



MUNIAL'26

H-ECSC

Study Guide

Under-Secretary-General: Alim Aybaz

Academic Assistant: Yaman Çınar Kahraman

Table Of Contents

Letter from the Secretary-General..... 4

Letter from the Under-Secretary General..... 5

Introduction..... 6

Historical Background..... 7

- a. The Origins Of The Schuman Plan..... 7
- b. Post-World War II Europe..... 8
 - i. The Economic and Social Consequences..... 9
- c. The Monnet Plan..... 10
 - i. The Pooling Of Coal And Steel..... 11
 - ii. The European Institutions..... 12
- d. The Beginning of the Cold War..... 12
- e. The Marshall Plan and the Establishment Of OEEC..... 12
- f. The Declaration of 9 May 1950..... 15

The Structure of the ECSC..... 16

- a. The Institutions of the ECSC..... 16
 - i. The High Authority..... 16
 - ii. Common Assembly..... 17
 - iii. Special Council of Ministers..... 17
 - iv. Court of Justice..... 17
 - v. The Consultative Committee..... 17
- b. Legal Acts of the ECSC..... 18
- c. The Legal Personality of the ECSC..... 18
- d. The Policies of ECSC..... 18
- e. Financial Framework of the ECSC..... 19

Rules of Procedure..... 20

- Rule 1: Scope..... 20
- Rule 2: Language..... 20
- Rule 3: The High Authority..... 20
- Rule 4: Political Groups..... 21
- Rule 5: Conduct and Behaviour..... 21
- Rule 6: Communication..... 21
- Rule 7: Roll Call..... 22
- Rule 8: Conduct of the Debate..... 22

Rule 9: Points.....	24
Rule 10: Motions.....	25
References.....	27

Letter from the Secretary-General

Dear Attendees,

It is an honor to welcome you all to the 7th annual session of İzmir Atatürk Lisesi Model United Nations Conference. I am Duru Kılıç, your Secretary-General. If you are reading this letter, you probably already know why you should be here, but let us remind you once more.

MUNIAL is a legacy preserved by generations, now bestowed upon us by our upperclassmen. Being entrusted with this conference was not an easy feat; so you can be sure that we are no amateurs when it comes to MUN, and that it isn't a coincidence you are attending the best. Our esteemed Director-General, Can Karadağ, and I have sacrificed months, if not years, working for our titles. But it wasn't just for MUNIAL; it was for the journey where we grew, improved, and found the best versions of ourselves. Now we stand proud, confident that this year will be no short of what our upperclassmen showed us, if not better.

MUN isn't just an academic achievement, though. This is a free space where you can improve your people skills, make new connections, have fun, and enhance your cultural knowledge. For me, this journey was one where I found family, and now I am honored to be the one creating the opportunity for others to do the same.

Sincerely,

Duru Kılıç

Letter from the Under-Secretary General

Esteemed Delegates,

I am Alim R. Aybaz, a graduate from İzmir Atatürk Lisesi, now a freshman at Gebze Technical University. At first I have been taken part at TRAINIAL 2022 as a delegate, and have begun to attending conferences and MUN's ever since. Then, at 2024, I have been taken part in MUNIAL 2024 as the director general and to me it was my last conference. But here I am once again, and I am sure that this is my last conference, after 4 years in conferences.

About our committee, we are going to simulate the *European Coal and Steel Community*. All of you the delegates are going to represent your own countries and allocations, as well as you know. And of course, you are going to follow a certain hierarchical order within your allocations. The committee will start at the year of 1951, the specific beginning date of the committee will be announced at the conference. As your academic team we won't be accepting any directives that are written before conference. I want you all to prepare for the committee of course but I do not think that writing directives beforehand is a part of the preparation.

In this study guide, you are going to learn information about the committee's procedure and the historical background. When we were preparing the guide we have wanted to give you almost all of the information you need about the historical background and the procedure of the committee. You might have find the study guide longer than usual or just normal, but it is important for you to read and go through the guide. Although reading the guide could be enough for you to learn about the historical background of the committee it is still important for you to make your own researches. With these preparations which you could make before the conference could help you to take roles more actively through the committee, and also could help you to form new ideas. Remember, being competent about the historical background of the committee that you are in always carries great importance, especially when you are in a crisis/semi-crisis committee.

Finally, I wish you an unforgettable conference where you can develop new ideas and build lasting friendships. I look forward to meeting you all and witnessing your debates on the floor. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions regarding the procedure.

Best regards,

Alim R. AYBAZ

Under-Secretary General of the Historical European Coal and Steel Community Committee

You can contact me via: alimraybaz@gmail.com

Introduction

The European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) was an organization which formed after Second World War to integrate Europe's steel and coal industries into a single common market based on the principle of supranationalism which the creation of a High Authority would govern made up of appointed representatives from the member states who would not represent their national interest but would take and make decisions in the general interests of the Community as a whole.

On 18 April 1951, the Treaty establishing the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) was signed in Paris by *Robert Schuman* for France, *Konrad Adenauer* for the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG), *Paul van Zeeland* and *Joseph Meurice* for Belgium, *Count Carlo Sforza* for Italy, *Joseph Bech* for Luxembourg and *Dirk Stikker* and *Jan van den Brink* for the Netherlands.

The Treaty establishing the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) created several institutions responsible for the pooling of Europe's coal and steel resources and, in addition, for maintaining peace in Europe:

- a *High Authority* assisted by a *Consultative Committee*;
- a *Common Assembly*;
- a *Court of Justice*;
- a *Special Council of Ministers*.

The High Authority's supranational character was a significant breakthrough. The Members of the High Authority did not actually represent their own country's interests but were under oath to defend the general interest of the Member States. They enjoyed wide-ranging powers to help them achieve this aim. For instance, they were able to intervene in national coal and steel markets, but were unable to replace such existing businesses. The High Authority's financial autonomy, which was guaranteed by a 'tax' based on a maximum 1 % levy on the turnover of coal and steel companies, reinforced its independence vis-à-vis the six governments.

Historical Background

a. The Origins Of The Schuman Plan

In economic terms, coal and steel were vital raw materials. Coal remained the principal energy source, and the French Government, seeking to modernise its heavy industry, recognised the steel industry in eastern France's dependence on substantial coal supplies. But, at a time when the liberated countries were having difficulty in satisfying domestic demand, the only available coal deposits were to be found precisely in the Ruhr (since the United Kingdom, Belgium, and the Netherlands had temporarily withdrawn from international trade). The creation of a European 'pool' for coal and steel would, therefore, allow France to counter the threat of a shortage in Europe and, at the same time, meet its own needs for raw materials, despite the foreseeable dissolution of the International Authority for the Ruhr. In a broader sense, the Schuman Plan also sought to increase European coal and steel output to boost overall economic growth. In addition, it indicated a significant reduction in producer and consumer prices.



Image 1: *On 20 June 1950, in the Salon de l'Horloge at the French Foreign Ministry in Paris, Robert Schuman (standing, centre), French Foreign Minister, opens the intergovernmental negotiations for the implementation of the Schuman Plan. This photo is typically used to illustrate the 9 May 1950 press conference, at which no photographs were taken.*

From a political perspective, the Schuman Plan assumed that integrating Germany into a permanent European structure was the best way to prevent it from threatening its neighbours

and to guarantee peace in Europe. It improved Franco-German relations based on mutual interests and fostered a climate of cooperation in Europe by putting Germany on an equal footing, which was of great symbolic significance. The independence of the High Authority, the supranational body responsible for the operation of the European coal and steel pool, was also devised as a new way of counteracting the pursuit of narrow, national self-interests. Moreover, the United States, eager to see Western Europe rebuilt economically and militarily, urged France to take decisive steps, since the British had clearly expressed their aversion to a European customs union or to any supranational approach.

France also felt that the European institutions in place at the end of the 1940s were not functioning properly. Based on these considerations, France decided to go it alone by proposing an original and practical plan to pool European coal and steel production.

b. Post-World War II Europe

The toll of the Second World War in terms of both human and material resources was the heaviest that mankind had ever known. Although the conflict had a global dimension that was even more pronounced than the 1914–1918 War, it was Europe that was the principal victim of this confrontation. The total number of victims is estimated at almost 40 million, more than half of whom were civilians. Following all the deportations and expulsions, there were, in 1945, nearly 20 million displaced persons awaiting repatriation. The unprecedented racial, religious, and political persecutions and the mass deportations into labour or extermination camps had stirred up hatred among the peoples of Europe. The discovery of mass graves in the concentration camps appeared to shake the very spiritual and moral foundations of Western civilisation. The Germans were overwhelmed by a feeling of guilt, which fuelled an intense ethical debate and only added to the disarray of the defeated nation. Europe was in ruins and reduced to total confusion: factories and transport links destroyed, traditional trade dislocated, livestock wiped out, and shortages in raw materials and foodstuffs prevalent. The war was being prolonged by purges and the settling of old scores, which were once again tearing apart the liberated countries. Reconciliation seemed extremely difficult. It was impossible to imagine that, one day, yesterday's enemies might join together to form a common organisation. There were three fundamental questions for the people of Europe, exhausted by the conflict. The first was economic: how could material damage be repaired and economic activity revived on the old continent? The second was political: how could the return of a conflict which had set Europe and the whole world ablaze be prevented? The third was cultural: how could the survival and renaissance of European civilisation be ensured in the face of increasing threats, which seemed embodied in the ideological schism and confrontation between the victorious American and Soviet blocs?

i. The Economic and Social Consequences

The immediate effects of the Second World War on the European economy had been disastrous. Damage to communications networks disrupted the transport of raw materials and finished products. The irregularity of industrial supplies and damage to production equipment led to numerous temporary layoffs and, consequently, a reduction in purchasing power at a time when all kinds of requirements continued to grow. Even in the victorious countries, food rationing continued well after the war, and the black market fostered dangerous social inequalities. Crime, juvenile delinquency, and prostitution increased. The simultaneous reconstruction of accommodation, industry, and the transport infrastructure was stifling national economies. Under these conditions, people were first and foremost preoccupied with the restrictions affecting everyday life and often had difficulty in thinking about their long-term future. The coal shortage during the severe winter of 1946–1947 led to widespread strikes and mass demonstrations.

The spectre of inflation and currency devaluation, which reminded people of the economic crises and stock-exchange crashes of the inter-war years, led European leaders to take rigorous measures. The persistent imbalance between domestic supply and demand for consumer products was pushing prices higher and exacerbating budget deficits, both domestically and externally. Countries were incurring debt to finance reconstruction programmes and rectify social inequalities. In 1944, Belgium implemented a significant programme to restore the franc, which involved a drastic reduction in the circulation of banknotes and deposits. Some essential sectors of the European economy had been nationalised, and modernisation and retooling programmes were gradually put in hand. While unemployment was affecting much of the continent, some countries paradoxically faced a shortage of labour in the very sectors essential to economic revival. Although thousands of German prisoners of war had been set to work, programmes for the large-scale migration of foreign workers had been implemented to meet the specific needs of agriculture and the coal and steel industries. It was in this challenging economic context that Belgium and France concluded a protocol with Italy on cooperation and immigration that provided for the supply of coal to Italy, which its economy desperately needed, in exchange for thousands of unemployed Italian workers. More than 500,000 Italians emigrated to Western European countries between 1946 and 1955.

In an attempt to boost exports and address unemployment more effectively amid European economic growth, Great Britain devalued the pound sterling in 1949 by 30.5% against the gold standard. This drastic reduction had a rapid domino effect on other, weaker European currencies. The Netherlands, the Scandinavian countries, and Finland immediately devalued their currencies by the same percentage as the UK: 25%, Germany: 25%, France: 22%, and Belgium: 12.5%.

Disillusionment caused by poverty spread and led to demands for greater social justice. The low level of wages led to numerous strikes, particularly in France and Italy. The fledgling social security systems were put to a severe test by the large

number of disabled persons, widows, and other victims of the war who claimed a pension. Society as a whole was therefore affected by the war's high welfare costs. Keeping faith with specific programmes established during the war or following the tradition of mutual-benefit societies, European countries took steps to develop a broader-based social security system. They laid the foundations for the modern welfare state.

c. The Monnet Plan

Jean Monnet, Commissioner-General of the French National Planning Board, considered that prosperity and social progress depended absolutely upon closer economic ties between European States. This conviction was drawn from his considerable international experience, lessons learned from the War, and his close ties with American businessmen and diplomats. In particular, he was the French Provisional Government's representative in the *European Coal Organisation (ECO)*. He was responsible for negotiating with the Americans and for allocating Marshall Plan funds to modernise France. At the end of the war, he drafted the first revival and modernisation plan for France. He considered that economic cooperation with Germany was essential, particularly given its central position in Europe and its industrial potential,



Image 2: *Jean Monnet*

which the War had mainly left unscathed. It was, without doubt, still too early to move towards total economic union at the European level because of the vast discrepancies in prices, wages, and tax regimes. Nor was the general public ready for it. By the end of the 1940s, several plans for limited customs unions, which could have helped drive economic integration in Western Europe, proved unsuccessful. Therefore, what was required was a new approach that would enable gradual progress to be made. The idea of a European industrial pool began to appear regularly in the French press at that time, and thereafter it was openly discussed in diplomatic circles. Monnet was receptive to those ideas, as he was also seeking a way to alleviate Franco-German tensions and was concerned about the threats posed by the Cold War. He believed it would be extremely difficult to build a European edifice from the top down, a method often advocated by federalist movements. He foresaw, instead, a Europe built on a functional basis, integrating key economic sectors to create genuine solidarity among partners. For this reason, from the spring of 1950 onward, he began to consider establishing a common market based on the coal and steel sectors, which were vital to both civilian and military industries. However, his plan differed from most international

cooperation plans under consideration in the steel sector, as Monnet presented the coal and steel pool as an indispensable but transitional stage toward creating a European federation. Placing coal and steel under international control also made it possible to envision the end of Allied control over the Ruhr with confidence, and it eliminated the risk of industrial cartels forming in the German coalfields. On this basis, both France and Germany would agree to submit to international controls to ensure that the common market in coal and steel operated smoothly. Jean Monnet also knew he could count on the support of the US High Commissioner in Germany, John McCloy, who called for closer Franco-German ties and hoped France would soon take steps in that direction.

i. The Pooling Of Coal And Steel

There were two main reasons why Jean Monnet proposed the pooling of coal and steel in 1950. The six Member States of the future ECSC used coal more than any other fuel, and the Ruhr was the principal region for coal deposits. At that time, coal alone accounted for nearly 70 % of fuel consumption in Western Europe. Although the Six, together with Great Britain, accounted for only 20% of global coal production, they held an almost complete monopoly over supplies in Western Europe. Coal from Eastern Europe was becoming increasingly scarce, while American coal remained very expensive and could be purchased only with dollars, which Europe lacked. French steel companies imported most of their coal, and the pooling of Franco-German resources guaranteed free access to coal from the Ruhr, even if the International Authority for the Ruhr, in which France was actively involved, were to be abolished. The creation of a European pool made it impossible for Germany to sell its coal at high prices and, in so doing, cause difficulties for French industry. Steel was the most important raw material for weapons manufacture and for industry in general. In the absence of effective coordination of European economic recovery plans, each country developed its own steel capacity in relative isolation, which carried the risk of overproduction. A more fundamental French concern was that powerful industrial cartels would control German steel production and that the steel would be used for weapons production, which the French feared most. The pooling of steel was therefore seen as a means of destroying the cartels' potential influence and preventing future rearmament. Finally, from a symbolic perspective, the pooling of steel necessarily made a new Franco-German war out of the question. In terms of how to proceed, Jean Monnet, who, in 1947, had initiated the planning process in France, could not envisage a common market for coal and steel that operated properly and was accessible to other interested countries without a certain degree of central control to guarantee a more coherent industrial policy in Europe. The coal and steel pool affected 150 million consumers.

ii. The European Institutions

Jean Monnet believed that effective institutions were needed to exercise control over the planned Common Market. The sectors to be pooled would be managed by an independent institution that would ensure free competition, prevent the formation of cartels, eliminate discriminatory practices, guarantee consumers equal access to supplies, and coordinate investment. The supranational authority would have its own financial resources and would be responsible for managing the common market. It would facilitate the opening up of markets through flexible methods of support and control. To fulfil these tasks, it would operate as a collegial body with independent members, with a view to becoming the embryo of a European government.

d. The Beginning of the Cold War

The end of the Second World War did not signal a return to normality. On the contrary, it resulted in a new conflict, less bloody, but longer and more insidious: the Cold War. The Allied Powers could not agree on a Peace Treaty with a Germany, which was defeated and divided into four occupied zones. The conflicts of interest between the new world powers multiplied, and a climate of fear and suspicion reigned. The result was a prolonged period of international tension, interspersed with dramatic crises that, at times, led to localised armed conflicts without triggering a full-scale war between the United States and the USSR. From 1947 to the end of the Cold War, Europe, divided into two blocs, was at the heart of the struggle between the two superpowers. The Cold War reached its first climax with the Soviet blockade of Berlin. The explosion of the first Soviet atomic bomb in the summer of 1949 reinforced the USSR in its role as a world power. This situation confirmed the predictions of Winston Churchill, who, in March 1946, had been the first Western statesman to speak of an 'Iron Curtain' dividing Europe in two.

e. The Marshall Plan and the Establishment Of OEEC

At the end of the war, the *United Nations (UN)*, whose founding Charter was signed in San Francisco in June 1945, provided aid to European countries devastated by the war. Europe was faced with serious food shortages and had to maintain various rationing schemes. It was also short of dollars and therefore had to limit imports of civil and military equipment. *The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Agency (UNRRA)*, founded in November 1943, brought emergency individual aid packages to the European countries, especially humanitarian aid. However, this programme was haphazard and would not have a significant impact on the region's economy. Intra-European trade was hindered by a lack of foreign exchange and by the need for an international authority capable of effectively organising trade worldwide. The United States, whose interests lay in promoting such trade to increase its own

exports, decided to support the European economy through a large-scale structural recovery programme. The United States wanted to protect American prosperity and stave off the threat of national overproduction. But the United States' desire to give Europe massive economic aid was also politically motivated. The fear of Communist expansion in Western Europe during the Cold War was undoubtedly a decisive factor, as important as the conquest of new markets. The Americans, therefore, decided to fight poverty and hunger in Europe, factors which, they felt, encouraged the spread of Communism. The Marshall Plan was part of the US policy of containment—as outlined by US President Truman in his speech to the United States Congress on 12 March 1947—of the real or imagined spread of Communism in Europe. In a speech made on 5 June 1947 at Harvard University in Cambridge, Massachusetts, the US Secretary of State, *George C. Marshall*, proposed the granting of economic and financial assistance to all the countries of Europe, subject to closer European cooperation. This was the *Marshall Plan*, also known as the *European Recovery Program (ERP)*. France and Great Britain were very keen and, three weeks later, in Paris, convened a conference, to which they also invited the USSR, to elaborate a common programme in response to General Marshall's offer. But *Vyacheslav Molotov*, the *Soviet Foreign Minister*, categorically refused to countenance any international control and opposed economic aid for Germany. The Soviet Union rejected the Marshall Plan and persuaded its satellite countries and neighbouring Finland to refuse US aid. This rejection deepened the split between Eastern and Western Europe. In January 1949, in response to the Marshall Plan, the USSR established a programme of economic cooperation among Soviet-bloc countries, known as the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (*CMEA, or Comecon*). Ultimately, 16 countries signed up to the Marshall Plan: Austria, Belgium, Denmark (with the Faroe Islands and Greenland), France, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy (and San Marino), Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal (with Madeira and the Azores), Sweden, Switzerland (with Liechtenstein), Turkey and the United Kingdom. They immediately established the Committee of European Economic Cooperation (CEEC), which produced a report outlining priorities for the European economy. But the Americans insisted these countries should control the management and distribution of the funds themselves. The CEEC, therefore, established a permanent agency for this purpose. On 16 April 1948, in Paris, 16 countries signed a Convention to establish the *Organisation for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC)*. West Germany and the territory of Trieste joined in 1949. The colonies and overseas territories of the OEEC countries were represented by their parent states, and the United States and Canada. However, they did not belong to the Organisation, but were also involved in its work. 3/3 The OEEC was therefore a *de facto worldwide* organisation. In 1960, when the United States and Canada joined, the organisation became the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), which later expanded further. In April 1948, the United States enacted legislation governing foreign aid and established the Economic Cooperation Administration (ECA) to administer the Marshall Plan. They decided to send a Permanent Representative to Europe and to set up a special agency in each of the countries involved. Bilateral agreements were concluded between the United States and each country. The programme for European recovery was divided into subsidies and loans amounting to about 13 billion dollars, distributed between April 1948 and June 1951. Beyond investment in modernisation schemes, US aid was

primarily used to purchase goods indispensable to European economies: food and agricultural products, raw materials, tools, and industrial equipment. The United States also allocated funds to develop production of strategic goods in European colonies, where it sought to contain the spread of Communism. In October 1948, the OEEC established a *Committee on Overseas Territories (COT)*, which, through a special fund, encouraged European countries to cooperate with the United States in developing Africa. The political importance of the Marshall Plan cannot be overestimated. Through this aid, the US President



Image 3: *On 5 June 1947, the US Secretary of State, George C. Marshall, gives an address at Harvard University, Massachusetts, in which he offers the countries of Europe economic and financial assistance in exchange for closer European cooperation. George C. Marshall is in the centre, holding a hat and talking to Second World War hero, General Omar Nelson Bradley.*

Harry Truman wanted to help the free nations of Europe solve their economic problems. But it was also a question of stopping Communism, which was a threat in countries such as France and Italy. This policy paid off. In the April 1948 elections, the Christian Democrat Party defeated the hitherto so influential Communist Party in Italy. Intensive propaganda campaigns were also part of the Marshall Plan. For example, a ‘train for Europe’, filled with food supplies and staple goods, travelled through the recipient countries to publicise the work in progress and the results already obtained. The press, radio, and television were also called in to help. The programme

for recovery in Europe was undoubtedly a weapon in the Cold War. But the Marshall Plan marked the entry of Western Europe into the consumer age, symbolised, for example, by

Coca-Cola and Hollywood films. In 1948, the OEEC negotiated a multilateral agreement on intra-European payments. That was followed, in 1949, by a trade liberalisation scheme. From July 1950 to December 1958, the *European Payments Union (EPU)* restored the convertibility of European currencies and removed quantitative trade restrictions. The OEEC also promoted economic productivity in Europe through the European Agency for Productivity, which it established in 1953 to study and disseminate technical advances in industry. As an initial umbrella organisation for European democratic countries with free-market economies, the OEEC was an essential forerunner of a united Europe. It remained, however, an organisation for intergovernmental cooperation that was unable to create a customs union.

f. The Declaration of 9 May 1950

On 9 May 1950 — in a speech inspired by Jean Monnet — the French Foreign Minister, Robert Schuman, proposed the pooling of the coal and steel resources of France and the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) within an organisation open to membership by other European countries. Robert Schuman and Jean Monnet sought to use this almost revolutionary declaration to generate a shock wave that would launch the process of European unification. Drafted under the strictest secrecy, the Schuman Declaration aimed to bring about a profound change in mentalities that would help win over the people of Europe. But Schuman needed first of all to secure the agreement of his own Government, whilst ensuring that he also had the support of Konrad Adenauer and the United States.

The Structure of the ECSC

a. The Institutions of the ECSC

i. The High Authority

The High Authority consisted of nine members. The Member State governments, by common accord, appointed eight members from among their nationals. Those members then nominated a ninth member, who was appointed, provided that the nominee received at least five votes. Germany, France, and Italy each had two members, and the Benelux countries had one member each. The members of the High Authority did not represent their own countries' interests but took an oath to defend the general interest of the Member States. That guaranteed the supranational character of the High Authority — its principal innovative feature. The fact that the High Authority's members were prohibited from engaging in any other occupation and from having interests involving the Community guaranteed their independence. The High Authority, the executive body, had broad powers and responsibilities. It was responsible for 3/9 of ensuring the attainment of the objectives set out in the Treaty. It was responsible for establishing and ensuring the smooth functioning of the common market in coal and steel. In addition, the High Authority was generally required to ensure that the Community operated properly and complied with the Treaty.



Image 4: Group photo taken at the inaugural session of the High Authority of the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) in Luxembourg on 10 August 1952.

ii. Common Assembly

The Assembly consisted of 78 representatives of the peoples of the Member States, delegated by the national parliaments or elected by direct universal suffrage. The ECSC Treaty used the expression "representatives of the peoples" to underscore its authors' determination to distinguish this Common Assembly from the assembly of a traditional international organisation, composed of representatives of national governments. The Assembly exercised the supervisory powers conferred upon it by the Treaty.

iii. Special Council of Ministers

The Special Council of Ministers consisted of representatives of the Member States. Each State delegated a member of its government to serve on the Council. The Presidency of the Council was held in turn by each member of the Council for three months, in alphabetical order by Member State. The Council exercised its responsibilities in the cases provided for and in the manner indicated by the Treaty, in particular, to harmonise the action of the High Authority and that of the governments, which were responsible for the general economic policies of their countries. The Special Council of Ministers was required to participate in certain decisions taken by the High Authority by issuing opinions.

iv. Court of Justice

The Court of Justice ensured that the law was observed in the interpretation and application of the Treaty and the appropriate implementing regulations. It consisted of seven judges appointed by common accord for six years by the governments of the Member States from persons whose independence was beyond doubt and who possessed the qualifications required for appointment to the highest judicial offices in their own countries. There was no requirement that the judges should be nationals of the Member States. Under the Statute of the Court of Justice, which was set out in a Protocol annexed to the Treaty, the Court was assisted by two Advocates-General.

v. The Consultative Committee

The Consultative Committee consisted of 30 to 50 members. It included equal numbers of producers, workers, consumers, and dealers in the coal and steel sector, each appointed to a two-year term. They were not bound by any mandate or instruction from the organisations that nominated them. The Consultative Committee had a Plenary Assembly, a Bureau, and a President. The ECSC Treaty provided for both obligatory and optional consultation of the ECSC Consultative Committee. The

High Authority consulted the Consultative Committee in all instances where it deemed it appropriate. But it was, of course, under an obligation to consult the Consultative Committee whenever such consultation was required under the Treaty. The High Authority also submitted the general objectives and programmes to the Consultative Committee and kept it informed of the thrust of its activity.

b. Legal Acts of the ECSC

The High Authority had three legal instruments available to it for it to carry out its tasks:

- Decisions, which were binding in their entirety;
- Recommendations, which were binding as to the aims to be pursued but left open the choice of the appropriate methods for achieving those aims;
- Opinions, which had no binding force.

The legal acts of the ECSC were published in the Official Journal of the ECSC from 30 December 1952.

c. The Legal Personality of the ECSC

In international relations, the ECSC had the legal personality necessary to exercise its responsibilities and achieve its aims. It maintained appropriate relations with the United Nations and the Organisation for European Economic Cooperation and kept them regularly informed of the Community's activities. In addition, a Protocol annexed to the Treaty laid down the conditions governing relations between the ECSC and the Council of Europe.

d. The Policies of ECSC

The ECSC's role was to contribute to economic expansion, employment growth, and a rising standard of living in the Member States by establishing a common market for coal and steel. The ECSC was progressively to bring about conditions which would ensure the most rational distribution of production at the highest possible level of productivity, while safeguarding continuity of employment and taking care not to provoke fundamental and persistent disturbances in the economies of the Member States. The common market was set in place very rapidly: the common market in coal was opened on 10 February 1953, and the common market in steel on 1 May 1953.

e. Financial Framework of the ECSC

The ECSC had its own resources, which derived from levies on undertakings. It could also contract loans or receive gifts. The ECSC drew up the general budget, the draft administrative budget, and the operating budgets. The ECSC budget was adopted by the Committee of Presidents of the ECSC institutions, with the Assembly having only limited budgetary powers. The Assembly reviewed the general estimate of administrative expenditure, which was drawn up by the individual institutions and included in the High Authority's General Report, but could only discuss and not reject or amend it.

Rules of Procedure

Rule 1: Scope

1.1 The Historical European Coal and Steel Community in MUNIAL'26 Rules of Procedure (hereinafter referred to as "the Rules of Procedure") shall apply to the European Coal and Steel Community in full during the conference, unless stated otherwise by the Secretariat. The Secretariat may amend the rules of procedures that shall prevail in the session.

Rule 2: Language

2.1. The official language of this committee is English.

Rule 3: The High Authority

3.1. The ECSC shall be chaired by the Committee Directors.

3.2. The term "High Authority" shall refer to in the Community, either the President of the High Authority, the Secretary-General, the Vice-President, or any of them jointly and shall preside over the body.

3.3. The Presidency shall be responsible for all issues pertaining to the conduct of the debate and the course of the legislative procedures and, in that role shall, among other things open, declare the opening and closing of each sitting, compose the General Speakers' List, moderate all debates, ensure observance of the Rules of Procedure, accord the right to speak, and announce decisions

3.4. If questions arise over the interpretation of these Rules of Procedure, the Presidency shall rule on the correct interpretation.

3.5. The High Authority's interpretation of the MUNIAL'26 Rules of Procedure shall prevail over the Representatives during the Conference. Yet, the interpretation of the Secretary General, Under Secretaries General, and Academic Assistants, to be presented to the Presidency orally or in writing, shall have precedence.

3.6. If a conflict between different provisions of these Rules of Procedure becomes apparent, the Presidency shall decide on the proper course of action.

3.7. The High Authority may take any reasonable and appropriate action to ensure the maintenance of order during debates. These actions may include, but are not limited to, calling the offenders to order, refusing them the right to speak or vote, requiring them to apologize, or removing them from the Chamber.

3.8. The High Authority shall have the right to rule out points and motions put forward by Members, unless otherwise provided in these Rules of Procedure.

3.9. The High Authority shall not vote on any issue on the agenda.

Rule 4: Political Groups

4.1 Members of the ECSC may be a member of one of the political groups of the Parliament.

4.2 . Each group must have a leadership that shall be composed of at least one group leader and of up to two group secretaries. A group may change its leadership if necessary and shall immediately inform the High Authority of the ECSC of all such changes. Groups with two group leaders should appoint one male and one female group leader.

4.3. A Member of the Community may request to become a non-attached member or to change their group by submitting a reasoned request to the Presidency. For a group change request, the request must be accompanied by a signed letter from the new group's leadership accepting the Member into the group. Taking into account the request, the Presidency will rule on whether to permit the change.

4.4. In order to institute a new group, at least 7 Members of the Parliament representing at least 3 Member States shall submit a soundly reasoned and duly signed request to the High Authority stating, among other things, all the members of the new group, its full English name and leadership. Taking into account the request and the opinion of its Legal Service, the High Authority will rule on whether to permit the establishment of the new group.

Rule 5: Conduct and Behaviour

5.1. All participants shall behave courteously at all times.

5.2. Words, expressions, or other actions which affront human dignity, constitute malicious attacks or discrimination against any other person are forbidden. The Secretariat may take any necessary disciplinary

action if a participant engages in such behavior, including the termination of the individual's participation in the Conference.

5.3. Any words, expressions, or other actions that disrupt the orderly conduct of the debates are not permitted.

5.4. If a participant consistently engages in the aforementioned behavior, the Secretariat may decide to end the individual's participation and refrain from granting the certificate of participation.

Rule 6: Communication

6.1. The means of communication during the sessions between the participants and the High Authority is through message papers.

6.2. Except for personal excuses to be delivered to the High Authority, the content of the message shall be relevant to the ongoing discussion in the institution. The message must be in English. If the note does not meet the above criteria, the Presidency may halt communication.

6.3. The High Authority reserves the right to suspend note-passing if they deem it necessary. This decision is not appealable.

Rule 7: Roll Call

7.1. At the beginning of each session, the High Authority shall record the status of the Members present and determine the required majorities.

7.2. The roll call shall be performed in the English alphabetical order.

7.3. Members shall state their status as present when they are called upon.

7.4. Members that have not replied to the roll call will be treated as absentees, even if they are physically present, until they send a message paper to the Presidency stating their status.

7.5. Members that have missed more than half of the time allocated for the session cannot alter their statuses from 'absent'. Such Members cannot join the debate, nor exercise their voting rights. Members marked absent may not join the debate or vote until the Presidency changes their status.

7.6. Members, who have missed more than 2 sessions without a valid excuse, to be judged by the Secretariat, cannot receive their Certificates of Participation.

Rule 8: Conduct of the Debate

8.1. The discussions may take place in three different types of debates: The General Speakers' List, Moderated Caucus, and Unmoderated Caucus.

8.2. General Speakers' List

8.2.1. Any Member wishing to speak shall raise their placard or pass a note to the High Authority to be added to the General Speakers' List. The speaking time is limited to 1 minute and 30 seconds, unless otherwise altered.

8.2.2 After the conclusion of a speech, points of information may be raised. A point of information may only be raised if the previous speaker accepts it and must take the form of a question related to the subject matter of the speech held by the previous speaker. The High Authority may limit the number of points. The High Authority may, at its discretion, refuse the original speaker the right to answer.

8.2.3. The High Authority may limit the number of speakers permitted on the General Speakers' List or suspend the list.

8.2.4. The general debate ends when there are no more speakers on the General Speakers' List for the general debate or when a motion to close the debate has been

raised, allowed for a vote, and voted upon. The High Authority may close the General Speakers' List on its own accord if the circumstances so warrant.

8.2.5. A Member can make a request to be removed from the General Speakers' List once added there. This request shall be granted by the Presidency, except when the Member is the next to speak or follows immediately after the current speaker in the General Speakers' List.

8.3 Moderated Caucus

8.3.1. A Moderated Caucus shall be proposed by a Motion for a Moderated Caucus, which requires a simple majority to pass.

8.3.2. A Motion for Moderated Caucus is in order when the floor is open for points and motions.

8.3.3. The Member giving the motion must briefly state its topic, specify a total time limit which shall not be less than five minutes nor more than twenty minutes, and also specify an individual speaker time limit.

8.3.4. The High Authority may rule the motion out of order and this decision is not subject to appeal.

8.3.5. A Member may introduce a Motion to Extend the Moderated Caucus. This motion requires a simple majority to pass

8.3.6. A Moderated Caucus can be proposed by any MEP/Minister by raising a motion in accordance with *Rule 14.1.2*. Additionally, a Moderated Caucus can be announced at the discretion of the Presidency.

8.3.7. A Moderated Caucus is moderated by the High Authority. Anyone who wishes to speak shall raise their placard to indicate their intention. The order of speakers shall be determined at the discretion of the High Authority.

8.3.8. Each speaker may speak according to the time limit and on the topic set out in the motion.

8.3.9. Upon entering into a Moderated Caucus, the General Speakers' List shall be suspended and shall be returned after the conclusion of the Moderated Caucus.

8.3.10 The Caucus may be closed or suspended before its natural conclusion at the discretion of the High Authority, if the circumstances so warrant.

8.4. Unmoderated Caucus

8.4.1. An Unmoderated Caucus shall be proposed by a Motion for an

Unmoderated Caucus, which requires a simple majority to pass. Additionally, an Unmoderated Caucus can be announced at the High Authority's discretion.

8.4.2. The Member giving the motion must briefly state its topic and specify a total time limit which shall not be less than five minutes nor more than twenty minutes.

8.4.3. The High Authority may suggest a more appropriate Caucus length and put it to a vote, or may rule the Unmoderated Caucus out of order without the possibility of any appeal.

8.4.4. Upon entering into an Unmoderated Caucus, the General Speakers' List shall be suspended, and Members will carry out informal discussion on the topic specified in the motion

8.4.5. A Member may introduce a Motion to Extend the Unmoderated Caucus. This motion requires a simple majority to pass.

8.4.6. Upon entering into an Unmoderated Caucus, the General Speakers' List shall be suspended and shall be returned to after the conclusion of the discussion.

8.4.7. The total duration of the Unmoderated Caucus may not exceed 20 minutes and the Presidency shall alert the Members when the Unmoderated Caucus is reaching its time limit.

Rule 9: Points

9.1. Members may raise any of the following points during the process, where not expressly limited by other measures in these Rules, by raising their placards and stating their point. No point other than the Point of Personal Privilege may interrupt another speaker. A Point of Order may also interrupt the speaker only if the speaker exceeds the time limit and the High Authority does not interrupt.

9.1.1. A Point of Personal Privilege may be raised if the proponent is in direct physical discomfort (e.g., unable to hear the speaker) and is unable to take part in the proceedings as a result of said discomfort. Points of Personal Privilege may be raised at any point during the proceedings, other than an Unmoderated Caucus, and may interrupt a speaker.

9.1.2. A Point of Order may be raised if the proponent believes that an error in following the Rules of Procedure has taken place. The High Authority will rule on the admissibility of the point and, if necessary, take remedial action as soon as possible. Points of Order may be raised at any point during the proceedings other than the Unmoderated Caucus.

9.1.3. Right of Reply may be raised at any time if the proponent feels that they or their national honour has been insulted, however, a Right of Reply may not interrupt an

ongoing speech. The High Authority shall request the proponent to explain their request concisely, and if the point is admissible, will grant the proponent a short remark to reply to the comment. The High Authority may also require the original speaker to apologize. The High Authority's decision whether to grant the right of reply is not subject to appeal. A "Right of Reply" to a right of reply is not in order.

9.1.4. A Point of Parliamentary Inquiry may be raised if the proponent has a question or a request for clarification about the Rules of Procedure to the Presidency. Points of Parliamentary Inquiry may be raised at any point during the proceedings, other than during an Unmoderated Caucus.

9.1.5. A Point of Information may be raised during the General Speakers' List and must take the form of a question related to the subject matter of the speech by the previous speaker. A point of information may also be directed to the High Authority. The point may be stated only if the High Authority permits it and the previous speaker accepts it. The High Authority may limit the time available for the point or the reply.

9.1.6. The High Authority shall rule on the admissibility and appropriateness of any points raised.

Rule 10: Motions

10.1. Members may raise any of the following motions during the General Speakers' List, where not expressly stated otherwise:

10.1.1. A Motion to Adjourn the Meeting may be raised to suspend all the activities of the body until MUNIAL'26 and requires a two-thirds majority to pass. The High Authority may rule such motions out of order and these decisions shall not be subject to appeal.

10.1.2. A Motion to Suspend the Meeting may be raised whenever the floor is open. A Member may give a Motion to Suspend the Meeting in order to suspend all functions of the body until the next meeting. The High Authority may rule such motions out of order and these decisions shall not be subject to appeal.

10.1.3. A Motion to Close the Debate may be raised to close the general debate. This motion may be overruled by the High Authority, and the decision is not subject to appeal.

10.1.4. A Motion to Limit/Extend Speaking Time may be raised if the proponent wishes to alter the speaking time of the General Speakers' List. The proponent must specify the requested new speaking time.

10.1.5. A Motion for a Moderated Caucus may be raised to have the institution move into Moderated Caucus for a proposed amount of time. The proposer must specify the requested duration of the Caucus, the speaking time, and the topic of the Caucus. The total duration of the Caucus may not exceed 20 minutes.

10.1.6. A Motion to Extend the Moderated Caucus may only be raised during a Moderated Caucus to extend its total duration. The final total duration of the Caucus may not exceed 20 minutes.

10.1.7. A Motion for an Unmoderated Caucus may be raised to have the institution move into an informal discussion for a proposed amount of time. The proposer must specify the requested duration of the Caucus that may not exceed 20 minutes.

10.1.8. A Motion to Extend the Unmoderated Caucus may only be raised during an Unmoderated Caucus to extend its total duration. The total duration of the extension may not exceed the duration of the original Unmoderated Caucus.

10.1.9. A Motion to Terminate the Caucus is in order during a Moderated and Unmoderated Caucus unless there is any already an entertained speaker for the related motion at that particular moment. The High Authority may either put the motion to a vote immediately or recognize up to two speakers against the motion. If speakers are entertained, and after the relevant speeches have been delivered, a motion to close the debate will be in order, requiring a two-thirds majority to pass. After the debate is closed, a simple majority is required to terminate the caucus.

10.2. For a motion to be accepted it needs to pass a procedural vote. For a motion to close the debate and for a motion to adjourn the meeting to pass, a two-thirds majority in favour is necessary.

10.3. The High Authority may request for any motion to be seconded by another Member for it to be voted upon.

10.4. The High Authority may call for objections to the motion and if no objections are made, may consider the motion to be accepted unanimously.

10.5. The High Authority may grant or may refuse a motion at their discretion. The order of precedence of points and motions is as follows (highest to lowest): • Point of Personal Privilege • Point of Order • Right of Reply • Point of Parliamentary Inquiry • Point of Information • Motion to Adjourn the Meeting • Motion to Suspend the Meeting • Motion to Close the Debate • Motion to Limit/Extend Speaking Time • Motion to Terminate the Caucus • Motion to Extend the Previous Caucus • Motion for an Unmoderated Caucus • Motion for a Moderated Caucus

References

1. <https://www.cvce.eu/en/education/unit-content/-/unit/02bb76df-d066-4c08-a58a-d4686a3e68ff/53babf84-f8e0-4810-bb80-2ed15706efad>
2. <https://www.cvce.eu/en/education/unit-content/-/unit/02bb76df-d066-4c08-a58a-d4686a3e68ff/873d140d-4bf0-4a30-b087-4b52fd0ab81b>
3. <https://www.cvce.eu/en/education/unit-content/-/unit/02bb76df-d066-4c08-a58a-d4686a3e68ff/3b073a30-f149-4016-8a58-281270d4336f>
4. <https://www.cvce.eu/en/education/unit-content/-/unit/02bb76df-d066-4c08-a58a-d4686a3e68ff/446b8c09-53ee-4f39-ad56-74013ad1e01d>
5. <https://www.cvce.eu/en/education/unit-content/-/unit/02bb76df-d066-4c08-a58a-d4686a3e68ff/59a178d2-782d-4736-b64b-7e5df1df82b0>
6. <https://www.cvce.eu/en/education/unit-content/-/unit/02bb76df-d066-4c08-a58a-d4686a3e68ff/86c3edd9-af8b-47e6-92b5-0ffb2fc44f06>
7. https://european-union.europa.eu/principles-countries-history/history-eu/1945-59/schuman-declaration-may-1950_en
8. <https://www.cvce.eu/en/recherche/unit-content/-/unit/5cc6b004-33b7-4e44-b6db-f5f9e6c01023/0443f0da-70a0-488a-912f-36a14dc208a1>
9. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/European-Coal-and-Steel-Community>
10. https://www.cvce.eu/obj/the_treaties_establishing_the_european_communities-en-4a537592-d9d0-41a7-853a-f6cd74aed386.html
11. https://www.cvce.eu/en/obj/group_photo_taken_at_the_inaugural_session_of_the_ecs_c_high_authority_luxembourg_10_august_1952-en-3f6ba2d7-abdc-4ebc-af8b-6c53f6429fa0.html
12. https://www.cvce.eu/obj/announcement_of_the_marshall_plan_harvard_5_june_1947-en-3a9826e9-2114-4069-a38c-45b34928482b.html
13. https://www.cvce.eu/en/obj/the_schuman_plan_9_may_1950-en-3b807107-a8ab-431e-ae12-f53426a93cda.html
14. [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/thinktank/en/document/EPRS_STU\(2015\)538883](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/thinktank/en/document/EPRS_STU(2015)538883)