

Hint: I will ask about how Spinelli & Rossi compare a "nation-state" model of Europe with a "federal" model of Europe. Make sure you understand what they think is at stake!

## Ventotene Manifesto

Altiero Spinelli and Ernesto Rossi

Always read the intro in italics!

*Visions of a united Europe have their roots in the political and cultural unity of ancient Rome and medieval Christendom. In the twentieth century these visions grew to maturity in the harsh climate of modern war. When the Allies began to turn back Hitler's armies, Europeans of many political persuasions commenced arguing for a united Europe as a means of eliminating the possibility of war and thus preserving European civilization. The resistance movements fighting fascist occupation were especially vocal in their criticism of the nation-state system and their support for a unified Europe. Leading the way was a small group of left-wing intellectuals from the Italian Resistance Movement who illegally launched their drive for a federated Europe from a political internment center on the island of Ventotene.*

Altiero Spinelli (1907–1986), a former communist and future academic and politician (see Chapter 14), and Ernesto Rossi (1897–1967), an anti-fascist journalist, in consultation with several other prisoners, drafted what came to be known as the Ventotene Manifesto in June 1941. Ada Rossi smuggled the Manifesto to the Italian mainland, where the underground press published it in late 1941.<sup>1</sup> In August 1943 Spinelli founded the European Federalist Movement, which adopted the Manifesto as its political program.

The Manifesto is ultimately a call to action. It begins with a critique of totalitarianism and its causes, then proceeds to call for a movement of workers and intellectuals to seize the opportunity offered by the war to create a "European Federation" equipped to provide security and social justice for all Europeans. The section of the Manifesto reprinted here—which appeared under the heading "Post-war Duties: European Unity"—assesses the coming postwar crisis and asserts that a European Federation would easily solve "the multiple problems which poison international life on the continent." Finally, the authors sketch the outline of a federal state that controls the armed forces of Europe, its economy, and its internal security,

---

Translated by Emma Urgesi. Reprinted with permission from *Centro Italiano di Formazione Europea*, Rome, Italy, [www.altierospinelli.org/manifesto/en/manifesto1944en\\_en.html](http://www.altierospinelli.org/manifesto/en/manifesto1944en_en.html).

while leaving the states with sufficient autonomy to develop the political life of their people.

Germany's defeat would not automatically lead to the reformation of Europe according to our ideal of civilisation.

In the brief, intense period of general crises (during which the States will lie broken, during which the popular masses are anxiously awaiting for a new message and will, meanwhile, like molten matter, burn, being easily poured into new moulds, capable of welcoming the guidance of serious internationalists) the classes which were the most privileged under the old national systems will attempt, underhanded or violently, to moderate the feelings, the internationalist passions and they will ostentatiously begin the [sic] reconstruct the old, State institutions. And the English leaders, perhaps in agreement with the Americans, may try to push things in this direction, in order to restore the policy of the balance of power, in the apparent and immediate interests of their empires.

The conservative forces, that is: the directors of the basic institutions of the national States; the top-ranking officers in the armed forces up to, where possible, monarchies; the groups of monopolistic capitalism that have bound their profits to the fortunes of the States; the big landowners and the ecclesiastical hierarchy, who can expect their parasitical income only in a stable, conservative society; and following these, the interminable band of people who depend on them or who are simply misled by their traditional power. All these reactionary forces already feel the structure is creaking, and are trying to save their skins. A collapse would deprive them all of a sudden of all the guarantees they have enjoyed up to now, and would expose them to the attack of the progressive forces.

A real revolutionary movement must rise from among those who were able to criticise the old, political statements: it must know how to collaborate with democratic and with communist forces as well as with all those who work for the break-up of totalitarianism, without becoming ensnared by the political practices of any of these.

The reactionary forces have capable men and officers who have been trained to command and who will fight ruthlessly to preserve their supremacy. When circumstances are very hard, deceitfully they will show themselves as the lovers of liberty, of peace, of general well-being, of the poorer classes.

Already in the past we have seen how they made use of popular movements, and they paralysed, deflected and transformed them into exactly the opposite of what they were. No doubt they will be the most dangerous forced [sic] to be faced.

The point they will seek to exploit is the restoration of the national State. Thus they will be able to grasp the most widespread of popular feelings, most deeply offended by recent events, most easily handled to reactionary purposes: the patriotic sentiment. In this way they can also hope to confuse their adversaries' ideas more easily, since for the popular masses, the only political experience acquired up to this time has been within the national context, it is therefore fairly easy to direct them and their more shortsighted leaders towards the reconstruction of the States "felled" by the tempest.

If this purpose were to be reached, the reaction would have won. In appearance, these States might well be broadly democratic and socialist; it would only be a question of time before power returned into the hands of the reactionaries. National jealousies would again develop, and each State would again express its satisfaction only in its armed strength. In a more or less brief space of time their most important duty would be to convert populations into armies. Generals would again command, the monopoly holders would again draw profits from autarkies, the bureaucracy would continue to swell, the priests would keep the masses docile. All the initial conquests would shrivel into nothing, in comparison to the necessity of preparing for war once more.

The question which must be resolved first, failing which progress is but mere appearance, is definitive abolition of division of Europe into national, sovereign States. The collapse of the majority of the States on the continent under the German steam-roller has already placed the destinies of the European populations on common ground: either all together they will submit to Hitler's dominion, or after his fall, all together they will enter a revolutionary crisis, and they will not find themselves adamantly distinct in solid, state structures. The general spirit today is already far more disposed than it was in the past towards a federal reorganisation of Europe. The hard experience of the last decades has opened the eyes even of those who refused to see, and has matured many circumstances favourable to our ideal.

All reasonable men recognise that it is impossible to maintain a balance of power among European States with militarist Germany enjoying equal conditions, nor can Germany be broken up into pieces once it is conquered. We have seen a demonstration that no country within Europe can stay on the sidelines while the others battle: declarations of neutrality and non-aggression pacts come to naught. The uselessness, even harmfulness, of organisations like the League of Nations has been demonstrated: they pretended to guarantee an international law without a military force capable of imposing its decision, by respecting the absolute sovereignty of the member States. The principle of non-intervention turned out to be absurd. According to it each population should be left free to choose the despotic government it thought best, as if the constitution of each of the single States were not a question of vital interest for all the other European nations. The multiple problems which poison international life on the continent have proved to be insoluble: tracing boundaries through areas inhabited by mixed populations, defence of

alien minorities, seaports for landlocked countries, the Balkan Question, the Irish problem, and so on. All these matters would find easy solutions in the European Federation, just as corresponding problems, suffered by the small States which became part of a vaster national unity, lost their harshness as they were transformed into problems regarding relationship between various provinces.

[O]nce the horizon of the Old Continent is passed beyond, and all the people who make up humanity join together for a common plane, it will have to be recognised that the European Federation is the only conceivable guarantee that relationships with American and Asiatic peoples can exist on the basis of peaceful co-operation, while awaiting a more distant future, when the political unity of the entire globe becomes a possibility.

The dividing line between progressive and reactionary parties no longer follows the formal line of greater or lesser democracy, or of more or less socialism to be instituted; rather the division falls along the line, very new and substantial, that separates the party members into two groups. The first is made up of those who conceive the essential purpose and goal of struggle as the ancient one, that is, the conquest of national political power—and who, although involuntarily, play into the hands of reactionary forces, letting the incandescent lava of popular passions set in the old moulds, and thus allowing old absurdities to arise once again. The second are those who see the creation of a solid international State as the main purpose; they will direct popular forces toward this goal, and, having won national power, will use it first and foremost as an instrument for achieving international unity.

\* Through propaganda and action, seeking to establish in every possible way agreements and links among the single movements which are certainly being formed in the various countries, the foundation must be built now for a movement that knows how to mobilise all forces for the birth of the new organism which will be the grandest creation, and the newest, that has occurred in Europe for centuries; and the constitution of a steady federal State, that will have an European armed service instead of national armies at its disposal; that will break decisively economic autarchies, the backbone of totalitarian regimes; that will have sufficient means to see that its deliberations for the maintenance of common order are executed in the [individual] federal States, while each State will retain the autonomy it needs for a plastic articulation and development of a political life according to the particular characteristics of the various people.

\* If a sufficient number of men in the most important European countries understand this, then the victory will shortly be at hand, as both the situation and the spirit will be favourable to their project. They will have before them parties and factions that have already been disqualified by the disastrous

experience of the last twenty years. It will be the moment of new action and it will also be the moment for new men: the MOMENT FOR A FREE AND UNITED EUROPE!

#### Note

1. Walter Lipgens, *Documents on the History of European Integration. Vol. 1: Continental Plans for European Union 1939–1945*, ed. Walter Lipgens (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1985), pp. 471–73.

# The Tragedy of Europe

Winston S. Churchill

*Calls for a united Europe—like that of the Ventotene Manifesto—drew the attention of a wide range of political leaders and activists. Many were young idealists or politicians with limited influence; no leaders of undeniable political stature raised a strong voice in favor of a federated Europe—that is, until Winston Churchill (1874–1965) spoke from a platform in Zurich.*

*Churchill, the great wartime prime minister of Britain, found himself leader of the Conservative opposition in Parliament after Labour's victory in the 1945 general election. Despite his removal from office, Churchill remained a key architect of the postwar world by identifying the dangers facing the West and articulating a clear strategy for defending Western interests and values.*

*Churchill's speech at Zurich University on 19 September 1946 profoundly influenced the shape of postwar Europe. He began this speech with the refrain common to all the postwar integrationists: Europe must unite before war destroys the continent, its glorious civilization, and perhaps much of the rest of the world. He called specifically for a "United States of Europe" led by Europe's former antagonists, France and Germany, but he did not outline a detailed program for achieving unity. Rather, he argued simply and powerfully for Europe to adopt an ideal to guide its future. Interestingly, Churchill seems to exclude Britain from his grand European project, thus reflecting an ambiguity toward Europe that remains strong in Britain today.*

*Churchill's stature forced European leaders to take his Zurich call seriously. His efforts eventually led to the Hague Congress of May 1948 and the creation of the Council of Europe in 1949, both milestones in European integration.*

which to speak to you today about the tragedy of Europe. This noble continent, comprising on the whole the fairest and the most cultivated regions of the earth, enjoying a temperate and equable climate, is the home of all the great parent races of the western world. It is the fountain of Christian faith and Christian ethics. It is the origin of most of the culture, arts, philosophy, and science both of ancient and modern times. If Europe were once united in the sharing of its common inheritance, there would be no limit to the happiness, to the prosperity and glory which its three or four hundred million people would enjoy. Yet it is from Europe that have sprung that series of frightful nationalistic quarrels, originated by the Teutonic nations, which we have seen even in this twentieth century and in our lifetime. <sup>wreck the peace and mar the prospects of all mankind.</sup>

*He means Germany.*

\* And what is the plight to which Europe has been reduced? Some of the smaller states have indeed made a good recovery, but over wide areas a vast quivering mass of tormented, hungry, care-worn and bewildered human beings gape at the ruins of their cities and homes, and scan the dark horizons for the approach of some new peril, tyranny or terror. Among the victors there is a babel of jarring voices; among the vanquished a sullen silence of despair. That is all that Europeans, grouped in so many ancient states and nations, that is all that the Germanic Powers have got by tearing each other to pieces and spreading havoc far and wide. Indeed, but for the fact that the great Republic across the Atlantic Ocean has at length realized that the ruin or enslavement of Europe would involve their own fate as well, and has stretched out hands of succor and guidance, the Dark Ages would have returned in all their cruelty and squalor. They may still return.

Yet all the while there is a remedy which, if it were generally and spontaneously adopted, would as if by a miracle transform the whole scene, and would in a few years make all Europe, or the greater part of it, as free and as happy as Switzerland is today. What is this sovereign remedy? It is to re-create the European Family or as much of it as we can, and provide it with a structure under which it can dwell in peace, in safety and in freedom. We must build a kind of United States of Europe. In this way only will hundreds of millions of toilers be able to regain the simple joys and hopes which make life worth living. The process is simple. All that is needed is the resolve of hundreds of millions of men and women to do right instead of wrong and gain as their reward blessing instead of cursing.

Much work has been done upon this task by the exertions of the Pan-European Union which owes so much to Count Coudenhove-Kalergi and which commanded the services of the famous French patriot and statesman, Aristide Briand. There is also that immense body of doctrine and procedure, which was brought into being amid high hopes after the first world war, as the League of Nations. The League of Nations did not fail because of its principles or conceptions. It failed because these principles were deserted by

those states who had brought it into being. It failed because the governments of those days feared to face the facts, and act while time remained. This disaster must not be repeated. There is therefore much knowledge and material with which to build; and also bitter dear-bought experience.

I was very glad to read in the newspapers two days ago that my friend President Truman had expressed his interest and sympathy with this great design. There is no reason why a regional organization of Europe should in any way conflict with the world organization of the United Nations. On the contrary, I believe that the larger synthesis will only survive if it is founded upon coherent natural groupings. There is already a natural grouping in the Western Hemisphere. We British have our own Commonwealth of Nations. These do not weaken, on the contrary they strengthen, the world organization. They are in fact its main support. And why should there not be a European group which could give a sense of enlarged patriotism and common citizenship to the distracted peoples of this turbulent and mighty continent and why should it not take its rightful place with other great groupings in shaping the destinies of men? In order that this should be accomplished there must be an act of faith in which millions of families speaking many languages must consciously take part.

We all know that the two world wars through which we have passed arose out of the vain passion of a newly-united Germany to play the dominating part in the world. In this last struggle crimes and massacres have been committed for which there is no parallel since the invasions of the Mongols in the fourteenth century and no equal at any time in human history. The guilty must be punished. Germany must be deprived of the power to rearm and make another aggressive war. But when all this has been done, as it will be done, as it is being done, there must be an end to retribution. There must be what Mr. Gladstone many years ago called "a blessed act of oblivion." We must all turn our backs upon the horrors of the past. We must look to the future. We cannot afford to drag forward across the years that are to come the hatreds and revenges which have sprung from the injuries of the past. If Europe is to be saved from infinite misery, and indeed from final doom, there must be an act of faith in the European family and an act of oblivion against all the crimes and follies of the past.

Can the free peoples of Europe rise to the height of these resolves of the soul and instincts of the spirit of man? If they can, the wrongs and injuries which have been inflicted will have been washed away on all sides by the miseries which have been endured. Is there any need for further floods of agony? Is it the only lesson of history that mankind is unteachable? Let there be justice, mercy and freedom. The peoples have to will it, and all will achieve their hearts' desire.

I am now going to say something that will astonish you. The first step in the re-creation of the European family must be a partnership between

*Why do you think the League of Nations keeps getting mentioned?...*

France and Germany. In this way only can France recover the moral leadership of Europe. There can be no revival of Europe without a spiritually great France and a spiritually great Germany. The structure of the United States of Europe, if well and truly built, will be such as to make the material strength of a single state less important. Small nations will count as much as large ones and gain their honor by their contribution to the common cause. The ancient states and principalities of Germany, freely joined together for mutual convenience in a federal system, might each take their individual place among the United States of Europe. I shall not try to make a detailed program for hundreds of millions of people who want to be happy and free, prosperous and safe, who wish to enjoy the four freedoms of which the great President Roosevelt spoke, and live in accordance with the principles embodied in the Atlantic Charter. If this is their wish, they have only to say so, and means can certainly be found, and machinery erected, to carry that wish into full fruition.

\* But I must give you a warning. Time may be short. At present there is a breathing space. The cannon have ceased firing. The fighting has stopped; but the dangers have not stopped. If we are to form the United States of Europe or whatever name or form it may take, we must begin now.

In these present days we dwell strangely and precariously under the shield and protection of the atomic bomb. The atomic bomb is still only in the hands of a state and nation which we know will never use it except in the cause of right and freedom. But it may well be that in a few years this awful agency of destruction will be widespread and the catastrophe following from its use by several warring nations will not only bring to an end all that we call civilization, but may possibly disintegrate the globe itself.

\* I must now sum up the propositions which are before you. Our constant aim must be to build and fortify the strength of [the United Nations]. Under and within that world concept we must re-create the European family in a regional structure called, it may be, the United States of Europe. The first step is to form a Council of Europe. If at first all the states of Europe are not willing or able to join the union, we must nevertheless proceed to assemble and combine those who will and those who can. The salvation of the common people of every race and of every land from war or servitude must be established on solid foundations and must be guarded by the readiness of all men and women to die rather than submit to tyranny. In all this urgent work, France and Germany must take the lead together. Great Britain, the British Commonwealth of Nations, mighty America, and I trust Soviet Russia—for then indeed all would be well—must be the friends and sponsors of the new Europe and must champion its right to live and shine.

## The Schuman Declaration

### Robert Schuman

*Efforts in the 1940s to realize Churchill's vision of a united Europe led to increased economic and political cooperation but did not yield anything like a United States of Europe. European leaders needed a new strategy to achieve such a goal. On 9 May 1950, Robert Schuman (1886–1963), France's foreign minister, outlined a plan to unite under a single authority the coal and steel industries of Europe's bitterest enemies, France and Germany. The purpose of the plan, which was developed by Jean Monnet, was to begin building a peaceful, united Europe one step at a time. European governments would start with two industries essential to the making of war, coal and steel, then add other economic and political sectors until all major decisions were taken at a European level. This would create, in Schuman's words, a "de facto solidarity" that would ultimately make war between France and Germany "materially impossible." The practical approach of Schuman and Monnet won favor on the European continent; France, Germany, Italy, and the Benelux countries eventually responded by creating the European Coal and Steel Community in 1952.*

*World peace cannot be safeguarded without the making of creative efforts proportionate to the dangers which threaten it.*

The contribution which an organized and living Europe can bring to civilization is indispensable to the maintenance of peaceful relations. In taking upon herself for more than 20 years the role of champion of a united Europe, France has always had as her essential aim the service of peace. A united Europe was not achieved and we had war.

Europe will not be made all at once, or according to a single plan. It will be built through concrete achievements which first create a *de facto* solidarity. The coming together of the nations of Europe requires the elim-

\* How is Churchill's vision different from Spavelli's? Rossi?  
What do they each believe that a united Europe can achieve?

ination of the age-old opposition of France and Germany. Any action taken must in the first place concern these two countries.

\* With this aim in view, the French government proposes that action be taken immediately on one limited but decisive point. It proposes that Franco-German production of coal and steel as a whole be placed under a common High Authority, within the framework of an organization open to the participation of the other countries of Europe.

The pooling of coal and steel production should immediately provide for the setting up of common foundations for economic development as a first step in the federation of Europe, and will change the destinies of those regions which have long been devoted to the manufacture of munitions of war, of which they have been the most constant victims.

The solidarity in production thus established will make it plain that any war between France and Germany becomes not merely unthinkable, but materially impossible. The setting up of this powerful productive unit, open to all countries willing to take part and bound ultimately to provide all the member countries with the basic elements of industrial production on the same terms, will lay a true foundation for their economic unification.

This production will be offered to the world as a whole without distinction or exception, with the aim of contributing to raising living standards and to promoting peaceful achievements.

In this way, there will be realized simply and speedily that fusion of interests which is indispensable to the establishment of a common economic system; it may be the leaven from which may grow a wider and deeper community between countries long opposed to one another by sanguinary divisions.

By pooling basic production and by instituting a new High Authority, whose decisions will bind France, Germany and other member countries, this proposal will lead to the realization of the first concrete foundation of a European federation indispensable to the preservation of peace.

Very direct language from Schuman, no?

4

## Preambles to the Treaties Establishing the European Communities (The Treaties of Paris and Rome)

[Go ahead and read all of these.]

[I've marked particularly interesting parts.]

*In Rome on 25 March 1957, the six member countries of the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) signed treaties establishing the European Economic Community (EEC) and the European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM). These two treaties are often called the "Treaties of Rome" (the ECSC treaty was signed in Paris). The EEC treaty is also sometimes referred to as the "Treaty of Rome."*

*The preambles to each of the three original treaties reflect the founders' vision for building, through economic integration, "an ever closer union among the peoples of Europe." The deep desire for peace on the Continent runs through each of the preambles and links them to the visions articulated by Spinelli and Rossi, Churchill, Schuman, Monnet, and many others. But the documents also represent a subtle shift in emphasis away from peace to economic prosperity as the driving motive for unity. We can detect the shift in the Schuman Declaration and its parallel, the preamble to the ECSC treaty, but it becomes more evident in the preamble to the EEC treaty, where "economic and social progress" seems to take precedence over preserving and strengthening "peace and liberty." European leaders, while mindful of the dangers of violent conflict in Western Europe, were becoming more concerned with the material improvement of life on a peaceful continent.*

### European Coal and Steel Community

CONSIDERING that world peace can be safeguarded only by creative efforts commensurate with the dangers that threaten it,

CONVINCED that the contribution which an organized and vital Europe can make to civilization is indispensable to the maintenance of peaceful relations,

RECOGNIZING that Europe can be built only through practical achievements which will first of all create real solidarity, and through the establishment of common bases for economic development,

ANXIOUS to help, by expanding their basic production, to raise the standard of living and further the works of peace,

RESOLVED to substitute for age-old rivalries the merging of their essential interests; to create, by establishing an economic community, the basis for a broader and deeper community among peoples long divided by bloody conflicts; and to lay the foundations for institutions which will give direction to a destiny henceforward shared,

HAVE DECIDED to create a European Coal and Steel Community.

### European Economic Community

DETERMINED to lay the foundations of an ever closer union among the peoples of Europe,

RESOLVED to ensure the economic and social progress of their countries by common action to eliminate the barriers which divide Europe,

AFFIRMING as the essential objective of their efforts the constant improvement of the living and working conditions of their peoples,

RECOGNIZING that the removal of existing obstacles calls for concerted action in order to guarantee steady expansion, balanced trade and fair competition,

ANXIOUS to strengthen the unity of their economies and to ensure their harmonious development by reducing the differences existing between the various regions and the backwardness of the less favored regions. → seems rude...

DESIRING to contribute, by means of a common commercial policy, to the progressive abolition of restrictions on international trade,

INTENDING to confirm the solidarity which binds Europe and the overseas countries and desiring to ensure the development of their prosperity, in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations,

RESOLVED by thus pooling their resources to preserve and strengthen peace and liberty, and calling upon the other peoples of Europe who share their ideal to join in their efforts,

HAVE DECIDED to create a European Economic Community.

### European Atomic Energy Community — Don't worry about reading this one.

RECOGNIZING that nuclear energy represents an essential resource for the development and invigoration of industry and will permit the advancement of the cause of peace,

CONVINCED that only a joint effort undertaken without delay can offer the prospect of achievements commensurate with the creative capacities of their countries,

RESOLVED to create the conditions necessary for the development of a powerful nuclear industry which will provide extensive energy resources, lead to the modernization of technical processes and contribute, through its many other applications, to the prosperity of their peoples,

ANXIOUS to create the conditions of safety necessary to eliminate hazards to the life and health of the public,

DESIRING to associate other countries with their work and to cooperate with international organizations concerned with the peaceful development of atomic energy,

HAVE DECIDED to create a European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM).

Between the Ventotene Manifesto in 1944 and these treaties in 1957, can you start to see the evolution of the idea of "a unified Europe"? Today's EU starts to emerge right around this time. What do you think Spinelli & Rossi would say about how their vision started to become a reality?



# A Ferment of Change

Jean Monnet

Jean Monnet (1888–1979) was the “father of Europe.” No single individual influenced the shape of the European Union more than this French civil servant and diplomat. Monnet convinced Robert Schuman to propose the European Coal and Steel Community and became the first president of its High Authority. Monnet convinced Johan Willem Beyen and Paul-Henri Spaak to propose EURATOM and the EEC, and then he established the influential Action Committee for a United States of Europe to pressure governments to accept the proposals. Monnet worked hard, and eventually successfully, to enlarge the Community by adding Britain, Ireland, and Denmark. And shortly before his death, Monnet persuaded EC governments to turn their regular summits into the European Council.<sup>1</sup>

Monnet was a pragmatic government official who quite naturally developed a strategy for uniting Europe that looked much like the step-by-step functionalism of David Mitrany (see Chapter 15). Monnet argued that problems of insecurity and human need in the world—and in Europe in particular—required radical changes in the way people thought. Nations, he believed, should adopt common rules governing their behavior and create common institutions to apply these rules. Such a strategy, even if applied on a small scale, would create a “silent revolution in men’s minds” that would change the way people thought and acted. For Monnet, the European Communities of the early 1960s demonstrated that small collective steps set off “a chain reaction, a ferment where one change induces another.” This ferment, he asserted, would not lead to another nineteenth-century-style great power—nor would it be confined to Europe. Integration was a process that may have started in Europe but would soon have to include the broader West, followed by the rest of the world, if humanity was to “escape destruction.” In short, Monnet was calling for nothing less than a new, more civilized way of organizing and conducting international politics.

---

Reprinted with permission from *Journal of Common Market Studies* 1, no. 1 (1962): 203–211. Copyright 1962 by John Wiley and Sons.

This century has probably changed the manner of life more for every one of us than all the thousands of years of man's progress put together. In the past, men were largely at the mercy of nature. Today in our industrial countries of the Western world and elsewhere, we are acquiring an unprecedented mastery over nature. Natural resources are no longer a limitation now that we control more and more forms of energy and can use raw materials in more and more ways. We are entering the age of abundance where work, as we know it, will only be one of many human activities. For the first time we in the West are witnessing the emergence of a truly mass society marked by mass consumption, mass education and even mass culture.

We are moving, in the West, from a society where privilege was part of nature to one where the enjoyment of human rights and human dignity are common to all. Unfortunately, two-thirds of mankind have not shared in this process.

And now, on the very eve of creating unprecedented conditions of abundance, we are suddenly faced with the consequences of our extraordinary mastery over the physical forces of nature. Modern medicine is steadily increasing our prospects of life, so that the population of the world is increasing fantastically fast. This revolution is creating new explosive pressures of all kinds in the world. At the same time, science is repeatedly creating new powers of destruction. This faces us with the greatest threat humanity has ever had to deal with. The issue today is no longer peace or war, but the triumph or destruction of civilized life.

We cannot assume that we shall avoid such destruction. We have only to look back on the last fifty years to see how constant the risk of upheaval has become. No region of the world has escaped violence. One-third of mankind has become Communist, another third has obtained independence from colonialism, and even among the remaining third nearly all countries have undergone revolutions or wars. True, atomic bombs have made nuclear war so catastrophic that I am convinced no country wishes to resort to it. But I am equally convinced that we are at the mercy of an error of judgment or a technical breakdown, the source of which no man may ever know.

We are then in a world of rapid change, in which men and nations must learn to control themselves in their relations with others. This, to my mind, can only be done through institutions; and it is this need for common institutions that we have learnt in Europe since the war.

We are used to thinking that major changes in the traditional relations between countries only take place violently, through conquest or revolution. We are so accustomed to this that we find it hard to appreciate those that are taking place peacefully in Europe even though they have begun to affect the world. We can see the communist revolution, because it has been violent and because we have been living with it for nearly fifty years. We can

see the revolution in the ex-colonial areas because power is plainly changing hands. But we tend to miss the magnitude of the change in Europe because it is taking place by the constitutional and democratic methods which govern our countries.

Yet we have only to look at the difference between 1945 and today to see what an immense transformation has been taking place under our very eyes, here in what used to be called the old world. After the war, the nations of continental Europe were divided and crippled, their national resources were depleted and, in most of them, the peoples had little faith in the future. During the last fifteen years, these countries have lost their empires. It might have been expected they would be further depressed by what many considered the loss of past greatness and prestige.

And yet, after all these upheavals, the countries of continental Europe, which have fought each other so often in the past and which, even in peacetime, organized their economies as potential instruments of war, are now uniting in a Common Market which is laying the foundations for political union. Britain is negotiating to enter this European Community and by this very fact changing the tradition of centuries. And now the President of the United States is already asking Congress for powers to negotiate with the enlarged European Common Market.

To understand this extraordinary change in all its basic simplicity, we must go back to 1950, only five years after the war. For five years, the whole French nation had been making efforts to re-create the bases of production, but it became evident that to go beyond recovery towards steady expansion and higher standards of life for all, the resources of a single nation were not sufficient. It was necessary to transcend the national framework.

The need was political as well as economic. The Europeans had to overcome the mistrust born of centuries of feuds and wars. The governments and peoples of Europe still thought in the old terms of victors and vanquished. Yet, if a basis for peace in the world was to be established, these notions had to be eliminated. Here again, one had to go beyond the nation and the conception of national interest as an end in itself.

We thought that both these objectives could in time be reached if conditions were created enabling these countries to increase their resources by merging them in a large and dynamic common market; and if these same countries could be made to consider that their problems were no longer solely of national concern, but were mutual European responsibilities.

Obviously this could not be done all at once. It was not possible to create a large dynamic market immediately or to produce trust between recent enemies overnight. After several unsuccessful attempts, the French Government through its Foreign Minister, M. Robert Schuman, proposed in 1950 what many people today would regard as a modest beginning but which seemed very bold at the time; and the parliaments of France, Ger-

Finish \*  
the chapter  
from here.

→ Think of Spinelli & Rossi

many. Italy and Benelux voted that, for coal and steel, their countries would form a single common market, run by common institutions administering common rules, very much as within a single nation. The European Coal and Steel Community was set up. In itself this was a technical step, but its new procedures, under common institutions, created a silent revolution in men's minds. It proved decisive in persuading businessmen, civil servants, politicians and trade unionists that such an approach could work and that the economic and political advantages of unity over division were immense. Once they were convinced, they were ready to take further steps forward.

In 1957, only three years after the failure of the European Army, the six parliaments ratified the Treaty of Rome which extended the Common Market from coal and steel to an economic union embracing all goods. Today, the Common Market, with its 170 million people that will become 225 million when Britain joins, is creating in Europe a huge continental market on the American scale.

The large market does not prejudge the future economic systems of Europe. Most of the Six have a nationalized sector as large as the British and some also have planning procedures. These are just as compatible with private enterprise on the large market as they are within a single nation. The contribution of the Common Market is to create new opportunities of expansion for all the members, which make it easier to solve any problems that arise, and to provide the rest of the world with prospects of growing trade that would not exist without it. In Europe, an open society looking to the future is replacing a defensive one regretting the past.

The profound change is being made possible essentially by the new method of common action which is the core of the European Community. To establish this new method of common action, we adapted to our situation the methods which have allowed individuals to live together in society: common rules which each member is committed to respect, and common institutions to watch over the application of these rules. Nations have applied this method within their frontiers for centuries, but they have never yet been applied between them. After a period of trial and error, this method has become a permanent dialogue between a single European body, responsible for expressing the view of the general interest of the Community, and the national governments expressing the national views. The resulting procedure for collective decisions is something quite new and, as far as I know, has no analogy in any traditional system. It is not federal because there is no central government; the nations take their decisions together in the Council of Ministers. On the other hand, the independent European body proposes policies, and the common element is further underlined by the European Parliament and the European Court of Justice.

This system leads to a completely changed approach to common action. In the past, the nations felt no irrevocable commitment. Their responsibility

was strictly to themselves, not to any common interest. They had to rely on themselves alone. Relations took the form either of domination if one country was much stronger than the others, or of the trading of advantages if there was a balance of powers between them. This balance was necessarily unstable and the concessions made in an agreement one year could always be retracted the next.

But in the European Communities, common rules applied by joint institutions give each a responsibility for the effective working of the Community as a whole. This leads the nations, within the discipline of the Community, to seek a solution to the problems themselves, instead of trading temporary advantages. It is this method which explains the dramatic change in the relations of Germany with France and the other Common Market countries. Looking forward to a common future has made them agree to live down the feuds of the past. Today people have almost forgotten that the Saar was ever a problem and yet from 1919 to 1950 it was a major bone of contention between France and Germany. European unity has made it seem an anachronism. And today, at French invitation, German troops are training on French soil.

We have seen that Europe has overcome the attitude of domination which ruled state policies for so many centuries. But quite apart from what this means for us in the old continent, this is a fact of world importance. It is obvious that countries and peoples who are overcoming this state of mind between themselves will bring the same mentality to their relations with others, outside Europe. The new method of action developed in Europe replaces the efforts at domination of nation states by a constant process of collective adaptation to new conditions, a chain reaction, a ferment where one change induces another.

Look at the effect the Common Market has already had on world tariffs. When it was set up, it was widely assumed the member countries would want to protect themselves and become, as some put it, an inward-looking group. Yet everything that has happened since has shown this view to be wrong. The Six have reduced the tariffs between themselves and towards other countries faster than expected. Now President Kennedy proposes America and Europe should cut tariffs on manufactures by half, and the Common Market will certainly welcome it. This leads to a situation where tariffs throughout the major trading areas of the world will be lower than they have ever been.

These changes inside and outside Europe would not have taken place without the driving force of the Common Market. It opens new prospects for dealing with problems the solution of which was becoming increasingly urgent. I am thinking of world agriculture in a more and more industrial

civilization: of links between the new and the long-established industrial regions, and in particular of the need for growing trade between Japan and the United States and Europe together.

Naturally, increasing trade will also benefit the Commonwealth. The prospect of Britain's future entry into the Common Market has already made the Continent more aware than ever before of the problems of the Commonwealth. Clearly, for countries whose major need is to obtain more capital for development, the fact that Britain is part of a rapidly developing Europe holds great promise of future progress.

Similarly, problems are arising that only Europe and the United States together have the resources to deal with. The need to develop policies of sustained growth, which in large part depend on maintaining international monetary stability, is an example. Increasing the aid of the West to the underdeveloped areas on a large scale is another. Separately, the European nations have inevitably taken divergent views of aid policies. But tomorrow, the nations of Europe by acting together can make a decisive contribution. The necessary precondition of such a partnership between America and Europe is that Europe should be united and thus be able to deploy resources on the same scale as America. This is what is in the course of happening today.

That we have begun to cooperate on these affairs at the Atlantic level is a great step forward. It is evident that we must soon go a good deal further towards an Atlantic Community. The creation of a united Europe brings this nearer by making it possible for America and Europe to act as partners on an equal footing. I am convinced that ultimately, the United States too will delegate powers of effective action to common institutions, even on political questions. Just as the United States in their own day found it necessary to unite, just as Europe is now in the process of uniting, so the West must move towards some kind of union. This is not an end in itself. It is the beginning on the road to the more orderly world we must have if we are to escape destruction.

Ha.

The discussions on peace today are dominated by the question of disarmament. The world will be more and more threatened by destruction as long as bombs continue to pile up on both sides. Many therefore feel that the hopes for peace in the world depend on as early an agreement on armaments as possible, particularly an agreement on nuclear arms. Of course we must continue to negotiate on these questions. But it is too simple to hope the problems that arise out of philosophic conflicts could be settled without a change in the view which people take of the future. For what is the Soviet objective? It is to achieve a Communist world, as Mr. Khrushchev has told us many times. When this becomes so obviously impossible that nobody, even within a closed society, can any longer believe it—when the partnership of America and a United Europe makes it plain to all that the West may

change from within but that others cannot change it by outside pressures, then Mr. Khrushchev or his successor will accept the facts, and the conditions will at last exist for turning so-called peaceful coexistence into genuine peace. Then at last real disarmament will become possible.

Personally, I do not think we shall have to wait long for this change. The history of European unification shows that when people become convinced a change is taking place that creates a new situation, they act on their revised estimate before that situation is established. After all, Britain has asked to join the Common Market before it was complete. The President of the United States is seeking powers to negotiate with the European Community on steps to an Atlantic partnership even before Britain has joined. Can we not expect a similar phenomenon in the future relations with the Soviet Union?

What conclusions can we draw from all these thoughts?

One impression predominates in my mind over all others. It is this: unity in Europe does not create a new kind of great power: it is a method for introducing change in Europe and consequently in the world. People, more often outside the European Community than within, are tempted to see the European Community as a potential nineteenth-century state with all the overtones of power this implies. But we are not in the nineteenth century, and the Europeans have built up the European Community precisely in order to find a way out of the conflicts to which the nineteenth-century power philosophy gave rise. The natural attitude of a European Community based on the exercise by nations of common responsibilities will be to make these nations also aware of their responsibilities, as a Community, to the world. In fact, we already see this sense of world responsibilities developing as unity in Europe begins to affect Britain, America and many other areas of the world. European unity is not a blueprint, it is not a theory, it is a process that has already begun, of bringing peoples and nations together to adapt themselves jointly to changing circumstances.

European unity is the most important event in the West since the war, not because it is a new great power, but because the new institutional method it introduces is permanently modifying relations between nations and men. Human nature does not change, but when nations and men accept the same rule and the same institutions to make sure that they are applied, their behavior towards each other changes. This is the process of civilization itself.

#### Note

1. Richard Mayne, "Gray Eminence," in *Jean Monnet: The Path to European Unity*, ed. Douglas Brinkley and Clifford Hackett (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991), 114–116.

of delegates from their respective parliaments, acquire the taste and habit of examining together problems of common interest, and as far as possible adopt a united attitude towards them. Linked with what was already being practiced in the economic sphere in Brussels and Luxembourg, might not this general cooperation lead to a European policy as regards progress, security, influence, external relations, aid to the developing countries, and finally and above all as regards peace? Might not the grouping thus formed by the Six gradually attract the other states of the Continent into joining in on the same terms? And perhaps in this way, by opposing war, which is the history of men, that united Europe which is the dream of the wise might ultimately be achieved.

In the course of a press conference on 5 September [1960], after saying that "to build Europe, which means to unite Europe, is an essential aim of our policy," I declared that to this end it was necessary "to proceed, not on the basis of dreams, but in accordance with realities. Now, what are the realities of Europe? What are the pillars on which it can be built? The truth is that those pillars are the states of Europe . . . states each of which, indeed, has its own genius, history and language, its own sorrows, glories and ambitions; but states that are the only entities with the right to give orders and the power to be obeyed." Then, while recognizing "the technical value of certain more or less extranational or supranational organisms," I pointed out that they were not and could not be politically effective, as was proved by what was happening at that very moment in the European Coal and Steel Community, EURATOM and the Brussels Community. I insisted that, "although it is perfectly natural for the states of Europe to have specialist bodies available to prepare and whenever necessary to follow up their decisions, those decisions must be their own." Then I outlined my plan: "To arrange for the regular cooperation of the states of Western Europe in the political, economic and cultural spheres, as well as that of defense, is an aim that France deems desirable, possible and practical. . . . It will entail organized, regular consultations between the governments concerned and the work of specialist bodies in each of the common domains, subordinated to those governments. It will entail periodic deliberations by an assembly made up of delegates of the national parliaments. It must also, in my view, entail as soon as possible a solemn European referendum, in order to give this new departure for Europe the popular backing which is essential to it." I concluded: "If we set out on this road . . . links will be forged, habits will be developed, and, as time does its work, it is possible that we will come to take further steps towards European unity."

## 7

# Preamble to the Single European Act

*Representatives of the twelve members of the European Community signed the Single European Act (SEA) in February 1986 and saw it implemented in July 1987. The SEA, the first major revision of the Treaties of Rome, brought together in one "single" act a treaty on European cooperation in the area of foreign policy and institutional and procedural reforms (such as the increased use of qualified majority voting and the introduction of the cooperation procedure) designed to facilitate the completion of the Single Market. The SEA, while not universally recognized as significant at the time, marked a milestone in the attempt by Community leaders to bury the legacy of Charles de Gaulle and "relaunch" Europe. The success of the SEA in facilitating the Single Market opened the way for further institutional reforms in the early 1990s.*

*The preamble to the SEA differs significantly from its predecessors. Gone is the vision of a united Europe as an alternative to war. In its place is a vision of an evolving European Union ready to act in the world as a single entity to protect the common interests of its members, promote democracy and human rights, contribute to the "preservation of international peace," and "improve the economic and social situation in Europe." The preamble assumed the European Communities now resembled a sovereign entity more than a mere collection of individual states, an evolution the signatories believed corresponded to the "wishes of the democratic peoples of Europe."*

MOVED by the will to continue the work undertaken on the basis of the Treaties establishing the European Communities and to transform relations as a whole among their States into a European Union, in accordance with the Solemn Declaration of Stuttgart of 19 June 1983,

RESOLVED to implement this European Union on the basis, firstly, of the Communities operating in accordance with their own rules and, secondly, of European Cooperation among the Signatory States in the sphere of foreign policy and to invest this union with the necessary means of action,

DETERMINED to work together to promote democracy on the basis of the fundamental rights recognized in the constitutions and laws of the Member States, in the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms and the European Social Charter, notably freedom, equality and social justice,

CONVINCED that the European idea, the results achieved in the fields of economic integration and political cooperation, and the need for new developments correspond to the wishes of the democratic peoples of Europe, for whom the European Parliament, elected by universal suffrage, is an indispensable means of expression.

AWARE of the responsibility incumbent upon Europe to aim at speaking ever increasingly with one voice and to act with consistency and solidarity in order more effectively to protect its common interests and independence, in particular to display the principles of democracy and compliance with the law and with human rights to which they are attached, so that together they may make their own contribution to the preservation of international peace and security in accordance with the undertaking entered into by them within the framework of the United Nations Charter,

DETERMINED to improve the economic and social situation by extending common policies and pursuing new objectives, and to ensure a smoother functioning of the Communities by enabling the institutions to exercise their powers under conditions most in keeping with Community interests.

WHEREAS at their Conference in Paris from 19 to 21 October 1972 the Heads of State or of Government approved the objective of the progressive realization of Economic and Monetary Union,

HAVING REGARD to the Annex to the conclusions of the Presidency of the European Council in Bremen on 6 and 7 July 1978 and the Resolution of the European Council in Brussels on 5 December 1978 on the introduction of the European Monetary System (EMS) and related questions, and noting that in accordance with that Resolution, the Community and the Central Banks of the Member States have taken a number of measures intended to implement monetary cooperation,

HAVE DECIDED to adopt this Act.

## A Family of Nations

Margaret Thatcher

*Margaret Thatcher (1925–2013) served as Britain's prime minister from 1979 to 1990. During her eleven years in office, she attempted to reduce the role of government in British society, particularly the economy. Her distrust of big government extended to the institutions of the European Community, which she considered a threat to prosperity in Europe and her policy successes in Britain. While prime minister, Thatcher raised the ire of most EC leaders by working tirelessly and unapologetically for Britain's particular interests and by resisting, often alone, most attempts to expand the powers of EC institutions. After her elevation to the House of Lords, she furthered her reputation as a virulent Euroskeptic by leading a small group of parliamentarians in a loud but unsuccessful fight to block Britain's ratification of the Maastricht treaty in 1993.*

*Prime Minister Thatcher outlined her views on European integration in a speech at the College of Europe in Bruges, Belgium, on 20 September 1988. There she placed Britain firmly in Europe but rejected the notion that "Europe" meant the absorption of Britain—and all the other member states—into a single, bureaucratized European "superstate." The European Community, she argued, would succeed only if each member state was allowed to maintain its own identity. Her vision—which mirrors de Gaulle's—of Europe as a "family of nations" represented well the traditional British approach to integration but challenged the federalist vision of the founders and continental builders of the Community. For this reason, Margaret Thatcher's Bruges speech proved highly controversial.*

*Mr. Chairman, you have invited me to speak on the subject of Britain and Europe. Perhaps I should congratulate you on your courage. If you believe some of the things said and written about my views on Europe, it must seem rather like inviting Genghis Khan to speak on the virtues of peaceful coexistence!*

Reprinted from [www.margaretthatcher.org](http://www.margaretthatcher.org) with permission from the estate of Lady Thatcher.

What will this mean for religion?

## Preamble to the Treaty on European Union (The Maastricht Treaty)

*(Read the whole thing. Note a shift towards  
statements about values & identity. This  
will be important for us later on...)*

*Several factors, including the success of the Single Market program and the collapse of communism, increased momentum for integration as the European Community entered the 1990s. In December 1990, the member states opened negotiations to complete economic and monetary union, reform EC institutions, and expand Community competence in foreign and security policy. Final negotiations took place in December 1991 in Maastricht, The Netherlands, and the Maastricht treaty was signed there on 7 February 1992. Ratification seemed certain until Danish voters rejected the treaty on 2 June 1992 and opened a debate in Europe over the merits of integration. Public dissatisfaction with the complex treaty combined with a currency crisis and a severe economic recession to sap popular and elite enthusiasm for the European project. Nevertheless, all twelve countries finally ratified the treaty, which came into force in late 1993.*

*The preamble to the Maastricht treaty reflects the essence of Jacques Delors's thinking: the need to construct a new Europe out of a formerly divided continent requires a leap to a new stage of integration through the creation of a European Union. The institutions of the Union will have responsibility for issue areas previously reserved for national governments. But respect for Europe's core values, increased accountability, and faithful application of the principle of subsidiarity will, according to the treaty, preserve democracy and diversity within the new Europe.*

RESOLVED to mark a new stage in the process of European integration undertaken with the establishment of the European Communities.

RECALLING the historic importance of the ending of the division of the European continent and the need to create firm bases for the construction of the future Europe,

CONFIRMING their attachment to the principles of liberty, democracy and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms and the rule of law,

DESIRING to deepen the solidarity between their peoples while respecting their history, their culture and their traditions,

DESIRING to enhance further the democratic and efficient functioning of the institutions so as to enable them better to carry out, within a single institutional framework, the tasks entrusted to them,

RESOLVED to achieve the strengthening and the convergence of their economies and to establish an economic and monetary union including, in accordance with the provisions of this Treaty, a single and stable currency,

DETERMINED to promote economic and social progress for their peoples, within the context of the accomplishment of the internal market and of reinforced cohesion and environmental protection, and to implement policies ensuring that advances in economic integration are accompanied by parallel progress in other fields,

RESOLVED to establish a citizenship common to nationals of their countries,

RESOLVED to implement a common foreign and security policy including the eventual framing of a common defence policy, which might in time lead to a common defence, thereby reinforcing the European identity and its independence in order to promote peace, security and progress in Europe and in the world.

REAFFIRMING their objective to facilitate the free movement of persons, while ensuring the safety and the security of their peoples, by including provisions on justice and home affairs in this Treaty,

RESOLVED to continue the process of creating an ever closer union among the peoples of Europe, in which decisions are taken as closely as possible to the citizen in accordance with the principle of subsidiarity,

IN VIEW of further steps to be taken in order to advance European integration,

HAVE DECIDED to establish a European Union.

11

## February 15, or What Binds Europeans Together

Jürgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida

*The European Union at the turn of the century struggled to maintain the momentum generated in the late 1980s and early 1990s. There were bright spots: the EU continued to attract new members—Austria, Finland, and Sweden in 1995, and ten more in 2004; it successfully introduced the euro; it implemented two new treaties, Amsterdam (1999) and Nice (2001); and in late 2001 opened a constitutional convention. But referendum defeats in Denmark, Ireland, and Norway (which again rejected EU membership) and the emergence of Euroskeptical political movements in some parts of the EU indicated increased popular resistance to the reforms many argued were needed to manage an enlarged Union with enhanced responsibilities. Some pro-integration observers lamented the absence among European citizens of a collective European identity that could legitimate a federal democracy. How, they asked, could Europe forge a continental identity?*

*Two of Europe's most prominent philosophers, the German critical theorist Jürgen Habermas (b.1929) and the late French deconstructionist Jacques Derrida (1930–2004), saw an answer in Europe's popular protests against the US-led invasion of Iraq in early 2003. In this opinion piece, Habermas and Derrida—who were philosophical rivals in the 1980s but forged a personal friendship in the 1990s, which lasted until Derrida's death—asserted that the protests were a likely "sign of the birth of a European public sphere." But they also realized that the war had divided Europe and uncovered the failure of the EU's common foreign policy. What was needed, they argued, was a new commitment by a core group of member states to forge an independent and irresistible (to other member states) foreign and security policy that would provide the world with an effective counterweight to the "hegemonic unilateralism of the United States."*

From *Constellations* 10, no. 3 (2003): 291–297. Translated by Max Pensky. Reprinted with permission from John Wiley and Sons. This piece originally appeared in the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 31 May 2003.



against one another: the imperative of developing new, supranational forms of cooperation after the Second World War. The successful history of the European Union may have confirmed Europeans in their belief that the *domestication of state power* demands a *mutual* limitation of sovereignty, on the global as well as the national-state level.

Each of the great European nations has experienced the bloom of its imperial power. And, what in our context is more important still, each has had to work through the experience of the loss of its empire. In many cases this experience of decline was associated with the loss of colonial territories. With the growing distance of imperial domination and the history of colonialism, the European powers also got the chance to *assume a reflexive distance from themselves*. They could learn from the perspective of the defeated to perceive themselves in the dubious role of victors who are called to account for the violence of a forcible and uprooting process of modernization. This could support the rejection of Eurocentrism, and inspire the Kantian hope for a global domestic policy.

12

## Preambles to the Treaty Establishing a Constitution for Europe and the Treaty of Lisbon

The European Convention, under the leadership of former French president Valéry Giscard d'Estaing, drafted a constitution that was signed in Rome by representatives of the member states on 29 October 2004. The text proved controversial from the beginning, not least because some Catholic politicians and member states, following the lead of Pope John Paul II, objected to the absence of an explicit reference to Christianity as a source of Europe's values in the preamble. Despite the disagreements, eighteen member states ratified the constitutional treaty, including two that offered the treaty to their electorates in a referendum. But on 29 May 2005 the French voted decisively against the treaty and two days later the Dutch did the same, thus sealing the constitution's fate. After a period of reflection, the leaders of the member states reassembled most of the pieces of the failed constitution and renamed it the Treaty of Lisbon, which they duly signed in 2007 and implemented in December 2009.

The preamble to the constitutional treaty may not contain many memorable phrases, but it does offer a succinct summary of Europe's values and vocation—at least as seen through the eyes of European Union leaders. Europe stands for "universal values": human rights, freedom, democracy, equality, and the rule of law. Its hard-won achievements have made it "a special area of human hope" and its continued efforts "to forge a common destiny" from its diverse peoples will further the process of "civilization, progress and prosperity" across the European continent, even as Europe strives for "peace, justice and solidarity throughout the world."

The constitutional treaty gave Europe a grand vision. But its defeat required a more humble approach. The Lisbon treaty aims for efficiency, coherence, and democratic legitimacy.

Preamble to the Treaty  
Establishing a Constitution for Europe

DRAWING INSPIRATION from the cultural, religious and humanist inheritance of Europe, from which have developed the universal values of the inviolable and inalienable rights of the human person, freedom, democracy, equality and the rule of law,

BELIEVING that Europe, reunited after bitter experiences, intends to continue along the path of civilization, progress and prosperity, for the good of all its inhabitants, including the weakest and most deprived; that it wishes to remain a continent open to culture, learning and social progress; and that it wishes to deepen the democratic and transparent nature of its public life, and to strive for peace, justice and solidarity throughout the world,

CONVINCED that, while remaining proud of their own national identities and history, the peoples of Europe are determined to transcend their former divisions and, united ever more closely, to forge a common destiny,

CONVINCED that, thus "United in diversity," Europe offers them the best chance of pursuing, with due regard for the rights of each individual and in awareness of their responsibilities towards future generations and the Earth, the great venture which makes of it a special area of human hope.

DETERMINED to continue the work accomplished within the framework of the Treaties establishing the European Communities and the Treaty on European Union, by ensuring the continuity of the Community acquis.

GRATEFUL to the members of the European Convention for having prepared the draft of this Constitution on behalf of the citizens and States of Europe . . . [the representatives of the member states] have agreed as follows . . .

Preamble to the Treaty of Lisbon

DESIRING to complete the process started by the Treaty of Amsterdam and by the Treaty of Nice with a view to enhancing the efficiency and democratic legitimacy of the Union and to improving the coherence of its action,

HAVE RESOLVED to amend the Treaty on European Union, the Treaty establishing the European Community and the Treaty establishing the European Atomic Energy Community . . .

## Reflections on the Crisis in Europe (excerpts)

*In 2010 the Great Recession, which began in the United States with the bursting of the housing bubble, rolled into Europe. The economic crisis, which affected the entire EU but centered on Ireland, Greece, Portugal, Spain, Latvia, Cyprus, and Italy, evolved into a sovereign debt crisis that threatened to break up the Eurozone. By 2012 the Eurozone countries, led by Germany, had stabilized the troubled economies but serious threats remained to the long-term viability of the euro. As the euro crisis progressed, most European leaders recognized the need to reform the Eurozone to improve economic governance. Some advocated minimal changes, while others called for a banking union, Eurobonds, and European control of member-state budgets. European federalists renewed their calls for a leap to a full political union. But not every political leader enthusiastically embraced deeper integration as the solution to European economic woes. The British in particular questioned the wisdom of granting European institutions greater authority.*

*The political leaders featured below outlined various responses to the economic crisis. Alexander Stubb, Finland's minister of European affairs and trade, represents the Eurozone's "northern" perspective (shared by the Germans and Dutch). He characteristically emphasized open markets as a means to improved competitiveness, stricter rules designed to prevent irresponsible spending by Eurozone governments, protections against transfers of wealth from disciplined northern to imprudent southern economies, and minimal EU institutional changes. A broader and more "southern" view was taken by former Portuguese prime minister and European Commission president José Manuel Barroso, who argued for a new treaty to establish a political union—a "federation of nation states"—that would provide the institutional structure necessary to create a full economic union with the capacity to pay back existing member-state loans and issue new debt. Such a view is anathema to British prime minister David Cameron, who responded to political pressure from within his own party by calling for a renegotiated relationship between Britain and its European partners—and a British referendum on the result. His speech, however, was more than a call for a referendum: it was also a carefully crafted Thatcher-esque vision of*