

Open Access Repository www.ssoar.info

Shipbuilding in Italy, 1861-1913: the burden of the evidence

Ciccarelli, Carlo; Fenoaltea, Stefano

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with: GESIS - Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Ciccarelli, C., & Fenoaltea, S. (2009). Shipbuilding in Italy, 1861-1913: the burden of the evidence. *Historical Social Research*, 34(2), 333-373. <u>https://doi.org/10.12759/hsr.34.2009.2.333-373</u>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer CC BY Lizenz (Namensnennung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zu den CC-Lizenzen finden Sie hier:

https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.de

Gesis Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften

Terms of use:

This document is made available under a CC BY Licence (Attribution). For more Information see: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0



Diese Version ist zitierbar unter / This version is citable under: https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-286852

Shipbuilding in Italy, 1861-1913: The Burden of the Evidence

Carlo Ciccarelli & Stefano Fenoaltea*

Abstract: »Schiffsbau in Italien, 1861-1913: die Last des Beweises«. Shipbuilding in post-Unification Italy is here documented by new national and regional time series. Where the extant national series point to secular decline, the new estimates reveal a major increase in output tied primarily to the growth of repair work on the one hand and of naval construction on the other. The regional estimates, which have no precedent in the literature, point to considerable concentration: Liguria accounted for more than half the product, and Campania for almost another quarter. Again, while in most regions shipbuilding was barely significant, in Liguria it represented up to a quarter of total industrial production. The further disaggregation of naval construction points to significant exports, from the 1890s, by the private yards in Tuscany and Liguria; the consensus view that Italy's engineering industry was then too backward to export at all is clearly unfounded.

Keywords: Shipbuilding, Italy, Economic History, Cliometrics.

The interpretation of Italy's development in the decades that followed Unification turns to no mean extent on the actual, and counterfactual, performance of the engineering industry (Cohen J. S. and Federico G. 2001). The facts themselves are poorly documented, however, and the industry's time path is typically measured indirectly, by the apparent consumption of iron and steel (e.g., Gerschenkron A. 1955, Carreras A. 1999, Fenoaltea S. 2003a).

Within "the vast and variegated area of engineering," as Alexander Gerschenkron put it (Gerschenkron A. 1955, 369), shipbuilding stands out as something of a special case. On the one hand, it is poorly captured by the usual measures, for its production was partly, and in the early years overwhelmingly, wood-based rather than metal-based; on the other, it was subject to sectorspecific technological and political shocks, and responded idiosyncratically to more general ones (e.g., war-related movements in shipping rates). Fortunately, however, it is extensively documented in its own right, as both the merchant

Historical Social Research, Vol. 34 - 2009 - No. 2, 333-373

^{*} Address all communications to: Carlo Ciccarelli, Stefano Fenoaltea, both Facoltà di Economia, Università di Roma "Tor Vergata", via Columbia 2, 00133 Roma, Italy; e-mail: carlo.ciccarelli@uniroma2.it, stefano.fenoaltea@uniroma2.it.

The regional estimates were produced as part of the research project on "Unità d'Italia e sviluppo disuguale: la struttura creditizia e la crescita industriale per regioni dal 1861 al 1913" of the Ufficio Ricerche Storiche of the Bank of Italy. The authors alone are responsible for the material presented here. David Chessum and Achille Rastelli generously shared information from their specialized collections, and are gratefully thanked.

marine and the navy were then, like the railroads, the object of systematic reports, parliamentary investigations, and an extensive secondary literature.

These sources are used here to generate new time-series estimates for the shipbuilding industry, narrowly defined to exclude work on inshore and inland vessels ("boats"). The new national series confirm that shipbuilding went very much its own way, with production movements driven first by the market for traditional merchant sailing-ships, then by naval construction, then by the subsidies for merchant steamers, and finally, in the run-up to the War, by the arms race. Overall, the shipbuilding industry displayed healthy growth, with a trend rate sufficient to treble production over half a century. Its progress was driven largely by repair work and especially by naval construction; the extant official series neglects both of these, and displays a declining trend.

The regional series, which are the first of their kind, document the concentration of production in Liguria and Campania. These two started close to even, but Liguria took greater advantage of the early sailing-ship boom, and then captured a clear lead in the production of metal ships of all kinds; it would be the privileged beneficiary of the pre-War arms race, as of the ensuing bloodbath.

The naval shipbuilding series are further disaggregated to separate arsenal and private-yard new construction. Liguria and Campania dominated the former, Liguria (again) and Tuscany the latter. From the early 1890s the private yards worked extensively for the export market: the consensus view that Italy's engineering industry was then too backward to export at all is clearly unfounded.

1. National production

The new national estimates of 1911-price value added in ship construction and maintenance are summarized below in Appendix Table A. Cols. 1 and 2 refer to the new construction of merchant and naval vessels, respectively; both are simple sums of the physical series (in register or displacement tons) transcribed in Appendix Table B, with the 1911-price value added weights also transcribed therein.¹

The two type-specific merchant-marine construction series in Appendix Table B, cols. 1-2 are derived from the well-known data in the annual reports on the merchant marine (e.g., Ministero di Agricoltura, Industria e Commercio 1885, 433, Ministero della Marina 1913, 73; see also, for example, Corbino E. 1922). The series in the (primary and secondary) sources report the register

Displacement tons are measures of weight. Register tons are measures of internal volume; gross tonnage includes, and net tonnage excludes, that occupied by the vessel's machinery and the like. As a rule of thumb, in the case of steamships one net ton corresponds to one displacement ton, fuel and cargo excluded.

³³⁴

tonnage launched; the present series improve them by allowing for changes in Italy's borders and for changes in the unit of measurement, and shift the resulting figures six months backward to approximate construction.² The 13 type-specific naval construction series in Appendix Table B, cols. 3-15 are built up from ship-specific data in contemporary and retrospective sources; they cover the 490 naval vessels reportedly built in Italy for the Italian navy or for export, and distribute the displacement tonnage of each ship over its construction period.³ The corresponding value added weights are obtained as usual from market prices and technical coefficients; they refer to the shipbuilding sector alone, and accordingly exclude the cost of equipment purchased from other sectors of the engineering industry.

Appendix Table A, cols. 3 and 4 refer to the maintenance of merchant and naval vessels, respectively. The merchant-maintenance series is again the sum of separate series for sail- and steam-powered vessels. The former is indexed by the total tonnage of the fleet in service (again measured at constant borders, and in homogeneous units), with what turn out to be very minor corrections for imports and exports (maintenance abroad of Italian ships, and maintenance in Italy of foreign ships). The second is itself in two components, of comparable weight: one refers to the maintenance associated with the throughput of beaching slips and dry-docks (which served foreign as well as Italian ships), the other to the residual maintenance of Italian ships alone, again indexed by the (corrected) tonnage of the fleet.

In the case of naval maintenance, the sources include a wealth of descriptive information on the maintenance (and improvement) of individual ships, which does not lend itself to quantification, and aggregate budget figures, which change repeatedly and abruptly in apparent response to unspecified modifications in accounting rules. The budget data were accordingly used only to derive the 1911-price total; the corresponding "real" index is instead obtained by tracking the service lives of each of the 559 ships reported to have served in the Navy between 1861 and 1913, aggregating their displacements with type-specific weights (to exclude low-maintenance components like the armor, if any, and the cargo of bulk carriers), and trimming the resulting total to exclude the ships that were very new or very close to being retired.

Appendix Table C presents the estimates of the merchant fleets, of interest in their own right, of the equivalent naval fleet maintained, and of the three components of the aggregate merchant-maintenance series.⁴

⁴ The merchant-fleet series may be considered improvements of those appearing in Istat 1958, p. 138, and Mitchell B. R. 1975, pp. 616, 621.



² The present tonnages are all reduced to Moorsom measures, actually used in Italy from 1874 to 1905.

³ The main retrospective sources are the publications of the Historical Research Office of the Italian Navy (e.g., Ufficio Storico della Marina Militare 1969, 1978); contemporary sources (e.g., Jane F. T. 1906) serve to identify Italian-built ships in foreign navies.

The four subaggregates presented in Appendix Table A are illustrated in Figure 1. The paths of the maintenance series are, not surprisingly, close to rising trends. Merchant maintenance displays some cyclical deviations in the later decades, which can be traced to the irregular decline of the sailing fleet, and the similarly irregular growth in dry-dock throughput.⁵ The occasional periods of decline in naval maintenance correspond instead to the large-scale scrapping of obsolete ships, both in the wake of Unification and again after the turn of the century. Merchant maintenance always far outweighed naval maintenance: naval vessels were the more complex, but on a comparable basis the merchant fleet was much larger, and much more intensively used. On the present estimates the annual average 1911-price value added in merchant maintenance.

Figure 1: Shipbuilding in Italy: value added at 1911 prices (million lire)



Sources: Table 1.

The cyclical variations in new construction were altogether sharper, and its two components follow strikingly different paths. That of the navalconstruction series is reminiscent of the overall cycle in investment and public spending, with a sharp upswing through the mid-1880s and another in the final

⁵ The visible upward step in the total in 1891 is itself attributable to the reopening of the large Orlando dry-dock in Leghorn.

³³⁶

years before the Great War (Fenoaltea 1988); somewhat astonishingly, well over half the total at the pre-war peak was due to just five vessels, the Cavourand Doria-class battleships then under construction.⁶ The main movements of merchant construction are instead the early (twin-peaked) boom and subsequent bust between 1861 and 1880, and a second sharp boom, followed by an irregular decline, after 1895. The first boom was entirely in sailing-ship construction (Appendix Table C, col. 1), and driven to all accounts by market forces (apparently the growth in the desired domestic fleet, itself tied to the growth of Italy's commodity imports, Istat 1958, 159-160); the second was instead in steam-ship construction, and clearly associated with the new subsidies to their builders and owners (e.g., De Courten L. 1989, 48, Flore V. D. 1970, 470-472). As is clear from Figure 1, merchant construction was the dominant component only in the early years; after that, and with only the brief exception of the steamer boom at the turn of the century, naval construction was much the larger. Overall, the 1911-price value added in merchant construction averaged 10.4 million lire per year, much like the corresponding maintenance, against 14.7 million lire per vear in naval construction.

Figure 2 presents three time series as index numbers, with 1900 = 100. One is the present total reported in Appendix Table A, col. 5; another is the Istat "ships launched" series, which refers in fact only to merchant ships; and the third is the present component (merchant-ship construction: Appendix Table A, col. 1) closest to the Istat series (Istat 1958, 130). As an index of aggregate product, the Istat series seems entirely misleading: where the present total displays successively higher peaks in 1869, 1874, 1900, 1906, and 1913 and a trend growth rate of 2.24 percent per year (marginally above that of industry as a whole), the Istat series displays a secular decline from a peak in 1869 and a trend growth rate of minus 1.53 percent per year. The Istat series is naturally altogether closer to the present index of merchant construction alone, but again not as close as one might wish. Its main distortion seems to stem from the fact that it directly aggregates sail and steam register tons, and (in 1861-1907) net tons at that; because a steamer is a more complex machine per gross ton, and naturally has a much higher ratio of gross tons to net tons, the Istat series much understates the (steam-ship) output of the later years relative to the (sailingship) output of the early ones.⁷

⁶ The naval construction boom in the pre-War years was tied specifically to the pan-European Dreadnought race, that of the 1880s to the narrower Franco-Italian rivalry in the Mediterranean (Ropp T. 1941).

⁷ The Istat series is also more volatile than the present series, as the latter spreads tonnages launched over the plausible construction period, but that is by the bye.

³³⁷



Figure 2: Shipbuilding in Italy: index numbers (1900 = 100)

Sources: see text.

2. Regional production

The regional production estimates that correspond to the five national series in Appendix Table A are collected below as Appendix Tables D-H. The navalconstruction estimates are again much the best: the sources identify the yards that built the ships, and the regional estimates directly replicate their national counterparts.

The merchant-construction estimates are somewhat weaker, for in the sources the local output totals are not broken down, as the national totals are, by vessel type. The latter breakdown is approximated by distributing among the various regions the tonnages of the steamers that could be identified as such (in the periodic lists of steamers, which however report their current register tonnages rather than those they first obtained), calculating the corresponding 1911-price value added, and then allocating the residual value added (in the construction of unidentified steamers as well as sailing vessels) in proportion to the residual tonnage constructed.

The maintenance estimates are weaker still. In the absence of better indicators the present regional estimates of naval maintenance disaggregate the na-

tional series in simple proportion to the labor establishment of the various naval arsenals; these also employed an unknown number of temporary workers, which would appear, and are here assumed, to have shot up when the yard was also engaged in new construction (e.g., Parlamento italiano 1914a, 90-91, 1914b, 52).

In the case of merchant vessels, finally, the national estimates for both the maintenance of sailing ships and the non-dry-dock maintenance of steamships are allocated in proportion to the tonnages registered in each region, on the assumption that such maintenance was performed primarily in the ships' home port, where the crew could be discharged. The national estimates of the steamers' dry-dock maintenance are instead allocated directly on the basis of the installations' relative throughputs, as reported from 1899, as estimated from partial data in 1879 and 1885-98, and as extrapolated or interpolated in other years.

Region	(1) <u>New co</u> Naval	(2) <u>nstruction</u> Merchant	(3) <u>Main</u> Naval	(4) <u>ntenance</u> Merchant	(5) Naval	(6) otal Merchant	(7) Total	
Piedmont	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	
Liguria	42.1	68.5	40.0	63.9	41.6	66.2	54.6	
Lombardy	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	
Venetia	10.3	2.6	18.2	3.7	12.0	3.2	7.3	
Emilia	.0	.4	.0	.3	.0	.3	.2	
Tuscany	13.4	5.6	.3	4.3	10.5	4.9	7.6	
Marches	.0	3.7	.1	.5	.0	2.1	1.1	
Umbria	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	
Latium	.0	.0	.0	.2	.0	.1	.1	
Abruzzi	.0	.0	.0	.2	.0	.1	.1	
Campania	33.6	13.4	34.3	11.3	33.8	12.3	22.4	
Apulia	.5	.7	6.4	1.7	1.8	1.2	1.5	
Basilicata	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	
Calabria	.0	.2	.0	.3	.0	.2	.1	
Sicily	.1	4.9	.0	13.5	.1	9.2	4.9	
Sardinia	.0	.1	.6	.2	.1	.2	.2	

Table 1: Shipbuilding in Italy's regions: shares of cumulative production (percent)

Sources: see text.

Table 1 presents the shares of cumulative production claimed by the various regions. Geographically, production was highly concentrated, but with some-what different patterns across its various components. Naval work was practically exhausted by just four regions: Liguria had some two fifths, and Campania a third, of both new construction and maintenance; Tuscany and Venetia each had another ninth of the total, with rather more new construction in Tuscany and much more maintenance in Venetia. The small residual (2%) is taken up almost entirely by Apulia, which had a certain presence in maintenance (6%). Merchant work was at once more concentrated in Liguria, which captured near two thirds of both new construction and maintenance, and more

widely shared by the other regions: Campania took another eighth, Sicily less than a tenth (most of it in maintenance), and Tuscany a twentieth, with another 6% shared by Venetia, the Marches, and Apulia, and the residual 1% by the rest.

Figures 3-5 illustrates the paths of ship building and repairing in the two leading regions, Liguria and Campania. In naval work (Figure 3) the two regions long appear quite evenly matched. In new construction, the lead moved back and forth between them; in maintenance, their paths were close to each other and largely parallel (save in the 1870s, when Liguria took over the lead). In merchant work (Figure 4) one finds a very different pattern, and a sharp contrast between the two: where Liguria followed (or led) the sharp fluctuations in the national aggregate (Figure 1), Campania was more nearly stagnant. Campania participated in the early boom-and-bust in sailing-ship construction, but far less vigorously than Liguria; the later (subsidy-fed) boom in steamer production it largely missed, and between 1895 and 1913 Campania was only fifth in tonnage built, behind Liguria, Sicily, the Marches and Tuscany. In maintenance, tied to the locally-registered fleet, Campania and Liguria appear very even at Unification; but Campania then merely stagnated, while Liguria grew and grew - thanks also to the postal subsidies for steam navigation from which Campania's shipowners seem wilfully to have been excluded (Flore V. D. 1970, 358).8 The regional aggregates (illustrated in Figure 5) are dominated by the differences in merchant work: Liguria moved much as Italy did (or vice versa), Campania mainly plodded along.

⁸ In the aftermath of Unification, when Italy's steam navigation was in its infancy, the postal subsidies could make or break a steamship company, and government ministers had their favorites; quite analogously, decades later and an ocean away, the U.S. Postmaster General awarded the Latin American air mail contract to Juan Trippe's Pan American, effectively dooming Ralph O'Neill's pioneering and far superior NYRBA airline.













Figure 5: Shipbuilding in Liguria and Campania: total work (million lire at 1911 prices)

Sources: Appendix Table H.

At the very end of the period at hand, as noted, the Dreadnought race lifted naval and overall ship building to unprecedented levels. Campania built just one of the five battleships laid down after 1909; Liguria, drawing on the capacity it had built up with its unique strength in merchant work, built the other four.

Table 2 scales the aggregate regional estimates to gauge the local significance of the industry at the census-year benchmarks. In cols. 1-4 they are divided by preliminary estimates of total industrial production; in cols. 5-8 they are divided by the male population of working age, which proxies for the aggregate regional economy (Fenoaltea S. 2003b, 1069, 1088-1091).⁹ On both counts, in Italy as a whole shipbuilding appears to be of no more than average import.¹⁰ Above-average ratios are found only in the two regions one has come to expect. Campania's ratios run roughly double the national averages; Lig-

⁹ The updated aggregates incorporate partly unpublished new estimates for mining and quarrying, textiles and (non-leather) apparel, metals and non-metallic mineral products, chemicals and the like, the utilities, and construction

¹⁰ Shipbuilding is just one sector among many dozens, and the average share of each sector is perforce quite small.

³⁴³

uria's run ten to twenty times those averages, and, like these, reflect the idiosyncratic cycle in shipyard work.

	(1) Sha industr	(2) ire of sh ial prod	(3) ipbuild: uction	(4) ing in (percent)	(5) Shipbui of wo	(6) lding pr rking ag	(7) oduct pe e (1911	(8) er male lire)
	1871	1881	1901	1911	1871	1881	1901	1911
Piedmont	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0
Liguria	24.7	11.2	22.7	15.8	64.1	32.8	91.6	110.6
Lombardy	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0
Venetia	1.1	1.0	1.3	.9	2.0	2.0	3.5	4.0
Emilia	.1	.0	.0	.0	.1	.1	.1	.2
Tuscany	.7	1.3	.9	.8	1.3	3.0	2.9	3.7
Marches	. 3	.2	1.3	1.4	. 4	.3	2.8	4.4
Umbria	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0
Latium	.0	.0	.0	.0	.1	.1	.0	.1
Abruzzi	.1	.0	.0	.0	.1	.0	. 0	.1
Campania	3.1	3.0	3.5	3.6	5.6	6.7	9.9	14.0
Apulia	.3	.2	1.0	.6	.4	.3	1.8	1.8
Basilicata	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0
Calabria	.2	. 1	. 0	.0	.2	. 1	.1	. 0
Sicily	.5	.6	.9	1.1	1.0	1.3	2.0	3.2
Sardinia	.1	.1	.2	.1	.1	.1	.4	.4
Italy	1.6	1.1	1.8	1.5	3.0	2.3	5.2	6.8

Table 2: Shipbuilding in Italy's regions: local significance, census years

Sources: see text.

These estimates suggest that shipbuilding by itself represented from a tenth to a quarter of Liguria's industrial value added; and even these remarkable proportions understate the industry's local importance, for they include the installation, but not the construction, of the ships' engines and weapons. In the case of naval vessels, in particular, such equipment might cost as much again as the assembled hull; its origin is hard to pin down, as it moved easily across regional (and national) borders, but the secondary literature suggests that a large part was produced in Liguria itself.

In the Italian context, and at comparable levels of disaggregation, this degree of regional specialization is highly exceptional, at least among the sectors of industry that have already been documented (save of course the mining sectors, where specialization is given by Mother Nature); and absent comparably detailed evidence for other countries, international comparisons are not yet possible.

3. The market for naval vessels

A significant strand of the contemporary debate on matters maritime concerned the pattern of naval procurement. Naval construction had traditionally been concentrated in the arsenals; the owners of shipyards naturally pressed, apparently with increasing success, for a share of the work (e.g., Parlamento italiano 1882, 338-497).

Appendix Table I presents the private-yard component of naval construction in Italy's regions; it is obtained by replicating Appendix Table B, and the corresponding aggregates, with the data base restricted to the ships built in private yards, separating out exports. The arsenal-built component is not reported, but it is simply the difference between the partial series in Appendix Table I and the aggregate estimates of naval construction in Appendix Table E. The corresponding national series are the simple sums of the regional estimates, and are not separately reported.

The national series obtained by summing over the appropriate regional series are illustrated in Figure 6; exports were all from private yards, and appear as the vertical difference between private-yard production and private-yard production for the Italian Navy. Three phases can be identified. In 1861-73, the contribution of private yards was negligible or nearly so. From 1874 – even before the Old Right lost its parliamentary majority – until 1893 private yards averaged some 30% of naval construction. Over the last two decades (1894-1913), finally, the contribution of the private yards was comparable to that of the arsenals.

Figure 6: Naval ship construction in Italy: arsenal and private-yard value added at 1911 prices (million lire)



Sources: see text.

At the regional level, the mix was very different. In Venetia the arsenal accounted for all the naval work, save only a few small auxiliary vessels (6 bulk carriers and 9 tugs). In Campania, similarly, the arsenals in Naples and Castellammare accounted for some 90% of the total; the Pattison works accounted for almost all of the region's private-yard destroyers (14), torpedo boats (56), and auxiliary vessels (8). Tuscany was here almost a mirror-image of Venetia, with no arsenal work at all after the Leghorn (S. Rocco) works were taken over by Orlando.¹¹ Liguria alone combined arsenals and private yards in almost equal proportions, with both the major arsenal in La Spezia and the major Ansaldo and Odero yards in Genoa/Sampierdarena capable of producing even the largest fighting ships.¹²

The Ligurian and Tuscan series are illustrated in Figure 7, like the national series in Figure 6.



Figure 7: Naval ship construction in Liguria and Tuscany: arsenal and private-yard value added at 1911 prices (million lire)

A. Liguria

¹¹ The arsenal was sold in 1866; the *Conte Verde*, then building, is here considered entirely arsenal-built.

¹² Numerous other private yards were located in Liguria, including for example the FIAT-S. Giorgio and Muggiano submarine works near La Spezia.



Sources: see text.

In both regions, from the mid-1890s, exports occasionally represented the bulk of private-yard work. Only a minor share of Italy's naval exports were ships actually laid down to foreign order; the largest batch was represented by the *Garibaldi*-class cruisers repeatedly laid down for the Italian navy and bought, while still under construction, by foreign powers (Fraccaroli A. 1970, Bagnasco E. and Rastelli A. 1991).¹³

The significance of these exports goes beyond their mere numbers, for they are directly relevant to the long-standing debate over Italy's tariff policy. Half a century ago, Gerschenkron argued that coal-less Italy should have protected

¹³ The Garibaldi-class Cristóbal Colón, delivered incomplete, was lost in the Spanish-American battle of Santiago, Cuba, July 3, 1898. The main ships not initially laid down to domestic order were the armored cruiser Georgios Averoff (built in Leghorn and sold to Greece), and the protected cruiser Libia (laid down in Genoa as the Drama, for Turkey, and here excluded from the export total because it was taken over by the Italian navy); two for-eign battleships (the Vasco da Gama and the Messoudieh) were also rebuilt, in Leghorn and Genoa respectively. Among minor vessels, FIAT submarines in particular were both exported and built abroad to Italian design; the Balilla, too, had been laid down as the U-42, for Germany.



engineering rather than fuel-intensive metalmaking (Gerschenkron A. 1955, 368-369). One of his less obeisant students countered that the royal road to industrial development was not the conquest of the limited domestic market, but the break-out into the ("unlimited") world market; in Italy the increase in the costs of domestic engineering products due to the tariff on iron and steel stunted industrial growth not because it increased the consumption in Italy of foreign goods, but because it priced their Italian counterparts out of world markets and prevented export-led growth (Fenoaltea S. 1973, 136-139). Gianni Toniolo in turn dismissed the suggested counterfact, arguing that Italy's engineering industry could not have exported even with duty-free imports of steel, simply because it had not yet reached the technical, *qualitative*, level necessary to succeed in world markets (Toniolo G. 1977, 662, 665, 672, 1990, 145); and his objection has been repeated with approval by Luciano Cafagna (Cafagna L. 1989, 276-277), then by Vera Zamagni (Zamagni V. 1993, 115-116), and again by Jon Cohen and Giovanni Federico (Cohen J. S. and Federico G. 2001, 65).

In the period at hand major naval vessels were the very pinnacle of technological sophistication. Italy's engineering firms produced them for export: whatever else they may have been, they were not too technologically backward to export at all.

Conclusion

The new evidence presented here leads to a number of novel conclusions. At the national level, shipbuilding was not, as the extant series suggest, a sector in absolute, and *a fortiori* relative, decline: if one properly measures merchantship construction, and counts repair work and naval construction as well, shipbuilding easily kept pace with industrial production as a whole.

The regional series point to a very high degree of concentration in a very few regions, and, in the leading region, an extensive specialization in shipbuilding itself. This degree of regional specialization is unusual among Italy's industries; the extent to which it was also unusual with respect to shipbuilding in other countries cannot yet be determined.

Over time, private yards obtained an increasing share of naval construction, and developed a significant export business. Weapons systems embody cuttingedge technology: the conventional wisdom that Italy's engineering industry was then too backward to produce goods that would sell on the world market seems simply wrong.

References

Bagnasco E. & Rastelli A. (1991) Le costruzioni navali italiane per l'estero, Rivista marittima, Roma.

Cafagna L. (1989) Dualismo e sviluppo nella storia d'Italia, Marsilio, Venezia.

- Carreras, A. (1999) Un ritratto quantitativo dell'industria italiana, Amatori F., Bigazzi D., Giannetti R. & Segreto L., *Storia d'Italia. Annali, 15. L'industria*, Einaudi, Torino, pp. 179-272.
- Cohen J. S. & Federico G. (2001) *The Growth of the Italian Economy, 1820-1960*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Corbino E. (1922) Dati statistici sullo sviluppo della marina mercantile italiana, *Giornale degli economisti e Rivista di statistica*, 33, pp. 177-186.
- de Courten L. (1989) La marina mercantile italiana nella politica di espansione (1860-1914): industria, finanza e trasporti marittimi, Bulzoni, Roma.
- Fenoaltea S. (1973) Riflessioni sull'esperienza industriale italiana dal Risorgimento alla prima guerra mondiale, Toniolo G., *Lo sviluppo economico italiano 1861-1940*, Laterza, Bari, pp. 121-156.
- Fenoaltea S. (1988) International Resource Flows and Construction Movements in the Atlantic Economy: The Kuznets Cycle in Italy, 1861-1913, *Journal of Economic History*, 48, pp. 605-638.
- Fenoaltea S. (2003a) Notes on the Rate of Industrial Growth in Italy, 1861-1913, *Journal of Economic History*, 63, pp. 695-735.
- Fenoaltea S. (2003b) Peeking Backward: Regional Aspects of Industrial Growth in Post-Unification Italy, *Journal of Economic History*, 63, pp. 1059-1102.
- Flore V. D. (1970) L'industria dei trasporti marittimi in Italia, parte II, Bollettino informazioni marittime, Roma.
- Fraccaroli A. (1970) Italian Warships of World War I, Ian Allen, London.
- Gerschenkron A. (1955) Notes on the Rate of Industrial Growth in Italy, 1881-1913, *Journal of Economic History*, 15, pp. 360-375.
- Istat (Istituto centrale di statistica) (1958) Sommario di statistiche storiche italiane, 1861-1955, Roma.
- Jane F. T. (1906) Jane's Fighting Ships 1906-07, Sampson Low, Marston.
- Ministero della Marina (1913), Sulle condizioni della marina mercantile italiana al 31 dicembre del 1911, Roma.
- Ministero di Agricoltura, Industria e Commercio (1885), Movimento della navigazione nei porti del Regno, 1884, Roma.
- Mitchell B. R. (1975) European Historical Statistics, 1750-1970, Macmillan, London.
- Parlamento italiano (1882) Commissione parlamentare d'inchiesta per la marina mercantile, *Inchiesta parlamentare sulla marina mercantile (1881-82)*, vol. 1, Botta, Roma.
- Parlamento italiano (1914a) Atti Parlamentari, Camera, Legislatura XXIV, Sessione 1913, Documenti, Disegno di Legge n. 29, Allegato 37, Roma.
- Parlamento italiano (1914b) Atti Parlamentari, Camera, Legislatura XXIV, Sessione 1913, Documenti, Disegno di Legge n. 29 A. Relazione, Roma.
- Ropp, T. (1941) The Modern Italian Navy, Military Affairs, 5, pp. 32-48, 104-116.
- Toniolo, G. (1977) Effective Protection and Industrial Growth: The Case of Italian Engineering, *Journal of European Economic History*, 6, pp. 659-673.
- Toniolo G. (1990) An Economic History of Liberal Italy (1850-1918), Routledge, London.
- Ufficio storico della Marina militare (1969), Le navi d'Italia, vol. 5, I cacciatorpediniere italiani, 1900-1969, Roma.

Ufficio storico della Marina militare (1978), Le navi d'Italia, vol. 8, Almanacco storico delle navi militari d'Italia, 1861-1975, Roma.

Zamagni V. (1993) "The Economic History of Italy, 1860-1990: Recovery after Decline", Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Appendix

Appendix Table A: Shipbuilding in Italy, 1861-1913: value added at 1911 prices (million lire)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	Constr	ruction	Mainter	nance	
	Merchant	Naval	Merchant	Naval	Total
1861	5.87	6.03	3.82	1.82	17.55
1862	7.61	6.11	4.02	1.78	19.52
1863	9.08	7.53	4.33	1.75	22.69
1864	11.46	6.91	4.46	1.69	24.52
1865	13.81	6.91	4.75	1.66	27.13
1866	15.26	6.06	5.17	1.70	28.19
1867	18.33	5.40	5.46	1.89	31.07
1868	21.11	4.88	5.87	2.13	33.99
1869	21.77	4.05	6.33	2.51	34.67
1870	18.61	3.61	6.78	2.46	31.46
1871	15.30	2.72	7.14	2.35	27.50
1872	14.88	2.13	7.27	2.04	26.32
1873	17.66	4.80	7.41	2.12	31.99
1874	20.93	6.74	7.63	2.18	37.49
1875	19.37	5.85	7.90	2.16	35.28
1876	13.38	6.47	8.18	2.17	30.19
1877	8.41	7.68	8.26	2.14	26.49
1878	6.24	6.79	8.24	2.23	23.49
1879	4.46	7.01	8.24	2.33	22.04
1880	3.28	6.46	8.23	2.41	20.38
1881	3.83	7.44	8.33	2.51	22.11
1882	4.28	10.19	8.56	2.52	25.56
1883	4.08	10.70	8.77	2.64	26.19
1884	3.47	14.04	8.83	2.73	29.08
1885	2.72	16.59	8.94	2.90	31.15
1886	2.11	20.78	8.71	2.98	34.57
1887	1.60	20.86	8.65	3.25	34.36
1888	2.44	15.81	8.77	3.62	30.64
1889	4 83	14 56	8 78	4 00	32.17

Table A continued...

1890	7 55	15 73	8 54	4 26	36.08
1890	6.64	15.03	9.79	4.54	36.00
1892	4.39	14.30	9.56	5.02	33.27
1893	3.16	14.52	10.08	5.58	33.34
1894	2.38	15.03	10.26	5.82	33.49
1895	2.74	15.20	10.62	5.93	34.50
1896	3.89	16.50	10.95	6.05	37.39
1897	6.61	17.13	11.53	6.19	41.46
1898	11.83	14.66	11.80	6.59	44.88
1899	19.14	18.11	12.41	6.81	56.47
1900	21.73	17.99	13.69	6.96	60.38
1901	16.78	15.17	15.24	6.90	54.10
1902	14.16	19.94	15.92	6.80	56.82
1903	11.91	21.67	15.92	6.68	56.19
1904	12.55	18.11	16.06	6.48	53.20
1905	13.84	24.85	15.54	6.43	60.66
1906	15.45	26.45	16.72	6.25	64.87
1907	15.20	24.69	17.72	6.15	63.76
1908	10.84	20.85	18.63	6.23	56.55
1909	9.87	16.57	20.04	6.42	52.90
1910	8.00	25.90	20.35	6.56	60.82
1911	8.19	39.31	20.59	6.99	75.08
1912	14.05	53.75	21.94	7.69	97.43
1913	16.41	51.12	24.39	8.44	100.35

Sources: see text.

	_		_				_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
~	(15)		Other	aux. vecele	450	0	0	582	2, 816	3,010	1,630	253	141	21	0	0	0	0	0	0
1 prices	(14)		Bulk	trans-	200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
d at 191	(13)		Tugs		700	0	0	0	71	132	74	58	58	54	37	169	380	697	657	547
le adde	(12)		Gun-	boats	700	0	0	0	333	666	666	752	606	833	600	257	92	149	149	107
mit valı	(11)	(Tor-	pedo	2,800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
on and t	(10)	nent tons	Subma-	rines	3,800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
roductic	(6)	displacen	De-	stroyers	2,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
/sical p	(8)	vessels (Other	cruisers	1,550	0	61	122	122	122	122	122	122	35	0	0	0	204	823	908
913: ph	(2)	Naval	Protected	cruisers	1,350	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	507	579	579
y, 1861-1	(9)		Armored	cruisers	1,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
n in Ital	(5)		Battle-	ships	1,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,844	2,926	2,926
instructio	(4)		Frigates,	corvettes	1,350	2,887	2,472	2,066	1,197	851	458	645	833	833	681	146	0	0	0	0
3: Ship cc	(3)		Armored	frigates	1,000	2,136	2,679	4,292	3,555	3,657	3,999	3,659	2,825	2,243	2,243	2,224	1,796	1,367	1,197	276
x Table F	(2)	nt vessels oss tons)	steam		325	0.	0.	.2	.2	4	7.	4	τ.	2.0	1.4	.2	.2	2.6	3.5	1.2
Appendi	(1)	Merchai (000 gru	sail		235	25.0	32.4	38.4	48.5	58.2	63.9	77.5	88.8	89.9	77.3	64.8	63.0	71.6	84.3	80.7
4					weight ^a	1861	1862	1863	1864	1865	1866	1867	1868	1869	1870	1871	1872	1873	1874	1875

	118	439	252	0	0	0	23	30	24	218	327	319	492	530	177	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	C
	212	346	195	27	0	0	0	0	525	,060	548	189	562	813	421	179	691	,077	698	135	443	501	80
	273	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	96	106	150	158	380	620	694	362	150 1	30	0	0	0	C
	33	0	0	0	0	0	216	432	432	348	434	610	610	434	130	204	407	407	204	0	20	40	153
	0	0	0	0	0	5	29	83	200	288	710	,226	826	608	944	917	618	363	236	26	23	63	86
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 1	0	9	38	38	13	0	0	0	0	0	C
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	146	212	212	118	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	91
	1,027	1,100	598	480	130	0	0	0	209	1,029	2,263	1,817	1,464	1,890	1,653	1,235	1,348	830	378	356	171	775	633
	508	0	0	410	1,644	1,940	1,940	2,266	2,759	2,606	3,360	3,300	1,525	2, 320	2,468	2,909	3,312	3,191	2,910	1,728	1,284	827	333
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	,008	,008	,113	,505	.,937	,893	,597	,690	167
	18	2	2	2	11	4	32	8	94	63	35	4	14	60	55 1	51 1	70 1	01 3	7	8 03	36 11	36 11	5
	0 3,87	0 5,71	0 5,71	0 5,71	0,4,04	0 4,80	0 7,33	0 7,01	0 8,65	0 9,62	0 9,68	0 9,20	0 8,27	0 5,79	0 5,35	0 4,76	0 4,17	0 3,80	0 4,61	0 3,32	0 2,73	0 2,73	0 3 02
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	4	2	۲.	۲.	i,	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.8	i,	i.	1.2	1.6	6:	4.5	6.0	2.4	1.9	3.2	5.2	9.4	17.2	317
nued	9	.5	.6	0.	2	6	0.	1	c,	6.	.5	.2	.2	3	6.	0.	4	6	7	4	.5	3	2
B contin	56.	35.	25.	18.	13.	13.	16.	15.	12.	10.	8.	5.	8.	19.	25.	20.	15.	10.	5.	4.	З.	4	9
Table l	1876	1877	1878	1879	1880	1881	1882	1883	1884	1885	1886	1887	1888	1889	1890	1891	1892	1893	1894	1895	1896	1897	1898

				r		r		r								
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,544	
	65	85	43	0	949	6,277	8,267	3,839	0	32	64	674	643	0	1,776	
	31	267	361	403	207	40	40	106	186	139	141	274	747	1,019	1,032	
	265	152	40	40	640	1,620	1,400	390	0	132	98	0	429	448	0	
	122	131	36	82	166	548	1,900	2, 320	875	261	159	462	1,738	1,531	763	
	0	0	0	0	28	153	223	188	268	293	120	379	1,080	1,305	1, 191	
	224	460	433	481	312	188	491	1,340	959	545	545	545	1,225	2,790	3,306	
	849	572	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	839	
	333	333	138	0	0	0	0	0	330	661	826	1,973	2,320	3,927	3,486	.
	8,250	7,804	3,241	7,147	9,636	1,568	4, 813	6, 582	10,431	11,660	10, 143	6,096	1,449	0	0	
	7,083	7,255	10,490	11,294	10,060	11,629	10,225	8,866	8,293	5,168	3,138	12,991	22,352	32,592	30,065	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
:	52.5	60.5	40.5	24.5	22.8	32.6	36.9	41.1	40.2	27.7	25.5	20.2	21.4	38.3	43.9	
ontinued.	8.8	8.8	15.4	26.4	19.1	8.2	7.8	8.9	9.1	7.8	6.7	6.0	5.2	6.9	9.1	
Table B c	1899	1900	1901	1902	1903	1904	1905	1906	1907	1908	1909	1910	1911	1912	1913	
			L													

^avalue added at 1911 prices: cols. 1-2, lire/gross ton; cols. 3-15, lire/displacement ton. Sources: see text.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	Estimated	l mid-year r	nerchant	Naval fleet	Value add	ded in merc	hant-fleet
	fleet (tho	usand regis	ter tons)	maintaineda	maintenan	ce (million	1911 lire)
	sail-pow.	engine-p	powered		sail-	engii	ne-powered
	(net t.)	(net t.)	(gross t.)		powered	dry-dock	other
1861	517	3		60.8	3.61	.17	.04
1862	531	8		59.4	3.68	.23	.11
1863	545	14		58.2	3.88	.26	.19
1864	559	19		56.2	3.92	.28	.26
1865	605	21		55.2	4.19	.27	.29
1866	660	22		56.8	4.57	.30	.30
1867	704	23		62.9	4.86	.29	.31
1868	759	23		71.7	5.26	.30	.31
1869	816	24		84.6	5.65	.35	.33
1870	867	29		82.1	6.01	.37	.40
1871	902	35		78.2	6.24	.42	.48
1872	913	38		68.1	6.27	.48	.52
1873	910	44		70.6	6.27	.54	.60
1874	913	51		72.7	6.30	.63	.70
18/5	931	55		/1.9	6.4/	.68	./5
1876	963	58		72.3	6.69	.70	.79
18//	9/6	58		/1.4	6./4	./3	./9
1870	907	59		74.2	6.72	./2	.80
10/9	940	60		/0.9	6.37	.81	.80
1000	928	08		80.3	6.39	.91	.93
1882	800	01		84.1	6.16	1.00	1.00
1883	876	102	166	04.1 97.9	6.05	1.10	1.24
1003	870	102	100	07.0	5.04	1.33	1.39
1885	830	124	200	91.0	5.94	1.52	1.57
1886	815	135	200	90.0	5.63	1.45	1.00
1887	767	153	247	107.4	5 28	1.27	2 07
1888	715	169	271	120.6	4 94	1.56	2.27
1889	670	181	286	131.9	4 64	1.20	2 40
1890	638	187	295	141.9	4 38	1.69	2.47
1891	630	194	309	151.5	4.34	2.86	2.59
1892	618	201	320	168.9	4.22	2.66	2.68
1893	599	205	326	184.0	4.10	3.25	2.73
1894	580	208	330	194.1	3.94	3.56	2.76
1895	564	215	340	195.8	3.84	3.93	2.85
1896	542	230	365	199.8	3.69	4.20	3.06
1897	528	249	398	206.4	3.58	4.62	3.33
1898	533	269	430	219.6	3.62	4.58	3.60
1899	548	297	476	227.0	3.73	4.69	3.99
1900	563	346	552	229.7	3.84	5.23	4.62
1901	572	401	634	230.1	3.89	6.04	5.31
1902	573	437	690	226.6	3.90	6.24	5.78
1903	577	455	717	222.8	3.92	6.00	6.00
1904	577	462	727	216.1	3.92	6.05	6.09
1905	556	473	743	214.3	3.78	5.53	6.22
1906	532	499	802	208.3	3.61	6.39	6.72
1907	512	531	872	205.0	3.46	6.96	7.30
1908	496	569	935	2075	334	/ 46	/ 83

Appendix Table C: Estimated fleets and maintenance in Italy, 1861-1913

Table C	continued						
1909	485	622	1,026	211.9	3.27	8.18	8.59
1910	477	676	1,114	218.7	3.21	7.81	9.33
1911	462	709	1,164	233.1	3.11	7.73	9.75
1912	433	754	1,236	256.4	2.89	8.70	10.35
1913	406	844	1,383	281.4	2.70	10.11	11.58

^athousand equivalent displacement tons.

Sources: see text.



Key to Appendix Tables D-I: Italy's regions

1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(2)	(9)	(2)	(8)	(6)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)
ied-	Liguria	Lom-	Venetia	Emilia	Tuscany	Marches	Umbria	Latium	Abruzzi	Campa-	Apulia	Basilica-	Calabria	Sicily	Sardinia
lont		bardy								nia		ta			
00.	3.16	00.	.19	.05	.37	.08	00.	00.	.04	1.64	.10	00.	.03	.20	00.
00.	4.62	00.	.19	.06	.54	.11	00.	.00	.03	1.68	.14	00.	.04	.20	.01
00.	6.13	00.	.12	.05	.57	.11	00.	00.	.02	1.78	.12	00.	.03	.15	.01
.00	8.13	00.	.26	.03	.45	60.	00.	00.	.01	2.20	60.	00.	.03	.17	.01
00'	10.26	00.	.31	.02	.50	.08	00.	00.	00.	2.24	.11	00.	.04	.23	.02
.00	11.50	00.	.45	.01	.49	.05	00.	00.	.01	2.39	.11	00.	.03	.20	.01
00	13.93	00.	.50	.02	.44	.02	00.	00.	00.	3.10	.08	00^{-1}	.03	.19	.01
.00	16.92	00.	.54	.01	.40	.01	00.	00.	.01	2.83	.10	00.	.04	.22	.02
00.	17.71	00.	.60	.01	.31	.02	00.	00.	.01	2.71	.10	00.	.04	.23	.02
.00	14.85	00.	.48	.02	.22	.03	00.	00.	00.	2.68	.08	00.	.03	.20	.01
00.	11.68	00.	.64	.05	.21	.04	00.	00.	.01	2.34	.07	00.	.04	.21	.01
00'	11.11	00.	.50	.12	.28	.05	00.	00.	.01	2.45	.05	00.	.03	.28	.02
.00	13.36	00.	.43	.12	.64	.05	00.	00.	.02	2.73	.04	00.	.03	.24	.01
00	15.48	00.	.46	.07	76.	.04	00.	00.	.01	3.68	.03	00.	.03	.17	00.
00^{-1}	13.67	00.	.35	.05	.61	.02	00.	00.	00.	4.37	.05	00.	.02	.23	00'
.00	9.19	00.	.38	.02	.17	.04	00.	.00	00.	3.22	.07	00.	.02	.19	.08
00.	5.55	00.	.29	.01	.12	.12	.00	00.	00.	2.06	.06	00.	.02	.10	.08
00.	3.40	00.	.24	.02	.26	.10	00.	00.	00.	2.03	.07	00.	.03	.08	00.

Appendix Table D: Merchant ship construction in Italy's regions. 1861-1913: value added at 1911 prices (million lire)

ble D co	ontinue	d	-	-	-	-		-	-					-		
79	.00	2.27	00.	.23	.02	.31	.03	00.	.01	.00	1.34	.07	00.	.01	.17	.01
80	00^{-1}	1.87	00^{-1}	.17	.02	.22	.04	00^{-1}	.02	00.	.67	.06	00.	.01	.20	.01
81	00.	2.15	00.	.18	.01	.61	.05	00.	.01	00.	.61	.06	00.	.01	.12	.00
82	00.	2.72	00.	.18	.01	.59	.05	00.	00.	00.	.56	.05	00.	.02	.08	.01
83	00.	2.88	00.	.18	.01	.22	.03	00.	00.	00.	.62	.03	00.	.02	60.	.01
84	00.	2.01	00.	.22	.01	.31	.03	00.	00.	00.	.72	.03	00.	.03	.10	.00
85	00.	.92	00.	.23	.01	.37	.05	00.	00.	00.	.95	.03	00.	.03	.12	.00
86	00.	.52	00.	.20	.01	.33	.05	00.	00.	00.	.80	.03	00.	.02	.15	00 [.]
87	00.	.54	00.	.17	00.	.31	.04	00.	00.	00 [.]	.32	.03	00.	.02	.16	00 [.]
88	00.	1.33	00.	.18	.02	.30	.02	00.	00.	00 [.]	.36	.05	00 [.]	.01	.17	00 [.]
89	00.	3.33	00.	.19	.02	.28	.03	00	00.	00 [.]	.81	90.	00 [.]	.01	.08	.01
06	00.	5.67	00.	.22	.01	.31	.05	00.	00.	00 [.]	1.09	.07	00 [.]	.03	.08	.01
91	.00	4.74	00.	.30	.02	.30	.05	00.	00.	00 [.]	.93	60.	00.	.03	.17	.01
92	00.	2.49	00.	.40	.03	.25	.06	00.	00.	00 [.]	.93	.08	00 [.]	.01	.13	.01
93	00.	1.76	00.	.31	.03	.15	.06	0.0	00.	00 [.]	.65	.08	00 ⁻	.01	.11	.01
94	00'	1.32	00.	.14	.03	.25	.06	00	00.	00 [.]	.34	.10	00 [.]	.01	.11	.01
95	00.	1.39	00.	.12	.03	.55	.07	0.0	00 ⁻	00 [.]	.39	.10	00 [.]	.01	.07	.01
96	00'	2.85	00.	60.	.03	.37	.08	00	00.	00 [.]	.34	.06	00 [.]	.01	90.	.01
67	00.	5.25	00.	.08	.01	69.	.06	00.	00.	00 [.]	.41	.04	00 ⁻	00 ⁻	.04	.01
98	.00	10.14	00.	.08	.01	97.	.05	00.	00.	00.	.67	.04	00.	00.	.03	.01
66	00.	15.43	00.	.10	.03	2.42	.08	00.	00.	00 [.]	76.	.04	00 ⁻	.01	90.	.01
00	00.	16.40	00.	.13	.04	3.32	.74	00.	00.	00 [.]	1.01	<u>.</u>	00.	.01	.06	00 [.]
																Ī

	.00	.01	00.	00.	.00	.02	.04	.03	.02	.02	00.	00.	00.
	⁻⁰⁷	50.	2.09	2.13	1.15	52.39	2.20	3.49	3.20	09'	8.	1.85	86.
	00.	.02	.01	00 [.]	00 [.]	00.	00.	00.	00 [.]	00.	00 [.]	00 ⁻	00 ⁻
	00 [.]	00 ⁻	00.	00 ⁻	00.	00 ⁻	00 ⁻	00 [.]	00 [.]	00 ⁻	00.	00 ⁻	00 ⁻
	.03	.04	.05	.05	.12	.16	.12	.08	.07	.10	.10	.11	.10
	1.19	1.68	1.25	.73	.81	16.	1.06	1.09	68.	69.	.63	.81	96.
	00.	00.	00 [.]	00 [.]	00 [.]	00.	00.	00 [.]	00 [.]	00 [.]	00 [.]	00 ⁻	00 [.]
	00 ⁻	00 ⁻	00.	00 [.]	00.	00 ⁻	00.	00 [.]	00.	00 [.]	00.	00 ⁻	00 [.]
	00	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.
	8.6	1.41	1.34	1.02	1.71	2.19	1.41	60.	.58	1.51	1.39	1.66	2.22
	1.37	1.31	1.13	.35	.41	.43	.41	.44	.73	.61	.53	1.14	1.10
	.03	.04	.05	.04	.05	.07	.05	.07	.10	60.	60.	.12	.10
	.17	.33	.32	.19	.18	.23	.40	.52	.36	.21	.19	.21	.25
	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00.	00.	00.	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00.	00^{-1}	00.	00^{-1}	00.
	13.06	9.26	5.65	8.03	9.41	9.05	9.50	5.03	3.92	4.19	4.37	8.15	10.69
ontinued	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.
Table D c	1901	1902	1903	1904	1905	1906	1907	1908	1909	1910	1911	1912	1913

Sources: see text.

(। (।	(01)	Sardinia	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.
ion lire)	(CI)	SICILY	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	00.
es (mill	(14)	Calabria	00.	00.	.00	00.	.00	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.
13/	(c1)	Basinca- ta	.00	00.	.00	00.	.00	.00	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	.00	00.	00.	00.	.00	00.	00.
(12)	(71)	Apulla	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	00.	00.	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	00.	00.
(11)	(II)	Cam- pania	2.76	2.59	2.18	2.49	2.48	2.44	1.79	1.45	1.26	1.05	.81	.77	2.12	2.66	2.05	2.55	3.17	3.17	3.69
010	(01)	ADIUZZI	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	00.
(6)	(7) I otimo	1 duui 1	00.	00.	.00	.00	.00	.00	00.	.00	00.	00.	00.	.00	.00	.00	00.	.00	.00	00.	00.
(8)	(0) T Tanhain	UIII0114	00.	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	00.	00.	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	00.	00.
E	(/) Manhar	INIAICTICS	00.	.00	.00	.05	.09	.05	.04	.04	.02	00.	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	00.	00.
9	(0)	1 uscany	.85	.85	1.23	.45	.45	.45	.51	.57	.75	.69	.43	.00	.14	.67	.67	.98	1.57	1.32	1.29
3	(C)	EINIIA	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	00.
(\overline{A})	(+) V ⁷	veneua	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.42	.68	.69	.70	.31	.12	.79	.86	.91	1.05	1.12	1.04	.78
Ċ	(c) I	bardy	00.	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	00.	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	00.
0	(7)	Liguia	2.42	2.67	4.2	3.92	3.89	3.12	2.64	2.15	1.33	1.17	1.17	1.23	1.75	2.56	2.21	1.89	1.81	1.25	1.25
(1)	(T)	mont	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
			1861	1862	1863	1864	1865	1866	1867	1868	1869	1870	1871	1872	1873	1874	1875	1876	1877	1878	1879

n lire) added at 1911 prices (million , 1861-1913: value construction in Italy's regions, ndix Table E: Naval shin

$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	2	5 .0(86. 0	00.	1.28	00.	00.	00.	00.	2.95	0.0	00.	00.	00.	00.
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $.25 .00 .90	06 ⁻ C		00.	1.30	00.	00.	00.	00.	3.98	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.
2.14 $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ 2.74 $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ 2.59 $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ 3.13 $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ 3.13 $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ 3.13 $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ 3.13 $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ 3.13 $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ 1.72 $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ 1.72 $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ 1.72 $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ 1.72 $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ 1.74 $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ 1.72 $.01$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ 1.84 $.01$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ 1.84 $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.$.53 .00 2.30 .	0 2.30 .		00	1.49	00'	00.	00^{-1}	00.	4.88	00.	00.	00'	00.	00.
2.74.00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00 2.59 .00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00 3.16 .00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00 3.13 .00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00 3.13 .00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00 1.72 .00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00 1.72 .00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00 1.72 .00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00 1.72 .01.00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00 1.72 .01.00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00 1.61 .01.00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00 1.61 .01.00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00 1.61 .01.00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00 1.61 .01.00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00 1.61 .01.00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00	.22 .00 2.30 .0	0 2.30 .(0(2.14	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	5.05	00.	00.	00'	00'	00.
2.59 $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ 3.16 $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ 3.13 $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ 3.13 $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ 1.72 $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ 2.32 $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ 1.54 $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ 1.54 $.01$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ 1.54 $.01$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ 1.61 $.02$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ 1.61 $.02$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ 1.61 $.01$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ 1.61 $.01$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ 1.61 $.01$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ 1.61 $.01$ $.00$ $.00$ $.00$ <t< td=""><td>.78 .00 3.47 .0</td><td>0 3.47 .0</td><td>0.</td><td>0</td><td>2.74</td><td>00'</td><td>00.</td><td>00^{-1}</td><td>00.</td><td>6.05</td><td>00.</td><td>00.</td><td>00'</td><td>00.</td><td>00.</td></t<>	.78 .00 3.47 .0	0 3.47 .0	0.	0	2.74	00'	00.	00^{-1}	00.	6.05	00.	00.	00'	00.	00.
3.66 $.00$ <	.53 .00 4.56 .0	0 4.56 .0	0.	0	2.59	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	6.91	00.	00.	00'	00'	00.
3.13 00	.96 .00 5.48 .0	0 5.48 .0	0.	0	3.66	00^{-1}	00.	00	00.	6.68	00.	00.	00	00.	00.
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $.61 .00 5.63 .0	0 5.63 .0	0.	0	3.13	00'	00.	00.	00.	5.49	00 [.]	00 [.]	00 [.]	00 [.]	00.
2.32 00	.01 .00 3.98 .00	0 3.98 .00	0.	С	1.72	00^{-1}	00.	00 [.]	00.	4.10	00 ⁻	00.	00 [.]	00.	00.
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $.72 .00 2.12 .00	0 2.12 .0(0.0	(2.32	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00 [.]	00.	4.39	00 ⁻	00.	00 ⁻	00 [.]	00.
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$.32 .00 1.80 .00	0 1.80 .00	00.	_	1.54	00^{-1}	00.	00 ⁻	00 ⁻	6.08	00 ⁻	00.	00 ⁻	00 ⁻	00 ⁻
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $.07 .00 2.21 .00	0 2.21 .00	00.		1.67	.01	00^{-1}	00 [.]	00.	5.07	00 ⁻	00.	00 ⁻	00.	00.
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $.12 .00 2.35 .00	0 2.35 .00	00.		1.84	.02	00.	00.	00 [.]	4.97	00.	00.	00 [.]	00.	.00
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$.06 .00 2.35 .00	0 2.35 .00	00.		2.03	.03	.00	00.	.00	4.96	60.	00 [.]	00 [.]	00.	.00
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$.32 .00 2.72 .00	0 2.72 .00	00.		1.61	.02	00.	00.	00 [.]	3.91	.45	00.	00 [.]	00.	.00
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$.24 .00 1.95 .00	0 1.95 .00	00.		2.44	00.	00.	00.	00 [.]	3.12	.45	00.	00	00 [.]	.00
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$.25 .00 1.51 .00	0 1.51 .00	00.		4.70	00'	00.	00.	00.	2.59	.45	00 [.]	00 [.]	00 [.]	00.
5.69 .00 .00 .00 .00 2.74 .45 .00 </td <td>.16 .00 1.50 .00</td> <td>0 1.50 .00</td> <td>00.</td> <td></td> <td>5.49</td> <td>00.</td> <td>00.</td> <td>00.</td> <td>00[.]</td> <td>3.53</td> <td>.45</td> <td>00.</td> <td>00[.]</td> <td>00[.]</td> <td>.00</td>	.16 .00 1.50 .00	0 1.50 .00	00.		5.49	00.	00.	00.	00 [.]	3.53	.45	00.	00 [.]	00 [.]	.00
3.86 .00 .00 .00 .00 4.55 .45 .00 </td <td>.27 .00 1.50 .00</td> <td>0 1.50 .00</td> <td>00.</td> <td></td> <td>5.69</td> <td>00.</td> <td>.00</td> <td>00.</td> <td>00.</td> <td>2.74</td> <td>.45</td> <td>00[.]</td> <td>00[.]</td> <td>00[.]</td> <td>.00</td>	.27 .00 1.50 .00	0 1.50 .00	00.		5.69	00.	.00	00.	00.	2.74	.45	00 [.]	00 [.]	00 [.]	.00
2.51 .00 <td>.27 .00 1.98 .00</td> <td>0 1.98 .00</td> <td>00.</td> <td>-</td> <td>3.86</td> <td>00.</td> <td>00.</td> <td>00.</td> <td>00[.]</td> <td>4.55</td> <td>.45</td> <td>00.</td> <td>00[.]</td> <td>00[.]</td> <td>.00</td>	.27 .00 1.98 .00	0 1.98 .00	00.	-	3.86	00.	00.	00.	00 [.]	4.55	.45	00.	00 [.]	00 [.]	.00
.65 .00 .00 .00 .00 5.18 .19 .00 .00 .00 .00	.18 .00 2.78 .00	0 2.78 .0(0.	(2.51	00'	00.	00.	00.	5.08	.45	00 [.]	00 [.]	00 [.]	00.
	.74 .00 1.42 .00	0 1.42 .00	00.		.65	00.	00.	00.	00 [.]	5.18	.19	00.	00 [.]	00 [.]	.00

Table E c	continue	d														
1902	00.	12.88	00.	1.31	00.	77.	00.	00.	00 [.]	00 [.]	4.98	00.	00 [.]	00 ⁻	00.	00 [.]
1903	00.	14.04	00^{-1}	1.37	00.	1.38	00.	00.	00 [.]	00.	4.89	00 [.]	00 [.]	00 ⁻	00 ⁻	00 [.]
1904	00.	6.79	00.	1.83	00.	2.08	00^{-1}	00.	00.	00.	7.41	00.	00 [.]	00 [.]	00 [.]	00 [.]
1905	00.	9.79	00^{-1}	1.69	00.	3.93	00.	00.	00 [.]	00.	9.44	00 [.]	00 [.]	00 ⁻	00 ⁻	00 .
1906	00.	13.74	00.	.71	00.	2.93	00.	00.	00 [.]	00 [.]	9.06	00 [.]				
1907	00.	11.35	00.	.43	0.0	3.39	00.	00.	00 ⁻	00 [.]	9.52	00 [.]	00 [.]	00 [.]	00 ⁻	00 [.]
1908	00.	7.63	00.	.35	00.	4.62	00'	00^{-1}	00 [.]	00 [.]	8.23	.02	00 [.]	00 [.]	00.	00 [.]
1909	00.	3.96	00.	.43	00.	3.90	00.	00.	00 [.]	00 [.]	8.24	.03	00 [.]	00 ⁻	00 ⁻	00
1910	00.	10.40	00.	1.78	00.	2.66	00'	00^{-1}	00 [.]	00 [.]	11.02	.03	00 [.]	00 [.]	00.	00 [.]
1911	00.	24.75	00.	2.18	0.0	2.14	00.	00.	00 ⁻	00 [.]	9.91	.02	00 ⁻	00 ⁻	.30	00 ⁻
1912	00.	29.24	00.	1.68	00.	3.24	00'	00^{-1}	00 [.]	00 [.]	19.28	00 [.]	00 [.]	00 [.]	.31	00 [.]
1913	00.	31.37	00.	06.	0.0	3.10	00.	00.	00 ⁻	00 [.]	15.75	00 ⁻	00 [.]	00 ⁻	00 ⁻	00 ⁻
Company.	, see tax	+														

Sources: see text.

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)	(2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)	(3) (4) (5) (6) (7)	(4) (5) (6) (7)	(5) (6) (7)	(6) (7)	(2)		(8)	(6)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)
	Pied-	Liguria	Lom-	Venetia	Emilia	Tuscany	Marches	Umbria	Latium	Abnizzi	Campa-	Apulia	Basilica-	Calabria	Sicily	Sardinia
	mont		bardy								nia		ta			
1861	00.	1.49	00.	.21	.02	.28	.08	00.	.01	.04	1.19	.12	00.	.02	.34	.01
1862	.00	1.59	00.	.22	.02	.29	60.	00^{-1}	.01	.04	1.22	.12	00.	.02	.38	.01
1863	.00	1.73	00.	.23	.03	.31	.10	00.	.01	.05	1.30	.13	00.	.03	.42	.02
1864	.00	1.92	00.	.23	.03	.30	.10	00.	.01	.05	1.20	.12	00.	.03	.45	.02
1865	00.	2.17	00.	.25	.03	.31	.11	00.	.01	.05	1.16	.13	00.	.04	.47	.02
1866	00.	2.51	00.	.27	.03	.33	.12	00.	.01	.06	1.13	.14	00.	.04	.51	.02
1867	00.	2.80	00.	.29	.03	.34	.13	00.	.01	.06	1.05	.14	00.	.05	.54	.02
1868	00.	3.15	00.	.30	.03	.35	.12	00.	.01	.05	1.08	.14	00.	.05	.55	.02
1869	00	3.56	00.	.30	.03	.36	.11	00.	.01	.05	1.10	.14	00.	.05	5.9	.02
1870	00	3.99	00.	.31	.03	.36	.10	00.	.01	.04	1.11	.14	00.	.05	.62	.02
1871	00	4.38	00.	.31	.03	.35	.08	00.	.02	.03	1.09	.13	00.	.05	.65	.02
1872	00.	4.48	00.	.30	.03	.36	.08	.00	.02	.03	1.08	.13	00.	.05	.70	.02
1873	.00	4.59	00.	.29	.03	.36	.07	.00	.02	.03	1.07	.12	00.	.05	.76	.02
1874	.00	4.74	00.	.28	.03	.37	.07	00^{-1}	.02	.03	1.06	.12	00.	.05	.85	.02
1875	.00	4.93	00.	.27	.03	.38	.07	00^{-1}	.02	.03	1.07	.12	00.	.05	.92	.03
1876	.00	5.10	00.	.27	.03	.39	.06	.00	.02	.03	1.13	.11	00.	.05	.95	.03
1877	.00	5.14	00.	.26	.03	.40	.06	.00	.02	.02	1.17	.11	00.	.05	76.	.03
1878	.00	5.13	00.	.25	.03	.39	.05	.00	.02	.02	1.20	.10	00.	.05	.97	.03
1879	.00	5.11	00.	.24	.03	.39	.05	.00	.02	.02	1.20	.10	00.	.04	1.02	.03
1880	.00	5.09	.00	.25	.03	.39	.05	.00	.02	.02	1.18	.10	00.	.04	1.04	.02

Appendix Table F: Merchant ship maintenance in Italy's regions, 1861-1913: value added at 1911 prices (million lire)

14 .02 19 .02 255 .02 333 .02 39 .02 .45 .02	19 .02 25 .02 33 .02 39 .02 .45 .02	25 .02 33 .02 39 .02 39 .02	33.02 39.02 .45.02	39 .02 .45 .02	.45 .02		.58 .02	.59 .02	.56 .01	.57 .01	.52 .01	.57 .01	.55 .01	.56 .01	.62 .02	.60 .02	.58 .02	.81 .03	.86 .03	.20 .03	.39 .03	.37 .03	.32 .03
.04 1 .04 1 .04 1 .04 1 .04 1 .04 1 .04 1 .04 1 .04 1 .04 1	.04 1. .04 1. .04 1. .04 1. .04 1.	.04 1. .04 1. .04 1. .04 1. .04 1	.04 1. .04 1. .04 1. .04 1	.04 1. .04 1 .04 1	.04 <u>1</u> .04 <u>1</u>	.04		.03	.03 1	.03 1	.03 1	.02	.02	.02	.02	.02	.01 1	.01 1	.01	.02	.02 2	.02	.02 2
00.00.00.	00.00.	00.00.	00.	00.	00.		00 [.]	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00 [.]	00.	00 [.]	00.	00 [.]	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00 ⁻
.10	•	.101	.11	.12	.13	.14	.15	.16	.17	.18	.19	.19	.19	.20	.20	.20	.20	.21	.22	.24	.25	.25	.25
1.16	I	1.16	1.16	1.17	1.16	1.11	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.14	1.12	1.08	1.04	1.01	96.	76.	66.	1.03	1.10	1.17	1.23	1.28	1.29
.01		.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01
	.03	.03	.04	.04	.05	.05	.04	.04	.03	.03	.02	.02	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.02	.02
	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.
	.04	.04	.04	.03	.03	.03	.03	.03	.03	.03	.03	.03	.03	.03	.03	.03	.03	.03	.03	.04	.04	.04	.05
	.41	.41	.42	.43	.42	.38	.39	.34	.32	1.34	.61	.36	.38	.42	.34	.38	.44	.47	.57	.48	.45	.62	.45
n 0	.02	.03	.03	.03	.02	.02	.02	.02	.02	.02	.03	.03	.03	.03	.03	.03	.03	.03	.03	.03	.03	.03	.04
	.29	.32	.35	.39	.40	.40	.40	.41	.43	.45	.45	.44	.43	.42	.42	.42	.42	.43	.48	.54	.56	.39	.57
0.0	2.2.2	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.
	5.29	5.42	5.36	5.32	5.05	5.00	4.99	5.04	4,84	4.98	5.56	6.32	6.55	6.90	7.28	7.86	8.06	8.34	9.33	10.48	10.90	10.86	11.01
	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00'	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.
	1887	1883	1884	1885	1886	1887	1888	1889	1890	1891	1892	1893	1894	1895	1896	1897	1898	1899	1900	1901	1902	1903	1904

ole F c	continued															
	00.	10.57	00.	.61	.04	.46	.05	00.	.02	.01	1.26	.25	00.	.02	2.20	.03
5	00.	11.60	00.	.68	.04	.73	.05	00^{-1}	.02	.01	1.26	.26	00 [.]	.02	2.02	.03
7	00.	12.01	00.	.74	.05	.72	.05	00^{-1}	.02	.01	1.27	.27	00 [.]	.02	2.53	.03
8	00.	12.90	00.	.68	.05	.67	.05	00^{-1}	.03	.01	1.19	.28	00 [.]	.02	2.70	.03
6	00.	14.22	00.	.70	.05	.66	.06	00^{-1}	.04	.01	1.29	.30	00 [.]	.02	2.68	.04
0	00.	14.60	00.	.49	.05	.70	.06	00^{-1}	.04	.02	1.33	.31	00 [.]	.01	2.70	.04
1	00.	14.84	00.	.48	.05	.61	.07	00^{-1}	.05	.02	1.45	.31	00 [.]	.01	2.65	.04
5	00.	14.71	00.	.50	.05	.62	.07	00^{-1}	.05	.03	2.67	.32	00 [.]	.01	2.88	.04
3	00.	16.87	00.	.54	.05	.67	.07	00^{-1}	.06	.03	2.60	.35	00.	.01	3.10	.04

Sources: see text.

	(16)	Sardinia		00.	00'	00.	00.	00.	00'	00.	00.	00'	00'	00.	00.	00.	00'	00'	00	00.	00'	.00	.00	00.
	(15)	Sicily		00.	00.	00.	00.	.00	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00^{-1}	00.	00.	00.	.00	00.
	(14)	Calabria		00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	.00	.00	00.
	(13)	Basilica-	ta	00.	00^{-1}	00.	00.	.00	00^{-1}	00.	00.	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00.	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00.	00^{-1}	.00	.00	00.
	(12)	Apulia		00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00^{-1}	00.	00.	.00	.00	00.
	(11)	Campa-	nia	.93	.91	.89	.86	.85	06.	.83	.95	1.12	1.08	1.03	.88	.87	.83	.78	.72	.66	.62	.67	.70	.75
	(10)	Abruzzi		00.	00^{-1}	00.	00.	.00	00^{-1}	00.	00.	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00.	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00.	00^{-1}	00.	.00	00.
	(6)	Latium		00.	00^{-1}	00.	00.	.00	00^{-1}	00.	00.	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00.	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00.	00^{-1}	00.	.00	00.
0	(8)	Umbria		00.	00^{-1}	00.	00.	.00	00^{-1}	00.	00.	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00.	00.	00.	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00.	00^{-1}	.00	.00	00.
	(7)	Marches		.02	.02	.02	.02	.02	.02	.02	00.	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00.	00.	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00.	00^{-1}	.00	.00	00.
	(9)	Tuscany		.15	.14	.14	.14	.13	.07	00.	00.	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00.	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00.	00^{-1}	00.	.00	00.
	(5)	Emilia		00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00^{-1}	00.	00.	00^{-1}	.00	.00	00.
	(4)	Venetia		00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	.38	.43	.51	.49	.47	.37	.36	.35	.32	.30	.28	.38	.41	.43	.47
	(3)	Lom-	bardy	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00^{-1}	00.	00.	00^{-1}	.00	.00	00.
	(2)	Liguria		.73	.71	.70	.67	.66	.72	.66	.75	.89	.89	.85	.80	.89	1.00	1.06	1.15	1.20	1.22	1.25	1.28	1.29
	(1)	Pied-	mont	00.	00.	00.	00.	.00	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00	00.	00.	.00	.00	00.
				1861	1862	1863	1864	1865	1866	1867	1868	1869	1870	1871	1872	1873	1874	1875	1876	1877	1878	1879	1880	1881

Appendix Table G: Naval ship maintenance in Italy's regions, 1861-1913: value added at 1911 prices (million lire)

	00.	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00.	00^{-1}	00 [.]	00 [.]	00 [.]	00 ⁻	00 ⁻	00 [.]	.05	90.	90.	.06	90.	.07	.07	.07	.07	.07	.07	90.	90'	.06
	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00 [.]	00.	00.	00.	00 [.]	00.	00 [.]	00 [.]	00 [.]	00.	00.	00 [.]	00 [.]	00 [.]	00.	00.				
	00	00	00.	00.	00	00.	0.	0.	00 [.]	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00 [.]	00.	00.	00.	00.	00 [.]	00.
	00.	00.	00^{-1}	00.	00.	00 [.]	00.	00.	00 ⁻	00 ⁻	00 [.]	00 ⁻	00 ⁻	00 ⁻	00.	00 [.]	00 [.]	00 ⁻	00 [.]	00 [.]	00 [.]	00 [.]	00 ⁻	00 [.]	00 [.]
	00.	00'	00.	00.	00'	00.	00.	00.	.04	.05	.15	.28	.41	.47	.60	.62	.66	.68	69.	69.	.68	.74	.71	.71	.63
	.76	.82	.87	.93	.98	1.10	1.23	1.39	1.49	1.59	1.72	1.82	1.86	1.88	1.92	1.92	2.04	2.18	2.20	2.21	2.17	2.14	2.08	2.06	2.06
	00.	00.	00^{-1}	00.	00.	00 [.]	00.	00.	00.	00.	00 [.]	00.	00.	00.	00.	00 [.]	00 [.]	00.	00 [.]	00.	00 [.]	00 [.]	00.	00 [.]	00.
	.00	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	.00	00^{-1}	00 ⁻	00 [.]	00 [.]	00 ⁻	00 [.]	00 ⁻	00 ⁻	00 ⁻	00 [.]	00 [.]	00 ⁻	00 ⁻	00 ⁻	00 [.]	00 [.]					
	00.	00.	00^{-1}	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00.	00.	00.	00^{-1}	00.	00^{-1}	00.	00.	00^{-1}	00.	00.
	.00	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	.00	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00.	00.	00.	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00.	00.	00.	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00.	00.	00.	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00.	00.	00.
	.00	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00.	00^{-1}	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00.	00.	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00.	00.	00.	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00.	00.
	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00^{-1}	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.
	.48	.53	.55	.61	.63	.71	.80	.91	.98	1.04	1.12	1.21	1.22	1.23	1.20	1.24	1.32	1.29	1.38	1.31	1.29	1.27	1.23	1.22	1.19
	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	0.0	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.
	.29	.29	.31	.36	.37	.45	.59	.70	.75	.86	2.0	2.21	.27	2.29	.28	.35	50	.59	.62	.62	.58	.47	.40	.38	.31
itinued	.00 1	.00 1	.00 1	.00 1	.00 1	.00 1	.00	.00	.00	.00 1	00.	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00 2	.00	.00	.00 2	.00 2	.00 2	.00	.00	.00 2	.00
le C con	82	83	84	85	36	87	88	89	06	91	92	93	94	95	96	<i>L</i> €	98	66	00	01	32	33	04	35	96
Iab	188	188	188	185	188	188	185	185	189	189	189	189	189	189	189	189	189	189	19(19(19(19(19(19(19(

	.06	.06	.06	.07	.07	.08	.08
	00.	00.	00.	00 [.]	00.	00.	00.
	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.
	00.	00.	00.	00 ⁻	00.	00.	.00
	.68	69.	.70	.72	.77	.85	1.01
	2.03	2.05	2.16	2.23	2.38	2.62	2.87
	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.
	00 ⁻	00.	00.	00 [.]	00 ⁻	00 ⁻	.00
	00	00	00	00	00	00	00
	. 00	. 00	. 00	. 00	. 00	. 00	. 00
). 00). 00). 00). 00). 00). 00). 00
	0.0	0.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	1 .0	2.0	4 .0	2 .0	0. 6	3.0	5.0
	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.3
	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	.00
žd	2.28	2.30	2.35	2.43	2.59	2.92	3.12
continue	00'	00.	00'	00'	00'	00'	00.
Table G	1907	1908	1909	1910	1911	1912	1913

Sources: see text.

	(16)	Sardinia	.02	.02	.02	.03	.04	.03	.03	.04	.04	.03	.03	.04	.03	.03	.03	
6	(15)	Sicily	.54	.58	.57	.62	.70	.72	.73	77.	.82	.82	.86	96.	1.00	1.01	1.14	
	(14)	Calabria	.05	.06	.05	.06	.07	.07	.08	60.	.10	60.	60.	.08	.08	.08	.07	
	(13)	Basilica- ta	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	
	(12)	Apulia	.21	.26	.25	.21	.24	.24	.22	.24	.24	.21	.20	.17	.16	.14	.16	
ממכת מו	(11)	Campa- nia	6.52	6.40	6.15	6.75	6.72	6.86	6.77	6.30	6.19	5.92	5.27	5.18	6.79	8.22	8.27	
4 mm 4	(10)	Abruzzi	.08	.07	.06	.06	.06	.06	.06	.06	.06	.05	.04	.05	.05	.04	.03	
	(6)	Latium	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.02	.02	.02	.02	.02	
1001 (11	(8)	Umbria	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	
1,29,01	(2)	Marches	.19	.22	.22	.26	.30	.23	.21	.17	.15	.13	.11	.12	.12	.10	60.	
111 1111 J	(9)	Tuscany	1.64	1.82	2.24	1.33	1.39	1.34	1.28	1.32	1.41	1.26	66.	.63	1.14	2.01	1.66	
GIIINIIN	(5)	Emilia	.07	60.	.08	.06	.04	.04	.05	.05	.05	.06	.08	.15	.15	.10	.08	
oduno .	(4)	Venetia	.41	.41	.35	.49	.56	.72	1.59	1.94	2.11	1.99	1.74	1.28	1.86	1.95	1.86	
1 2100 1	(3)	Lom- bardy	0.0	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	
VINIA	(2)	Liguria	7.80	9.59	12.68	14.64	16.99	17.85	20.02	22.97	23.49	20.90	18.07	17.62	20.60	23.78	21.87	
, , , ,	(1)	Pied- mont	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	
			1861	1862	1863	1864	1865	1866	1867	1868	1869	1870	1871	1872	1873	1874	1875	

Appendix Table H: Shipbuilding in Italy's regions, 1861-1913: value added at 1911 prices (million lire)

	.10	.11	.03	.03	.03	.03	.03	.03	.02	.02	.02	.02	.02	.02	.02	.02	.03	.08
	1.15	1.07	1.05	1.19	1.25	1.20	1.23	1.27	1.36	1.45	1.54	1.62	1.75	1.67	1.64	1.74	1.66	1.68
	.07	.07	.07	.06	.05	.06	.06	.06	.07	.08	.06	.06	.05	.05	.06	.06	.04	.03
	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00 [.]						
	.18	.17	.17	.17	.16	.16	.15	.13	.14	.15	.15	.17	.19	.21	.28	.31	.42	.64
	7.62	7.07	7.02	6.90	5.49	6.51	7.37	7.64	8.81	9.96	9.62	8.02	6.79	7.69	9.75	8.74	8.74	8.52
	.03	.02	.03	.02	.02	.02	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01
	.02	.02	.02	.03	.04	.03	.03	.03	.04	.04	.05	.05	.05	.04	.03	.03	.02	.02
	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.
	.10	.17	.16	.08	60.	60.	60.	.07	.06	.08	.08	.06	.05	.06	.08	60.	.10	.12
	1.54	2.09	1.98	1.99	1.90	2.30	2.48	2.77	3.47	3.39	4.41	3.82	2.41	2.94	2.18	3.31	2.70	2.53
	.05	.04	.05	.04	.04	.04	.04	.04	.03	.04	.03	.03	.04	.05	.04	.05	.05	.06
	2.01	1.95	1.91	1.65	1.83	1.82	3.25	3.32	4.59	5.79	6.70	6.91	5.36	3.63	3.43	4.01	4.31	4.31
	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.
l	17.33	13.70	11.01	9.88	9.49	9.85	10.82	10.81	10.46	10.14	11.90	13.59	13.92	15.80	18.58	17.66	15.20	15.35
ontinueo	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.
Table H c	1876	1877	1878	1879	1880	1881	1882	1883	1884	1885	1886	1887	1888	1889	1890	1891	1892	1893

	.08	60.	00.	60.	.10	.10	60.	.10	.10	.10	.10	.10	.11	.14	.13	.12	.12	.11	.12	.13	
	1.66	1.63	1.68	1.63	1.61	1.86	1.92	2.24	2.44	4.45	4.45	3.35	4.41	4.73	6.20	5.88	3.29	3.84	5.05	4.08	
	.04	.03	.03	.02	.02	.02	.02	.02	10	.04	.02	.02	.02	.02	.02	.02	.01	.01	.01	.01	
	00.	00.	00.	00 [.]	00.	00.	00 [.]	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.									
	1.15	1.22	1.31	1.31	1.35	1.38	1.40	1.15	76.	1.03	1.02	1.08	1.04	1.07	1.06	1.10	1.16	1.20	1.27	1.46	
	7.15	6.41	5.83	6.83	6.45	8.73	9.39	9.76	10.06	9.55	11.50	13.56	13.29	13.88	12.56	12.58	15.27	14.36	25.37	22.20	
	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.02	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.02	.02	.03	.03	
	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.02	.02	.02	.02	.02	.02	.03	.04	.04	.05	.05	90.	
	00.	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	00.	00^{-1}	00^{-1}	
	.11	.10	.10	60.	.08	.11	77.	.93	1.45	1.39	1.07	1.76	2.23	1.46	.14	.64	1.57	1.46	1.73	2.29	
	2.24	3.40	5.41	6.57	6.92	6.75	6.40	2.50	2.53	3.13	2.88	4.81	4.09	4.52	5.74	5.28	3.97	3.28	5.00	4.87	
	.06	.06	.05	.04	.04	.06	.07	.06	.07	60.	.08	.10	.12	.10	.12	.15	.14	.14	.17	.14	
	4.52	3.73	3.22	3.23	3.31	3.81	4.76	3.43	3.49	3.35	3.82	3.71	2.81	2.67	2.68	2.63	3.59	4.05	3.62	3.03	
	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	
	16.46	17.82	65.65	21.63	24.98	33.63	\$5.52	33.89	35.62	33.03	28.23	32.15	36.71	35.13	27.87	24.45	31.62	16.54	55.02	52.06	
ontinued.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	00.	⁷ 00 ⁻	; 00.	00.	see text.
Table H c	1894	1895	1896	1897	1898	1899	1900	1901	1902	1903	1904	1905	1906	1907	1908	1909	1910	1911	1912	1913	Sources:

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
		for th	ne <i>Regia n</i>	for export				
	Liguria	Venetia	Tuscany	Marches	Campania	Sicily	Liguria	Tuscany
1861	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
1862	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
1863	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
1864	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
1865	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
1866	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
1867	.00	.00	.06	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
1868	.00	.00	.12	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
1869	.00	.00	.30	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
1870	.00	.00	.24	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
1871	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
1872	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
1873	.18	.00	.14	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
1874	.61	.00	.67	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
1875	.61	.00	.67	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
1876	.61	.00	.97	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
1877	.56	.00	1.57	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
1878	.00	.00	1.32	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
1879	.00	.00	1.29	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
1880	.00	.00	1.28	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
1881	.00	.00	1.30	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
1882	.03	.00	1.49	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
1883	.04	.00	214	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
1884	.60	.00	274	.00	.26	.00	.00	.00
1885	.89	.00	2.59	.00	.34	.00	.00	.00
1886	1.56	.00	3.66	.00	.75	.00	.00	.00
1887	3.08	.02	3.13	.00	.66	.00	.00	.00
1888	2.15	.09	1.72	.00	.62	.00	.00	.00
1889	2.33	.11	2.32	.00	.74	.00	.00	.00
1890	3.36	.04	1.54	.00	1.01	.00	.00	.00
1891	3.85	.00	1.67	.01	.45	.00	.00	.00
1892	3.03	.00	1.84	.02	.11	.00	.00	.00
1893	1.71	.00	1.57	.03	.27	.00	.00	.46
1894	1.08	.00	.68	.02	.19	.00	1.84	.93

Appendix Table I: Naval ship construction in Italy's regions, 1861-1913: private-yard value added at 1911 prices (million lire)

Table I continued										
1895	.02	.00	.29	.00	.03	.00	5.12	2.15		
1896	.05	.00	.00	.00	.09	.00	5.29	4.70		
1897	.26	.00	.00	.00	.10	.00	4.27	5.49		
1898	1.94	.00	1.76	.00	.01	.00	1.59	3.93		
1899	3.02	.03	2.35	.00	.27	.00	1.77	1.50		
1900	2.91	.06	2.35	.00	.91	.00	1.79	.16		
1901	.65	.08	.62	.00	1.05	.00	3.13	.03		
1902	.00	.09	.00	.00	1.15	.00	8.44	.77		
1903	.00	.04	.9	.00	.00	.00	.88	1.19		
1904	.00	.03	.22	.00	.88	.00	1.66	.85		
1905	3.20	.03	3.51	.00	2.57	.00	2.19	.42		
1906	8.03	.00	2.93	.00	2.54	.00	1.08	.00		
1907	6.97	.00	2.17	.00	.37	.00	.33	1.23		
1908	4.79	.00	2.17	.00	.73	.00	.49	2.46		
1909	3.67	.00	1.44	.00	.45	.00	.28	2.46		
1910	8.22	.00	.17	.00	2.00	.00	.31	2.49		
1911	19.35	.09	.84	.00	3.84	.30	.41	1.30		
1912	18.22	.25	3.20	.00	4.27	.31	.84	.04		
1913	17.51	.27	3.10	.00	3.97	.00	1.69	.00		

Sources: see text.