

Mayer, Otto G.

Article — Digitized Version
After the Paris summit

Intereconomics

Suggested Citation: Mayer, Otto G. (1972) : After the Paris summit, Intereconomics, ISSN 0020-5346, Verlag Weltarchiv, Hamburg, Vol. 07, Iss. 11, pp. 342-, <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02929665>

This Version is available at:
<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/138732>

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.

After the Paris Summit

by Otto G. Mayer, Hamburg

Apparently most of the "professional" Europeans have not been disappointed by the Paris Summit of the nine EEC-members. Above all the statesmen were pleased at the end for at home each of them could claim to be a success. In short, the following results were achieved at the Summit: manifestation of the firm intent to establish a European Union until 1980 — a declaration, that for instance Federal Chancellor Brandt considers to be the most important conference resolution —, establishment of a European Monetary Fund until April 1, 1973, and, besides, contribution of bright ideas to a common regional and social policy.

These results may have supported the "European awareness" of those in power. The real importance of these resolutions, however, passed by the Paris Summit will be discussed for a while yet. Either the so-called decisions are disputed as regards their usefulness or they are still requiring follow-up decisions in order to become concrete. Practical and long overdue measures for promoting also the population's European awareness are missing almost completely. A future European government under parliamentary control — in other words a democratisation of the Community by strengthening the powers of a Parliament consisting of directly elected members—also continued to remain a chimera. Not more technocracy but more democracy will be able to demand "awareness" and "commitment" of the population. But the required clear, binding

and practical guidelines for the reform of the institutions, the trimming of procedures for taking decisions have again be put on the shelf with beautiful phrases.

The declaration of a European Union until 1980 also incurs the danger of remaining a collection of idle words. It finally fixes the term when this target is to be attained, but the real meaning of this European Union remains an open question. The suggestion of a conferee that this conception has not been clearly defined, because otherwise the fixing of this aim would have been probably undone, seems to be characteristic of the procedures.

The impossibility of arriving at a decision on the future shape of the necessary exchange of views with the USA and other major industrial countries was also one of the disappointments of this Summit. Brandt's demand for a high level dialogue with the USA was rejected by Pompidou's reference to the American embassy in Brussels. Small wonder if the USA should react negatively. Strained relations between the EEC and USA would hardly benefit the Community because of its economical, political and military dependence on the United States.

Certainly the developing countries will be disappointed with the conference results. True, the communiqué demands from the member states "to realise gradually a comprehensive worldwide policy of development aid taking into consideration the

results of UNCTAD and acting within the framework of the development strategy decided on by the United Nations". But the Summit Conference avoided all precise obligations. All pertaining questions are to be examined and decided on in due course during 1973.

Discordant, too, remains the resolution to establish the Monetary Fund in 1973 and to let the second phase of the Economic and Monetary Union start next year. While the Monetary Union is approached by one more step, the Economic Union is still in a sad state as far as the fixing of common economic targets, their order of precedence and concrete measures for their realisation—catchword: stability—are concerned.

That increased attention is to be given in future at last to social problems, including labour relations and environment protection, is to be noted as an unambiguously positive feature. The "Norwegian shock" seems to have had at least some salutary effects. President Mansholt apparently valued the Summit on a whole positively when he stated that its results opened up great chances. Since the substance of the aspired "European Union" was defined in Paris, it would now depend only on the political intent of all involved, the authorities and the population, what shape this Union would take in future. "Everything, everything is possible", he said. But can it really be the meaning of a conference that afterwards nearly everything just continues to be possible?