

EDITED BY M. M. KOSTECKI

State Trading in
International Markets

State Trading in International Markets

*Theory and Practice of Industrialized
and Developing Countries*

Edited by

M. M. Kostecki

M

© M. M. Kostecki 1982

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without permission

First published 1982 by
THE MACMILLAN PRESS LTD
London and Basingstoke
Companies and representatives
throughout the world

ISBN 0 333 30930 8

Printed in Hong Kong

The Contributors

Ivan Bernier
Professor of Law
Law Faculty
Laval University
Quebec

Jean-Emile Denis
Associate Professor of Business Administration
Ecole des Hautes Etudes Commerciales de Montréal
University of Montreal

Robert H. Floyd
Senior Economist
IMF
Washington

M. M. Kostecki
Associate Professor of Economics
Ecoles des Hautes Etudes Commerciales (HEC)
University of Montreal

Walter C. Labys
Professor of Economics
College of Mineral and Energy Resources
West Virginia University
Morgantown

P. J. Lloyd
Professor of Economics
Department of Economics
The Australian National University
Canberra

Harriet Matejka
Associate Professor of Economics
Graduate Institute of International Studies
University of Geneva

Alex F. McCalla
Professor of Agricultural Economics
University of California
Davis

Klaus Netter
Senior Economic Affairs Officer
UNCTAD
Geneva

Øystein Noreng
Professor of Business Administration
Oslo Institute of Business Administration

Frieder Roessler
Senior Officer
GATT Secretariat
Geneva

Andrew Schmitz
Professor of Agricultural and Resource Economics
University of California
Berkeley

Klaus Stegemann
Associate Professor of Economics
Department of Economics
Queen's University
Kingston

Raymond Vernon
Herbert F. Johnson Professor of International Business Management
Graduate School of Business Administration
Harvard University

Abbreviations

CIF	Cost insurance freight
COMECON (CMEA)	Council of Mutual Economic Assistance
EEC	European Economic Community
EFTA	European Free Trade Association
FOB	Free on board
GATT	General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade
IBRD	International Bank for Reconstruction and Development
IMF	International Monetary Fund
ITC	International Tin Council
ITO	International Trade Organization
ITC	International Trade Commission
MFN	Most-favoured nation treatment
MMC	Multinational Mining Companies
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
OEEC	Organization for European Economic Cooperation
OPEC	Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries
PMB	Public Marketing Board
STO	State Trading Organization
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development

Acknowledgements

This book is a collaborative work, an outgrowth of much inter-changing of perspectives and findings among the editor, those who have contributed some of the other chapters, and a number of additional scholars who gave so generously of their advice.

We are all very grateful for the inspiration we received from W. M. Corden of the Australian National University and from Raymond Vernon of Harvard University, who encouraged us to initiate this research project.

A major portion of these papers was presented at a conference held at the Ecole des Hautes Etudes Commerciales (HEC) of the University of Montreal in April 1979.

We would also like to thank the HEC, the Ford Foundation and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada for their financial support.

We are especially indebted to the Centre for International Business Studies at the HEC; its director, André Poirier; and its administrator, Sylvia Toledano, who lent so much assistance in organizing this endeavour.

Finally, I would like to thank Bonnie Darves-Bornoz and Sybil Denis, who edited a major portion of the manuscript; and Violet Jackson, who typed the entire text.

None of the persons mentioned above can be held accountable for any of the opinions and facts set forth in this study. That responsibility belongs to the authors, and to myself.

M. M. KOSTECKI

Contents

The Contributors	vii
List of Tables	ix
List of Figures	xi
Abbreviations	xiii
Acknowledgements	xv
INTRODUCTION	1
Raymond Vernon	
1 STATE TRADING BY THE ADVANCED AND DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: THE BACKGROUND	6
M. M. Kostecki	
2 STATE TRADING IN AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS BY THE ADVANCED COUNTRIES	22
M. M. Kostecki	
3 STATE TRADING IN GRAIN	55
Alex F. McCalla and Andrew Schmitz	
4 THE ROLE OF STATE TRADING IN MINERAL COMMODITY MARKETS	78
Walter C. Labys	
5 STATE TRADING AND THE POLITICS OF OIL	103
Øystein Noreng	
6 STATE TRADING AND THE THEORY OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE	117
P. J. Lloyd	
7 TRADE POLICY INSTRUMENTS, STATE TRADING AND FIRST-BEST INTERVENTION	142
Harriet Matejka	

8	STATE TRADING AND DOMESTIC DISTORTIONS IN A MIXED WORLD ECONOMY Klaus Stegemann	161
9	INCOME TAXATION OF STATE-TRADING ENTERPRISES Robert H. Floyd	189
10	COOPERATION AMONG STATE-TRADING ORGANIZATIONS OF DEVELOPING COUNTRIES Klaus Netter	210
11	EXPORT PERFORMANCE OF THE MARKETING BOARDS IN LDCs – THE CASE OF COCOA AND COFFEE IN WEST AFRICA Jean-Emile Denis	221
12	STATE TRADING AND THE GATT Ivan Bernier	245
13	STATE TRADING AND TRADE LIBERALIZATION Frieder Roessler	261
	Appendixes	285
	Select Bibliography on State Trading	295
	Index	301

List of Tables

2.1	Domestic output and state trading of rice in Japan (1971–6)	31
2.2	Wheat prices for export and home consumption practised by the Australian Wheat Board (\$US/ton)	36
3.1	The taxonomy of the grain trade	57
3.2	World trade in wheat: Sources and destinations weighted averages	59
3.3	World trade in coarse grains: Sources and destinations weighted averages	61
3.4	World wheat trade matrix – trading relationships and actual trade	63
3.5	State trading in wheat – percentage of volume of principal exporters accounted for by state traders	64
4.1	Copper: State-trading organizations	82
4.2	Ownership of copper companies (1976)	83
4.3	Tin: State-trading organizations	87
4.4	Ownership of tin smelting capacity (1976)	89
4.5	Bauxite: State-trading organizations	92
4.6	Ownership of bauxite mining capacity (1973)	93
4.7	Iron ore: State-trading organizations	97
4.8	Ownership of iron ore companies (1974)	98
5.1	Oil exports of OPEC countries by types of companies (1978)	108
8.1	Comparison of situations depicted in Figure 8.2	179
11.1	Leading producers of cocoa beans	227
11.2	Leading exporters of cocoa beans	227
11.3	Cocoa: P_{ij} for each country (1959–75)	228
11.4	P_{ij} frequency distribution – cocoa	230
11.5	χ^2 test on P_{ij} frequency distribution – cocoa	231
11.6	Regression of P_{ij} for cocoa – values of coefficients, F and R^2	232
11.7	Partial adjustment model – cocoa	233
11.8	Share in world coffee exports	235
11.9	Share in robusta exports	236
11.10	Robusta coffee: P_{ij} for each country (1959–75)	237

11.11	P_{ij} frequency distribution – coffee	239
11.12	χ^2 test on P_{ij} frequency distribution – coffee	240
11.13	Regression of P_{ij} on the independent variables – coffee – values of coefficients F and R^2	241
11.14	Partial adjustment model – coffee – values of λ , R^2 and F	242
13.1	Scope for tax and subsidy-equivalent instructions to state-controlled enterprises	266

List of Figures

2.1	State trading and linking scheme	33
3.1	Marketing boards and private traders	72
3.2	A market with both a board and private trade participating	73
3.3	Multinational marketing firms	75
7.1	Optimal tariff or state-trading intervention	147
7.2	Optimal export tax or state-trading intervention	149
7.3	Optimal export subsidy or state-trading intervention	151
8.1	Domestic distortions causing wasteful imports	166
8.2	Intervention at two margins	177
9.1	State trading and profit taxation	202

Introduction

Raymond Vernon

Some thirty years ago, the governments representing the principal trading countries of that period were assembled in Havana to frame a charter for a global trade organization. Although the period was one of anxieties and uncertainties, the emphasis at the time was on building anew, on avoiding the errors and conflicts of the past. It was a time, therefore, that lent itself to hope, yet a period that could easily lead to error and to illusion.

As far as the leading countries of that period were concerned, the hope of the majority was to achieve an open trading system, in which barriers to trade would be low and in which those that existed would be applied without discrimination against any particular source or market. This view was not universal, any more than it is universal today; then, as now, there were governments that had misgivings about the desirability of such a system, on the grounds that it might produce a distribution of income and power – both within countries and between countries – which was socially undesirable. Despite such misgivings, however, the goal of the open trading system prevailed, and with it went the related assumption that the markets in the system would be created mainly by commercial buyers and sellers, each constrained by its costs and each striving for a profit.

The governments that were drafting and negotiating this new world order of course were aware – indeed, acutely aware – of the fact that much of the world's trade was being conducted on a different basis. Governments were deeply involved in international trade in numerous ways, including the imposition of discriminatory tariffs and quotas, the payment of subsidies, and the conduct of state trading. But tariffs and quotas, it was supposed, could be brought down to tolerable levels and applied on a non-discriminatory basis; subsidies could be held in

check; state traders could conceivably agree to act as if they were commercial traders, buying and selling in the same way as a profit-maximizing firm.

Some of the hopes of those negotiators of thirty years ago, as it turned out, came remarkably close to realization. Tariffs and quotas were greatly reduced, at least in trade in manufactured goods among the advanced industrialized countries, and a beginning was made on the control of subsidies. But the early hopes for some sort of agreement on the practices of state-trading firms went nowhere. In the light of thirty years' subsequent experience, the approach that was devised at the time for dealing with state-trading enterprises now appears unrealistic.

Perhaps the first major challenge to the hopes of those that would have reduced state trading to an ordinary commercial activity came from the agricultural programmes of the advanced industrialized states. Governments in many of these countries had developed programmes for stabilizing and supplementing the income of their farmers, and had created state-trading agencies to carry out some part of those programmes. These state traders in agricultural products usually exercised control over competing imports, acted as discriminating monopolists in the export of products, and drew on the support of the public treasury whenever their costs exceeded their revenues. Operating under an explicit mandate from their governments, these agencies as a rule had no great difficulty in resisting the application of the general trade principles to their situations.

The advanced industrialized countries were the source of a second challenge as well. Government procurement practices have rarely been altogether free of discrimination in favour of domestic interests; and until very recently, the agreements of governments have done little to alter that basic condition. Accordingly, wherever state-owned enterprises existed, they could be expected to tilt their purchases and sales in favour of national interests. This tendency was particularly apparent whenever the transactions were associated with high technology or with the national defence.

Yet another major challenge came from the developing countries. These countries, of course, saw many things in the new trade rules that seemed out of keeping with their stage of development. In particular, any undertaking to restrain their state-trading enterprises seemed especially inappropriate to their circumstances.

There were various reasons why the developing countries resisted any limitations on the powers of their state-trading firms. For one

thing, many developing countries had considerable misgivings about the general efficacy and superiority of a market economy, and many were prepared to experiment with the extensive use of controls. Many developing countries – emulating some of the more industrialized countries – established state-trading entities to perform some of the taxing and subsidizing and price-stabilizing functions that would otherwise have been assigned to the government ministries. Finally, even those countries that were prepared eventually to assign an important role to open markets and market prices in their national economies commonly had the feeling that a period of state trading might be needed before indigenous enterprises were in a position to be exposed to foreign competitors. In the meantime, governments had no desire to hamper their young enterprises with any agreed restraints.

Still another source of challenge came from the socialist centrally-directed economies. Some of these, in the interests of maintaining control, preferred to conduct their trade in balanced bilateral deals with their trading partners; in such cases, it was fruitless to require state-trading entities to choose their sources and markets on a non-discriminatory commercial basis. Moreover, practically all of these countries conducted their foreign trade through channels that insulated their internal price structure from the structure of world prices. In cases of this sort, efforts to constrain state traders by analogizing their trading mark-ups to tariffs had no operational meaning.

In the thirty years since this first abortive attempt to include state-trading firms in the rules of an international trading system, the international transactions conducted by such firms have expanded considerably. As the various articles in this volume demonstrate, state-trading enterprises are now to be found operating out of many countries in many different commodities. Moreover, as governments have expanded the number and variety of their enterprises in manufacturing, mining, and services, the international trade conducted by such firms has grown commensurately. The result is that, in some products, including wheat, copper, oil, and aircraft, state-owned enterprises are today a major factor in international markets.

The growth of such trade raises new questions about the adequacy of the existing rules of the game. Questions of this sort have been appearing for other reasons as well. Ironically, the very success of governments in promoting large increases in world trade over the past thirty years has been partly responsible for the new uncertainties. Some governments dare not open their economies any further, for fear of imposing unacceptable burdens of adjustment inside the

economy; but at the same time, most governments are loath to pull back for fear of losing foreign markets and adding to domestic costs. Practically all governments recognize that if international trade is to continue to widen the opportunities and reduce the costs of trading countries, the rules will have to accommodate more complex principles than have heretofore governed. Accordingly, governments seem to be edging into an era which will see a major reconsideration of the rules of the trading game.

In devising a new set of rules to govern the behaviour of state-trading enterprises, there is no flinching from one overwhelming fact. These enterprises are characteristically engaged in the kind of activities that straddle the line between domestic policies and foreign policies. The taxing function and the trading function for instance are often interrelated; efforts to redistribute national income through the internal price system also have their direct impact on international trade. The intertwining of sensitive domestic issues with foreign policy issues poses an especially difficult challenge for devising an acceptable set of international institutions and rules of the game.

To deal with this challenge effectively, the international community will have to know much more than it presently knows about motivations, behaviour, and consequences of the operations of state-trading enterprises. Moreover, much of what is available is easily subject to misinterpretation. Because such enterprises are commonly used by governments to dispense subsidies to some target group inside the national economy, the meaning of reported losses has not always been easy to interpret. Because others are tax collectors for their governments, the meaning of reported profits has sometimes been just as obscure. The fact that governments often use such enterprises in the execution of bilateral trade deals, or in programmes of domestic protection, has tended to confuse the trade policies of the governments with the predilections of the enterprises themselves. On the other hand, the fact that ambitious managers of state enterprises have sometimes struck off for themselves on highly independent entrepreneurial adventures has led some observers to believe that state traders if left to themselves would be indistinguishable from private traders.

When governments eventually turn to the problem of devising new rules of the game for state enterprises, their general positions will inevitably be affected by the way in which they look upon economic systems in the large, that is, by their economic ideology. The challenge will be to try to find a *modus vivendi* that accommodates a number of distinctively different ideologies, so that nations can continue to

benefit from some of the undisputed advantages of international exchange and so that those benefits can be equitably shared. To achieve that result will require at least two things: an extraordinary measure of mutual tolerance on the part of the negotiators; and an understanding in depth of the characteristics and consequences of the operations of state-trading firms. No single volume of essays will provide that understanding, but this volume represents a strong beginning.