1993.

NOTE DI LAVORO DELLA FONDAZIONE ENI ENRICO MATTEI

Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei Working Paper Series

Our working papers are available on the Internet at the following addresses:

<http://www.feem.it/Feem/Pub/Publications/WPapers/default.html>

<http://papers.ssrn.com>

SUST	1.2002	<i>K. TANO, M.D. FAMINOW, M. KAMUANGA and B. SWALLOW:</i> <u>Using Conjoint Analysis to Estimate Farmers' Preferences for Cattle Traits in West Africa</u>
ETA	2.2002	<i>Efrem CASTELNUOVO and Paolo SURICO:</i> <u>What Does Monetary Policy Reveal about Central Bank's Preferences?</u>
WAT	3.2002	<i>Duncan KNOWLER and Edward BARBIER:</i> <u>The Economics of a "Mixed Blessing" Effect: A Case Study of the Black Sea</u>
CLIM	4.2002	<i>Andreas LÖSCHEL:</i> <u>Technological Change in Economic Models of Environmental Policy: A Survey</u>
VOL	5.2002	<i>Carlo CARRARO and Carmen MARCHIORI:</i> <u>Stable Coalitions</u>
CLIM	6.2002	<i>Marzio GALEOTTI, Alessandro LANZA and Matteo MANERA:</i> <u>Rockets and Feathers Revisited: An International Comparison on European Gasoline Markets</u>
ETA	7.2002	<i>Effrosyni DIAMANTOUDI and Efthios S. SARTZETAKIS:</i> <u>Stable International Environmental Agreements: An Analytical Approach</u>
KNOW	8.2002	<i>Alain DESDOIGTS:</i> <u>Neoclassical Convergence Versus Technological Catch-up: A Contribution for Reaching a Consensus</u>
NRM	9.2002	<i>Giuseppe DI VITA:</i> <u>Renewable Resources and Waste Recycling</u>
KNOW	10.2002	<i>Giorgio BRUNELLO:</i> <u>Is Training More Frequent when Wage Compression is Higher? Evidence from 11 European Countries</u>
ETA	11.2002	<i>Mordecai KURZ, Hehui JIN and Maurizio MOTOLESE:</i> <u>Endogenous Fluctuations and the Role of Monetary Policy</u>
KNOW	12.2002	<i>Reyer GERLAGH and Marjan W. HOFKES:</i> <u>Escaping Lock-in: The Scope for a Transition towards Sustainable Growth?</u>
NRM	13.2002	<i>Michele MORETTO and Paolo ROSATO:</i> <u>The Use of Common Property Resources: A Dynamic Model</u>
CLIM	14.2002	<i>Philippe QUIRION:</i> <u>Macroeconomic Effects of an Energy Saving Policy in the Public Sector</u>
CLIM	15.2002	<i>Roberto ROSON:</i> <u>Dynamic and Distributional Effects of Environmental Revenue Recycling Schemes: Simulations with a General Equilibrium Model of the Italian Economy</u>
CLIM	16.2002	<i>Francesco RICCI (I):</i> <u>Environmental Policy Growth when Inputs are Differentiated in Pollution Intensity</u>
ETA	17.2002	<i>Alberto PETRUCCI:</i> <u>Devaluation (Levels versus Rates) and Balance of Payments in a Cash-in-Advance Economy</u>
Coalition Theory Network	18.2002	<i>László Á. KÓCZY (liv):</i> <u>The Core in the Presence of Externalities</u>
Coalition Theory Network	19.2002	<i>Steven J. BRAMS, Michael A. JONES and D. Marc KILGOUR (liv):</i> <u>Single-Peakedness and Disconnected Coalitions</u>
Coalition Theory Network	20.2002	<i>Guillaume HAERINGER (liv):</i> <u>On the Stability of Cooperation Structures</u>
NRM	21.2002	<i>Fausto CAVALLARO and Luigi CIRAOLO:</i> <u>Economic and Environmental Sustainability: A Dynamic Approach in Insular Systems</u>
CLIM	22.2002	<i>Barbara BUCHNER, Carlo CARRARO, Igor CERSOSIMO and Carmen MARCHIORI:</i> <u>Back to Kyoto? US Participation and the Linkage between R&D and Climate Cooperation</u>
CLIM	23.2002	<i>Andreas LÖSCHEL and ZhongXIANG ZHANG:</i> <u>The Economic and Environmental Implications of the US Repudiation of the Kyoto Protocol and the Subsequent Deals in Bonn and Marrakech</u>
ETA	24.2002	<i>Marzio GALEOTTI, Louis J. MACCINI and Fabio SCHIANTARELLI:</i> <u>Inventories, Employment and Hours</u>
CLIM	25.2002	<i>Hannes EGLI:</i> <u>Are Cross-Country Studies of the Environmental Kuznets Curve Misleading? New Evidence from Time Series Data for Germany</u>
ETA	26.2002	<i>Adam B. JAFFE, Richard G. NEWELL and Robert N. STAVINS:</i> <u>Environmental Policy and Technological Change</u>
SUST	27.2002	<i>Joseph C. COOPER and Giovanni SIGNORELLO:</i> <u>Farmer Premiums for the Voluntary Adoption of Conservation Plans</u>
SUST	28.2002	<i>The ANSEA Network:</i> <u>Towards An Analytical Strategic Environmental Assessment</u>
KNOW	29.2002	<i>Paolo SURICO:</i> <u>Geographic Concentration and Increasing Returns: a Survey of Evidence</u>
ETA	30.2002	<i>Robert N. STAVINS:</i> <u>Lessons from the American Experiment with Market-Based Environmental Policies</u>

NRM	31.2002	<i>Carlo GIUPPONI and Paolo ROSATO: <u>Multi-Criteria Analysis and Decision-Support for Water Management at the Catchment Scale: An Application to Diffuse Pollution Control in the Venice Lagoon</u></i>
NRM	32.2002	<i>Robert N. STAVINS: <u>National Environmental Policy During the Clinton Years</u></i>
KNOW	33.2002	<i>A. SOUBEYRAN and H. STAHN : <u>Do Investments in Specialized Knowledge Lead to Composite Good Industries?</u></i>
KNOW	34.2002	<i>G. BRUNELLO, M.L. PARISI and Daniela SONEDDA: <u>Labor Taxes, Wage Setting and the Relative Wage Effect</u></i>
CLIM	35.2002	<i>C. BOEMARE and P. QUIRION (lv): <u>Implementing Greenhouse Gas Trading in Europe: Lessons from Economic Theory and International Experiences</u></i>
CLIM	36.2002	<i>T.TIETENBERG (lv): <u>The Tradable Permits Approach to Protecting the Commons: What Have We Learned?</u></i>
CLIM	37.2002	<i>K. REHDANZ and R.J.S. TOL (lv): <u>On National and International Trade in Greenhouse Gas Emission Permits</u></i>
CLIM	38.2002	<i>C. FISCHER (lv): <u>Multinational Taxation and International Emissions Trading</u></i>
SUST	39.2002	<i>G. SIGNORELLO and G. PAPPALARDO: <u>Farm Animal Biodiversity Conservation Activities in Europe under the Framework of Agenda 2000</u></i>
NRM	40.2002	<i>S.M. CAVANAGH, W. M. HANEMANN and R. N. STAVINS: <u>Muffled Price Signals: Household Water Demand under Increasing-Block Prices</u></i>
NRM	41.2002	<i>A. J. PLANTINGA, R. N. LUBOWSKI and R. N. STAVINS: <u>The Effects of Potential Land Development on Agricultural Land Prices</u></i>
CLIM	42.2002	<i>C. OHL (lvi): <u>Inducing Environmental Co-operation by the Design of Emission Permits</u></i>
CLIM	43.2002	<i>J. EYCKMANS, D. VAN REGEMORTER and V. VAN STEENBERGHE (lvi): <u>Is Kyoto Fatally Flawed? An Analysis with MacGEM</u></i>
CLIM	44.2002	<i>A. ANTOCI and S. BORGHESI (lvi): <u>Working Too Much in a Polluted World: A North-South Evolutionary Model</u></i>
ETA	45.2002	<i>P. G. FREDRIKSSON, Johan A. LIST and Daniel MILLIMET (lvi): <u>Chasing the Smokestack: Strategic Policymaking with Multiple Instruments</u></i>
ETA	46.2002	<i>Z. YU (lvi): <u>A Theory of Strategic Vertical DFI and the Missing Pollution-Haven Effect</u></i>
SUST	47.2002	<i>Y. H. FARZIN: <u>Can an Exhaustible Resource Economy Be Sustainable?</u></i>
SUST	48.2002	<i>Y. H. FARZIN: <u>Sustainability and Hamiltonian Value</u></i>
KNOW	49.2002	<i>C. PIGA and M. VIVARELLI: <u>Cooperation in R&D and Sample Selection</u></i>
Coalition Theory Network Coalition Theory Network	50.2002	<i>M. SERTEL and A. SLINKO (liv): <u>Ranking Committees, Words or Multisets</u></i>
ETA	51.2002	<i>Sergio CURRARINI (liv): <u>Stable Organizations with Externalities</u></i>
ETA	52.2002	<i>Robert N. STAVINS: <u>Experience with Market-Based Policy Instruments</u></i>
ETA	53.2002	<i>C.C. JAEGER, M. LEIMBACH, C. CARRARO, K. HASSELMANN, J.C. HOURCADE, A. KEELER and R. KLEIN (liii): <u>Integrated Assessment Modeling: Modules for Cooperation</u></i>
CLIM	54.2002	<i>Scott BARRETT (liii): <u>Towards a Better Climate Treaty</u></i>
ETA	55.2002	<i>Richard G. NEWELL and Robert N. STAVINS: <u>Cost Heterogeneity and the Potential Savings from Market-Based Policies</u></i>
SUST	56.2002	<i>Paolo ROSATO and Edi DEFRANCESCO: <u>Individual Travel Cost Method and Flow Fixed Costs</u></i>
SUST	57.2002	<i>Vladimir KOTOV and Elena NIKITINA (lvii): <u>Reorganisation of Environmental Policy in Russia: The Decade of Success and Failures in Implementation of Perspective Quests</u></i>
SUST	58.2002	<i>Vladimir KOTOV (lvii): <u>Policy in Transition: New Framework for Russia's Climate Policy</u></i>
SUST	59.2002	<i>Fanny MISSFELDT and Arturo VILLAVICENCO (lvii): <u>How Can Economies in Transition Pursue Emissions Trading or Joint Implementation?</u></i>
VOL	60.2002	<i>Giovanni DI BARTOLOMEO, Jacob ENGWERDA, Joseph PLASMANS and Bas VAN AARLE: <u>Staying Together or Breaking Apart: Policy-Makers' Endogenous Coalitions Formation in the European Economic and Monetary Union</u></i>
ETA	61.2002	<i>Robert N. STAVINS, Alexander F. WAGNER and Gernot WAGNER: <u>Interpreting Sustainability in Economic Terms: Dynamic Efficiency Plus Intergenerational Equity</u></i>
PRIV	62.2002	<i>Carlo CAPUANO: <u>Demand Growth, Entry and Collusion Sustainability</u></i>
PRIV	63.2002	<i>Federico MUNARI and Raffaele ORIANI: <u>Privatization and R&D Performance: An Empirical Analysis Based on Tobin's Q</u></i>
PRIV	64.2002	<i>Federico MUNARI and Maurizio SOBRERO: <u>The Effects of Privatization on R&D Investments and Patent Productivity</u></i>
SUST	65.2002	<i>Orley ASHENFELTER and Michael GREENSTONE: <u>Using Mandated Speed Limits to Measure the Value of a Statistical Life</u></i>
ETA	66.2002	<i>Paolo SURICO: <u>US Monetary Policy Rules: the Case for Asymmetric Preferences</u></i>
PRIV	67.2002	<i>Rinaldo BRAU and Massimo FLORIO: <u>Privatisations as Price Reforms: Evaluating Consumers' Welfare Changes in the U.K.</u></i>
CLIM	68.2002	<i>Barbara K. BUCHNER and Roberto ROSON: <u>Conflicting Perspectives in Trade and Environmental Negotiations</u></i>
CLIM	69.2002	<i>Philippe QUIRION: <u>Complying with the Kyoto Protocol under Uncertainty: Taxes or Tradable Permits?</u></i>
SUST	70.2002	<i>Anna ALBERINI, Patrizia RIGANTI and Alberto LONGO: <u>Can People Value the Aesthetic and Use Services of Urban Sites? Evidence from a Survey of Belfast Residents</u></i>
SUST	71.2002	<i>Marco PERCOCO: <u>Discounting Environmental Effects in Project Appraisal</u></i>

NRM	72.2002	<i>Philippe BONTEMS and Pascal FAVARD: <u>Input Use and Capacity Constraint under Uncertainty: The Case of Irrigation</u></i>
PRIV	73.2002	<i>Mohammed OMRAN: <u>The Performance of State-Owned Enterprises and Newly Privatized Firms: Empirical Evidence from Egypt</u></i>
PRIV	74.2002	<i>Mike BURKART, Fausto PANUNZI and Andrei SHLEIFER: <u>Family Firms</u></i>
PRIV	75.2002	<i>Emmanuelle AURIOL, Pierre M. PICARD: <u>Privatizations in Developing Countries and the Government Budget Constraint</u></i>
PRIV	76.2002	<i>Nichole M. CASTATER: <u>Privatization as a Means to Societal Transformation: An Empirical Study of Privatization in Central and Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union</u></i>
PRIV	77.2002	<i>Christoph LÜLSFESMANN: <u>Benevolent Government, Managerial Incentives, and the Virtues of Privatization</u></i>
PRIV	78.2002	<i>Kate BISHOP, Igor FILATOTCHEV and Tomasz MICKIEWICZ: <u>Endogenous Ownership Structure: Factors Affecting the Post-Privatisation Equity in Largest Hungarian Firms</u></i>
PRIV	79.2002	<i>Theodora WELCH and Rick MOLZ: <u>How Does Trade Sale Privatization Work? Evidence from the Fixed-Line Telecommunications Sector in Developing Economies</u></i>
PRIV	80.2002	<i>Alberto R. PETRUCCI: <u>Government Debt, Agent Heterogeneity and Wealth Displacement in a Small Open Economy</u></i>
CLIM	81.2002	<i>Timothy SWANSON and Robin MASON (Ivi): <u>The Impact of International Environmental Agreements: The Case of the Montreal Protocol</u></i>
PRIV	82.2002	<i>George R.G. CLARKE and Lixin Colin XU: <u>Privatization, Competition and Corruption: How Characteristics of Bribe Takers and Payers Affect Bribe Payments to Utilities</u></i>
PRIV	83.2002	<i>Massimo FLORIO and Katuscia MANZONI: <u>The Abnormal Returns of UK Privatisations: From Underpricing to Outperformance</u></i>
NRM	84.2002	<i>Nelson LOURENÇO, Carlos RUSSO MACHADO, Maria do ROSÁRIO JORGE and Luis RODRIGUES: <u>An Integrated Approach to Understand Territory Dynamics. The Coastal Alentejo (Portugal)</u></i>
CLIM	85.2002	<i>Peter ZAPFEL and Matti VAINIO (Iv): <u>Pathways to European Greenhouse Gas Emissions Trading History and Misconceptions</u></i>
CLIM	86.2002	<i>Pierre COURTOIS: <u>Influence Processes in Climate Change Negotiations: Modelling the Rounds</u></i>
ETA	87.2002	<i>Vito FRAGNELLI and Maria Erminia MARINA (Iviii): <u>Environmental Pollution Risk and Insurance</u></i>
ETA	88.2002	<i>Laurent FRANCKX (Iviii): <u>Environmental Enforcement with Endogenous Ambient Monitoring</u></i>
ETA	89.2002	<i>Timo GOESCHL and Timothy M. SWANSON (Iviii): <u>Lost Horizons. The noncooperative management of an evolutionary biological system.</u></i>
ETA	90.2002	<i>Hans KEIDING (Iviii): <u>Environmental Effects of Consumption: An Approach Using DEA and Cost Sharing</u></i>
ETA	91.2002	<i>Wietze LISE (Iviii): <u>A Game Model of People's Participation in Forest Management in Northern India</u></i>
CLIM	92.2002	<i>Jens HORBACH: <u>Structural Change and Environmental Kuznets Curves</u></i>
ETA	93.2002	<i>Martin P. GROSSKOPF: <u>Towards a More Appropriate Method for Determining the Optimal Scale of Production Units</u></i>
VOL	94.2002	<i>Scott BARRETT and Robert STAVINS: <u>Increasing Participation and Compliance in International Climate Change Agreements</u></i>
CLIM	95.2002	<i>Banu BAYRAMOGLU LISE and Wietze LISE: <u>Climate Change, Environmental NGOs and Public Awareness in the Netherlands: Perceptions and Reality</u></i>
CLIM	96.2002	<i>Matthieu GLACHANT: <u>The Political Economy of Emission Tax Design in Environmental Policy</u></i>
KNOW	97.2002	<i>Kenn ARIGA and Giorgio BRUNELLO: <u>Are the More Educated Receiving More Training? Evidence from Thailand</u></i>
ETA	98.2002	<i>Gianfranco FORTE and Matteo MANERA: <u>Forecasting Volatility in European Stock Markets with Non-linear GARCH Models</u></i>
ETA	99.2002	<i>Geoffrey HEAL: <u>Bundling Biodiversity</u></i>
ETA	100.2002	<i>Geoffrey HEAL, Brian WALKER, Simon LEVIN, Kenneth ARROW, Partha DASGUPTA, Gretchen DAILY, Paul EHRlich, Karl-Goran MALER, Nils KAUTSKY, Jane LUBCHENCO, Steve SCHNEIDER and David STARRETT: <u>Genetic Diversity and Interdependent Crop Choices in Agriculture</u></i>
ETA	101.2002	<i>Geoffrey HEAL: <u>Biodiversity and Globalization</u></i>
VOL	102.2002	<i>Andreas LANGE: <u>Heterogeneous International Agreements – If per capita emission levels matter</u></i>
ETA	103.2002	<i>Pierre-André JOUVET and Walid OUESLATI: <u>Tax Reform and Public Spending Trade-offs in an Endogenous Growth Model with Environmental Externality</u></i>
ETA	104.2002	<i>Anna BOTTASSO and Alessandro SEMBENELLI: <u>Does Ownership Affect Firms' Efficiency? Panel Data Evidence on Italy</u></i>
PRIV	105.2002	<i>Bernardo BORTOLOTTI, Frank DE JONG, Giovanna NICODANO and Ibolya SCHINDELE: <u>Privatization and Stock Market Liquidity</u></i>
ETA	106.2002	<i>Haruo IMAI and Mayumi HORIE (Iviii): <u>Pre-Negotiation for an International Emission Reduction Game</u></i>
PRIV	107.2002	<i>Sudeshna GHOSH BANERJEE and Michael C. MUNGER: <u>Move to Markets? An Empirical Analysis of Privatisation in Developing Countries</u></i>
PRIV	108.2002	<i>Guillaume GIRMENS and Michel GUILLARD: <u>Privatization and Investment: Crowding-Out Effect vs Financial Diversification</u></i>
PRIV	109.2002	<i>Alberto CHONG and Florencio LÓPEZ-DE-SILANES: <u>Privatization and Labor Force Restructuring Around the World</u></i>
PRIV	110.2002	<i>Nandini GUPTA: <u>Partial Privatization and Firm Performance</u></i>
PRIV	111.2002	<i>François DEGEORGE, Dirk JENTER, Alberto MOEL and Peter TUFANO: <u>Selling Company Shares to Reluctant Employees: France Telecom's Experience</u></i>

PRIV	112.2002	<i>Isaac OTCHERE</i> : <u>Intra-Industry Effects of Privatization Announcements: Evidence from Developed and Developing Countries</u>
PRIV	113.2002	<i>Yannis KATSOULAKOS and Elissavet LIKOYANNI</i> : <u>Fiscal and Other Macroeconomic Effects of Privatization</u>
PRIV	114.2002	<i>Guillaume GIRMENS</i> : <u>Privatization, International Asset Trade and Financial Markets</u>
PRIV	115.2002	<i>D. Teja FLOTHO</i> : <u>A Note on Consumption Correlations and European Financial Integration</u>
PRIV	116.2002	<i>Ibolya SCHINDELE and Enrico C. PEROTTI</i> : <u>Pricing Initial Public Offerings in Premature Capital Markets: The Case of Hungary</u>
PRIV	1.2003	<i>Gabriella CHIESA and Giovanna NICODANO</i> : <u>Privatization and Financial Market Development: Theoretical Issues</u>
PRIV	2.2003	<i>Ibolya SCHINDELE</i> : <u>Theory of Privatization in Eastern Europe: Literature Review</u>
PRIV	3.2003	<i>Wietze LISE, Claudia KEMFERT and Richard S.J. TOL</i> : <u>Strategic Action in the Liberalised German Electricity Market</u>
CLIM	4.2003	<i>Laura MARSILIANI and Thomas I. RENSTRÖM</i> : <u>Environmental Policy and Capital Movements: The Role of Government Commitment</u>
KNOW	5.2003	<i>Reyer GERLAGH</i> : <u>Induced Technological Change under Technological Competition</u>
ETA	6.2003	<i>Efrem CASTELNUOVO</i> : <u>Squeezing the Interest Rate Smoothing Weight with a Hybrid Expectations Model</u>
SIEV	7.2003	<i>Anna ALBERINI, Alberto LONGO, Stefania TONIN, Francesco TROMBETTA and Margherita TURVANI</i> : <u>The Role of Liability, Regulation and Economic Incentives in Brownfield Remediation and Redevelopment: Evidence from Surveys of Developers</u>
NRM	8.2003	<i>Elissaios POPYRAKIS and Reyner GERLAGH</i> : <u>Natural Resources: A Blessing or a Curse?</u>
CLIM	9.2003	<i>A. CAPARRÓS, J.-C. PEREAU and T. TAZDAÏT</i> : <u>North-South Climate Change Negotiations: a Sequential Game with Asymmetric Information</u>
KNOW	10.2003	<i>Giorgio BRUNELLO and Daniele CHECCHI</i> : <u>School Quality and Family Background in Italy</u>
CLIM	11.2003	<i>Efrem CASTELNUOVO and Marzio GALEOTTI</i> : <u>Learning By Doing vs Learning By Researching in a Model of Climate Change Policy Analysis</u>
KNOW	12.2003	<i>Carole MAIGNAN, Gianmarco OTTAVIANO and Dino PINELLI (eds.)</i> : <u>Economic Growth, Innovation, Cultural Diversity: What are we all talking about? A critical survey of the state-of-the-art</u>
KNOW	13.2003	<i>Carole MAIGNAN, Gianmarco OTTAVIANO, Dino PINELLI and Francesco RULLANI (lix)</i> : <u>Bio-Ecological Diversity vs. Socio-Economic Diversity. A Comparison of Existing Measures</u>
KNOW	14.2003	<i>Maddy JAASSENS and Chris STEYAERT (lix)</i> : <u>Theories of Diversity within Organisation Studies: Debates and Future Trajectories</u>
KNOW	15.2003	<i>Tuzin BAYCAN LEVENT, Enno MASUREL and Peter NIJKAMP (lix)</i> : <u>Diversity in Entrepreneurship: Ethnic and Female Roles in Urban Economic Life</u>
KNOW	16.2003	<i>Alexandra BITUSIKOVA (lix)</i> : <u>Post-Communist City on its Way from Grey to Colourful: The Case Study from Slovakia</u>
KNOW	17.2003	<i>Billy E. VAUGHN and Katarina MLEKOV (lix)</i> : <u>A Stage Model of Developing an Inclusive Community</u>
KNOW	18.2003	<i>Selma van LONDEN and Arie de RUIJTER (lix)</i> : <u>Managing Diversity in a Globalizing World</u>
Coalition Theory Network	19.2003	<i>Sergio CURRARINI</i> : <u>On the Stability of Hierarchies in Games with Externalities</u>
PRIV	20.2003	<i>Giacomo CALZOLARI and Alessandro PAVAN (lx)</i> : <u>Monopoly with Resale</u>
PRIV	21.2003	<i>Claudio MEZZETTI (lx)</i> : <u>Auction Design with Interdependent Valuations: The Generalized Revelation Principle, Efficiency, Full Surplus Extraction and Information Acquisition</u>
PRIV	22.2003	<i>Marco LiCalzi and Alessandro PAVAN (lx)</i> : <u>Tilting the Supply Schedule to Enhance Competition in Uniform-Price Auctions</u>
PRIV	23.2003	<i>David ETTINGER (lx)</i> : <u>Bidding among Friends and Enemies</u>
PRIV	24.2003	<i>Hannu VARTAINEN (lx)</i> : <u>Auction Design without Commitment</u>
PRIV	25.2003	<i>Matti KELOHARJU, Kjell G. NYBORG and Kristian RYDQVIST (lx)</i> : <u>Strategic Behavior and Underpricing in Uniform Price Auctions: Evidence from Finnish Treasury Auctions</u>
PRIV	26.2003	<i>Christine A. PARLOUR and Uday RAJAN (lx)</i> : <u>Rationing in IPOs</u>
PRIV	27.2003	<i>Kjell G. NYBORG and Ilya A. STREBULAEV (lx)</i> : <u>Multiple Unit Auctions and Short Squeezes</u>
PRIV	28.2003	<i>Anders LUNANDER and Jan-Eric NILSSON (lx)</i> : <u>Taking the Lab to the Field: Experimental Tests of Alternative Mechanisms to Procure Multiple Contracts</u>
PRIV	29.2003	<i>TangaMcDANIEL and Karsten NEUHOFF (lx)</i> : <u>Use of Long-term Auctions for Network Investment</u>
PRIV	30.2003	<i>Emiel MAASLAND and Sander ONDERSTAL (lx)</i> : <u>Auctions with Financial Externalities</u>
ETA	31.2003	<i>Michael FINUS and Bianca RUNDSHAGEN</i> : <u>A Non-cooperative Foundation of Core-Stability in Positive Externality NTU-Coalition Games</u>
KNOW	32.2003	<i>Michele MORETTO</i> : <u>Competition and Irreversible Investments under Uncertainty</u>
PRIV	33.2003	<i>Philippe QUIRION</i> : <u>Relative Quotas: Correct Answer to Uncertainty or Case of Regulatory Capture?</u>
KNOW	34.2003	<i>Giuseppe MEDA, Claudio PIGA and Donald SIEGEL</i> : <u>On the Relationship between R&D and Productivity: A Treatment Effect Analysis</u>
ETA	35.2003	<i>Alessandra DEL BOCA, Marzio GALEOTTI and Paola ROTA</i> : <u>Non-convexities in the Adjustment of Different Capital Inputs: A Firm-level Investigation</u>

GG	36.2003	<i>Matthieu GLACHANT</i> : <u>Voluntary Agreements under Endogenous Legislative Threats</u>
PRIV	37.2003	<i>Narjess BOUBAKRI, Jean-Claude COSSET and Omrane GUEDHAM</i> : <u>Postprivatization Corporate Governance: the Role of Ownership Structure and Investor Protection</u>
CLIM	38.2003	<i>Rolf GOLOMBEK and Michael HOEL</i> : <u>Climate Policy under Technology Spillovers</u>
KNOW	39.2003	<i>Slim BEN YOUSSEF</i> : <u>Transboundary Pollution, R&D Spillovers and International Trade</u>
CTN	40.2003	<i>Carlo CARRARO and Carmen MARCHIORI</i> : <u>Endogenous Strategic Issue Linkage in International Negotiations</u>
KNOW	41.2003	<i>Sonia OREFFICE</i> : <u>Abortion and Female Power in the Household: Evidence from Labor Supply</u>
KNOW	42.2003	<i>Timo GOESCHL and Timothy SWANSON</i> : <u>On Biology and Technology: The Economics of Managing Biotechnologies</u>
ETA	43.2003	<i>Giorgio Busetti and Matteo MANERA</i> : <u>STAR-GARCH Models for Stock Market Interactions in the Pacific Basin Region, Japan and US</u>
CLIM	44.2003	<i>Katrin MILLOCK and Céline NAUGES</i> : <u>The French Tax on Air Pollution: Some Preliminary Results on its Effectiveness</u>
PRIV	45.2003	<i>Bernardo BORTOLOTTI and Paolo PINOTTI</i> : <u>The Political Economy of Privatization</u>
SIEV	46.2003	<i>Elbert DIJKGRAAF and Herman R.J. VOLLEBERGH</i> : <u>Burn or Bury? A Social Cost Comparison of Final Waste Disposal Methods</u>
ETA	47.2003	<i>Jens HORBACH</i> : <u>Employment and Innovations in the Environmental Sector: Determinants and Econometrical Results for Germany</u>
CLIM	48.2003	<i>Lori SNYDER, Nolan MILLER and Robert STAVINS</i> : <u>The Effects of Environmental Regulation on Technology Diffusion: The Case of Chlorine Manufacturing</u>
CLIM	49.2003	<i>Lori SNYDER, Robert STAVINS and Alexander F. WAGNER</i> : <u>Private Options to Use Public Goods. Exploiting Revealed Preferences to Estimate Environmental Benefits</u>
CTN	50.2003	<i>László Á. KÓCZY and Luc LAUWERS (Ixi)</i> : <u>The Minimal Dominant Set is a Non-Empty Core-Extension</u>
CTN	51.2003	<i>Matthew O. JACKSON (Ixi)</i> : <u>Allocation Rules for Network Games</u>
CTN	52.2003	<i>Ana MAULEON and Vincent VANNEBELBOSCH (Ixi)</i> : <u>Farsightedness and Cautiousness in Coalition Formation</u>
CTN	53.2003	<i>Fernando VEGA-REDONDO (Ixi)</i> : <u>Building Up Social Capital in a Changing World: a network approach</u>
CTN	54.2003	<i>Matthew HAAG and Roger LAGUNOFF (Ixi)</i> : <u>On the Size and Structure of Group Cooperation</u>
CTN	55.2003	<i>Taiji FURUSAWA and Hideo KONISHI (Ixi)</i> : <u>Free Trade Networks</u>
CTN	56.2003	<i>Halis Murat YILDIZ (Ixi)</i> : <u>National Versus International Mergers and Trade Liberalization</u>
CTN	57.2003	<i>Santiago RUBIO and Alistair ULPH (Ixi)</i> : <u>An Infinite-Horizon Model of Dynamic Membership of International Environmental Agreements</u>
KNOW	58.2003	<i>Carole MAIGNAN, Dino PINELLI and Gianmarco I.P. OTTAVIANO</i> : <u>ICT, Clusters and Regional Cohesion: A Summary of Theoretical and Empirical Research</u>
KNOW	59.2003	<i>Giorgio BELLETTINI and Gianmarco I.P. OTTAVIANO</i> : <u>Special Interests and Technological Change</u>
ETA	60.2003	<i>Ronnie SCHÖB</i> : <u>The Double Dividend Hypothesis of Environmental Taxes: A Survey</u>
CLIM	61.2003	<i>Michael FINUS, Ekko van IERLAND and Robert DELLINK</i> : <u>Stability of Climate Coalitions in a Cartel Formation Game</u>
GG	62.2003	<i>Michael FINUS and Bianca RUNDSHAGEN</i> : <u>How the Rules of Coalition Formation Affect Stability of International Environmental Agreements</u>
SIEV	63.2003	<i>Alberto PETRUCCI</i> : <u>Taxing Land Rent in an Open Economy</u>
CLIM	64.2003	<i>Joseph E. ALDY, Scott BARRETT and Robert N. STAVINS</i> : <u>Thirteen Plus One: A Comparison of Global Climate Policy Architectures</u>
SIEV	65.2003	<i>Edi DEFRANCESCO</i> : <u>The Beginning of Organic Fish Farming in Italy</u>
SIEV	66.2003	<i>Klaus CONRAD</i> : <u>Price Competition and Product Differentiation when Consumers Care for the Environment</u>
SIEV	67.2003	<i>Paulo A.L.D. NUNES, Luca ROSSETTO, Arianne DE BLAEIJ</i> : <u>Monetary Value Assessment of Clam Fishing Management Practices in the Venice Lagoon: Results from a Stated Choice Exercise</u>
CLIM	68.2003	<i>ZhongXiang ZHANG</i> : <u>Open Trade with the U.S. Without Compromising Canada's Ability to Comply with its Kyoto Target</u>
KNOW	69.2003	<i>David FRANTZ (Iix)</i> : <u>Lorenzo Market between Diversity and Mutation</u>
KNOW	70.2003	<i>Ercole SORI (Iix)</i> : <u>Mapping Diversity in Social History</u>
KNOW	71.2003	<i>Ljiljana DERU SIMIC (Iixii)</i> : <u>What is Specific about Art/Cultural Projects?</u>
KNOW	72.2003	<i>Natalya V. TARANOVA (Iixii)</i> : <u>The Role of the City in Fostering Intergroup Communication in a Multicultural Environment: Saint-Petersburg's Case</u>
KNOW	73.2003	<i>Kristine CRANE (Iixii)</i> : <u>The City as an Arena for the Expression of Multiple Identities in the Age of Globalisation and Migration</u>
KNOW	74.2003	<i>Kazuma MATOBA (Iixii)</i> : <u>Glocal Dialogue- Transformation through Transcultural Communication</u>
KNOW	75.2003	<i>Catarina REIS OLIVEIRA (Iixii)</i> : <u>Immigrants' Entrepreneurial Opportunities: The Case of the Chinese in Portugal</u>
KNOW	76.2003	<i>Sandra WALLMAN (Iixii)</i> : <u>The Diversity of Diversity - towards a typology of urban systems</u>

KNOW	77.2003	<i>Richard PEARCE</i> (Ixii): <u>A Biologist's View of Individual Cultural Identity for the Study of Cities</u>
KNOW	78.2003	<i>Vincent MERK</i> (Ixii): <u>Communication Across Cultures: from Cultural Awareness to Reconciliation of the Dilemmas</u>
KNOW	79.2003	<i>Giorgio BELLETTINI, Carlotta BERTI CERONI and Gianmarco I.P. OTTAVIANO</i> : <u>Child Labor and Resistance to Change</u>
ETA	80.2003	<i>Michele MORETTO, Paolo M. PANTEGHINI and Carlo SCARPA</i> : <u>Investment Size and Firm's Value under Profit Sharing Regulation</u>
IEM	81.2003	<i>Alessandro LANZA, Matteo MANERA and Massimo GIOVANNINI</i> : <u>Oil and Product Dynamics in International Petroleum Markets</u>
CLIM	82.2003	<i>Y. Hossein FARZIN and Jinhua ZHAO</i> : <u>Pollution Abatement Investment When Firms Lobby Against Environmental Regulation</u>
CLIM	83.2003	<i>Giuseppe DI VITA</i> : <u>Is the Discount Rate Relevant in Explaining the Environmental Kuznets Curve?</u>
CLIM	84.2003	<i>Reyer GERLAGH and Wietze LISE</i> : <u>Induced Technological Change Under Carbon Taxes</u>
NRM	85.2003	<i>Rinaldo BRAU, Alessandro LANZA and Francesco PIGLIARU</i> : <u>How Fast are the Tourism Countries Growing? The cross-country evidence</u>
KNOW	86.2003	<i>Elena BELLINI, Gianmarco I.P. OTTAVIANO and Dino PINELLI</i> : <u>The ICT Revolution: opportunities and risks for the Mezzogiorno</u>
SIEV	87.2003	<i>Lucas BRETSCHGER and Sjak SMULDERS</i> : <u>Sustainability and Substitution of Exhaustible Natural Resources. How resource prices affect long-term R&D investments</u>
CLIM	88.2003	<i>Johan EYCKMANS and Michael FINUS</i> : <u>New Roads to International Environmental Agreements: The Case of Global Warming</u>
CLIM	89.2003	<i>Marzio GALEOTTI</i> : <u>Economic Development and Environmental Protection</u>
CLIM	90.2003	<i>Marzio GALEOTTI</i> : <u>Environment and Economic Growth: Is Technical Change the Key to Decoupling?</u>
CLIM	91.2003	<i>Marzio GALEOTTI and Barbara BUCHNER</i> : <u>Climate Policy and Economic Growth in Developing Countries</u>
IEM	92.2003	<i>A. MARKANDYA, A. GOLUB and E. STRUKOVA</i> : <u>The Influence of Climate Change Considerations on Energy Policy: The Case of Russia</u>
ETA	93.2003	<i>Andrea BELTRATTI</i> : <u>Socially Responsible Investment in General Equilibrium</u>
CTN	94.2003	<i>Parkash CHANDER</i> : <u>The γ-Core and Coalition Formation</u>
IEM	95.2003	<i>Matteo MANERA and Angelo MARZULLO</i> : <u>Modelling the Load Curve of Aggregate Electricity Consumption Using Principal Components</u>
IEM	96.2003	<i>Alessandro LANZA, Matteo MANERA, Margherita GRASSO and Massimo GIOVANNINI</i> : <u>Long-run Models of Oil Stock Prices</u>
CTN	97.2003	<i>Steven J. BRAMS, Michael A. JONES, and D. Marc KILGOUR</i> : <u>Forming Stable Coalitions: The Process Matters</u>
KNOW	98.2003	<i>John CROWLEY, Marie-Cecile NAVES</i> (Ixiii): <u>Anti-Racist Policies in France. From Ideological and Historical Schemes to Socio-Political Realities</u>
	1000	Carlo CARRARO, Alessandro LANZA and Valeria PAPPONETTI: <u>One Thousand Working Papers</u>

- (l) This paper was presented at the Workshop “Growth, Environmental Policies and Sustainability” organised by the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Venice, June 1, 2001
- (li) This paper was presented at the Fourth Toulouse Conference on Environment and Resource Economics on “Property Rights, Institutions and Management of Environmental and Natural Resources”, organised by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, IDEI and INRA and sponsored by MATE, Toulouse, May 3-4, 2001
- (lii) This paper was presented at the International Conference on “Economic Valuation of Environmental Goods”, organised by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei in cooperation with CORILA, Venice, May 11, 2001
- (liii) This paper was circulated at the International Conference on “Climate Policy – Do We Need a New Approach?”, jointly organised by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Stanford University and Venice International University, Isola di San Servolo, Venice, September 6-8, 2001
- (liv) This paper was presented at the Seventh Meeting of the Coalition Theory Network organised by the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei and the CORE, Université Catholique de Louvain, Venice, Italy, January 11-12, 2002
- (lv) This paper was presented at the First Workshop of the Concerted Action on Tradable Emission Permits (CATEP) organised by the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Venice, Italy, December 3-4, 2001
- (lvi) This paper was presented at the ESF EURESCO Conference on Environmental Policy in a Global Economy “The International Dimension of Environmental Policy”, organised with the collaboration of the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Acquafredda di Maratea, October 6-11, 2001
- (lvii) This paper was presented at the First Workshop of “CFEWE – Carbon Flows between Eastern and Western Europe”, organised by the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei and Zentrum für Europäische Integrationsforschung (ZEI), Milan, July 5-6, 2001
- (lviii) This paper was presented at the Workshop on “Game Practice and the Environment”, jointly organised by Università del Piemonte Orientale and Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Alessandria, April 12-13, 2002
- (lix) This paper was presented at the ENGIME Workshop on “Mapping Diversity”, Leuven, May 16-17, 2002
- (lx) This paper was presented at the EuroConference on “Auctions and Market Design: Theory, Evidence and Applications”, organised by the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Milan, September 26-28, 2002
- (lxi) This paper was presented at the Eighth Meeting of the Coalition Theory Network organised by the GREQAM, Aix-en-Provence, France, January 24-25, 2003
- (lxii) This paper was presented at the ENGIME Workshop on “Communication across Cultures in Multicultural Cities”, The Hague, November 7-8, 2002
- (lxiii) This paper was presented at the ENGIME Workshop on “Social dynamics and conflicts in multicultural cities”, Milan, March 20-21, 2003

2002 SERIES

CLIM	<i>Climate Change Modelling and Policy</i> (Editor: Marzio Galeotti)
VOL	<i>Voluntary and International Agreements</i> (Editor: Carlo Carraro)
SUST	<i>Sustainability Indicators and Environmental Valuation</i> (Editor: Carlo Carraro)
NRM	<i>Natural Resources Management</i> (Editor: Carlo Giupponi)
KNOW	<i>Knowledge, Technology, Human Capital</i> (Editor: Dino Pinelli)
MGMT	<i>Corporate Sustainable Management</i> (Editor: Andrea Marsanich)
PRIV	<i>Privatisation, Regulation, Antitrust</i> (Editor: Bernardo Bortolotti)
ETA	<i>Economic Theory and Applications</i> (Editor: Carlo Carraro)

2003 SERIES

CLIM	<i>Climate Change Modelling and Policy</i> (Editor: Marzio Galeotti)
GG	<i>Global Governance</i> (Editor: Carlo Carraro)
SIEV	<i>Sustainability Indicators and Environmental Valuation</i> (Editor: Anna Alberini)
NRM	<i>Natural Resources Management</i> (Editor: Carlo Giupponi)
KNOW	<i>Knowledge, Technology, Human Capital</i> (Editor: Gianmarco Ottaviano)
IEM	<i>International Energy Markets</i> (Editor: Anil Markandya)
CSR	<i>Corporate Social Responsibility and Management</i> (Editor: Sabina Ratti)
PRIV	<i>Privatisation, Regulation, Antitrust</i> (Editor: Bernardo Bortolotti)
ETA	<i>Economic Theory and Applications</i> (Editor: Carlo Carraro)
CTN	<i>Coalition Theory Network</i>