

EVOLUTION OF THE FEDERALIST BASIS OF EUROPEAN INTEGRATION

Pavol HRIVÍK

Department of Political Sciences, Alexander Dubček University of Trenčín, Študentská 2, 911 50 Trenčín, Slovak Republic
Corresponding author E-mail address: pavol.hrivik@tuni.sk

Abstract

The article deals with the creating of fundamentals for application of a supranational approach in modern European Integration. Major attention is dedicated to a federalist integration paradigm, to concrete forms of implementation of federalism principles in looking for the most suitable arrangement of Europe with the aim of ensuring peace and stability and so to avoid war conflicts. The birth of the European Communities and, consequently, the European Union confirms a dominant role of supranational federalism in European Integration, and the model of multilevel governance in the functioning of the contemporary Union can be considered as a transitional phase on the way towards the federalist organization of Europe.

Key words: European Integration, supranational integration initiatives, European federalism, key eurofederalists

1 Introduction

One of the most significant theories of European Integration is that being based on some ideas of federalism. European federalism experienced the long historical evolution starting from the first reflections of Roman Stoics, through the Age of Reason in the 18th century, till the present times. The roots of European federalism are thus found deeply in the past, whereby initial ideas of its “more advanced” form are occurring in the 14th century. Into the first theorists, who directly affected the shaping of federalism in Europe, can be integrated such personalities as, for instance, Dante Alighieri (1265 – 1321), Johannes Althusius (1563 – 1638), John Locke (1632 – 1704), Charles-Louis de Secondant – Montesquieu (1689 – 1755), Immanuel Kant (1724 – 1804) or Alexis de Tocqueville (1805 – 1859). For instance, in his work *Toward Perpetual Peace* Kant supposes that a counterbalance of the prevailing Unitarian system of that age can be just a federative arrangement. The similar mind, in more than 100 years later, was expressed also by a French philosopher Pierre-Joseph Proudhon (1809 – 1865) in his work *Federal Principle* (1863).

Supranationalism (and just federalism is one of its forms) often came to light mainly in the intellectual world of the 18th century. It significantly influenced some ideological projects of a supranational arrangement of Europe after the First and Second World Wars with the aim to avoid future war conflicts on the Continent. Before the WW I., ideas and conceptions on some supranational United States of Europe found their expression in various shapes in some works or calls of Victor Hugo (1802 – 1885), Charles Fourier (1772 – 1837), P.-J. Proudhon, Napoleon III. (1808 – 1873) or Léon Bourgeois (1851 – 1925). (Hrivík 2013: 16-20)

After the WW I. and WW II., initiatives for the supporting and starting of European Integration are overfull with a great number of political personalities and significant scholars who joined their political and academic career with a theory of federalism, its forms and applications. This problem turns up to be still politically and theoretically essential and be regularly coming back to top of politics, and of brisk scholarly discussions. First of all in a European space, we are witnesses to the returning of sentiments and conceptions of federalism, often denoted as neo-federalism (Pinder 1986: 41-54), which find their political expression in the valid Lisbon Treaty (2009) as well. On one hand we can see, in European political practice, the most diverse concrete attempts of prominent advocates of European federalism (such as for example Richard Nicolaus Coudenhove-Kalergi, Aristides Briand, Altiero Spinelli, Jean Monnet, Alcide de Gasperi, Paul-Henri Spaak, Walter Hallstein or Jacques Delors) at enforcement of federalist philosophy of European Integration which was often coming into open conflicts with those who defended state sovereignty and national interests of European states (such were traditionally e.g. British politicians having been headed by Winston Churchill, or a Frenchman Charles de Gaulle). On other hand, it is possible to learn, among specialists on international relations, politicians and political philosophers, a permanent interest in analyzing the European and worldwide phenomenon of federalism.

The First World War brought a federalism theory into a prominence of political sciences. In searching answers to questions on reasons of a so large-scale and bloody fire of this war, hitting nearly all continents, scholars agreed on the fact that main reasons of any war is an existing system of national states and nationalism closely connected with them. Quite a number of politicians, scholars of political science and political philosophers endeavored to find out a solution for successful avoidance of a similar war catastrophe. And just federalism shall be a key theory and principle of a state formation, thanks to which the permanent peace in Europe should be achieved. Among official diplomatic activities of single states we are encountering, after the WW I, new international political activism, which is connected mainly with Count Richard Nicolaus

Coudenhove-Kalergi (1894 – 1972) who renewed the old idea of the United States of Europe proposed after the fashion of the USA.

2 Interwar initiatives for federative Europe

Having been founded the League of Nations (LN) after the WW I, among its head representatives were two close friends. One of them was the British civil servant Arthur Salter (1881 – 1975) and the second one was a Frenchman Jean Monnet (1888 – 1979). Whereas J. Monnet engaged in the LN's tasks, A. Salter was more and more interested in a question of how to achieve a birth of United States of Europe. In 1931 he published a collection of reflections under the name *United States of Europe* in which he was concerned with possibility of the building of federatively organized Europe within the LN. Later, in the essay *Idea of United States of Europe* Salter came out from the model of Germany unification in the 19th century which was realized via the "common market". Salter's United States of Europe should have functioned on the same principle, thus they should have been financed from some customs duties enforced on all goods coming from the outside. Just like in case of Germany, it would be inevitable to have a political tool which would determine how some funds being formed shall be distributed. Their institutional structure should be founded on the same principle as in case of the LN. Thus, they should have their own secretariat, council of ministers, parliamentary assembly and court of justice but with that difference that a central source of power has to be the secretariat as a permanent executive authority consisting of international civil servants loyal to a new organization and not to member states. Salter describes nothing else as a supranational principle which, nearly in three decades later, inspired J. Monnet at founding the first European Communities intended as a nucleus of the United States of Europe. In this postwar time, the forming and attempts at realizing ideas of supranational integration meant a boom. A central point of Salter's and Monnet's projects was an idea of a completely new form of governance – a common supranational government that will not be influenced by national governments, politicians, not even voters. National states, governments and parliaments will remain still in existence but be gradually submitted to a supranational power being superior to all of them.

In the half of the twenties of the 20th century, when in Europe there governed a magical sentiment that shadows of the previous decade are finally detracted, an issue of possible creation of any United States of Europe was also treated, independently of Salter and Monnet, by other frontal politicians, enterprisers and intellectuals. In advance of the end of the war in 1918 an Italian industrialist and founder of the Fiat Empire Giovanni Agnelli (1866 – 1945) issued the book *European Federation or the League of Nations*. The author claimed in it, that the unique effective antidote against destructive nationalism can only be federatively organized Europe. A spirit of that era was best captured by young Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi. In 1923 he published the book *Pan-Europe* which became inspiration of the movement with the same name. His vision consisted in an idea that, on the behalf of peace keeping, the German coal production should be joined with the French steel industry into the only one Pan-European industry. In his work he created a base for a federation of United States of Europe. (Hrivík 2013: 22-23) Two years later he elaborated his own vision by promoting a design of a French economist Charles Gidea (1847 – 1932) aimed at creating a customs union in Europe.

Kalergi's vision gained, with an unusual rate, support of quite a number of prominent personalities of Europe, among others Albert Einstein (1879 – 1955), Pablo Picasso (1881 – 1973), Sigmund Freud (1856 – 1939), Thomas Mann (1875 – 1955), Paul Valéry (1871 – 1945) or Giovanni Agnelli. Kalergi's campaign achieved the best results at European politicians at various levels. For example, Gustav Stresemann (1878 – 1929), a founder and leader of German People's Party, became one of influential sympathizers. He gained the post of Chancellor of the coalition government and Foreign Minister on 13 August 1923, whose party even inserted the idea of United States of Europe into its official election program. In France, to Kalergi was joined Premier Edouard Herriot (1872 – 1957) who issued the book *United States of Europe* in 1931, Léon Blum (1872 – 1950) who later became a premier, but namely Aristid Briand (1862 – 1932), a multiple premier and foreign minister.

A. Briand, as an ardent supporter of the LN, put forward the proposal of Pact for Renunciation to Frank Billings Kellogg (1856 – 1937), US Foreign Secretary of State, in which signatory states promised not to use war for resolving disputes or conflicts of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be which may arise among them. Kellogg reacted with the draft of agreement, known as the *Kellogg-Briand Pact*, of which conditions 15 states pledged to abide in 1929, including France and Germany. On the other hand, in an effort to preclude a threat of American economic power, Briand presented in the LN a dramatically new proposal. In his presentation, he said inter alia "that among nations which are geographically so closely tied up as European nations, some federal tie has to be existed ... This association will certainly operate mainly in an economic sphere ... I am certain at the same time that a federative configuration would be a gain also from a political and social standpoint without being endangered sovereignty of any member state." (Hrivík 2016: 71) 20th of May 1930 Briand sent *Memorandum on European Federalist Union* to governments of European states. He suggested, for peace and economic and social welfare, that Europe should come into a federative format. Despite of a preliminarily expressed support, Briand's initiative finally failed. (Hrivík 2013: 24-25)

3 Moving the idea of European federalism from the Continent abroad

Arrival of Nazism indeed pushed away the idea of federalizing Europe but did not cause its extinction. It moved at first into Great Britain finding here fertile land by the end of the 1930's, consequently into the US. The idea, the future of humankind will consist in any form of international federation, had during several decades a great response in certain thought streams. For example, a group of Britons called Alfred Milner's Kindergarten Group, comprising of higher civil officers, enforced the federalizing of the British Empire. Other significant authorities, involving e.g. a well-known philosopher Bertrand Russell (1872 – 1970) or a writer, historian and sociologist Herbert George Wells (1866 – 1946), for a long time explained a need to install global government functioning on federation principles.

In 1940, when Kalergi escaped from Europe governed by Nazis and became an exile in New York, the nongovernmental Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) – an organization with significant influence of power in American society sponsored by the Rockefeller Foundation and Ford Foundation – created him a working place at the New York University for lecturing on European Federation problems. Thanks to contacts with the CFR, he and his opinions were regularly presented in key newspapers such as New York Times and New York Tribune with a decisive impact on forming public opinion. In consequence of this, the idea of United States of Europe was getting into consciousness of influential American individualities during the war years.

The idea of federalism as a tool for maintenance of peace in Europe meant, in a period before the WW II, indeed a short but intensive epoch of attraction and popularity. It related with the rising of pacifism. In 1933 a British political science scholar and socialist Harold Laski (1893 – 1950) already claimed that peace cannot be created on a system of independent sovereign states. The other Briton – Lord Lothian (Philip Henry Kerr) (1882 – 1940), a politician, diplomat and leading journalist, issued a lecture *Pacifism is not Enough, nor Patriotism Either* (1935) in which he alleges that the main reason of any war is a division of humankind into sovereign states. However, pacifists will not be able to achieve a success if they do not strive for a federal constitution and federation of nations. (Lord Lothian 1935) A series of similar texts and publications followed out among them just a bestseller *Union Now* drew a great attention published by an American journalist, Clarence K. Streit (1896 – 1986), living in Switzerland. In this work the author appeals for federation of North Atlantic democracies that would include the US, Great Britain, democratic states of Western and Northern Europe, further Australia, New Zealand and South Africa. He purposes that this grouping should be based on any federal constitution comprising also human rights, a common defense policy and common currency. In reaction to the Munich Agreement (1938), in Britain there was founded a movement *Federal Union*, which earned a support of many significant personalities. Shortly after the beginning of the WW II in September 1939, the position of the Federal Union was expressively strengthened mainly in consequence of issuing a popular book *The Case for Federal Union* by William B. Curry, Headmaster of progressive Dartington Hall School. And finally, in the war period (1940 – 1945) Jean Monnet, a diligent propagandist of European Federation, worked on in Washington where he found some influential friends of American power from Felix Frankfurter (1882 – 1965), a judge of the Supreme Court, up to Dean Acheson (1893 – 1971), later Foreign Secretary of State. Several times he met President Franklin D. Roosevelt (18821 – 1945). In postwar time all these US authorities provided an active support and assistance for Monnet's campaign for European Integration.

4 European Federation in conceptions of anti-Nazi resistance

During the WW II, beyond a scope of Nazis, interwar dreams and conceptions of united Europe were living over. In every occupied state, resistance movements were formed. If these movements as a whole had any common factor so this was an intention to strive for a new commencement in postwar reconstruction of Europe. Their predominating thought was aimed at creation of new supranational structures that would cross the state borders. The most convincing protagonists of united Europe were Italian antifascists Altiero Spinelì (1907 – 1986) and Ernesto Rossi (1897 – 1967) who under arrest wrote so-called Ventotene Manifesto under the name *For a Free and United Europe* which became later one of the fundamental texts of European Federalists movement. After the fall of the regime of Benito Mussolini (1883 – 1945), they founded the *Movement for Federative Europe*.

And further resistance movements against Nazi dominance reserved in their plans a significant space to an idea of united Europe after finishing the war. They expressed a common interest in postwar Europe to be organized on totally disparate principles as they were formulated in 1919. The movements emphasized rights of nations, independence of states but also inevitable solidarity among states. Since 1942, in illegal programs of Belgian Socialists Party there had appeared federalist tendencies of Europe arrangement. Likewise it was in the Netherlands, where a main representative of these concepts was Hans-Dieter Salinger, a German economist and lawyer living in Haag. In France, European aspirations appeared in the illegal press (mainly in periodicals *Combat* since September 1942 and *Résistance a Le Populaire* in 1943) as challenges for establishing the United States of Europe after the victory in the WW II. In Lyon, *French Committee for European Federation* was founded in June 1944 and in the next month in Geneva there was issued *Declaration of European resistance movements* in which delegates of some movements asserted that yet a very federative union could: ensure

preservation of liberty and culture on European Continent, facilitate an economic renewal, allow a peaceful participation of the German nation in life of Europe, but only under the condition that this European organization will be firm and stable. Mentioned movements also promoted creation of European government which would be superior to national governments and have in hand European armed forces and a European court of justice.

In some states, which remained free, there even arose militant movements enforcing a federative arrangement of Europe. For example, the above-mentioned movement the *Federal Union* in Great Britain promoted both European and world's federalism. Coudenhove-Kalergi established beside the New York University an institute *Research Institute for European Postwar Federation*. These activities attracted the attention of media and an idea of United States of Europe started to propagate in the press and in consciousness of Americans. In the end, even several exiled governments of occupied states, having their residence in London, also were interested in a postwar era and appreciated an inevitability of some new organization of Europe.

5 Arrival of supranationalism in postwar European Integration

Eurofederalists, at the head with J. Monnet, were energetically and arduously struggling for creation of the first supranational international organizations on the Continent that should have represented the main stream of European Integration. Their initial attempts absolutely failed and the first postwar European organization – Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC) and Council of Europe (CE) – finally became intergovernmental. Protagonists of European federalism looked at the OEEC and CE with some feeling of fatalism because they were certain that none of these organizations can give any concrete aspect to European unity. Namely, in them there was inadequately expressive a common interest and common discipline was too loose. National sovereignty should be urgently attacked more courageously and in a smaller area. (Monnet 1978: 273-274) Pursuant to Monnet, for achieving the desired goal it was necessary something of much more effectual and ambitious, and the opportunity, he found, was carried by some events of the first half of 1950. During 1949 Western Germany, headed by Conrad Adenauer, finally started to govern on its own. Nevertheless, there was emerging a cardinal issue of how new Germany should integrate into the Western European community. The two western occupation powers – the US and Great Britain – wished Germany to progress the most quickly on the way towards full economic recovery and statehood, and hereby endeavored to utilize its potential against political and ideological pressures of the East. France was strongly against this intention which did not want to lose its influence on German economics because it was afraid that its eastern neighbor becomes again a strong political and economic rival. A main point of the dispute was coal and steel industries in the Ruhr region.

The dispute lingered on more than two years without any chance to find a positive solution. The US government was losing its patience and gave ultimatum to France. This was an opportunity for Monnet waiting for. He was trying for a long time to build firm federal fundamentals of United States of Europe which would commence to form through integrating production of coal and steel being supervised by a supranational organization. Pursuant to Monnet, this organization should control sectors of coal and steel industries not only in France and Germany but also in other Western European states as well. At last, when he started to formulate his plan concretely, he inserted into the final text of the project a mention that this sectional integration of Europe is the first step towards European Federation. Monnet's plan was propagated mainly by Robert Schuman, French Foreign Minister, who adopted it and, at the time, saw in the plan a good opportunity how to give satisfaction to the American side by a particular French proposal for a problem of the German Ruhr area. The document was called as the *Schuman Plan* (proposed in the *Schuman Declaration* on 9th May 1950) notwithstanding actually it was not true. European media immediately welcomed the plan with great enthusiasm and hope, but nobody knew where it makes for, nor alone Schuman. (Booker – North 2006: 77)

Launching realization of the plan was only the beginning of Monnet's successes. To negotiations were also invited representatives of the Benelux states and Italy. In such way a new grouping originated, entitled *the Six*, which formed into the first supranational European community – the *European Coal and Steel Community* (ECSC). The Treaty (so-called the *Paris Treaty*) was signed in Paris on 18th April 1951 with a 50-year limit, and, after its ratification in all states of the Six, the ECSC started to function on 10th August 1952. There was neither surprising that Monnet became a European executive body as the first president of the High Authority of the ECSC based in Luxemburg. He publicly presented the High Authority as the first European government. (Monnet 1978: 392)

Next two supranational initiatives of J. Monnet within the Six in the era 1952 – 1954, which should have strengthened a federalist approach in European Integration by its applying in political and defense spheres, ended in failure by several reasons, e.g. by aversion for weakening sovereignty of the state or by improving the international situation in the world. These initiatives concerned extremely ambitious plans for creation of the European Defense Community (called as the *Pleven Plan*) and the European Political Community (presented and exceedingly supported by influential Paul-Henri Spaak). In the end, these Monnet's initiatives were buried just by very France.

Monnet was forced to return to the original strategy of building “his” federative Europe through the consecutive integrating of other sectors of economics. He chose from several opportunities just nuclear industry

which was, at the time, in an early evolutionary stage. While coal and steel were symbols of the past, “power of atom” could put Europe into the position of a modern player on the international scene. Moreover, an amount of investments needed for development of this energy sector was so enormous that close all-European cooperation seemed to be real. For presenting a new organization – the *European Atomic Energy Community* (Euratom) – Monnet needed, according the approved strategy, any carrier of his idea. His option fell again upon the closest ally and friend Paul-Henri Spaak.

The first key negotiation of the Six for Euratom took place on 1st – 2nd October 1955 in Sicilian Messina. The negotiation agenda, under the impulse of representatives of Benelux and with Monnet’s support, was broadened to include issues of creating a common market within the Six. For the support of Messina negotiation, Monnet decided to found the *Action Committee for the United States of Europe* which published its introductory supporting manifesto on 15th October 1955. Thanks to means of the Ford Found, he was determined to ensure the Messina resolution to lead, without delay, towards federation of European states. With a backstage support of the US, Monnet also gained a significant aid which was a permanent visit-card for direct admittance to all prime ministers in Western Europe. His new role should have given “... him and his committee an opportunity to directly affect political elite without being subject to public control. At that time, Europe was being built by considerably small elite. Public support was indeed welcome but was not absolutely a necessary condition for Monnet’s Europe.” (Holland 1993: 9) On the basis of Monnet’s appeal, American President Dwight Eisenhower clearly supported formation of “atomic community”. On 22th February 1956 President announced that the US released 20 metric tons of enriched uranium (what corresponded to 40 million metric tons of coal) for peaceful utilization in friendly European states, whereby Euratom will be provided with uranium under more suitable terms than any independent state. But there was a condition that Euratom must have an effective umbrella body and manage commitments and responsibilities for similar topics which national governments have. The US so repeatedly bolstered up European supranational tendencies. Besides it, Great Britain refused its participation in a common market because, according to Britain, it was incompatible with its role as a world power. Nevertheless it decided, if possible, to preclude a supranational European market. But an expeditious reaction of the US to the British attitude, on cue, was not conciliatory. On 12th December 1955 John F. Dulles, Foreign Secretary of State, confirmed that the US supports creating a common market in Western Europe.

Representatives of states of the Six signed the Treaties on Euratom and on the common market presented as the European Economic Community (EEC) on 25th March 1957 in the Roman Capitoline (hence the Roman Treaties). In the preamble of the broader conceived Treaty on EEC there is said that the high contracting parties expressed their determination to build up foundations of a “still closer union of European nations” what confirms a support for the supranational character of the Community and its next development. The very text of the Treaty has rather the character of a constitution because it constituted political institutions of a new type and, at the same time, also their functions and powers. Their core was formed by the Commission of the EEC which represented a supranational executive organ of the Community as any its authority and which, as alone, had a monopoly right to submit drafts of obligatory legal forms. A model for this new form of government was well-known. It concerned the structure being taken from the ECSC and that once again took it from and modified according to the League of Nations, or better according to the design which was prepared, at the end of the 1920s, by Arthur Salter as a basis for a birth of United States of Europe. The first declared goal of the EEC was within the Six to create a common market based on four economic freedoms: free movement of goods, labor, services and capital. All four freedoms should have been achieved by a still more extensive system of controls. Regardless of these declared principles the founders of the EEC always looked at the product of the Roman Treaty as at a nucleus of a future European federal government. Its final goal shall be complete political integration. Pursuant to an effort for “a still closer union” there were all activities of the Community directed towards one fundamental aim: to extend its supranational powers while this cardinal aim will not be executed.

6 Conclusion

J. Monnet was henceforth intensively concerned with European federalism and its application within next shaping European Integration. By means of his Action Committee for the United States of Europe he was searching for possibilities how further to enlarge supranational scope of powers of the three European Communities and to bring them closer to his final goal which should be the United States of Europe in a federation form. One of inventions which inspired him in the year of 1957 was a monetary union. According to Monnet, the Six could become, through a common currency, a political union by five years. At the same time, the idea of common monetary, fiscal or budget policies was not strange to him. But, his conception on the common monetary policy was realized only by his followers. Monnet had indeed significant successors. One of them, who was expressively influenced by Monnet’s European thought, was a French socialist and financier Jacques Delors (1925 –). As President of European Commission in 1985 – 1995, he finalized integration process into new quality – into the supranational European Union with the common market and common monetary space (Eurozone). So Delors became a real propel motor of European Integration for a long time. He professed Monnet’s principle that close economic cooperation also leads to cooperation in a political sphere.

The Union today presents a significant milestone in strengthening a supranational character of European Integration gradually driving at any federative structure. Though the EÚ is functioning on the basis of multi-level governance which can be regarded as any transitional “intentionally deformed” form of European federation application, but this is gradually and discreetly evolving towards its clearer forms through neo-functionalism spillover. The founding Treaty of the EU and all its revisions formally confirm this proposition. The key problem of evolving European federalism is an apparent deficit of democracy and excessively growing the bureaucratic system of governance in the very Union. Exclusive participation of politicians, economists and illegitimate governmental elites, including Brussels bureaucracy, in decisive moments of forming the process and character of integration, without broad participation of European public are some of reasons of democratic deficit and thus all problems and consequences resulting from it can bring European Integration into a blind alley with possible disintegrating the Union. This fact is being confirmed by serious problems connected with the ongoing financial crisis, but namely with running massive migration in the present EU, and managing them not successfully. The issue of further development and successful application of European federalism in the organizing and functioning of the Union thus becomes more illusory than real.

References

- [1] BOOTHY, LORD (1978): *Boothy – Recollections of a Rebel*. London: Hutchinson, 1978.
- [2] BOOKER, Ch. – NORTH, R. (2006): *The Great Deception. The Secret History of the European Union*, 2006. Brno : Barrister&Principal, Limited, 2006.
- [3] BRUGMANS, H. (1948): *Fundamentals of European Federalism*. London: The Federal Union, 1948.
- [4] GLADWYN, L. (1966): *The European Idea*. London : Weidenfeld&Nicolson, 1966.
- [5] HOLLAND, M. (1993): *European Integration – From Community To Union*. London : Pinter Publishers, 1993.
- [6] HRIVÍK, P. (2013): *History and Structure of European Integration*. (in Slovak) Trenčín : TUAD, 2013.
- [7] HRIVÍK, P. (2016): *Shaping and Realization of the Supranational Paradigm in European Integration and American Involvement*. (in Slovak) In: *Silociary č. 1/2016*. Bratislava : Slovak Economic Society – Nezes, 2016. p. 65-101.
- [8] JASPER, W. F. (1950): *United States of Europe*. In: *New American No. 5/1989* alebo Galtier-Bossière, J.: *Mon journal dans la grande pagaie*. Paris, 1950.
- [9] LORD LOTHIAN (1935): *Pacifism is not Enough, nor Patriotism Either*. [online] In: *Federal Union, 1935*. [Quoted 21th December 2015] Accessible on internet: http://www.federalunion.org.uk/acrobat-files/pacifism_is_not_enough.pdf.
- [10] MONNET, J. (1978): *Memoir*. London : Collins, 1978.
- [11] PINDER, J. (1986): *European Community and nation-state: a case for neo-federalism?* In: *International Affairs*, č. 1/1986, p. 41–54.
- [12] SOUTOU, G. H. (1981): *The French Military Programme for Nuclear Energy, 1945 – 1981*. Occasional Paper No. 3/1981, Nuclear History Programme, Maryland.
- [13] SPAAK, P.-H. (1971): *The Continuing Battle: Memoirs of a European*. Boston: Little Brown and Co., 1971.
- [14] VAUGHAN, R. (1979): *Twentieth Century Europe: Path To Unity*. London: Croom Helm, 1979.
- [15] WOODHOUSE, C. M. (1961): *British Foreign Policy since the Second World War*. London: Hutchinson&Co., 1961.