**The Politicisation of EC Anti-dumping Policy:
Member States, Their Votes, and the European Commission¹**

Simon J. Evenett²
Oxford University and The Brookings Institution

And

Edwin Vermulst³
Vermulst, Waer & Verhaeghe, Attorneys-at-law, Brussels.

31 August 2004

Abstract:

This paper examines one political-economy aspect of the European Communities' (EC) anti-dumping policy that has tended to be overlooked in prior studies; namely, the role that member states play in deciding whether to impose definitive duties on imports that have been found to be dumped and that are deemed to have injured a European industry. We find that, in the late 1990s, numerous disagreements between member states occurred over the merits of imposing anti-dumping duties. These disagreements may well have been partly responsible for the strong decline in the number of European anti-dumping investigations initiated after 1999.

¹ We thank the participants at, and organisers of, the Symposium on a Centennial of Anti-Dumping Legislation and Implementation, which took place on 12 March 2004 at the University of Michigan.

² Email address: sevenett@mindspring.com.

³ Email address: edwin.vermulst@vww-law.be.

1. Introduction.

In 2002, the then-fifteen members of the European Union (EU) imported a total of \$933.1 billion of merchandise imports from non-EU trading partners. The very fact that the EC anti-dumping policy could influence just under one trillion dollars of international commerce is an indication of the potential importance of this form of contingent protection. With the enlargement of the EU in May 2004 the terms upon which goods enter another ten nations became conditioned in part by the EC's rules on dumped imports. These considerations, plus the concern that the phase-out of the Agreement on Textiles and Clothing in January 2005 will lead to a wave of unfair and/or fair trade investigations, highlight the importance of understanding the causes and consequences of EC anti-dumping policy.

In this paper we document and assess the role that the EU member states have played in influencing the outcome of anti-dumping proceedings. This contrasts with existing studies of the political economy of anti-dumping protection in Europe, which have tended to emphasise the role of political and technocratic influences on the dumping and injury investigations.⁴ Our starting point is that, under EC procedures of long standing, after an investigation by the European Commission has determined that certain imports were dumped and have caused injury, duties can only be imposed if a simple majority of the EU member states vote in favour of such protection. Moreover until recently (March 2004), EC anti-dumping rules were such that an abstention by a member state on a vote to impose such duties was actually counted as a vote against imposition. Therefore, before the rule change, eight of the then-fifteen member states had to vote in favour of imposing anti-dumping duties and associated measures for them to come into effect.

We suspect that the reason scholars have not studied the determinants and effects of member states' votes on European anti-dumping matters is that the records of such votes are not published. However, all is not lost as the outcomes of these votes (and other declarations of member states' views) are often leaked to business newspapers and specialist periodicals. We performed extensive searches of a leading database of media outlets and have assembled a collection of over sixty news articles that shed light on the pattern of member state voting on anti-dumping measures since 1991. We are, for example, able to calculate the proportion of votes (or similar expressions of views) that each of the fifteen (pre-2004 enlargement) member states cast in favour of restrictive measures.⁵ In fact, we are able to identify two blocks of member states, one that routinely supports the imposition of anti-dumping measures and one that opposes them. Moreover, an examination of these newspaper articles lead to the identification of six means by which the European Commission has altered the proposed scope of anti-dumping duties or investigations so as to increase the number of member states favouring the imposition of measures. In addition, these news articles enabled us to identify eight diplomatic

⁴ See, in particular, Eymann and Schuknecht (1993, 1996), Messerlin and Reed (1995), Schuknecht (1992), Tharakan (1991, 1995), and Tharakan and Waelbroeck (1994). It should be noted that much of the latter literature has been motivated by political economy analyses of U.S. dumping and material injury investigations, of which Finger, Hall, and Nelson (1982), Baldwin (1985), and Baldwin and Steagall (1994) are leading examples. A survey of the recent U.S. literature on these, and related, matters can be found in Blonigen and Prusa (2001).

⁵ See Table 5 below.

factors which are said to have influenced either member states' voting behaviour or the European Commission's proposals for definitive duties. To the extent that EU member states are responsive to the European Commission's overtures, to diplomatic considerations, as well as to the traditional interests of import-competing and import-buying domestic agents, then the political economy of EC anti-dumping policy may be more complex than the extant literature appears to suggest.

Our examination of the member states' voting patterns has led to other findings. First, the public disagreements between member states over two anti-dumping investigations into cotton in the late 1990s are just two public examples of a larger number of such disagreements since 1997. Moreover, the reduced likelihood that the European Commission's proposals for definitive duties will be adopted may well account, in part, for the falling number of EC anti-dumping investigations that have been initiated after 1999. (The number of such investigations initiated fell in absolute numbers and as a share of the total number of OECD members' anti-dumping investigations and, for that matter, as a share of the worldwide total also.) Second, we discuss the possible implications of a recent change in EC rules on counting abstentions in votes on definitive duties which is likely to favour the emergence of simple majorities for imposing such duties. Third, the recent enlargement of the EU may well alter the membership of the two blocks that consistently vote for or against definitive duties. We examine the record of recent anti-dumping investigations by the ten new accession countries, and find that only two of them (Poland and Lithuania) have been quite active users of this form of contingent protection since 1995.

The remainder of this paper is organised as follows. A short account of the EC's anti-dumping procedures is given in the next section, along with recent statistics on the number of anti-dumping investigations by the European Commission. The third section describes the sources used in this study and summarises the evidence (such as it is) on the voting patterns and other declared views of EU member states on anti-dumping investigations and proposed duties. The fourth section describes the manner in which diplomatic factors and steps taken by the European Commission are said to have potentially influenced the votes of member states. The fifth section discusses the possible effects of the recent enlargement of the EU on the voting patterns for definitive duties, and appropriate caveats are made for what is necessarily a speculative exercise. Some concluding remarks are offered in section six.

2. The EC anti-dumping system and the role of the member states.

Once an anti-dumping complaint about foreign imports has been received by the European Commission, a multi-step process begins. Three of the four most important steps are carried out by the European Commission; namely, the dumping investigation, the injury investigation⁶, and the determination of whether the imposition of anti-dumping duties would be in the Community's interest. During these three steps the European Commission is mandated to consult the member states, often through meetings

⁶ It is worth noting that the dumping and injury investigation are undertaken by different case handlers in the Trade Directorate of the European Commission.

of the Anti-dumping Advisory Committee, but the views of the member states are not legally binding.

Before definitive duties are imposed, however, another important step must be taken. Specifically, a simply majority in the European Council (that comprises the member states) must vote in favour of a European Commission proposal to that effect. Moreover before 8 March 2004, when new regulations came into effect, abstentions by member states in such votes were counted against proposals to impose duties. This implied that, before the recent enlargement of the EU, eight member states had to vote in favour of Commission proposals to impose duties. In sum, although the European Commission plays an important role in the prior three steps, it is the member states acting collectively that finally determine whether anti-dumping duties are imposed on imports into the European Union.

It is an interesting question as to whether this fourth step essentially politicises the supply of protection against dumped imports in the European Union. Although we will return to this matter later in the paper, a few preliminary comments are in order. If the member states view their role as essentially that of ratifying the outcomes of a technocratic Commission-led process, then it would be difficult to make the case for politicisation. If, however, member states consider the likely effects of proposed duties on the relevant import-competing and import-purchasing interests in their jurisdictions, then a different hypothesis arises; namely, national economic interests (mediated through national political institutions) may well determine votes in the European Council on imposing definitive duties and the views expressed in the Anti-dumping Advisory Committee. Furthermore, to the extent that the latter is true, and supposing that the Trade Directorate of the European Commission has come to a view as to the desirability of imposing duties, then a related hypothesis arises—that the European Commission tailors and amends proposals for definitive duties so as to encourage the creation of a simple majority in favour of imposing duties. Readers may want to bear these different hypotheses in mind when evaluating the evidence presented in subsequent sections of this paper.

Practitioners and others have noted a change in the role played by member states in EC anti-dumping investigations in recent years. Prior to 1995 it is said that a spirit of “live and let live” co-operation prevailed and that the member states tended to support the European Commission’s proposals to impose definitive anti-dumping duties. Since 1995, however, disagreements between member states and between the European Commission and the member states are said to have occurred more frequently. The anti-dumping cases involving *Cotton Fabrics* (two cases), *Hot Rolled Flat (Steel) Coils*, and *Carbon Black* are said to exemplify this new trend.

The *Cotton fabrics* cases are probably the best example of this trend. The European cotton producers’ association (Eurocoton) had originally filed an anti-dumping complaint against all types of cotton fabrics in 1997. In the EU, cotton fabrics are essentially produced in France, Spain, Portugal, and Italy. Most other Member States import cotton fabrics from countries such as India, Pakistan, and Egypt, the targets of the Eurocoton complaint. After the European Commission had completed its investigation and recommended definitive duties, most importing Member States voted against such measures. Eurocoton then filed a new complaint, this time targeting only *Unbleached*

cotton fabrics, but again the European Commission failed to garner enough support for the imposition of measures in 1998.

Eurocoton later challenged the failure of the European Council to adopt definitive measures before the European courts. On appeal, the European Court of Justice (ECJ) agreed with Eurocoton that the European Council had failed to motivate why it had rejected the measures proposed by the European Commission.⁷ Thus, while the ECJ did not necessarily find that the European Council had decided wrongly, it did rule that the European Council has an obligation to motivate its decision. This motivation requirement arguably makes it more difficult for the European Council to disagree with a Commission proposal to adopt definitive measures because if the European Council does so, it will have to explain why.

Another potentially important recent change in the EC anti-dumping system, which came into effect on 8 March 2004, has been to count abstentions in the European Council on votes to impose definitive duties as votes in favour of imposing such measures.⁸ Opponents of a proposed set of duties will now have to explicitly vote against definitive duties, rather than following the diplomatically more convenient route of abstaining. To the extent that “smaller” member states find it more difficult to oppose a coalition in favour of imposing duties that includes certain “larger” member states, then this change almost surely increases the likelihood that more definitive duties will be imposed in the future.

⁷ This judgement was rendered in 30 September 2003.

⁸ For details of, and the rationale for, this and the other proposed changes announced at the same time, see European Commission (2003).

If, before the rule change on 8 March 2004, it had become harder to secure a simple majority in favour of definitive duties then, *ceteris paribus*, one might expect the number of EC anti-dumping investigations initiated to fall. Interestingly, as shown in Figure 1, after the controversial cotton cases in 1997 and 1998, the number of anti-dumping investigations initiated indeed falls after 1999. Moreover, the EU share of the total number of anti-dumping investigations by OECD nations fell also, as did the EU share of total worldwide investigations. The latter suggests that there may be something EU-specific about the downturn in anti-dumping investigations, perhaps augmenting the effect of the late 1990s boom in the number of anti-dumping complaints made by firms in Europe and elsewhere.⁹ It is not our contention that variables such as the exchange rate and economic growth are irrelevant to understanding the intertemporal pattern of EC anti-dumping investigations. Nor do we claim that the observed downturn in investigations by the European Commission since 1999 is permanent; rather we note that this downturn has coincided with a growing propensity on the part of some member states to question the European Commission's proposals for the imposition of definitive duties.

3. Evidence on member states' views on EC anti-dumping investigations and proposals for definitive duties.

As noted earlier, the European Commission is obliged to consult the member states concerning on-going anti-dumping investigations. Moreover, proposals for definitive duties must receive the support of a simple majority in the European Council before being implemented. Unfortunately, the tallies of votes and views expressed by member states on such matters are not published in any official document of the European Union. However, such votes and views are often leaked to newspapers and specialist periodicals. In this section we describe the method used to assemble a collection of media articles that shed light on member states' votes and views on EC anti-dumping matters. We also summarise the contents of these articles, including the construction of a summary table that reports each member state's propensity to vote for definitive anti-dumping duties and for various steps in the EC anti-dumping procedure that could lead to such duties. The caveats and drawbacks of our approach are discussed in some detail also.

The database *Factiva* was the source of the newspaper and periodical articles assembled for this paper. The search function of this electronic database, which includes articles from over 9,000 sources, was used to locate newspaper and other accounts of the votes and views of member states on EC anti-dumping investigations between 1991 and 2003. Appendix Table 1 contains short descriptions of 67 articles that form the evidential base of this study. For each of the articles listed in that table, the source of the article, the date of publication, the good that was the subject of the anti-dumping investigation or measure, the subject trading partners, the reported votes of the member states (where available), the steps taken by the European Commission and trading partners to influence the member states' views on the anti-dumping matter in question, are all reported. The articles reported in Appendix Table 1 were published in English, although a significant

⁹ Knetter and Prusa (2000), among others, find that faster national income growth tends to reduce the number of anti-dumping cases filed to national authorities.

fraction are likely to have been translations of articles that were probably first published by French media outlets.

Table 1: Number of relevant newspaper articles and anti-dumping cases referred to in Appendix Table 1.

Year	Number of newspaper entries	Number of distinct anti-dumping cases referred to in a given year's newspaper articles
1991	3	3
1992	2	2
1993	1	1
1994	2	2
1995	2	1
1996	1	1
1997	15	8
1998	26	5
1999	5	5
2000	8	8
2001	1	1
2002	0	0
2003	1	1
Total	67	38

Table 1 provides information on when the media articles (used for this study) were published. Of the 67 articles in Appendix Table 1, only 11 were published before 1997. Most of the articles were published in 1997 and 1998, when the member states were unable to reach a consensus on the two cotton anti-dumping investigations discussed in the last section. It should, however, be noted that the articles in Appendix Table 1 that were published in 1997 and 1998 do not refer only to these cotton cases. Eleven other anti-dumping actions were the subject of news reports in these two years. In total, the newspaper articles in Appendix Table 1 refer to 38 distinct anti-dumping actions between the years 1991 and 2003.

Table 2 reports information on the media outlets which published the articles used in this study. Two outlets, *Agence Europe* and *European Report*, account for the overwhelming majority of the articles listed in Appendix Table 1. It is notable that certain of the leading business newspapers in Europe (in particular *The Financial Times* and *The Wall Street Journal Europe*) appear not to give much (if any) coverage to the role of member states in the EC anti-dumping system. This may well be another explanation for the lack of scholarly analysis of this subject matter.

Table 2: Newspapers and periodicals referred to in Appendix Table 1.

Name of newspaper or periodical	Number of entries in Appendix Table 1
Agence Europe	25
European Report	19
European Voice	4
Financial Times	3
Reuters News	3
Asia Pulse	2
Europe Energy	1
Business Standard	1
The Herald	1
Business Line (The Hindu)	1
The Economic Times	1
Agence France Presse	1
Electronic Times	1
Metal Bulletin	1
Novecon	1
The Statesman	1
Financial Express	1
Total: 17 newspapers and periodicals	67

One of the potential difficulties associated with using different newspaper sources is that they may report contradictory accounts of the member states' views and votes.¹⁰ In the few instances where actual or potential inconsistencies were found, we gave each of the relevant news articles a separate entry in Appendix Table 1. Moreover, we footnoted those inconsistencies, enabling the reader to directly compare the statements made in the relevant news articles.

The newspaper articles listed in Appendix Table 1 refer to six distinct stages of the EC anti-dumping procedure, see Table 3. A majority of the articles (54) refer to the three stages from the imposition of preliminary duties (denoted as stage P in Table 3 and Appendix Table 1) to the decision to impose definitive duties (denoted as stage D.) Few articles refer to the member states' views on initiating investigations, terminating investigations, and reviews of an existing anti-dumping measure.

With some notable exceptions (such as personal fax machines, pocket lighters, and hair brushes, and arguably photocopies and leather bags), the overwhelming majority of newspaper articles listed in Appendix Table 1 refer to anti-dumping investigations involving intermediate goods. That member states should disagree on the merits on anti-dumping measures on such goods is perhaps unsurprisingly, given that the commercial interests that import intermediate goods may find it easier to make representations to their national governments than do personal consumers.

¹⁰ Of course, another concern is that a newspaper report is inaccurate even when it is not contradicted by another newspaper report. Given the secrecy attendant in EC anti-dumping system checking for inaccuracy is impossible, whereas checking for consistency (when more than one media outlet reports on the same event) is, in principle, feasible. This is an important caveat that the reader might bear in mind.

Table 3: Stage of EC anti-dumping procedure referred to in newspaper articles in Appendix Table 1.

Stage of investigation	Acronym	Number of newspaper articles in Appendix Table 1
Initiate investigation	I	3
From initiation of investigation up until the imposition of preliminary duties	P	17
From imposition of preliminary duties to just before the decision to impose definitive duties.	PD	22
Decision to impose definitive duties	D	15
Decision to terminate an investigation	TI	4
Decisions associated with a review of a prevailing anti-dumping measure	R	6

Table 4: Frequency with which the EU's trading partners are listed in Appendix Table 1.

Trading partner	Number of mentions in Appendix Table 1 (taking the 1998 cotton case as one mention).
China	15
Japan	10
Thailand	8
Korea	8
India	7
Taiwan	6
Malaysia	5
Turkey	4
Indonesia	4
Russia	4
Egypt	3
Ukraine	3
Norway	2
Pakistan	2
Singapore	2
Brazil	1
Poland	1
USA	1
Belarus	1
Slovenia	1
Total: 20 trading partners	88

Given the propensity of European firms to source intermediate goods from Asian nations, in particular East Asian nations, it should not be surprising therefore that the most frequently named trading partners in contentious European anti-dumping investigations are from that region (see Table 4). This finding is another manifestation of the long-standing debate within Europe as to the appropriate means to respond to the rise of import competition from lower-wage Asian economies.

For each member state we also counted the number of times where a media report stated that it had voted (or expressed an opinion) in favour of, or against, a step in the EC anti-dumping process that could lead to the imposition of definitive duties. (We also counted the number of reported abstentions by each member state.) The results are reported in Table 5. In the case of Portugal, for example, there are 19 explicit references in the media articles (assembled in Appendix Table 1) to that member state's views on EC anti-dumping investigations. In each of the 19 references, Portugal indicated a preference for imposing definitive duties or for taking steps that could result in such duties being imposed. In our sample, therefore, Portugal had a 100 percent rate of support for the European Commission's anti-dumping investigations and related proposals.

The member states in Table 5 are listed in descending order of that rate of support. Five member states (Portugal, France, Italy, Greece, and Spain) have on 85 percent or more occasions supported steps towards anti-dumping duties. It would seem that these five countries represent the core of support for anti-dumping measures against Europe's trading partners. In contrast, six EU member states (Luxembourg, Netherlands, Finland, Germany, Sweden, and Denmark) have supported steps towards anti-dumping measures less than 15 percent of the time. The U.K. rate of support is just above the 15 percent level (at 15.6%), suggesting that in recent years opponents to the imposition of anti-dumping measures were just short of a simple majority. Therefore, on the voting rules that prevailed before 8 March 2004, if one or two additional member states could be persuaded to abstain (or even to vote against), then a proposal for definitive duties would be rejected.

Table 5 also provides information on the reported votes for definitive duties. The number of news articles where the votes of member states are explicitly reported is small, but the results may be of interest. Broadly speaking, the findings in the last paragraph are confirmed. Five member states appear to consistently vote for definitive duties, and seven vote against. Interestingly, when it comes to deciding on definitive duties (rather than on the intermediate stages leading up to proposals for such duties), Belgium tends to vote with the pro-duties block of member states. As a result, on a typical vote two small member states (Austria and Luxembourg) essentially determine whether there is a simple majority in favour of imposing definitive duties.

Table 5: Voting records of and views expressed by EU's member states on anti-dumping matters, 1991-2003.

Member state	Reported votes and views expressed by member states on all anti-dumping matters.					Reported votes by member states on the imposition of definitive duties.				
	Number of votes/views on restrictive measures or steps leading to restrictive measures.				Percentage of votes/view in favour of restrictive measures or steps leading to restrictive measures.	Number of votes/views on definitive duties.				Percentage of votes in favour of definitive duties.
	In favour	Opposed	Abstain	Total number of votes/views expressed.		In favour	Opposed	Abstain	Total number of votes.	
Portugal	19	0	0	19	100.0	5	0	0	5	100.0
France	21	0	1	22	95.5	5	0	1	6	83.3
Italy	19	1	0	20	95.0	5	0	0	5	100.0
Greece	12	0	1	13	92.3	5	0	0	5	100.0
Spain	17	3	0	20	85.0	5	0	0	5	100.0
Belgium	6	1	9	16	37.5	3	1	0	4	75.0
Austria	5	13	1	19	26.3	2	3	1	6	33.3
Ireland	5	15	1	21	23.8	0	3	0	3	0.0
UK	5	26	1	32	15.6	0	5	0	5	0.0
Luxembourg	2	6	6	14	14.3	1	3	1	5	20.0
Netherlands	2	21	1	24	8.3	0	3	0	3	0.0
Finland	1	15	0	16	6.3	0	3	0	3	0.0
Germany	0	25	2	27	0.0	0	3	1	4	0.0
Sweden	0	19	1	20	0.0	0	3	0	3	0.0
Denmark	0	19	1	20	0.0	0	2	0	2	0.0

On the basis of the findings in Table 5, it would appear that the accession of Austria, Finland, and Sweden to the EU in 1995 effectively added two members to the anti-duties block of member states and no members to the pro-duties block.¹¹ This, in turn, suggests the following hypothesis: the greater strength of the anti-duties block after the 1995 accessions emboldened these member states to contest more frequently the European Commission's proposals for definitive duties. In addition, so as to signal their opposition to definitive duties, this block of seven member states tended to voice their concerns throughout the entire investigative process, a strategy whose goal may have been to both discourage the proponents of duties and to reduce the expected payoff to any member state that contemplates using its swing vote strategically.

An indication of the potential implications of the recent (8 March 2004) change in the manner in which abstentions are counted can be deduced from the news articles collected for this study. In Table 6 eight instances are listed where the reported abstentions of member states would (under the new rules) have resulted in a simple majority in favour of either definitive duties or steps that could result in such duties.¹² Table 6 also identifies those member states whose abstentions would have "tipped the balance" in favour of adopting definitive duties or of a majority emerging in support of the various step taken by the European Commission in its investigations. In this regard, from 1998 until 2003 three small member states (Austria, Luxembourg, and Belgium) appear to have held some sway.

Table 6: Reported votes and views expressed by member states that would have generated the opposite simple majority, once abstentions are taken as votes in favour of a restrictive measure or steps leading to restrictive measure.

Relevant newspaper article number in Appendix Table 1	Identity of abstaining EU member(s), where specified	Year	Stage of investigation
13	Germany	1997	PD
25	Denmark, Luxembourg, and Ireland	1997	I
28	-	1998	P
39	Luxembourg and Belgium	1998	PD
40	Luxembourg and Belgium	1998	PD
41	Luxembourg and Belgium	1998	PD
51	Austria	1998	D
56	-	2000	P
60	-	2003	PD

¹¹ Sweden, for one, rarely used its anti-dumping law before joining the European Union and is reported to have taken a very skeptical line towards the imposition of anti-dumping duties and associated measures in the Anti-dumping Advisory Committee.

¹² This is not to say that the member states who abstained under the pre-8 March 2004 rules would have done so after the new rules can into effect.

4. Steps taken to influence the views of member states on anti-dumping matters.

An examination of the press materials assembled for this paper suggests that it would be a mistake to believe that no attempts, other than by domestic economic interests, are made to influence the views of EU member states on anti-dumping matters. In this section we document two types of third party influence (from the European Commission itself and from diplomatic pressure by non-EU countries that are the targets of EC anti-dumping investigations) and the means by which that influence is exercised.

In principle the European Commission could take steps to dissuade as well as to persuade member states from supporting a given set of proposed anti-dumping duties or a given anti-dumping investigation. We searched for evidence for either proposition, and could not find a single newspaper article that reported attempts (successful or otherwise) by the European Commission to reduce the level of member state support for a set of proposed duties. In contrast, six steps were identified that the European Commission has taken so as to increase the number of member states in favour of imposing anti-dumping duties (see Table 7). It should be noted, however, that most of these steps involved paring back the scope or duration of proposed anti-dumping duties. The European Commission, it would seem, is keen to get anti-dumping duties imposed and is willing to sacrifice some of the restrictive impact of those duties so as to build a constituency in favour of their imposition.

Table 7: Six steps that the European Commission is reported to have taken or offered to take so as to increase the number of member states voting for anti-dumping duties.

Step that the European Commission is reported to have taken or offered to take	Relevant newspaper article number in Appendix Table 1
Reduce the time period that duty is imposed for.	10
Reduce the time period before the duties are reviewed.	19, 20, 53
Reduce the magnitude of the duties.	20, 38, 41
Narrow the definition of the product under investigation.	24
Removal of trading partner from the scope of the anti-dumping order or duties.	38, 40, 41, 42, 48
Removal of specified products from the scope of the anti-dumping order or duties.	40, 42

The findings in Table 7 suggest another possible hypothesis concerning the strategy of European Commission when dealing with member states on anti-dumping matters. That is, might a strategy be to initially propose duties of a scope and duration that exceed the European Commission's preferred levels knowing that the proposed duties are likely to be whittled down as the deadline for deciding whether to adopt definitive duties approaches? Put succinctly, could the expectation of future bargaining between the member states and the European Commission influence the contents of the latter's

proposal for definitive duties in the first place?¹³ If this hypothesis is correct then one cannot conclude that the magnitudes of any imposed anti-dumping duties are necessarily reduced because of the requirement to persuade a simple majority of the member states to support the introduction of definitive duties.

In Table 8 eight diplomatic factors, which were reported in media articles as potential influences on the positions of member states on anti-dumping measures, are listed. In two cases (anti-dumping actions against Norway and Turkey) other factors affecting the EU's relationship with the target country are said to be important. In addition to lobbying and warnings of retaliation, geo-political factors also seem to be important. For example, in 2003, Spain, the U.K., and the Netherlands are said to have opposed the introduction of duties on imports of hot rolled steel from Egypt, so as to encourage the latter not to openly oppose the invasion of Iraq.

Table 8: Eight diplomatic factors that are reported to have been relevant in determining, at least in part, the outcome of EU anti-dumping investigations and associated voting by EU member states.

Reported factor	Trading partner concerned	Relevant newspaper article number in Appendix Table 1
Trading partner willing to negotiate export restraint or to stabilise exports.	Norway	3
Trading partner lobbies EU member states directly (in Europe or through EU ambassadors abroad).	India	11, 18, 45
	Egypt	41
Trading partner meets with Commission officials.	Norway	15
Trading partner in a preferential trading arrangement with the EU.	Norway	15
Trading partner has application for start of EU accession negotiations declined.	Turkey	41
Trading partner warns of serious damage to relations with EU if anti-dumping duties imposed.	Egypt	50
	India	50
	China	50
	Pakistan	50
	Indonesia	50
Trading partner is a developing country and, on these grounds, is seen by EU member state(s) are worthy of differential treatment.	Egypt	60
EU member state(s) wants trading partner to support, or at least not outright oppose, the invasion of Iraq in 2003.	Egypt	60

¹³ A number of the news articles listed in Appendix Table 1 contain statements are suggestive of such forward-looking behaviour by the European Commission.

It would seem, from the findings in Table 8 and the statements reported in the last column of Appendix Table 1, that the disagreements among member states over anti-dumping matters since 1997 have not gone unnoticed by the targets of EC anti-dumping investigations, and that the governments of the latter nations have in some cases augmented any representations made to the European Commission with those to the member states. In this instance, the growing politicisation of the EC's anti-dumping procedure (through a greater reluctance of member states to acquiesce to the proposals of the European Commission) is likely to have reduced the number and severity of the EC's anti-dumping measures.¹⁴ The latter depend in part on the membership of the European Union and on the foreign policy interests of the member states. Looking forward, this observation highlights the role of the ten new member states that joined the EU in May 2004; a factor that we turn to now.

Table 9: Pre-accession initiation of anti-dumping investigations and associated measures by the 10 states that joined the EU in 2004.

New member state of the EU	Number of anti-dumping investigations initiated between 1.1.1995 and 30.6.2003	Number of anti-dumping measures (duties and price-undertakings) in force on 30.6.2002
Czech Republic	3	1
Latvia	7	1
Lithuania	7	7
Poland	11	8
Slovenia	1	Not available
All other accession countries	0	0

Sources: For column 2, "Statistics on anti-dumping" obtainable at http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/adp_e/adp_e.htm. For column 3, "Report (2003) of the Committee on Anti-Dumping Practices," World Trade Organization, Annex C.

5. The ten acceding EU member states and their use of anti-dumping since 1995.

One important factor in determining the collective influence of the member states on the future supply of anti-dumping protection in Europe will be the views of the ten states that acceded to the EU in May 2004. Rather than speculate, we prefer to examine these ten nations prior use of anti-dumping measures to see if there are general tendencies as to the likely support of these states for the European Commission's future proposals for definitive duties. Based on World Trade Organization sources, Table 9 reports the number of anti-dumping investigations and measures taken from 1995 to 30 June 2003 by the ten new EU member states. Only five of the 10 acceding member states have actually instigated anti-dumping investigations in recent years. Of those five only two (Poland and

¹⁴ For the record, we found no news articles where it was reported that a member state wanted anti-dumping duties imposed (or increased) so as to satisfy a distinct foreign policy objective.

Lithuania) had more than one anti-dumping measure in place in the middle of 2002. Although certainly not conclusive evidence, these statistics suggest that the majority of the new EU members have not relied extensively on anti-dumping protection in the recent past and, as such, many are unlikely to be immediate candidates to join the pro-duties block on the European Council. However, there is a countervailing tendency that may offer little comfort to the existing members of the anti-duties block. Since most of the acceding members are small countries, and given the tendency for such countries to abstain on votes on EC anti-dumping matters, then (under the new rules for counting abstentions) it may be harder to obtain a simple majority against any proposed duties.

6. Concluding remarks.

Like much of the political economy literature on the U.S. anti-dumping system, many analyses of the EC anti-dumping procedure focus on the relative influence of economic and non-economic factors on the dumping and material injury investigations conducted by the European Commission. Without denying the importance of such studies, we have argued here that the role of member states in the EC anti-dumping system is significant, especially since 1997. A seven-strong anti-anti-dumping duties' block appears to have emerged among member states in the late 1990s, and they increasingly contest proposals for definitive duties made by the European Commission. This opposition also coincided with a sharp fall in the number of EC anti-dumping investigations from 1999 (both in absolute terms and as a share of the OECD total.) A shift from a Commission-dominated or "technocratic" anti-dumping system towards a more member-state influenced or "politicised" one has occurred.

We also draw out a number of potential implications of this more politicised system for the strategies of the European Commission and for opponents of anti-dumping duties, both within the EU and abroad. The likely effects of the recent rule changes on voting on EC anti-dumping measures and of enlargement were also discussed. From a comparative perspective perhaps the most important implication of this study is to call into question the presumption, widespread in the US literature, that (ideally) steps should be taken to depoliticise the supply of contingent protection. Recent European experience may serve as an important counter-example to this argument.¹⁵ In this regard it is also worth noting that, for at least six years, the Government of France has been arguing for a more technocratic and less politicised system to administer anti-dumping in Europe, precisely because "politics" is increasingly seen as reducing the supply of contingent protection.¹⁶

The study of member states' influence on the EC anti-dumping system deserves, in our view, more analysis. However, research is hampered by the absence of publicly available and official records of the opinions expressed and the votes of member states on EC anti-dumping matters. This is likely to frustrate the development of econometric analyses comparable to the study of the voting records of commissioners of the U.S. International

¹⁵ One possible explanation for the differences across the Atlantic in this regard is that the governments of EU member states may be more responsive to the pleas of the buyers of imports than U.S. legislators because of the diversity of economic activity is on average greater in a EU member state than in a U.S. congressional district or a U.S. state.

¹⁶ Reports on the original French proposals to this effect can be found in *Wall Street Journal Europe* (1998) and *Reuters News* (1998).

Trade Commission. Like us, others are probably going to have to rely on second-hand sources, with all of the concerns that this raises. On a positive note, our analysis might usefully be complemented by detailed case studies of some of the major anti-dumping investigations reported on in Appendix Table 1, in particular the cases involving cotton and hot rolled flat steel. These case studies might enrich our understanding of the relative importance of the economic, diplomatic, political, and other factors that determine the degree of anti-dumping protection in Europe.

7. References.

- Baldwin, R. (1985). *The Political Economy of U.S. Import Policy*. MIT Press. Cambridge.
- Baldwin, R., and J.W. Steagall. (1994). "An analysis of ITC decisions in antidumping, countervailing duty, and safeguard cases." *Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv*. 130: 290-307.
- Blonigen, B., and T.J. Prusa. (2001). "Antidumping." *National Bureau of Economic Research* working paper 8398. July.
- European Commission. (2003). "Anti-Dumping: EU acts to increase transparency, efficiency and predictability in the use of trade defence." Press release. 8 March.
- Eymann, A., and L. Schuknecht. (1993). "Antidumping enforcement in the European Community." In J.M. Finger (ed.) *Antidumping: How It Works and Who Gets Hurt*. University of Michigan Press. Ann Arbor.
- Eymann, A., and L. Schuknecht. (1996). "Antidumping Policy in the European Community: Political Discretion or Technical Determination?" *Economics and Politics*. 8(1996): 111-131.
- Finger, J.M., H.K. Hall, and D. R. Nelson. (1982). "The political economy of administered protection," *American Economic Review*. 72: 452-466.
- Knetter, M., and T.J. Prusa. (2000). "Macroeconomic Factors and Antidumping Filings: Evidence From Four Countries." *National Bureau of Economic Research* working paper 8010. November.
- Messerlin, P., and G. Reed. (1995). "Antidumping Policies in the United States and the European Community." *Economic Journal*, 105(433): 1565-1575. November.
- Reuters News*. (1998). "France launches EU debate on dumping policy." 28 January 1998.
- Schuknecht, L. (1992). *Trade Protection in the European Community*. Harwood Academic Publishers. Reading.
- Tharakan, P.K.M. (1991). "The political economy of anti-dumping undertakings in the European Communities." *European Economic Review*. 35: 1341-1359.
- Tharakan, P.K.M. (1995). "Political Economy and Contingent Protection." 105(433): 1550-1564. November.
- Tharakan, P.K.M., and J. Waelbroeck. (1994). "Antidumping and countervailing duty decisions in the E.C. and in the U.S.: An experiment in comparative political economy." *European Economic Review*. 38: 171-193.
- Wall Street Journal Europe*. (1998). "France's Asian Fears." 4 February 1998.

Appendix Table 1 of newspaper articles reporting on member state votes on anti-dumping investigations and duties in the European Union, 1991-2003.

Newspaper article number.	Title of article and newspaper.	Date of newspaper article.			Target good and stage of investigation. ¹⁷	Target trading partner(s).	Member states view on investigation continuing or duties being imposed. ¹⁸			Commission actions to alter member states' likely view of a given case.	Diplomatic measures by trading partner(s) or related considerations.
		Day	Month	Year			In favour.	Opposed.	Abstentions or undecided.		
1.	Definitive Anti Dumping Duty On Tungsten Halogen Lamps From Japan. <i>Agence Europe.</i>	22	1	1991	Tungsten halogen lamps; D.	Japan.	11.	1: UK.			
2.	Commission To Limit Japanese Micro-Circuit Imports (1 of 2). <i>Agence Europe.</i>	21	2	1991	Erasable Programme Read only Memories; PD.	Japan.		2: Ireland and the UK.			
3.	Commission Has Formally Closed The Anti-Dumping Procedure on Norwegian Salmon. <i>Agence Europe.</i>	19	3	1991	Salmon; TI.	Norway.	2: Ireland and the UK.				1. Article notes: "...the Norwegian authorities expressed their will to contribute to the balanced development of the fluctuation in salmon export to the EC and to combat factors that upset this."
4.	Council To	21	3	1992	Cotton yarn;	Brazil and		Number not			

¹⁷ For reference: see table 3 in the main text for the acronyms for the different stages of anti-dumping investigations.

¹⁸ In these columns the number of member states said to have a specific view of an anti-dumping investigation or measure is either (i) the number directly reported in the newspaper article or (ii) in case where every member state's view is reported, the number is calculated accordingly. In some newspaper articles (i) the total number of supporters or opponents of an anti-dumping investigation or measure is not reported or (ii) the identities of all of the supporters or opponents are not reported.

Newspaper article number.	Title of article and newspaper.	Date of newspaper article.			Target good and stage of investigation. ¹⁷	Target trading partner(s).	Member states view on investigation continuing or duties being imposed. ¹⁸			Commission actions to alter member states' likely view of a given case.	Diplomatic measures by trading partner(s) or related considerations.
		Day	Month	Year			In favour.	Opposed.	Abstentions or undecided.		
	Approve Definitive Anti-Dumping Rights On Imports Of Cotton Yarn From Brazil and Turkey. <i>Agence Europe</i> .				PD.	Turkey.		specified but includes UK.			
5.	Anti-Dumping: Decision Imminent On British Coal Complaint. <i>Europe Energy, Europe Information Service</i> .	21	4	1992	Coal; I.	Not specified.	Article states "seven [member states] voiced no objection to an investigation ..." ¹⁹	Number not specified but includes Germany.			
6.	Asian MSG Producers Increase Prices For Exports to EC. <i>Agence Europe</i> .	7	9	1993	Monosodium glutamate; D.	Indonesia, Thailand, Korea, and Taiwan.		1.			
7.	Community Terminates Anti-Dumping Proceedings On Chinese Gum Rosin. <i>Agence Europe</i> .	22	2	1994	Gum rosin; TI.	China.	1: Portugal	"A majority of the Member States" (number not specified): including Germany and Netherlands.			

¹⁹ Arguably this statement could be read as an abstention by the seven member states in question.

Newspaper article number.	Title of article and newspaper.	Date of newspaper article.			Target good and stage of investigation. ¹⁷	Target trading partner(s).	Member states view on investigation continuing or duties being imposed. ¹⁸			Commission actions to alter member states' likely view of a given case.	Diplomatic measures by trading partner(s) or related considerations.
		Day	Month	Year			In favour.	Opposed.	Abstentions or undecided.		
8.	Council Imposes Anti-Dumping Duty On Russian Isobutanol. <i>Agence Europe.</i>	31	3	1994	Isobutanol; D.	Russia.		Number not specified but includes the UK.			
9.	Union Seeks Compromise On Anti-Dumping Measures on Japanese Photocopiers. <i>Agence Europe.</i>	23	9	1995	Photocopiers; R.	Japan.	7.	8.		1. Article notes: "The Commission has proposed extending these duties by 20% for another three year. Member states are divided...But the positions are not set in stone, and all it would take is a shift by one Member State (Belgium?) from no to yes to reverse the situation."	
10.	Anti-Dumping Duty On Japanese Photocopiers To Be Extended By Two Years. <i>Agence Europe.</i>	29	9	1995	Photocopiers; R.	Japan.	8: Belgium, France, Italy, Spain, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, Portugal, and Austria.	Number not specified but includes Germany, Sweden, and the UK.		1. Article notes: "The Commission accepted to carry the period of implementing the duty from 3 to 2 years: under these conditions, an eighth country, Belgium, rallied	

Newspaper article number.	Title of article and newspaper.	Date of newspaper article.			Target good and stage of investigation. ¹⁷	Target trading partner(s).	Member states view on investigation continuing or duties being imposed. ¹⁸			Commission actions to alter member states' likely view of a given case.	Diplomatic measures by trading partner(s) or related considerations.
		Day	Month	Year			In favour.	Opposed.	Abstentions or undecided.		
										around those in favour taking them to 8..."	
11.	EU Verdict In Dumping Case Likely To Go Against India. <i>Business Standard</i>	3	10	1996	Unbleached cotton fabric; PD.	India.	5: including France and Portugal.	10.			1. Article notes that Indian officials have been engaging in "weeks of frantic lobbying in capitals across Europe..."
12.	Lobbies Battle Over EU Duties On Fabrics. <i>Financial Times</i> .	20	3	1997	Unbleached cotton grey fabrics; PD.	China, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Turkey, and Pakistan.		9.			
13.	EU Split on Cotton Dumping Action. <i>Financial Times</i> . ²⁰	21	3	1997	Unbleached cotton grey fabrics; PD.	China, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Turkey, and Pakistan.		7.	1: Germany (which, the article reports, has the "deciding vote.")		
14.	EU/Norway—EU Continues Deliberations On A Possible Anti-Dumping Duty	8	4	1997	Salmon; P.	Norway.	2: Ireland and the UK.	2: Denmark and Germany.	Article claims "...the other member states have not finalised their		

²⁰ The facts reported here from this newspaper article are consistent with those stated in "E.U./Cotton Anti-Dumping—2: Germany Position is Key," *Dow Jones Commodity Service*, on 25 March 1997.

Newspaper article number.	Title of article and newspaper.	Date of newspaper article.			Target good and stage of investigation. ¹⁷	Target trading partner(s).	Member states view on investigation continuing or duties being imposed. ¹⁸			Commission actions to alter member states' likely view of a given case.	Diplomatic measures by trading partner(s) or related considerations.
		Day	Month	Year			In favour.	Opposed.	Abstentions or undecided.		
	on Norwegian Salmon. <i>Agence Europe</i> .								positions..."		
15.	Anti-Dumping—Member States Uncertain Over 13.7% Duties on Norwegian Salmon. <i>European Report</i> .	9	4	1997	Salmon; P.	Norway.	2: Ireland and the UK.				1. Article notes "There are further legal complications related to the European Economic Area (EEA) Agreement, of which Norway is a signatory." 2. "Norwegian Foreign Minister Bjoern Tore Godal—who met with External Relations Commissioner Hans van den Broek on April 7—said he had never seen the EU take such a confrontational measure when the problem could be solved through talks."
16.	Meanwhile, there is still trouble	15	4	1997	Salmon; P.	Norway.	4: France, Ireland,	5: Denmark, Netherlands,			1. Article notes: "But with

Newspaper article number.	Title of article and newspaper.	Date of newspaper article.			Target good and stage of investigation. ¹⁷	Target trading partner(s).	Member states view on investigation continuing or duties being imposed. ¹⁸			Commission actions to alter member states' likely view of a given case.	Diplomatic measures by trading partner(s) or related considerations.
		Day	Month	Year			In favour.	Opposed.	Abstentions or undecided.		
	down at the farm. <i>The Herald.</i>						Finland, and UK.	Germany, Austria, and Sweden.			Norway's powerful propaganda campaign throughout the EU now appearing to bear fruit, the commission might now put off a decision until the last minute." 2. Article also states: "The EU has been bombarded by ministerial visits by the Norwegians during a long propaganda campaign against Scotland and Ireland."
17.	EU/Anti-Dumping—Pressure By European Cord Manufacturers For Application of Anti-Dumping Duties On Indian Synthetic Cord."	30	4	1997	Synthetic cord; TI.	India.	Article states "Most Member States are said to have taken a stand against this closure" (of the				

Newspaper article number.	Title of article and newspaper.	Date of newspaper article.			Target good and stage of investigation. ¹⁷	Target trading partner(s).	Member states view on investigation continuing or duties being imposed. ¹⁸			Commission actions to alter member states' likely view of a given case.	Diplomatic measures by trading partner(s) or related considerations.
		Day	Month	Year			In favour.	Opposed.	Abstentions or undecided.		
	<i>Agence Europe.</i>						investigation.)				
18.	EU spikes anti-dumping duty on cotton fabrics. <i>Business Line (The Hindu).</i>	16	5	1997	Unbleached cotton grey fabrics; D.	India and five other nations (including China and Pakistan.)	6: Belgium, Spain, Italy, Greece, France, and Portugal.	9: Denmark, Netherlands, Sweden, Ireland, UK, Finland, Austria, Luxembourg, and Germany.			Article notes: "The withdrawal of the duty could also be considered a major diplomatic victory for India as the Commerce Ministry had lobbied hard to get it removed."
19.	EU/Anti-Dumping—Majority Against Anti-Dumping Duties on Unbleached Cotton. <i>Agence Europe.</i>	17	5	1997	Unbleached cotton grey fabrics; D.	China, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Turkey, and Pakistan.	5: France, Italy, Spain, Greece, and Portugal.	8 including UK, Sweden, Finland, Netherlands, Ireland, Germany, and Austria.		1. Article notes: "In order to obtain a majority in favour, the Commission proposed on Thursday reducing from five to one year the length of the period at the end of which there would be a re-examination; [a] proposal that does not seem to have led to a majority." 2. Earlier the article noted that "The Commission made it known	

Newspaper article number.	Title of article and newspaper.	Date of newspaper article.			Target good and stage of investigation. ¹⁷	Target trading partner(s).	Member states view on investigation continuing or duties being imposed. ¹⁸			Commission actions to alter member states' likely view of a given case.	Diplomatic measures by trading partner(s) or related considerations.
		Day	Month	Year			In favour.	Opposed.	Abstentions or undecided.		
										that, for its part, it could submit another revised proposal.”	
20.	Anti-Dumping—EU Rejects Modified Duties On Cotton Imports. <i>European Report</i> . ²¹	21	5	1997	Unbleached cotton grey fabrics; D.	China, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Turkey, and Pakistan.	5: Belgium, Greece, Spain, Italy, and Portugal. (Reported support at 16 May 1997 meeting.)	8.	2: France and Luxembourg. ²²	1. Article notes: “In an effort to garner support from the Member States for definitive anti-dumping measures, the Commission slashed the duties in its proposal by up to a half. It also offered to review the duties after one year, instead of the customary five.”	
21.	EU/Anti-Dumping—Leather Bags From China. <i>Agence Europe</i> .	2	9	1997	Leather bags; D.	China.		5.			
22.	EU/Anti-Dumping—Poland and Russia.	11	9	1997	Non-alloyed zinc; D.	Russia and Poland.		4.	1.		

²¹ The findings of this newspaper article are identical to those reported in “EU rejects modified cotton dumping plan,” *Reuters News*, on 17 May 1997.

²² Please note the contradictory reports of the views of France and Luxembourg in this newspaper article and in the two articles directly above it.

Newspaper article number.	Title of article and newspaper.	Date of newspaper article.			Target good and stage of investigation. ¹⁷	Target trading partner(s).	Member states view on investigation continuing or duties being imposed. ¹⁸			Commission actions to alter member states' likely view of a given case.	Diplomatic measures by trading partner(s) or related considerations.
		Day	Month	Year			In favour.	Opposed.	Abstentions or undecided.		
	<i>Agence Europe.</i>										
23.	EU/Anti-Dumping—Consultations and Reactions. <i>Agence Europe.</i>	19	9	1997	Leather and synthetic shoes; D.	China, Indonesia, and Thailand.		Number not specified but includes Austria, Belgium, Finland, and Luxembourg.			
23.	EU/Anti-Dumping—Consultations and Reactions. <i>Agence Europe.</i> ²³	19	9	1997	Fax machines; P.	Japan, China, Korea, Malaysia, Singapore, Taiwan, and Thailand.		6.			
24.	EU majority against dumping duty on Asia faxes. <i>Reuters News.</i>	2	10	1997	Fax machines; P.	Japan, China, Korea, Malaysia, Singapore, Taiwan, and Thailand.		9. ²⁴		1. The article mentions a number of statements by an anonymous EC official. For example, “The source said he believed the Commission could win majority support if it narrowed	

²³ For the purposes of this table when a newspaper article refers to two or more distinct anti-dumping cases, and includes information on member state opinions towards each case, then a separate entry was given for each case.

²⁴ This number of opponents to the preliminary duties was also reported in “EU Resists Anti-Dumping Duty For Asia Faxes,” *European Report*, on 11 October 1997.

Newspaper article number.	Title of article and newspaper.	Date of newspaper article.			Target good and stage of investigation. ¹⁷	Target trading partner(s).	Member states view on investigation continuing or duties being imposed. ¹⁸			Commission actions to alter member states' likely view of a given case.	Diplomatic measures by trading partner(s) or related considerations.
		Day	Month	Year			In favour.	Opposed.	Abstentions or undecided.		
										down the definition (of faxes covered by the investigation). 'Of the nine that said no, maybe three or four were not hardliners,' he said. 'It would be enough for the Commission to win over two of these countries to get a majority.'"	
25.	Antidumping—Commission To Probe Asian In-Car CD Laser Systems. <i>European Report.</i>	1	11	1997	In-car compact disc systems; I.	Japan, China, South Korea, Malaysia, and Taiwan.	7: Italy, Netherlands, France, Portugal, Belgium, Greece, and Austria.	5: Germany, Spain, Sweden, Finland, and the UK.	3: Denmark, Luxembourg, and Ireland.		
26.	EU/Anti-Dumping—Synthetic Cord. <i>Agence Europe.</i>	9	1	1998	Synthetic cord; P.	India.		7: Germany, Austria, Denmark, Finland, Netherlands, UK, and Sweden.			
27.	EU Refuses to Fertilize Russian Industry. <i>Novecon.</i>	26	1	1998	Mineral fertilisers; PD.	Russia.	Number not specified but includes the UK.				
28.	EU duty on cloth	6	3	1998	Unbleached	India,	5: including	5: including	5.		

Newspaper article number.	Title of article and newspaper.	Date of newspaper article.			Target good and stage of investigation. ¹⁷	Target trading partner(s).	Member states view on investigation continuing or duties being imposed. ¹⁸			Commission actions to alter member states' likely view of a given case.	Diplomatic measures by trading partner(s) or related considerations.
		Day	Month	Year			In favour.	Opposed.	Abstentions or undecided.		
	lacks support. <i>Financial Times</i> .				cotton grey fabrics; P.	China, Pakistan, Indonesia, Egypt, and Turkey.	France, Spain, Portugal, and Greece.	the UK and the "Scandinavian" countries.			
29.	EU/Anti-Dumping—Pros And Cons Of Duties On Unbleached Cotton <i>Agence Europe</i> .	7	3	1998	Unbleached cotton grey fabrics; P.	India, China, Pakistan, Indonesia, Egypt, Turkey.	Number not specified but includes France, Spain, Greece, and Portugal.	Article notes that "other" countries are opposed but does not specifically identify them.	Article reports that "Netherlands, Austria, and Italy are hesitating."		
30.	Anti-dumping—Commission Agrees Controversial Cotton Duties. <i>European Report</i> .	28	3	1998	Unbleached cotton grey fabrics; P.	India, China, Pakistan, Indonesia, Egypt, and Turkey.	5: France, Spain, Greece, Italy, and Portugal.		1: Belgium.	1. Commission official states that: "At the moment, we have enough room for manoeuvre with this."	
31.	EU/Anti-Dumping—Provisional Duties On Imports Of Unalloyed Magnesium Originating in China. <i>Agence Europe</i> .	19	5	1998	Unwrought unalloyed magnesium; P.	China.		4: Germany, Denmark, Spain, and the UK.			
32.	Anti-Dumping—Eight EU Member States Complain Over	30	5	1998	Unbleached cotton grey fabrics; P.	India, China, Pakistan, Indonesia,		9: Austria, Denmark, Finland, Germany,		1. Article notes: "Commission officials acknowledge the	

Newspaper article number.	Title of article and newspaper.	Date of newspaper article.			Target good and stage of investigation. ¹⁷	Target trading partner(s).	Member states view on investigation continuing or duties being imposed. ¹⁸			Commission actions to alter member states' likely view of a given case.	Diplomatic measures by trading partner(s) or related considerations.
		Day	Month	Year			In favour.	Opposed.	Abstentions or undecided.		
	Cotton Duties. <i>European Report.</i>					Egypt, and Turkey.		Ireland, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Sweden, and the UK. (Reported opposition at March 1998 meeting.)		current hostility within the Council to the duties, but argue that a majority could be generated by the time the Member States have to vote on definitive duties.”	
33.	EU/Anti-Dumping. A Majority of Member States Dispute Provisional Duties Imposed by Commission on Unbleached Cotton Cloth Originating from Six Countries. <i>Agence Europe.</i>	30	5	1998	Unbleached cotton grey fabrics; P.	India, China, Pakistan, Indonesia, Egypt, and Turkey.		8: Austria, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Netherlands, Sweden, and the UK. (Reported opposition at 27 May 1998 meeting).			
34.	Commission attacked on cotton levy. <i>European Voice.</i> ²⁵	4	6	1998	Unbleached cotton grey fabrics; PD.	India, China, Pakistan, Indonesia, and Egypt.	5. (Report on March 1998 meeting.)	9. (Report on March 1998 meeting.) 8: Austria, Denmark, Finland,	1. (Report on March 1998 meeting.)	1. After the 8 opponents make a joint statement at the latter meeting, a EC official responds as follows. “Of	

²⁵ Unlike most of the newspaper articles summarised in this table, article number 34 contains information on more than one vote by the EU member states.

Newspaper article number.	Title of article and newspaper.	Date of newspaper article.			Target good and stage of investigation. ¹⁷	Target trading partner(s).	Member states view on investigation continuing or duties being imposed. ¹⁸			Commission actions to alter member states' likely view of a given case.	Diplomatic measures by trading partner(s) or related considerations.
		Day	Month	Year			In favour.	Opposed.	Abstentions or undecided.		
								Germany, Ireland, Netherlands, Sweden, and the UK. (Reported opposition at 27 May 1998 meeting).		course, we take note that these member states have expressed a view. But at the end of the day it's not an important point. There are no legal consequences."	
35.	EU/Anti-Dumping. Contradictory Declarations By Member States Over Anti-Dumping on Unbleached Cotton Fabrics. <i>Agence Europe</i> .	15	7	1998	Unbleached cotton grey fabrics; PD.	India, China, Pakistan, Indonesia, and Egypt.	No number specified, but Spain, Italy, and Portugal are mentioned.	8: Austria, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Netherlands, Sweden, and the UK. (Reported opposition at July 1998 meeting).			
36.	15 July General Affairs Council. <i>European Voice</i> .	16	7	1998	Unbleached cotton grey fabrics; PD.	India, China, Pakistan, Indonesia, and Egypt.	No number specified, but France, Spain, Italy, and Portugal are mentioned.	8: Including UK, Netherlands, and Germany.			
37.	India Wins Vital Support In Battling Anti-Dumping Duties. <i>Asia Pulse</i> .	17	7	1998	Unbleached cotton grey fabrics; PD.	India, China, Pakistan, Indonesia, and Egypt.	4: France, Spain, Italy, and Portugal.	8: Austria, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Ireland,	3: Belgium, Greece, and Luxembourg "yet to take a final stand on		

Newspaper article number.	Title of article and newspaper.	Date of newspaper article.			Target good and stage of investigation. ¹⁷	Target trading partner(s).	Member states view on investigation continuing or duties being imposed. ¹⁸			Commission actions to alter member states' likely view of a given case.	Diplomatic measures by trading partner(s) or related considerations.
		Day	Month	Year			In favour.	Opposed.	Abstentions or undecided.		
								Netherlands, Sweden, and the UK.	the issue.”		
38.	Cotton fabric exporters hit by EU conflict. <i>The Economic Times</i> .	20	7	1998	Unbleached cotton grey fabrics; PD.	India, China, Pakistan, Indonesia, and Egypt.				1: Omission of a target country (Turkey) from list of trading partners facing definitive duties. 2: Reduction of proposed duties on remaining five target countries.	
39.	EU/Anti-Dumping—Divergences Remain Over Unbleached Cotton. <i>Agence Europe</i> .	25	7	1998	Unbleached cotton grey fabrics; PD.	India, China, Pakistan, Indonesia, and Egypt.	6: Austria, France, Greece, Portugal, Italy, and Spain.	7: Germany, UK, Sweden, Finland, Denmark, Ireland, and the Netherlands.	2: Luxembourg and Belgium.		
40.	Anti-Dumping—Commission Hopes Third Time Lucky In Cotton Case. <i>European Report</i> . ²⁶	1	8	1998	Unbleached cotton grey fabrics; PD.	India, China, Pakistan, Indonesia, and Egypt.	6: including France and Italy.	7: Germany, UK, Sweden, Finland, Denmark, Ireland, and the Netherlands.	2: Luxembourg and Belgium (“undecided”)	1. Article notes “...critics of the measures suggested that the move to exclude Turkey had more to do with internal EU politics. They said it was one of the measures to	

²⁶ The total number of proponents of anti-dumping duties, and the number and identity of the two undecided nations, reported in this newspaper article are also mentioned in the “Cotton fabric exporters in a bind over EC move,” published in *The Economic Times* on 30 July 1998. Austria’s change of stance is also mentioned in the latter newspaper article.

Newspaper article number.	Title of article and newspaper.	Date of newspaper article.			Target good and stage of investigation. ¹⁷	Target trading partner(s).	Member states view on investigation continuing or duties being imposed. ¹⁸			Commission actions to alter member states' likely view of a given case.	Diplomatic measures by trading partner(s) or related considerations.
		Day	Month	Year			In favour.	Opposed.	Abstentions or undecided.		
										persuade Austria to back the package, along with other concessions like the exclusion of embroidered fabrics which would thus protect its specialist tapestry industry ²⁷ .” 2. “Commission officials believe their lobbying can bring Belgium and Luxembourg around, and point out that they have already secured a change from last March when nine Member States indicat[ed] they opposed the duties.”	
41.	Cotton anti-dumping vote on a knife-edge. <i>European Voice</i> .	10	9	1998	Unbleached cotton grey fabrics; PD.	India, China, Pakistan, Indonesia, and Egypt.	6: including France and Italy.	7: Germany, UK, Sweden, Finland, Denmark, Ireland, and the	2: Luxembourg and Belgium (“yet to declare their	1: Marginal duties imposed on embroidery “to win the support of Austria for	

²⁷ The reader is referred to article number 41 for a potentially contradictory statement about the nature of the tapestry-related concession to Austria.

Newspaper article number.	Title of article and newspaper.	Date of newspaper article.			Target good and stage of investigation. ¹⁷	Target trading partner(s).	Member states view on investigation continuing or duties being imposed. ¹⁸			Commission actions to alter member states' likely view of a given case.	Diplomatic measures by trading partner(s) or related considerations.
		Day	Month	Year			In favour.	Opposed.	Abstentions or undecided.		
								Netherlands.	hand")	definitive duties.” 2: Also article notes: “The Commission...has also come under attack from diplomats and lobbyists for allegedly altering duties for ‘political reasons,’ reducing some of the proposed levies to placate sceptical member states.” 3: Article goes on to claim Turkey was excluded because of Europe’s recent rejection of its application for EU membership.	
42.	EU/Antidumping. Majority Of Member States Opposed to Definitive Duties On Unbleached Cotton, But Commission	18	9	1998	Unbleached cotton grey fabrics; PD.	India, China, Pakistan, Indonesia, and Egypt.	6.	8: Luxembourg joins group opposing duties.	1: Belgium.	1. Article notes: “Meanwhile, the Commission can amend its proposal up until the time of the Council vote, with the goal of	

Newspaper article number.	Title of article and newspaper.	Date of newspaper article.			Target good and stage of investigation. ¹⁷	Target trading partner(s).	Member states view on investigation continuing or duties being imposed. ¹⁸			Commission actions to alter member states' likely view of a given case.	Diplomatic measures by trading partner(s) or related considerations.
		Day	Month	Year			In favour.	Opposed.	Abstentions or undecided.		
	Could Make A Last Ditch Effort By Changing Its Proposal. <i>Agence Europe</i> . ²⁸									obtaining a favourable majority.” 2. Notes that Commission has already excluded Turkey from target countries and withdrawn embroidered fabrics from the list of target products.	
43.	Egypt embarks on diplomatic drive to avoid EU anti-dumping tax. <i>Agence France Presse</i> .	28	9	1998	Unbleached cotton grey fabrics; PD.	India, China, Pakistan, Indonesia, and Egypt.	5: France, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Greece	6: Germany, Britain, Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Netherlands.	2: Belgium and Luxembourg.		1: From Egypt. A diplomat reports winning over Luxembourg to oppose duties.
44.	Cotton saga draws to a quiet close. <i>European Voice</i> .	1	10	1998	Unbleached cotton grey fabrics; PD.	India, China, Pakistan, Indonesia, and Egypt.		8: Luxembourg, UK, Denmark, Germany, Netherlands, Sweden, Ireland, and Finland (Reported opposition at 30 September 1998 meeting)		1. Article notes “There had been speculation that the Commission might amend its proposals in an effort to win over opponents at the 11 th hour, but officials said this was now unlikely.”	

²⁸ The opposition to duties reported here is consistent with a separate report titled “EU has no plans to amend cotton duty proposal,” *Reuters News*, 18 September 1998.

Newspaper article number.	Title of article and newspaper.	Date of newspaper article.			Target good and stage of investigation. ¹⁷	Target trading partner(s).	Member states view on investigation continuing or duties being imposed. ¹⁸			Commission actions to alter member states' likely view of a given case.	Diplomatic measures by trading partner(s) or related considerations.
		Day	Month	Year			In favour.	Opposed.	Abstentions or undecided.		
45.	EU unlikely to ratify anti-dumping duty. <i>The Statesman</i> .	4	10	1998	Unbleached cotton grey fabrics; PD.	India, China, Pakistan, Indonesia, and Egypt.		8.			1. Article notes: "On its part, the [Indian] government had left no stone unturned in its efforts to get the anti-dumping proceeding dropped, the Union Textile Secretary, Mr. Shyamal Ghosh, said. He said that he had personally met the Ambassadors of EU member nations and apprised them of India's position."
46.	India's textiles trade welcomes EU move on duty. <i>Reuters News</i> .	5	10	1998	Unbleached cotton grey fabrics; PD.	India, China, Pakistan, Indonesia, and Egypt.	6.	8.	1.		
47.	EU ministers reject cotton dumping duty. <i>Reuters News</i> .	5	10	1998	Unbleached cotton grey fabrics; PD.	India, China, Pakistan, Indonesia, and Egypt.	6: including France and Italy.	8: including the UK and Germany.			
48.	EU May Reject Anti-dumping	6	10	1998	Unbleached cotton grey	India, China,	2: France, Italy	8: Austria, Denmark,		1: Omission of a target country	

Newspaper article number.	Title of article and newspaper.	Date of newspaper article.			Target good and stage of investigation. ¹⁷	Target trading partner(s).	Member states view on investigation continuing or duties being imposed. ¹⁸			Commission actions to alter member states' likely view of a given case.	Diplomatic measures by trading partner(s) or related considerations.
		Day	Month	Year			In favour.	Opposed.	Abstentions or undecided.		
	Duty on Cotton Yarn. <i>Financial Express</i> .				fabrics; PD.	Pakistan, Indonesia, and Egypt.		Finland, Germany, Ireland, Netherlands, Sweden, and UK.		(Turkey) from list of trading partners facing definitive duties.	
49.	EU/Anti-Dumping. Council Does Not Introduce Definitive Duties On Unbleached Cotton Fabrics, Noting Lack Of A Majority. <i>Agence Europe</i> .	7	10	1998	Unbleached cotton grey fabrics; D.	India, China, Pakistan, Indonesia, and Egypt.	6: France, Italy, Portugal, Spain, Greece, and Austria.	8: UK, Germany, Sweden, Denmark, Ireland, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg.	1: Belgium.		
50.	Anti-Dumping—Cotton Duty Plan Thrown Out Again. <i>European Report</i> .	7	10	1998	Unbleached cotton grey fabrics; D.	India, China, Pakistan, Indonesia, and Egypt.	6: France, Italy, Portugal, Spain, Greece, and Austria.	8.	1: Belgium.		1: Article states “The news was greeted with relief by the five countries targeted, which had all complained bitterly about the planned duties, and had warned of a collapse in relations in they were confirmed.”
51.	Indian Steel Exporters Escape EU Anti-	19	11	1998	Stainless steel bars; D.	India.	7.	7.	1: Austria.		

Newspaper article number.	Title of article and newspaper.	Date of newspaper article.			Target good and stage of investigation. ¹⁷	Target trading partner(s).	Member states view on investigation continuing or duties being imposed. ¹⁸			Commission actions to alter member states' likely view of a given case.	Diplomatic measures by trading partner(s) or related considerations.
		Day	Month	Year			In favour.	Opposed.	Abstentions or undecided.		
	Dumping Duties. <i>Asia Pulse.</i>										
52.	EU says no to duty on imports. <i>Electronic Times.</i> ²⁹	8	3	1999	Electrolytic capacitors; D.	US and Thailand.	3.	7 (Reported opposition to duties at December 1998 meeting.) Council of Ministers refuse to impose duty in March 1999.			
53.	EU/Anti-dumping--Commission To Re-Examine Duties on Personal Fax Machines Originating in Japan and Singapore. <i>Agence Europe.</i>	10	3	1999	Personal fax machines; D.	Malaysia, China, Singapore, Taiwan, Japan, Korea, and Thailand.	"A majority" emerged for definitive duties when the vote was taken in April 1998. ³⁰			By promising to review, one year after their imposition, the anti-dumping measures against (at least Singapore and Japan), the article claims the Commission "enabled a majority to emerge in Council in favour of definitive anti-dumping	

²⁹ Unlike most of the newspaper articles summarised in this table, article number 52 contains information on more than one decision or vote by the EU member states.

³⁰ Note that this newspaper article refers to a majority decision that happened almost a year earlier than the report was published.

Newspaper article number.	Title of article and newspaper.	Date of newspaper article.			Target good and stage of investigation. ¹⁷	Target trading partner(s).	Member states view on investigation continuing or duties being imposed. ¹⁸			Commission actions to alter member states' likely view of a given case.	Diplomatic measures by trading partner(s) or related considerations.
		Day	Month	Year			In favour.	Opposed.	Abstentions or undecided.		
										duties..."	
54.	Brussels faces opposition in HR coil dumping case. <i>Metal Bulletin</i> .	27	9	1999	Hot rolled coil case; P.	Six unspecified countries.	Number not specified but includes Spain.	Number not specified but includes Sweden.			
55.	Anti-Dumping—Lighter and Capacity Duties Denied. <i>European Report</i> .	22	12	1999	Pocket lighters; R.	Japan, China, Thailand, and South Korea.	5: Italy, Greece, Portugal, Spain, and France.	9.			
55.	Anti-Dumping—Lighter and Capacity Duties Denied. <i>European Report</i> . ³¹	22	12	1999	Electrolytic aluminium capacitors; R.	Japan, South Korea, Taiwan.	3.	12.			
56.	Anti-Dumping—Duties On Asian TV Tubes, Cameras. <i>European Report</i> .	3	5	2000	Television tubes; P.	India, Malaysia, South Korea, and China.	6.	1.	8.		
56.	Anti-Dumping—Duties On Asian TV Tubes, Cameras. <i>European</i>	3	5	2000	Television camera parts; P.	Japan.	6.	8.	1.		

³¹ For the purposes of this table when a newspaper article refers to two or more distinct anti-dumping cases, and includes information on member state opinions towards each case, then a separate entry was given for each case.

³² The number of supporters and opponents reported in this newspaper article is the same as that reported in "EU/Japan—EU Rejects Duties on Japanese TV Cameras," *European Report*, on 6 May 2000. The latter article contains no mention, however, of one nation abstaining.

Newspaper article number.	Title of article and newspaper.	Date of newspaper article.			Target good and stage of investigation. ¹⁷	Target trading partner(s).	Member states view on investigation continuing or duties being imposed. ¹⁸			Commission actions to alter member states' likely view of a given case.	Diplomatic measures by trading partner(s) or related considerations.
		Day	Month	Year			In favour.	Opposed.	Abstentions or undecided.		
	<i>Report.</i> ^{32 33}										
56.	Anti-Dumping—Duties On Asian TV Tubes, Cameras. <i>European Report.</i> ³⁴	3	5	2000	Agricultural fertiliser potassium chloride; R.	Belarus, Russia, and Ukraine.	8.	4.			
56.	Anti-Dumping—Duties On Asian TV Tubes, Cameras. <i>European Report.</i> ³⁵	3	5	2000	Fasteners; TI.	Malaysia and Thailand.		15.			
56.	Anti-Dumping—Duties On Asian TV Tubes, Cameras. <i>European Report.</i> ³⁶	3	5	2000	Silicon carbide; R.	China, Russia, and Ukraine.	8.	5.			
57.	Commission Faces Battle With Chinese Glycine Anti-Dumping Duties. <i>European</i>	17	5	2000	Glycine; P.	China.	8.	No number specified but Denmark, Germany, Netherlands,	No number specified but Sweden and the United Kingdom are		

³³ For the purposes of this table when a newspaper article refers to two or more distinct anti-dumping cases, and includes information on member state opinions towards each case, then a separate entry was given for each case.

³⁴ For the purposes of this table when a newspaper article refers to two or more distinct anti-dumping cases, and includes information on member state opinions towards each case, then a separate entry was given for each case.

³⁵ For the purposes of this table when a newspaper article refers to two or more distinct anti-dumping cases, and includes information on member state opinions towards each case, then a separate entry was given for each case.

³⁶ For the purposes of this table when a newspaper article refers to two or more distinct anti-dumping cases, and includes information on member state opinions towards each case, then a separate entry was given for each case.

Newspaper article number.	Title of article and newspaper.	Date of newspaper article.			Target good and stage of investigation. ¹⁷	Target trading partner(s).	Member states view on investigation continuing or duties being imposed. ¹⁸			Commission actions to alter member states' likely view of a given case.	Diplomatic measures by trading partner(s) or related considerations.
		Day	Month	Year			In favour.	Opposed.	Abstentions or undecided.		
	<i>Report.</i>							and Austria are mentioned.	mentioned.		
58.	EU Brushed Away Asian Hairbrush Anti-Dumping Duties <i>European Report.</i>	11	11	2000	Hairbrush; D.	China, South Korea, Taiwan, and Thailand.	6: Portugal, Spain, France, Italy, Luxembourg, and Belgium.	8.	1: Germany.		
58.	EU Brushed Away Asian Hairbrush Anti-Dumping Duties <i>European Report.</i> ³⁷	11	11	2000	Ferromolybdenum; I.	China.			6. Article notes: "The decision to open the investigation, normally cleared without dissent, was however carried with six		

³⁷ For the purposes of this table when a newspaper article refers to two or more distinct anti-dumping cases, and includes information on member state opinions towards each case, then a separate entry was given for each case.

Newspaper article number.	Title of article and newspaper.	Date of newspaper article.			Target good and stage of investigation. ¹⁷	Target trading partner(s).	Member states view on investigation continuing or duties being imposed. ¹⁸			Commission actions to alter member states' likely view of a given case.	Diplomatic measures by trading partner(s) or related considerations.
		Day	Month	Year			In favour.	Opposed.	Abstentions or undecided.		
									abstentions.”		
59.	EU/Japan: Commission Rides Tightrope Over Bike Hub Dumping Case. <i>European Report</i> . ³⁸	6	10	2001	Internal gear hubs; P. Internal gear hubs; PD.	Japan.	2: Belgium, Ireland. (Reported opposition in March 2001 meeting) 7 (Reported opposition at more recent meeting)	9. 7.	1: Netherlands.		
60.	Anti-Dumping—Ministers Abandon Duties on Hot Rolled Steel. <i>European Report</i> . ³⁹	22	3	2003	Hot rolled flat steel; PD.	Egypt, Slovenia, and Turkey.	7.	5: Sweden, Denmark, Spain, the Netherlands, and the UK.	3.		1. Article notes: “The UK and the Netherlands had indicated they would have backed the proposal if Egypt was exempt, as it was considered a developing country. The Commission had hoped to overcome these concerns by persuading Egypt

³⁸ Unlike most of the newspaper articles summarised in this table, article number 59 contains information on more than one vote by the EU member states.

³⁹ The facts reported in this newspaper article can also be found in “Iron & Steel—High politics foil attempt to block Egyptian imports,” published in the *Metal Bulletin* on 20 March 2003.

Newspaper article number.	Title of article and newspaper.	Date of newspaper article.			Target good and stage of investigation. ¹⁷	Target trading partner(s).	Member states view on investigation continuing or duties being imposed. ¹⁸			Commission actions to alter member states' likely view of a given case.	Diplomatic measures by trading partner(s) or related considerations.
		Day	Month	Year			In favour.	Opposed.	Abstentions or undecided.		
											to accept price undertakings, but the government refused to accept higher prices.” 2. “But insiders said the three governments [Spain, UK, Netherlands] wanted to ensure Egyptian support—or at least not outright opposition—for the Iraqi campaign.”

Note: The search engine “Factiva” was used to locate these newspaper articles. For further information about these searches contact Simon J. Evenett at sevenett@mindspring.com.