



**ROMÂNIA**  
**UNIVERSITATEA BABEŞ-BOLYAI CLUJ-NAPOCA**  
Str. Mihail Kogălniceanu, nr. 1, 400084 Cluj-Napoca

Tel. (00) 40 - 264 - 40.53.00\*; 40.53.01; 40.53.02 ; 40.53.22

**Facultatea de Studii Europene**  
**Jean Monnet Ad Personam Chair: Modelling the New Europe**

<http://euro.ubbcluj.ro/jeanmonnetadpersonam/>

***On-line Journal Modelling the New Europe***

**- Comparative Central-European Integration -**

**Issue no. 1**

**December 2010**

**ISSN 2247 – 0514**

**ISSN – L 2247 – 0514**

Available on:

[http://euro.ubbcluj.ro/jeanmonnetadpersonam/documents/activity/journals/journal\\_nr\\_1.pdf](http://euro.ubbcluj.ro/jeanmonnetadpersonam/documents/activity/journals/journal_nr_1.pdf)

**Scientific Committee:**

- Prof. Dr. Nicolae PAUN, Faculty of European Studies, Babes-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca
- Prof. Dr. Gérard BOSSUAT, University of Cergy-Pontoise (Val d'Oise), France
- Prof. Dr. Ioan HORGA, Institute for Euroregional Studies, University of Oradea
- Prof. Dr. Ovidiu PECICAN Faculty of European Studies, Babes-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca
- Prof. Dr. Marius JUCAN Faculty of European Studies, Babes-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca
- Prof. Dr. Gheorghe CLIVETI, "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University, Iași
- Conf. Dr. Mircea MANIU, Faculty of European Studies, Babes-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca
- Conf. Dr. Simion COSTEA, Petru Maior University, Tg. Mures
- Dr. Titus POENARU, Industry, Research and Energy (Policy Advisor), EP Brussels
- Dr. Gilda TRUICA, European Institute of Romania, Head of Communication Unit

**Editorial Staff**

Lect. Dr. Georgiana CICEO: gciceo@yahoo.com

Drd. Miruna BALOSIN : miruna\_andreea2001@yahoo.com

*The On-line journal Modelling the New Europe represents the best way of disseminating the results of the project at a national and international level. The call for papers is opened to every MA or PhD student, young researchers, academic staff interested to promote researches and present different perspectives on the EU. This publication will appear every four months (December, April, August).*

*The next issue will be available on-line in April 2011.*

## **CONTENTS**

- **GERARD BOSSUAT: L'IDENTITE DE L'UNION EUROPEENNE**
- **LOREDANA BALTEŞ: THE UNITED EUROPE IN THE VIEW OF FRANÇOIS MITTERRAND**
- **GEORGIANA CICEO: THE MANY FACES OF EUROPEANNESS.TRENDS IN LOCAL, NATIONAL AND EUROPEAN IDENTIFICATIONS**
- **DORIN DOBRA: EUROPEAN IDEAS IN THE MIRROR OF THE INTER-WAR ROMANIAN GENERATION**
- **DRAGOŞ PĂUN: EURO – A SUCCESS STORY OF EUROPEAN INTEGRATION**
- **DAN ZBUCHEA: EUROPEAN INTEGRATION PREMISES IN THE II<sup>ND</sup> WORLD WAR RESISTANCE MOVEMENTS' THOUGHT**

## L'IDENTITE DE L'UNION EUROPEENNE

*Prof. Dr. GERARD BOSSUAT*

Université de Cergy-Pontoise

*« L'Europe n'a jamais existé. Ce n'est pas l'addition de souverainetés réunies dans des conseils qui crée une entité. Il faut véritablement créer l'Europe, qu'elle se manifeste à elle-même et à l'opinion américaine et qu'elle ait confiance en son propre avenir ».*

**Jean Monnet, note du 3 mai 1950**

### **Introduction**

L'identité européenne existe-t-elle ailleurs que dans les livres d'Art et d'Architecture ou dans les œuvres des grands écrivains d'Europe?

Que cherchons-nous?

- 1) Un corpus de valeurs éthiques, civiques, politiques, économiques, culturelles et sociales partagées par l'ensemble de l'Europe au XXe siècle, définissant une identité européenne propre<sup>1</sup>,
- 2) mais aussi des représentations concrètes de cette identité<sup>2</sup>,
- 3) le sentiment d'appartenance à un grand ensemble européen, manifestant l'adhésion du cœur à l'unité européenne<sup>3</sup> et
- 4) Une conscience européenne<sup>4</sup>,

---

<sup>1</sup> Ces valeurs sont d'ordre éthique, civique, politique, économiques, culturelles et sociale.

<sup>2</sup> Ces représentations sont, par exemple, les symboles concrets de l'identité: drapeau, nourriture commune, héros communs, musique commune, interprétation commune de l'histoire.

<sup>3</sup> Ce sentiment s'est manifesté pour les nations par des fêtes nationales, ou par le sentiment patriotique.

En résumé nous cherchons s'il existe quelque part dans les sociétés européennes un recueil et un affichage des valeurs européennes, et une adhésion des populations européennes par le cœur et la raison à ces valeurs. Si une identité européenne existe, elle devrait exprimer la dynamique du vivre ensemble européen. Elle devait donc être créatrice d'art et de culture, d'éthique politique, de citoyenneté, d'éducation. Elle devrait donner un sens à l'Histoire et reconnaître publiquement des lieux de mémoire communs ou donner lieu à des célébrations.

Mais nous savons aussi que l'homme européen est un agrégat d'identités, ie de références à des valeurs variées. Sur la scène des représentations identitaires des peuples européens, l'identité paneuropéenne est concurrencée par d'autres identités "englobantes" et plus anciennes: l'identité nationale, l'identité régionale, l'identité religieuse, l'identité linguistique ou l'identité idéologique, l'identité du groupe ou du clan (la grande famille). Entre ces modèles identitaires extrêmement théorisés et historicisés, références fortes pour les citoyens et les personnes, une coexistence est-elle possible?<sup>5</sup> Parler des valeurs qui nous réunissent n'est pas anodin, et peut remettre en cause cet agrégat. L'Europe, et quelle Europe, a-t-elle une identité reconnue par tous les Européens?

### Le souhait récurrent d'une identité européenne

Le monde intellectuel a toujours affirmé qu'une identité européenne existait. Dans l'introduction très éclairante d'une anthologie, *Europes*, Yves Hersant signale que **l'identité culturelle** est une valeur intégrée par les eurofonctionnaires de Bruxelles, en quête de consensus, mais vide de sens<sup>6</sup>.

En effet dans chacun des pays de l'Union européenne ou de la grande Europe, les citoyens se réfèrent plus à la nation, au pays, à une culture particulière, voire à des valeurs internationalisées par les grandes institutions internationales depuis le temps de la SDN qu'à une

---

<sup>4</sup> La conscience est de l'ordre de la raison et permet de se reconnaître une identité.

<sup>5</sup> L'identité européenne, régionaliste par essence, s'oppose à une identité mondialiste; l'identité atlantique est-elle compatible avec une identité européenne?

<sup>6</sup> Yves Hersant, Fabienne Durand-Bogaert, *Europes, de l'antiquité au XXe siècle anthologie critique et commentée*, Robert Laffont, Bouquins, Paris, 2000.

somme de valeurs européennes. Les valeurs partagées propres aux communautés nationales ont généré **un patriotisme, une émotion**, qui s'expriment dans des fêtes et des manifestations propres à entretenir les liens du groupe. Ce patriotisme a soudé en entité nationale des communautés humaines d'origine culturelle variée. Il a fait naître une mémoire commune et des **héros nationaux**.

L'Europe a-t-elle généré des **lieux de mémoire et des héros**? Hé bien, ils nous échappent ! L'absence de lieux de mémoire signifiant l'unité des Européens semble témoigner d'une absence d'identité européenne dans la conscience des habitants de l'Europe<sup>7</sup>. Pourtant, paradoxe étonnant, chacune des cultures de l'Europe géographique se reconnaît comme européenne et reconnaît aux autres, différentes pourtant, sa qualité de culture européenne. Faut-il chercher trace d'une identité européenne dans l'apparition et le développement en Europe de phénomènes paneuropéens? Celui de la société **technologique et scientifique**? Celui représenté par **les activités d'échange** des marchands, des banquiers, des ordres religieux, de la noblesse européennes? L'identité européenne est-elle **l'humanisme** de la Renaissance et sa fille la **philosophie des Lumières**? Est-ce la recherche de la liberté qui caractérise l'identité profonde de l'Europe? L'identité européenne, souvent célébrées par les intellectuels ou les écrivains, semble irréelle et utopique. "Pour les intellectuels, être européen cela va souvent sans dire, mais cela va parfois moins bien en le disant", écrit joliment un historien<sup>8</sup>.

En dépit de ces interrogations l'envie ou la nécessité de définir une identité européenne s'imposent dans un monde post-industriel, post idéologique, niveleur des spécificités des groupes humains, réducteurs des cultures et des langues régionales. La recherche frénétique d'une identité culturelle européenne serait donc le signe de l'effondrement des anciennes cultures européennes balayées par la société de consommation.

## **L'extérieur et la formation de l'identité européenne**

---

<sup>7</sup> Gérard Bossuat, « Des lieux de mémoire pour l'Europe unie », *Vingtième Siècle*, n° 61, janvier-mars 1999, p. 56-69.

<sup>8</sup> Groupe de travail sur élites intellectuelles et conscience de l'identité européenne: « Etre européen: espaces et représentations culturelles » rapport pour le colloque international de Paris, *Les identités européennes au XXe siècle*, septembre 1999.

Le monde non-européen joue-t-il un rôle dans le questionnement sur l'identité européenne? Dans cet extérieur comptent beaucoup les anciennes colonies européennes et les Etats-Unis.

Les “colons” européens installés aux Etats-Unis et en Australie ont cherché à affirmer une identité locale plutôt que vivre leur identité européenne d’origine. En termes de valeurs politiques, économiques et culturelles, l’Europe se différencie des Etats-Unis<sup>9</sup>. Mais cette différenciation est limitée car l’Europe comme les Etats-Unis appartiennent à la même civilisation occidentale ou atlantique, démocratique. Cette différence, souvent célébrée, n’a pas entraîné un processus de “fabrication” automatique d’une identité politique européenne aboutissant aux Etats-Unis d’Europe. L’action des Etats-Unis en Europe au XXe siècle, depuis leur première intervention en 1917, le besoin que les Démocraties européennes ont eu des Etats-Unis en 1940 puis à partir de la guerre froide en 1947-1950, ont conduit l’Europe occidentale à accepter le leadership américain, plus séduisant, que les excès des dictatures fascistes et communistes.

Le monde extérieur n’a donc pas fabriqué l’identité européenne, ni l’unité politique européenne. Faut-il alors tirer un trait sur l’identité européenne et constater son absence? L’historien observe cependant que les Etats européens démocratiques ont toujours refusé de s’abandonner à une domination étrangère, que l’Europe occidentale a su réagir comme un ensemble à partir de 1945, après les terribles épreuves de la première guerre, des fascismes, de “la purification ethnique” nazie, de la crise économique et de la Seconde guerre mondiale. Elle a donc afficher une certaine identité commune. La confrontation et la coopération avec les Etats-Unis montre que l’identité européenne existe, mais de faible intensité, et qu’elle a des caractères atlantiques et universels.

### **Les valeurs européennes au miroir de l’histoire**

L’histoire est-elle un bon miroir des valeurs européennes? L’histoire ne peut pas livrer un “paquet” de valeurs identitaires européennes. Aux temps médiévaux, les valeurs de la Chrétienté modelaient la société. Aujourd’hui l’Europe n’est plus uniquement chrétienne et donc ses valeurs

---

<sup>9</sup> Gérard Bossuat, « le rôle des Etats-Unis dans la formation des identités européennes », rapport pour le colloque international de Paris, *Les identités européennes au XXe siècle*, septembre 1999, à paraître.

ne peuvent être fondées sur la doctrine de l'Eglise<sup>10</sup>. En revanche la Révolution française de 1789 et les révolutions de 1848 marquent les valeurs européennes. Les libertés, la démocratie, la justice sociale, valeurs défendues sur les pavés de Paris, sont entrées dans le bagage des valeurs de l'Union européenne.

Mais l'Histoire ne donne pas une réponse définitive sur les valeurs des Européens d'aujourd'hui. Elle donne des pistes aux contemporains sur les valeurs identitaires du passé de l'Europe. Certaines sont dépassées, d'autres toujours actives. De plus, certaines, forgées par l'Histoire européenne ou euro-atlantique, sont devenues des valeurs universelles qui ne peuvent plus servir à distinguer l'Europe d'autres aires géopolitiques: c'est le cas des valeurs scientifiques et techniques, désormais mondialisées, ou celle de la liberté de conscience.

De plus l'Histoire renvoie un message brouillé sur les valeurs, car les lieux de mémoire sont nationaux ou évoquent l'horreur. En effet, guerres et génocides, massacres religieux ou ethniques, intolérances d'Etat, renvoient à des valeurs négatives à nos yeux. La guerre n'est plus en Europe une valeur fondatrice. Les héros européens, qui pourraient incarner des valeurs communes du Cap Nord à Gibraltar, sont des héros "ratés": Charlemagne est sans postérité; Napoléon 1er un héros discuté; Hitler un héros inacceptable. Même Schuman, de Gasperi, Adenauer, Mollet, sont des héros ambigus; de Gaulle est ambigu. Le vrai héros, Jean Monnet, est inconnu.

Certes, après la seconde guerre mondiale, l'Europe se décrit à nouveau comme **un espace de civilisation et un espace éthique** (Congrès de la Haye de mai 1948 et Conseil de l'Europe)<sup>11</sup>. Mais ce discours incantatoire fondé sur l'existence d'une civilisation européenne idéale est contre-productif car il ne tient pas compte de la réalité récente (L'Europe c'est la guerre, la discrimination, le génocide)<sup>12</sup>.

---

<sup>10</sup> Alfredo CANAVERO, Jean-Dominique DURAND, « les phénomènes religieux et l'identification européenne », rapport pour le colloque international de Paris, *Les identités européennes au XXe siècle*, septembre 1999.

<sup>11</sup> Groupe de travail sur élites intellectuelles et conscience de l'identité européenne: « Etre européen: espaces et représentations culturelles » rapport pour le colloque international de Paris, *Les identités européennes au XXe siècle*, septembre 1999.

<sup>12</sup> Yves HERSENT, Fabienne DURAND-BOGAERT, *Europes, de l'antiquité au XXe siècle anthologie critique et commentée*, Robert Laffont, Bouquins, Paris, 2000.

Que faire avec notre Histoire? Une sociologue, A-M Autissier, répond: “Notre héritage commun n'est pas donné; il nous revient de se l'approprier, de l'inventer ensemble dans l'incertitude d'un échange contemporain. Dans cette perspective, l'Europe de la culture reste un projet inédit”<sup>13</sup>.

## L'élaboration d'une identité de l'Union européenne

A la recherche d'une identité européenne qui se dérobe, le salut se trouve ailleurs, dans l'Union européenne, un système neuf, qui, depuis 1949-1950 sécrète ses propres valeurs. A défaut de valeurs européennes, il y a sans doute des valeurs et une identité de l'Union européenne.

**Les débats de l'Assemblée Consultative du Conseil de l'Europe** en 1949 montrent que les représentants parlementaires soit réfutent l'existence de valeurs communes, soit les trouvent évidentes<sup>14</sup>. Dans le préambule du Statut, il est fait référence aux “valeurs spirituelles et morales qui sont le patrimoine commun de leurs peuples”<sup>15</sup>. A savoir la philosophie grecque, le droit romain, le christianisme occidental, l'humanisme et la Révolution française. Ces valeurs sont “à l'origine des principes de liberté individuelle, de liberté politique et de prééminence du Droit, sur lesquels se fonde toute démocratie véritable”. L'Europe d'aujourd'hui, **selon le Conseil de l'Europe**, a de bonnes raisons de s'unir parce qu'elle a un passé culturel unificateur, comme si la communauté de pensée et d'intérêts créée par les pèlerinages de Saint-Jacques, le commerce de la soie, l'architecture gothique ou baroque, l'art du bronze, le souvenir d'Ulysse pouvaient donner un corpus de valeurs identitaires aux Européens d'aujourd'hui. Le Conseil de l'Europe a

<sup>13</sup> Anne-Marie AUTISSIER, «Approche socio-politique de la réutilisation du patrimoine en Europe », *La réutilisation culturelle et artistique des monuments historiques en Europe*, Synthèse de l'Etude et extraits des Actes du colloque (Château Savelli, – Italie-, 1998), ACCR Paris, 1998-1999, p. 110; voir le livre plus synthétique d'Anne-Marie AUTISSIER, *L'Europe de la culture, histoires et enjeux*, poche, internationale de l'imaginaire, Babel, Paris, 2005.

<sup>14</sup> Voir la présentation des débats par Aleksandar PAVKOVIC, « What is common heritage? » in *Journal of European Integration History*, 1999, 5, 2, p. 63 et seq.; Evidente pour André Philip, inexiste pour Lord Layton ou Eamon de Valera.

<sup>15</sup> ROBERTSON Arthur Henry, Le Conseil de l'Europe: sa structure, ses fonctions et ses réalisations, A.W. Sythoff, Leyde, 1962, 355p, p. 30.

voulu créer “un fonds de conscience européenne”<sup>16</sup>, objectif impeccable mais a-historique parce que l’Histoire n’est pas une éthique.

**Les Communautés européennes?** Les traités de Rome, la déclaration de Copenhague de décembre 1973, l’Acte unique européen de 1986, la naissance en 1992 d’une Union européenne, le traité de Lisbonne de 2007, ont suscité de nouvelles interrogations sur les valeurs de l’Union.

**D’abord Monnet** évoque de nouvelles valeurs politiques. “Dans mon esprit, une impression prédomine sur toutes les autres, écrit-il en 1962. La voici: l’unité en Europe ne crée pas un nouveau genre de grande puissance; c’est une méthode d’introduction d’un changement en Europe, et par conséquent, dans le monde. .... les Européens ont construit la Communauté européenne dans le but précis de trouver un moyen de sortir des conflits auxquels a conduit la philosophie du XIXe siècle”<sup>17</sup>. La Communauté européenne c’est d’abord la fin de l’Etat Léviathan, le commencement de la Paix internationale par le Droit.

Avant de nommer plus précisément les valeurs communautaires, il faut dire qu’elles ne peuvent être la copie conforme des valeurs propres à l’un des Etats membres même s’il y a nécessairement des emprunts<sup>18</sup>. Les valeurs communautaires remettent nécessairement en cause les héros des nations européennes puisque tous célèbrent les victoires d’une nation sur d’autres Européens. Les valeurs de l’Union européenne reposent sur la reconnaissance d’un intérêt supérieur européen qui s’impose à tous. Cette prise de conscience n’est pas encore faite dans certains pays européens, puisque dans les Balkans l’argument historique a été utilisé pour justifier des “nettoyages ethniques”. Un retournement de tendance semble s’être produit en 1945 à l’Ouest. Certes, “Charlemagne, Kant et Hugo ont moins compté que Hitler et Staline” au XXe siècle, explique l’historien Robert Frank<sup>19</sup>, mais une nouvelle conscience d’une “communauté de destin” est en train de transformer l’Europe<sup>20</sup>.

---

<sup>16</sup> Anne-Marie AUTISSIER, « Approche socio-politique de la réutilisation du patrimoine en Europe », *La réutilisation culturelle et artistique des monuments historiques en Europe*, actes du colloque (château de Savelli, Italie, 1998), Editions de l’ACCR, 1998-1999. p. 97.

<sup>17</sup> Jean Monnet, « A ferment of change ” Journal of Common Market Studies, vol. 1, n° 1 p. 203-11, 1962

<sup>18</sup> DONADIEU Pierre, *La société paysagiste*, Actes Sud, 2002

<sup>19</sup> Robert FRANK, « Une histoire problématique, une histoire du temps présent ”, *Vingtième Siècle*, juillet-septembre 2001, *Dossier Apprendre l’histoire de l’Europe*, p. 88.

<sup>20</sup> Edgar MORIN, *Penser l’Europe*, Gallimard, 1987, p. 137. Il emprunte le concept formulé par Otto Bauer en 1907.

## **Les valeurs de l'Union européenne**

1) Les traités européennes, les sommets et Conseils européens ont été des moments clefs pour exprimer les valeurs communautaires de référence. Le sommet de Copenhague du 14 décembre 1973 avec sa "**Déclaration sur l'identité européenne**", définit solennellement les valeurs de la Communauté européenne: la Démocratie parlementaire, l'Etat de droit, la Justice sociale déclarée "finalité du progrès économique"<sup>21</sup>, les Droits de l'homme et l'amitié privilégiée avec les Etats-Unis (atlantisme). Le préambule de "la Charte des droits fondamentaux de l'Union" de 2000 déclare que "l'Union se fonde sur les valeurs indivisibles et universelles de dignité humaine, de liberté, d'égalité et de solidarité, elle repose sur le principe de la démocratie et le principe de l'État de droit...."<sup>22</sup>.

2) La justice sociale est un élément de **la solidarité** organisée et **la régulation publique**<sup>23</sup>, différenciant l'Union européenne des États-Unis d'Amérique<sup>24</sup>.

3) L'Union européenne porte aussi une grande attention au **libéralisme économique**, valeur sur laquelle l'unité s'est construite. L'Union a répondu à la pression égalisatrice de la mondialisation en proposant "**une économie sociale de marché hautement compétitive**".

4) **Les Droits de l'homme** sont en partie fondateurs de l'identité de l'Union européenne qui a établi une *Charte européenne des droits fondamentaux* en 2000<sup>25</sup>. La filiation avec la

<sup>21</sup> Paragraphe 1 de la déclaration de Copenhague sur l'identité européenne. Pierre GERBET, Françoise DE LA SERRE, Gérard NAPHYLIAN, *L'union politique de l'Europe, jalons et textes*, « Déclaration sur l'identité européenne adoptée par les neufs chefs d'État et de gouvernement », Copenhague, 14 décembre 1973, p. 187, La Documentation française, 1998.

<sup>22</sup> *Journal officiel des Communautés européennes* 18.12.2000, (2000/C 364/01), p. 8.

<sup>23</sup> CHITI-BATELLI Andrea, *L'Union de l'Europe au tournant du siècle*, Presses d'Europe, Nice, 2000; DRESSLER Wanda, GATTI Gabriel, PEREZ-AGOTE Alfonso, *Les nouveaux repères de l'identité collective en Europe*, L'Harmattan, 1999, Logiques sociales, 286 p. TOUSSIGNANT Nathalie (dir. de); *Les identités de l'Europe: repères et prospective*, actes du colloque de Louvain-la-neuve, le 9 mai 1996, UCL, p. 41- 60, 1998.

<sup>24</sup> Marie-Thérèse BITSCH, Wilfried LOTH, Raymond POIDEVIN (sous la direction de), *Institutions européennes et identités européennes*, Bruylant, Bruxelles, 1998.

<sup>25</sup> À l'origine de la *Convention de sauvegarde des Droits de l'homme et des Libertés fondamentales* de novembre 1953, puis de la *Charte sociale* (1961), la *Convention pour la prévention de la torture* (1987) et la *Convention-cadre sur la protection des minorités* (1994).

fameuse *Déclaration des Droits de l'homme et du Citoyen* de 1789 ou encore de l'*Habeas Corpus* anglais est une évidence<sup>26</sup>.

5) L'Union ne cultive pas de valeurs militaristes ni même impérialistes, mais elle ne peut évacuer une réflexion sur l'usage de la force pour protéger ses valeurs fondatrices ou ses intérêts économiques légitimes. Or cette valeur, – appelons là l'**autodéfense** –, n'est pas partagée par tous les Etats membres dont certains préfèrent la protection de l'OTAN i.e. des Etats-Unis.

Mais le débat sur le projet de Constitution a provoqué des chocs à propos des valeurs. Les Chrétiens et le “parti des Lumières” se mobilisèrent à propos de **la place de Dieu** dans la Constitution. Dieu ne fut pas nommé dans la Constitution<sup>27</sup>. La controverse montrait, paradoxalement, que l'Union avait mûri et que le “vivre-ensemble” complétait le “produire-ensemble”. Elle fit ressortir les valeurs encore vivantes dans les sociétés européennes: les traditions religieuse et le Christianisme, la tradition laïque et libérale, la réinterprétation de l'Histoire. Le projet de Constitution du 29 octobre 2004 s'inspirait “des héritages culturels, religieux et humanistes de l'Europe, à partir desquels se sont développées les valeurs universelles que constituent les droits inviolables et inaliénables de la personne humaine, ainsi que la liberté, la démocratie, l'égalité et l'Etat de droit”. Le traité modificatif de Lisbonne du 13 décembre 2007 définit encore les valeurs de l'Union”: “le respect de la dignité humaine, la liberté, la démocratie, la tolérance, l'égalité entre les femmes et les hommes”<sup>28</sup>.

---

<sup>26</sup> Le préambule de la *Charte européenne des droits fondamentaux* rappelle que les peuples d'Europe, en établissant entre eux une union « sans cesse plus étroite », ont décidé de partager un avenir pacifique fondé sur des valeurs communes. Il évoque un « patrimoine spirituel et moral ». L'Union se fonde sur les valeurs indivisibles et universelles « de dignité humaine, de liberté, d'égalité et de solidarité; elle repose sur le principe de la démocratie et de l'État de droit... ». Toute personne a droit à la vie (abolition de la peine de mort, spécificité européenne par rapport à l'Amérique et obligation pour tout candidat à l'Union européenne), à l'intégrité physique et mentale (interdiction de pratiques eugéniques, du clonage reproductif des êtres humains, de la torture).

<sup>27</sup> Jean-Paul II, au nom du « vivre-ensemble », définissait lui-même la laïcité comme « l'espace pour un dialogue constructif, dans l'esprit des valeurs de liberté, d'égalité et de fraternité ».

<sup>28</sup> Gérard BOSSUAT, *Histoire de l'Union européenne, fondation, développement, avenir*, Paris, Belin, 2009; voir aussi le texte du traité dans [http://www.traite-de-lisbonne.fr/Traite\\_de\\_Lisbonne.php?Traite=2](http://www.traite-de-lisbonne.fr/Traite_de_Lisbonne.php?Traite=2) et une présentation courte du traité dans Pierre GERBET, (dir) Gérard BOSSUAT, Thierry GROSBOIS (ed), *Dictionnaire historique de l'Europe unie*, André Versaille Editions, Bruxelles, 2009.

## Conclusion

Les hommes et les femmes d'Europe sont pluridimensionnels. Ils et elles entretiennent un quadruple rapport affectif, d'intensité variable, avec leur nation, leur région, l'internationalisme, le passé, l'unité et donc avec les valeurs de ces cinq *topoi* marqueurs identitaires.

Les valeurs de l'Union européenne sont liées aux pratiques et aux textes communautaires depuis 1951. Elles sont universelles dans le sens où elles peuvent avoir été adoptées par d'autres Etats ou par la communauté internationale. Ce sont la démocratie, les droits de l'homme, la liberté, l'égalité, la solidarité, la paix internationale et le développement. Elles peuvent aussi être plus spécifiques, telles les valeurs de la gouvernance européenne, le respect de la diversité culturelle, le libéralisme tempéré par la justice sociale, la paix par le Droit.

Ces valeurs trouvent une expression concrète dans les politiques de l'Union, souvent critiquables. Le corpus de valeurs communautaires s'ajoute à celui des nations troubant parfois les références des individus. Si les valeurs de solidarité ou d'intérêt général sont inscrites dans les traités, leurs traductions concrètes sont interprétées à l'aune des choix politiques des décideurs. Le discours de la Commission est libéral parce que la Commission et la majorité parlementaire font des politiques conservatrices; les valeurs, elles, ne changent pas à la différence de leur concrétisation.

L'Union est une revanche sur les affrontements paneuropéens du passé. Elle utilise le meilleur des valeurs disponibles dans les cultures européennes. Elle emprunte aux expériences politiques des États-nations, aux Révolutions de 1789 et de 1848, à l'humanisme du christianisme et du socialisme démocratique. L'Union européenne est notre avenir parce qu'elle a rejeté aussi certaines valeurs dépassées héritées de l'Histoire<sup>29</sup>.

Juillet 2009

---

<sup>29</sup> Robert FRANK, «Une histoire problématique, une histoire du temps présent», Vingtième Siècle, juillet-septembre 2001, Dossier Apprendre l'histoire de l'Europe, p. 88. « c'est moins la vieille identité culturelle qui a naturellement débouché sur la nouvelle conscience politique que le mouvement inverse: c'est la conscience qui a modifié l'identité ».

## **THE UNITED EUROPE IN THE VIEW OF FRANÇOIS MITTERRAND**

*Dr. LOREDANA BALTEŞ*

Universitatea Babeş-Bolyai, Cluj-Napoca,  
lore\_baltes@yahoo.com

*Mitterrand's speech focused on the fact that the future of France at the European and International level is strongly connected to the construction of a competitive European community, capable to solve the social problems of its citizens, to ensure the peace and security on the continent and to be an important actor on the international relations scene.*

*The French President has supported and initiated countless community reforms and has created a veritable partnership with Germany for the consolidation and acceleration of the integration process. He also held a true belief that a united Europe, with France maintaining its position as a regional power, would be capable to balance the economical power of the United States. For all these reasons, he remains one of the leaders of the European Construction process.*

**Keywords:** François Mitterrand, France, European Union, European Construction process.

### **L'Europe Unie dans la vision de François Mitterrand**

*“La France est notre patrie, l'Europe est notre avenir”*

#### **François Mitterrand**

En France, l'intégration régionale et l'élargissement de la Communauté européenne représente un sujet d'actualité bien controversé. Selon les français, le processus communautaire tend à devenir déficitaire à cause du manque de réformes institutionnelles qui accompagnent le processus d'élargissement. Si en 2005, la France a rejeté le Traité pour une Constitution

européenne avec un pourcentage de 54,68%<sup>1</sup>; en 2009, selon un sondage réalisé par TNS Sofres, seulement 44%<sup>2</sup> de français sont restés favorables à l'appartenance de la France à la Construction européenne. Ceci semble signifier que les français se retrouvent de moins en moins dans cette entité, considérée parfois déficitaire, non-représentative et manquant de transparence.

Cette situation est bien différente de la période où François Mitterrand était le Président de la République, étant donné que celui-ci a su transmettre aux français, l'idée de la nécessité d'une étroite liaison entre l'évolution de la Communauté européenne et l'évolution de la France. Ainsi, son discours a mis l'accent sur le fait que l'avenir de la France au niveau européen et international est lié à la construction d'une communauté européenne compétitive, capable de résoudre les problèmes sociaux de ses citoyens, d'assurer la paix et la sécurité sur le continent et qui compte sur la scène des relations internationales.

De plus, pour Mitterrand, une Europe unie devrait tout d'abord avoir le soutien des peuples de ces états membres et elle ne devrait pas se limiter à l'espace économique communautaire. Ainsi, ses discours mobilisateurs ont déterminé les français à soutenir dans une proportion de 51,04%<sup>3</sup> le Traité de l'Union européenne.

Par le soutien et l'initiation de nombreuses réformes communautaires, par la création d'un véritable partenariat avec l'Allemagne au service de la consolidation et l'accélération du processus communautaire et par sa croyance réelle dans une Europe unie, capable de contrebalancer le pouvoir économique des Etats-Unis dans laquelle la France consolide sa position de grand pouvoir régional, François Mitterrand représente un des leaders du processus de la Construction européenne.

Pour conclure, cet ouvrage présente l'action profondément communautaire de François Mitterrand et sa vision concernant une Europe Unie.

## L'action communautaire de François Mitterrand

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://europeagenda2010.free.fr/ratification\\_fr.htm](http://europeagenda2010.free.fr/ratification_fr.htm).

<sup>2</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/public\\_opinion/archives/eb/eb71/eb71\\_fr\\_en\\_exec.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/eb/eb71/eb71_fr_en_exec.pdf).

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.revolution-socialiste.info/Just1992.htm>.

La France a été au cœur des transformations que connaît l'Europe aujourd'hui, grâce à François Mitterrand et à Jacques Delors, qui sont parmi les Européens ayant le plus contribué à la construction européenne au cours des vingt dernières années.

En tant que Président de la République Française, François Mitterrand avait déployé toutes les facettes de son talent, sa vision de l'avenir, son savoir-faire tactique, sa pugnacité, sa force de conviction, sa crédibilité auprès de ses homologues européens, pour entraîner les socialistes, les autres dirigeants européens, puis l'ensemble des Français dans la relance de la construction européenne.

Son mérite est encore plus grand si on prend en compte le fait que le Parti Socialiste n'a jamais fondé son discours sur les thèmes européens et que les français ont toujours été plus étatistes que communautaires. Dans ce sens, on peut même constater qu'il a changé la perception des français en ce qui concerne la construction européenne, en gagnant le référendum sur le Traité de Maastricht.

La position pro-européenne de Mitterrand se fait remarquée depuis 1948, quand il participe au Congrès de La Haye (*appelé le Congrès de l'Europe*) avec les pères de la construction européenne: **Jean Monnet, Konrad Adenauer, Alcide De Gasperi, Altiero Spinelli, Ernesto Rossi**, etc.

Pourtant, en 1954, il s'abstient lors du vote sur la Communauté européenne de défense, dont il écrira plus tard qu'elle aurait constitué une "*Europe des maréchaux*" qui, en l'absence de pouvoir politique européen, aurait été gouvernée par Washington. Déjà se manifeste ce qui restera un des points cardinaux de la pensée européenne de Mitterrand: la France ne doit s'engager que dans une Europe pleinement européenne et non dans une construction en trompe-l'œil qui serait le paravent d'une hégémonie quelconque.

En 1965, pendant sa campagne électorale pour les élections présidentielles, le thème européen a été le principal thème de son discours, en dépit de la position de ses alliés communistes et en demandant aux français de choisir *une Europe unie, structurée, contre l'isolationnisme*<sup>4</sup>.

En 1973, en tant que Premier Secrétaire du Parti Socialiste, il impose à ses collègues un discours favorable à la construction européenne, qui pourrait représenter un espace favorable au socialisme. "*Nous ne voulons l'Europe pour l'Europe, nous voulons l'Europe pour le*

---

<sup>4</sup> Musirelli, Jean, "François Mitterrand, l'euro-péen", Lettre n° 8, Paris, Institut François Mitterrand, le 2 juin 2004.

*socialisme<sup>5</sup>“ et “une France socialiste va soutenir l’entrée dans le marché commun des pays qui vont diminuer l’influence de l’impérialiste américain et qui vont aider au développement du socialisme, par exemple en Yougoslavie, Finlande, Suède et ensuite dans les pays membres du C.O.M.E.C.O.N. (Conseil d’assistance économique mutuelle)<sup>6</sup>“.* Ainsi, pour Mitterrand la nouvelle construction européenne devrait être socialiste et si “le Gaullisme parlait pour France et Allemagne, et Italie et les autres états ne pouvaient pas écouter la voix de la France. Imaginez-vous comme le socialisme, à son tour, va parler pour la France...Je crois en France et dans son pouvoir d’exemple, comme je crois dans le socialisme et dans sa force d’entraîner les masses<sup>7</sup>“.

Dès le mois de juin 1981, François Mitterrand s’engage d’ailleurs dans cette voie. Au Luxembourg, lors de son premier Conseil, il lance l’idée d’un *Espace social européen*. Aménagement du temps de travail à l’échelle des Dix, planification européenne autour de grands travaux, politique industrielle européenne audacieuse, dialogue social, etc., sont englobés dans cette formule et développées, quelques mois plus tard, dans le mémorandum que la France adresse aux partenaires communautaire.

En 1983, la Construction européenne est confrontée avec l’une des crises les plus graves: après la création du Système Monétaire Européen et la première élection au suffrage universel en 1979, aucun autre progrès n’a été fait. De plus, aucune perspective politique n’était envisagée.

Une série de contraintes bloquait la démarche européenne et la crise européenne était doublée par la crise des sociétés de l’Europe Occidentale. Ces pays avaient dépassé le miracle économique des années ’60, la révolution numérique avait produit de grandes restructurations industrielles, les deux chocs pétroliers, la croissance des coûts de production concomitant avec la baisse brusque de la demande au niveau international; tous altéraient les efforts de solidarité communautaire.

Dans ce contexte, en 1983, la France connaît deux grandes dévalorisations et Mitterrand est mis dans la situation de décider de lever le franc du SME afin de sauver l’économie française, ou le maintenir dans le système, en appliquant une politique de maxime rigueur et d’austérité. Sa

---

<sup>5</sup> Joxe, Pierre, Mitterrand François, “*Un socialisme du possible*”, Paris, Editions Le Seuil, 1970, p.172.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>7</sup> Mitterrand, François, “*Ma part de vérité* “, Paris, Editions Fayard, 1969, p.198.

décision a été de garder le franc dans le SME afin de prouver aux autres pays membres, l'attachement de la France à la Communauté européenne. Par cet acte fondateur, il ancre définitivement l'engagement européen au cœur de la politique du gouvernement socialiste.

Le 19 janvier 1983, par son fameux discours au Bundestag, il appuie la position d'Helmut Kohl, favorable au déploiement des missiles de l'OTAN et met ainsi le fondement d'une alliance avec le Chancelier allemand. La relation personnelle de confiance et d'amitié qui s'établit alors sera un des éléments-clé de la dynamique européenne dans la période 1984 -1995.

En 1984, le moteur franco-allemand commence à fonctionner, pendant la Présidence française de la (Communauté Economique Européenne) plus de 16 dossiers concernant: l'agriculture, l'industrie, les fonds structuraux, l'élargissement vers le sud, la coopération dans la recherche, etc. ont été solutionnés sous la Présidence française.

Devant ce blocage, François Mitterrand a agi en deux temps: premièrement, il a solutionné les problèmes qui bloquaient la CEE et ensuite il a relancé le processus de la construction européenne par plusieurs réformes communautaires.

Parallèlement, lors de la campagne pour les élections européennes de juin 1984, il multiplie les déclarations sur l'avenir de l'Europe. Relancer l'intégration communautaire, développer de nouvelles politiques communes, créer une véritable citoyenneté européenne, sont autant de thèmes qu'il aborde lors de ses interventions publiques. Notamment durant son discours devant le Parlement de Strasbourg, le 24 mai 1984. Là, François Mitterrand envisage d'ailleurs la tenue d'une nouvelle réunion de Messine pour donner un nouvel élan à la construction européenne et se déclare personnellement favorable au projet Spinelli que les députés européens venaient d'adopter.

Même s'il a déclaré qu'il soutient personnellement le projet *Spinelli* concernant la création d'une *Europe politique*, François Mitterrand s'engage ensuite dans le soutien de l'Acte Unique européen, qui a déterminé la relance de la construction européenne, car il exigeait la création du Marché Unique européen et la réforme institutionnelle.

En 1985, François Mitterrand soutient le projet *Eurêka* (projet communautaire qui vise la coopération technologique) en considérant que: “*l'Europe pourrait devenir le premier pouvoir industriel et technologique du monde*<sup>8</sup>” par une collaboration communautaire. Dans la même

---

<sup>8</sup> Discours de François Mitterrand au sein de l'Institut de Sciences Politiques de Paris, 1992, cité en *Onze discours sur l'Europe*, Naples, Editions Vivarium, 1996.

année, François Mitterrand soutient la *Convention européenne des droits de l'homme*, qui interdit entre autres la peine de mort. En France, la peine de mort a déjà été réglementée depuis 1981. En effet, en dépit de l'opinion publique favorable dans une proportion de 63%<sup>9</sup> à la peine de mort, François Mitterrand, en tant que Président de la République, demande l'abolition de la peine de mort.

L'adhésion de l'Espagne et du Portugal à la CEE est due en grande partie à François Mitterrand qui joue le rôle de catalyseur entre la Grande-Bretagne et les autres pays communautaires. Il soutient leur candidature et elles entrent officiellement dans la Communauté le 1er janvier 1986. A cette époque, la secrétaire d'État auprès du ministre des Relations extérieures, chargé des Affaires européennes, Catherine Lalumière, a dit: "*Quand je prends mes fonctions, nous entrons dans la phase finale des négociations pour l'entrée de l'Espagne et du Portugal. Du côté français, les dossiers sont parfaitement cadrés et maîtrisés. Il n'y a sur cette question qu'un patron et un seul, François Mitterrand. Il a clairement fixé l'objectif: ces deux pays doivent nous rejoindre, quelles que soient les critiques, les craintes et les arguties de ceux qui refusent cette perspective.[...] Il est exact qu'avec ces deux adhésions l'Europe devenait un peu plus latine, qu'elle s'ouvrait encore un peu plus sur le monde méditerranéen. Il est clair que cette donnée explique pour une part la forte détermination de François Mitterrand dans cette affaire. A cet aspect des choses, on peut très certainement ajouter sa sympathie personnelle pour les dirigeants de ces deux pays et l'orientation générale de leurs politiques*"<sup>10</sup>.

Dès sa réélection en mai 1988, il voulut relancer trois grands chantiers européens: la monnaie unique, l'harmonisation sociale et l'harmonisation fiscale. Il allait utiliser sa seconde Présidence de la Communauté durant le deuxième semestre 1989, pour impulser une dynamique qui conduisit au traité de Maastricht. Il allait réussir sur la monnaie unique et le protocole social. Mais l'harmonisation fiscale dut être ajournée, la France s'étant retrouvée seule à la défendre.

La monnaie unique fut le fruit d'un intense combat politique. François Mitterrand porta avec Jacques Delors ce projet, resté longtemps une utopie. Le chancelier Kohl qui, le 3 juin 1988 à Evian, avait donné à François Mitterrand son accord pour la monnaie unique, était de plus en plus réticent au fur à et à mesure que le calendrier se précisait. Pour le convaincre, François

---

<sup>9</sup> [http://cozop.com/agoravox/abolition\\_de\\_la\\_peine\\_de\\_mort\\_le\\_combat\\_est\\_pas\\_termine](http://cozop.com/agoravox/abolition_de_la_peine_de_mort_le_combat_est_pas_termine).

<sup>10</sup> Lalumière, Catherine, *Les rivages de l'Union*, Lettre n° 8, Paris. Institut François Mitterrand, le 2 juin 2004.

Mitterrand décida, en juillet 1989, la création d'un groupe de travail composé de représentants de haut niveau, des ministres des finances et des affaires étrangères des douze Etats membres, pour la France Jean-Claude Trichet, Directeur du Trésor, et Pierre de Boissieu, Directeur des affaires européennes. Ce groupe fut chargé des travaux préparatoires à l'ouverture d'une conférence intergouvernementale (CIG) sur l'Union économique et monétaire (UEM)<sup>11</sup>.

Dans le contexte des événements produits dans l'Europe Centrale et de l'Est en 1989, François Mitterrand joue de nouveau le rôle de leader communautaire, respectivement pilier de la construction européenne. Pendant cette période, Mitterrand est animé par l'idée que le destin de l'Europe est lié plus que jamais au destin de l'Allemagne. Ainsi, il accepte une Allemagne réunifiée au sein de la Communauté européenne, lorsqu'elle respecte les intérêts communautaires.

Pourtant, la plus grande réussite du tandem Mitterrand – Kohl, reste le Traité de Maastricht qui a permis la création de l'Union Economique et Monétaire, de la Politique Extérieure et de Sécurité Commune, de la citoyenneté européenne et qui a donné la vocation politique de la Communauté européenne en la transformant dans l'Union européenne.

Après la difficile négociation de ce traité, François Mitterrand décida de le faire ratifier par référendum. Il considérait que l'importance des partages de souveraineté contenus dans le traité justifiait une validation populaire directe. Malade, souffrant physiquement, il plaide ardemment pour “*une France forte dans une Europe forte capable de résister aux agressions extérieures*”. Il ajoutait que “*L'Europe cristallise à tort beaucoup de peurs: peur du changement, peur de la modernisation, de l'ouverture au monde et aux autres. C'est un paradoxe. On projette sur l'Europe des menaces imaginaires, alors qu'elle nous protège de risques bien réels*”<sup>12</sup>. Le référendum recueillit 51,4 % de voix favorables. La construction européenne était assise pour la première fois sur une base démocratique. Ce fut la dernière grande victoire politique de François Mitterrand.

Mitterrand croyait fortement que par l'Union Economique et Monétaire (UEM), l'Europe deviendrait un pouvoir économique et commercial, actif à l'échelle internationale. Ainsi, ce pas

---

<sup>11</sup> Guigou, Elisabeth, *Le Traité de Maastricht: la dernière grande œuvre européenne de François Mitterrand*, Lettre n° 8, Paris. Institut François Mitterrand, le 2 juin 2004.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibidem* 11.

est nécessaire sur le Marché Uni, car sans une Union Economique et Monétaire, il serait dominé par l'anarchie et la concurrence illicite<sup>13</sup>.

A la fin de son deuxième mandat Présidentiel, François Mitterrand a eu une contribution essentielle en ce qui concerne l'Europe sociale et notamment à l'élaboration de la Charte sociale, qui a été adoptée par tous les états membres de la CEE à l'exception de la Grande-Bretagne. Cette Charte sociale prévoit un accord entre les pays membres sur la politique sociale: c'est à dire sur l'harmonisation des normes sociales, qui était annexée au Traité de l'Union Européenne. Mitterrand considérait qu'une Europe sociale serait capable de résoudre les problèmes de ses citoyens, comme par exemple, le problème du chômage, même si le rôle primordial dans ce sens, revient aux politiques sociales nationales.

Par ailleurs, Mitterrand a eu une position constante en ce qui concerne le soutien de la politique de défense européenne. Depuis 1948, Mitterrand a plaidé pour une politique de défense européenne et il a accepté difficilement l'idée d'une tutelle américaine dans le domaine militaire européen. Il pensait que si on veut bâtir l'Europe, il faut considérer que cette Europe a besoin de sa propre politique de défense<sup>14</sup>.

En 1988, pendant une allocution publique, Mitterrand pose de nouveau le problème de la défense européenne: “*Comment bâtir une Europe politique sans bâtir une Europe de la défense? Mais comment bâtir l'Europe de la défense sans avoir bâti l'Europe politique?*”<sup>15</sup> se demande d'une façon rhétorique Mitterrand.

En 1991, celui-ci soutient la théorie d'une défense européenne fondée exclusivement sur un armement conventionnel<sup>16</sup>. En 1992, il lance la thèse d'une doctrine nucléaire pour l'Europe et en 1994, à la signature du *Livre Blanc sur la Défense*, il affirme: “*Si l'Europe arrive au point où on pourra la considérer comme un territoire assez uni pour être défendu contre les mêmes dangers, au nom des mêmes intérêts vitaux, alors je serai, au nom de la France, disposé à*

---

<sup>13</sup> Extras du discours de Président François Mitterrand devant le Parlement européen, Strasbourg, le 17 janvier 1995.

<sup>14</sup> Musirelli, Jean, “*François Mitterrand, l'europeen*”, Lettre n° 8, Institut François Mitterrand, le 2 juin 2004.

<sup>15</sup> Allocution de François Mitterrand au I.H.E.D.N. (Institut des Hautes Etudes de Défense Nationale), le 11 octobre 1988, en *Défense Nationale*, novembre 1988, p. 23-25.

<sup>16</sup> Loïck, Benoit, “*François Mitterrand et la défense nucléaire de l'Europe*”, Revue de Recherche Juridique – Droit Prospectif, 1998, p.640.

*engager une telle négociation [sur la mise au service de l'Europe de la F.N.S.]*<sup>17</sup><sup>“</sup>. Pourtant, François Mitterrand considérait la conscience européenne trop immature afin de bénéficier de sa propre défense nucléaire<sup>18</sup>.

## La vision de François Mitterrand d'une Europe unie

**La vocation européenne** de Mitterrand a ses racines dans son passé. Une personne qui a participé à la deuxième Guerre Mondiale, qui a été blessé et fait prisonnier, en a tiré deux grandes leçons: la première, que l'Europe devait s'unir pour survivre; la seconde, que l'avenir de la France s'inscrivait sur cet horizon.

Pour François Mitterrand, l'Europe unie représente une nécessité historique afin d'éviter la répétition du mal absolu qu'ont été les deux guerres mondiales. “*Je suis né pendant la première guerre et j'ai fait la deuxième. J'ai vu ce que cela était. J'ai vu deux grands peuples (...) riches de culture et d'histoire se détruire*”. [...] *Dès 1948, j'ai ressenti comme une évidence la nécessité de réconcilier ces deux peuples*”<sup>19</sup>.

Ainsi, dans la vision de François Mitterrand, l'Europe unie doit avoir comme fondement une forte coopération franco-allemande, qui dirige le processus communautaire.

François Mitterrand considère que le destin de la France est étroitement tributaire du succès de la construction européenne: “*J'estime complémentaire l'indépendance de la France et la construction de l'Europe*<sup>20</sup>”, écrit-il en 1986. Dans ce sens, si pour De Gaulle, l'Europe est une option, pour Mitterrand, elle représente une nécessité, car une Europe Unie devrait réduire la dépendance économique des états européens vis-à-vis des Etats-Unis et transformer la Communauté européenne en la plus compétitive entité économique du monde.

Si Mitterrand est tellement attaché à l'autonomie de l'Europe, c'est qu'il ne supporte pas la situation de tutelle dans laquelle les circonstances l'ont placée après la guerre. Pour lui,

---

<sup>17</sup> Interview avec François Mitterrand en *Nouvel Observateur* du 26 mai 1994, p. 159.

<sup>18</sup> Loëck, Benoit, ”*François Mitterrand et la défense nucléaire de l'Europe* “, Revue de Recherche Juridique – Droit Prospectif, 1998, p. 653.

<sup>19</sup> Musitelli, François, «*François Mitterrand, l'european*”, Lettre no.8, Paris, Institut François Mitterrand, 2 juin 2004

<sup>20</sup> *Ibidem* 19.

l'Europe cessait d'être l'acteur de sa propre histoire et elle était devenue l'objet ou l'enjeu de la rivalité pendant la Guerre froide. Il sait que l'Europe ne sera pas en mesure d'assumer pleinement son destin aussi longtemps qu'elle s'en remettra à la protection américaine du point de vue de sa sécurité. “*On ne peut concevoir une Europe solide, écrit-il, en 1988, si elle se révèle incapable d'assurer par elle-même la sécurité des peuples qui la composent. On ne peut non plus concevoir une défense commune sans l'autorité d'un pouvoir politique central*”<sup>21</sup>.

D'un côté, dans son discours devant le Parlement Européen, en 1995, François Mitterrand attire l'attention sur le fait que “*le nationalisme est la guerre*” et que le devoir de la construction européenne est d'assurer la paix sur le continent. De l'autre, Mitterrand pense que les états nationaux doivent rester au cœur de la géopolitique européenne et que la structure de la communauté devrait être intergouvernementale. Non pas parce qu'il été hostile au fédéralisme, mais parce que les peuples de certains états comme la France ou la Grande-Bretagne auraient digéré très difficilement une structure fédérale.

En ce qui concerne le rôle assumé par la France au sein d'une Europe Unie, en 1994, Mitterrand rappelle au peuple français de ne pas séparer la grandeur de la France de celle de la Construction européenne car: „*N'en doutez pas, l'avenir de la France passe par l'Europe. En servant l'une, nous servons l'autre*”<sup>22</sup>.

Il se sépare radicalement des conceptions libérales qui voient surtout dans l'Europe la construction d'un espace économique sans barrières, d'un marché sans régulation, offrant aux compagnies multinationales un terrain de manœuvre à leur mesure. Il est convaincu que l'Europe peut contribuer à la lutte contre le chômage, même si la première responsabilité, dans ce sens, revient aux politiques nationales.

Mitterrand met l'accent sur l'Europe des cultures qui sera contraire à l'Europe des nationalismes. Pendant son dernier discours devant le Parlement européen, en 1995, il dit: “*Vous qui êtes les élus des peuples européens, vous savez que la construction de cette Europe-là ne sera possible que par l'adhésion réelle des citoyens eux-mêmes. [...] L'Europe, ai-je dit, doit rencontrer l'adhésion des citoyens. Les grands espaces ouverts peuvent engendrer un sentiment d'angoisse. Et il faut prendre garde à ne pas laisser s'installer chez nos concitoyens une sorte de*

---

<sup>21</sup> *Ibidem* 28.

<sup>22</sup> Discours de Nouvel An soutenu par le Président François Mitterrand devant les français, le 31 décembre 1994.

*refus de l'autre, de refus de l'étranger ou bien une sorte d'agoraphobie européenne. Elle existe. [...] Il faut que les Européens aiment l'Europe.[...] Car l'Europe des cultures, c'est l'Europe tout entière et s'il est un domaine où la distinction entre l'Europe de l'Union et l'Europe de l'Est n'a aucun sens c'est bien celui-là. C'est pourquoi je me permets de faire devant vous deux propositions. La première modeste mais concrète, peut être appliquée sans délai. Élargissons à l'ensemble des pays européens les manifestations européennes emblématiques de l'Europe des quinze: prix littéraires, prix de traduction, orchestres des jeunes, capitale européenne de la culture, la liste est plus longue. La seconde est plus ambitieuse. L'Union devrait, selon moi, prendre une grande initiative pour aider nos voisins de l'Est à réparer dans le domaine de la culture, notamment, les effets de l'isolement dans lequel ils ont vécu pendant un demi-siècle*<sup>23</sup>.

François Mitterrand pensait que le soin de construire l'Union ne peut pas être laissé à une petite élite, si éclairée soit-elle, car l'Europe a besoin d'un baptême démocratique. Elle doit être placée au centre du débat public afin de susciter l'adhésion consciente des citoyens. En plus, il considérait essentiel pour l'avenir de la Construction européenne de définir une identité européenne soutenue par le patrimoine européen: les universités du Moyen Age, l'épanouissement de la Renaissance, la diffusion des Lumières, les mouvements nationaux de libération, etc. Pour Mitterrand, l'émancipation des classes ouvrières et les doctrines sociales sont autant de repères communs qui ont façonné une manière d'être Européen, distincte du reste du monde et propre à légitimer l'aspiration à se rassembler. En cela, il est convaincu que l'Europe à construire ne répond à aucun modèle préexistant et qu'elle est à inventer: “*l'Europe s'est faite pas à pas*<sup>24</sup>”, disait souvent Mitterrand. Pour lui c'était plus important la pertinence du processus de construction européenne que le résultat final. Il y voit la seule façon dynamique de réduire les divergences structurelles entre pays européens.

A la fois, pour lui, l'Union européenne ne saurait se réduire à sa seule dimension économique et marchande: “*L'Europe n'est pas une manufacture. Elle n'est pas qu'un marché*” dit-il devant le Parlement européen, à Strasbourg, le 25 octobre 1989. Il considérait que, si la monnaie unique ne peut se substituer à l'unification politique, qui reste la visée ultime, elle doit en constituer le moteur et favoriser la relance d'une dynamique institutionnelle qui piétine.

---

<sup>23</sup> Discours de François Mitterrand devant le Parlement européen, Strasbourg, 17 janvier 1995.

<sup>24</sup> Quatremer, Jean, « *Mitterrand prononce à Strasbourg un vibrant plaidoyer pour la construction européenne* », Libération, le 18 Janvier 1995.

Dans le contexte des événements produits en 1989 dans l'Europe Centrale et de l'Est, François Mitterrand milite pour une structure communautaire confédérative; il n'était pas hostile au fédéralisme, mais il craignait que l'affichage prématûr d'une visée fédéraliste ne provoque, en France, une levée de boucliers et, dans le concert européen, une rupture de la part de ceux qui y sont radicalement opposés. Il faut aller vers un partage de plus en plus étendu des souverainetés, mais sans brûler les étapes, en préparant soigneusement le terrain pour chacune des avancées, comme ce sera le cas pour l'union monétaire<sup>25</sup>.

Ainsi, le 31 décembre 1989, il lance l'idée d'une **Confédération européenne** qui permettrait de rétablir la continuité de l'espace européen au sein d'une institution de dialogue et de coopération réunissant, autour du noyau communautaire, toutes les nations démocratiques du continent. Il y voit le plus sûr moyen pour l'Europe de se prémunir contre la résurgence qu'il sent monter, dans les Balkans en particulier, d'un nationalisme agressif sur les décombres de l'empire soviétique.

En plus, il pensait qu'une intégration prématûrée de nouveaux états de l'Europe de l'Est allait créer un fossé au sein de la Communauté européenne au niveau économique, politique et social entre les deux côtés de l'Europe: de l'Ouest et de l'Est.

Cependant, Mitterrand a toujours considéré que le premier devoir de la Communauté était de ne pas oublier l'autre côté de l'Europe, celle qui pendant quarante ans a été arrachée à son histoire et privée de son identité. Dans les années 80, il lance le slogan "*Dépasser Yalta*". "*Je veux qu'on s'habitue à considérer la division actuelle entre les deux parties de l'Europe comme une frontière de circonstance. Si l'histoire est multiple, la géographie est une*"<sup>26</sup> déclarait-il en 1988.

Concernant l'élargissement de la Construction européenne, Mitterrand pensait qu': "*il faut se préparer aux élargissements ultérieurs de l'Union. Il y a entre ces deux impératifs un lien logique: plus l'Europe s'affirme sur le plan interne et plus sa force d'attraction s'exerce sur les autres pays démocratiques d'Europe. Encore faut-il que ces deux objectifs ne se contredisent pas. Et c'est là la difficulté, car il faut élargir, mais il faut renforcer l'Union existante. Il ne faut*

---

<sup>25</sup> Musitelli, François, «*François Mitterrand, l'european*», Lettre no.8, Paris, Institut François Mitterrand, 2 juin 2004

<sup>26</sup> <http://www.acsode.org/PACWB/article5.html>.

*pas que l'élargissement affaiblisse ce qui existe. Et il ne faut pas que ce qui existe empêche l'élargissement de l'Union aux limites de l'Europe démocratique. C'est un problème difficile à régler*<sup>27</sup>.

En 1994, en ce qui concerne les pays de l'Europe Centrale et de l'Est désireux de devenir membres de l'Union européenne, Mitterrand pensait que ceux-ci auraient besoin de 10 à 15 années avant de pouvoir adhérer à la construction européenne. Ainsi, en ce qui concerne l'élargissement de l'Union européenne, Mitterrand pensait: “qu'il faut élargir l'Europe sans l'affaiblir”<sup>28</sup>.

Pour conclure, par François Mitterrand la voix de la France s'est faite écoutée pendant 15 ans au niveau communautaire et international, en consolidant son prestige de grand pouvoir européen. En ce qui concerne François Mitterrand, il reste dans le panthéon de grandes personnalités européennes qui, par leur contribution, ont influencé d'une façon décisive l'évolution et la dynamique européenne.

### **Bibliographie:**

#### **Livres:**

- Attali, Jacques, “*François Mitterrand asa cum a fost*”, Editions Historia, Bucureşti, 2008.
- Balladur, Eduard, “*Le pouvoir ne se partage pas- Conversations avec François Mitterrand*”, Paris, Ed. Fayard, 2009.
- Loïck, Benoit, “*François Mitterrand et la défense nucléaire de l'Europe*”, Revue de Recherche Juridique– Droit Prospectif, 1998.
- Guigou, Elisabeth, *Le Traité de Maastricht: la dernière grande œuvre européenne de François Mitterrand*, Lettre n° 8, Paris, Institut François Mitterrand, le 2 juin 2004.
- Joxe, Pierre, Mitterrand François, “*Un socialisme du possible*”, Paris, Editions Le Seuil, 1970.
- Lalumière, Catherine, *Les rivages de l'Union*, Lettre n° 8, Paris, Institut François Mitterrand, le 2 juin 2004.
- Mitterrand, François, “*Ma part de vérité*”, Paris, Editions Fayard, 1969.

---

<sup>27</sup> Discours de François Mitterrand devant le Parlement européen, Strasbourg, 17 janvier 1995.

<sup>28</sup> “*Ce îi vom spune noi, europenii, lui Obama?*” en Interviu cu Hubert Védrine, Adevarul, 29 mai 2009.

Musitelli, François, “*François Mitterrand, l'euro-péen*”, Lettre no.8, Paris, Institut François Mitterrand, 2 juin 2004.

Quatremer, Jean, “*Mitterrand prononce à Strasbourg un vibrant plaidoyer pour la construction européenne*”, Libération, le 18 Janvier 1995.

**Discours:**

Allocution de François Mitterrand au I.H.E.D.N. (Institut des Hautes Etudes de Défense Nationale), le 11 octobre 1988, en *Défense Nationale*, novembre 1988.

Discours de Nouvel An soutenu par le Président François Mitterrand devant les français, le 31 décembre 1994.

Discours de François Mitterrand devant le Parlement européen, Strasbourg, 17 janvier 1995.

Discours de François Mitterrand au sein de l’Institut de Sciences Politiques de Paris, 1992, cité en *Onze discours sur l'Europe*, Naples, Editions Vivarium, 1996.

## **THE MANY FACES OF EUROPEANNESS. TRENDS IN LOCAL, NATIONAL, AND EUROPEAN IDENTIFICATIONS**

*LECTURER DR. GEORGIANA CICEO*

Babeş-Bolyai University

Cluj-Napoca, Romania

### ***Abstract***

*The gradual advance of the European integration process has generated vivid discussions on what defines the Europeanness and what its main features are. They were meant to bring useful insights to the wider ongoing debates with regard to who is entitled to embark in this process or what defines in a European context a certain type of political action. They attempted to move beyond the sheer political and economic considerations and to go to the core of the whole effort of building a European Union based on the intertwined processes of integration and enlargement. As such, they were closely entangled with those concerning the core values that define a European identity.*

***Key words:*** European Union, Europeanness, European identity

After years of permissive consensus that helped bringing the European unification project farther and farther in economic and political terms, the question of what the cultural dimension of the whole European political project really is has come to attract a lot of interest. Although economic prosperity and political stability were put on the forefront by the founding fathers of the EU, over the years it became clear that a lack of agreement on common cultural values results in a reduced support for further European integration and reinforces a certain reluctance vis-à-vis the transfer of allegiances to central European institutions<sup>29</sup> deepening an already sensitive issue on the agenda of European integration namely that of the democratic legitimacy

---

<sup>29</sup> S. Zetterholm, ‘Why is cultural diversity a political problem? A discussion of cultural barriers to political integration’ in: Staffan Zetterholm (ed.), *National Cultures and European Integration. Exploratory Essays on Cultural Diversity and Common Policies*, Oxford: Berg, 1994, p. 79-80.

of the whole project. It is now more than ever considered that the common currency needs to be accompanied by a ‘corresponding “cultural currency” that could help the European nations and their citizens to identify culturally’ in the already existent economic and political area, so that they can have an ‘orientation’ in the ‘growing Europeanization of their world’<sup>30</sup>. In fact, the main motivation behind any concerted effort to bring cultural unification in line with the already advanced economic and political unification has always been connected with the necessity of instilling a European consciousness or a European identity into European people’s minds. As identities are cultural constructions, this was regarded as an absolutely necessary precondition for bringing about the goal of an ever closer union among the peoples of Europe as enshrined in the Treaty of Maastricht and reinforced by the Treaty of Lisbon. Moreover, the existence of a European identity was supposed to increase the legitimacy of the European Union as a polity and help binding together its citizens.

But from its onset, the vertical deepening of the European integration went hand in hand with the horizontal process of enlargement which brought additional problems to the already difficult task of building a common European identity. The present article attempts to explore to what extent the last rounds of European enlargement have put to a test the very idea of European identity. Proceeding from the European motto of unity in diversity we intend to ask how much diversity the European Union can bear without diluting its own rationale. In doing so, we start by discussing the main features of the European identity as they came to be defined over the years. Thereafter we come to discuss how the enlargement to the East was approached from the perspective of the post-modern discussions on the European identity. We then take the discussion a step further in order to evaluate how far the concept of Europeanness came to be stretched in the context of Eastern European enlargement and how far these European values became embraced by the new members as this would be of utmost importance for the strengthening of the whole European construction.

## **What shapes Europeanness?**

---

<sup>30</sup> J. Rüsen, ”Cultural Currency” in: Sharon Macdonald (ed.), *Approaches to European Historical Consciousness. Approaches and Provocations*, Hamburg: Körber Stiftung, 2000, p. 76.

Over the years wide areas of convergence have been developed between a European and a European Union identity. Despite the fact that the EU identity cannot surpass the European identity it is obvious that the former contributed greatly to the reinforcement of the latter by establishing clear criteria for what it means to be regarded as European. A number of norms with deep roots in the common cultural heritage of ancient Greece, Christianity and Europe of Enlightenment, connected in a way or another with the ideal of liberal democracy and embedded in the domestic structures of the member states came to define European identity. They represent the main features of European secularism and were embodied as such in the Copenhagen criteria and Article 2 of the Consolidated Version of the Treaty on the European Union: the respect for human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, the rule of law and respect for human rights, including the rights of the persons belonging to minorities. This set of values came to be utilized as a compatibility test for all those aiming to acquire membership status as from the very beginning the European Community/Union was not conceived as a construction with a fixed geometry. According to Article 49, Title VI of the Consolidated Version of the Treaty on the European Union, ‘any European State which respects the values referred to in Article 2 and is committed to promoting them may apply to become a member of the Union’. The underlying understanding would be that only states belonging to the European continent and sharing the same set of norms and values may be taken into consideration. European Union’s faithfulness to these values reinforced its image as a normative power according to a formula put forward by Jan Manners.

The belonging to a common set of values does not mean in any way however that the European Union is trying to deprive its members from their cultural diversity. On the contrary, the Union takes pride in being founded on the multicultural idea of ‘unity in diversity’. Despite the inherent tensions contained in this idea such as those existing between the European and national identity it is by now widely agreed upon that these extremes do not mutually rule out each other as individuals are at the same time members of different social groups and hold multiple identities. According to Thomas Risse, the relation between European and national identities resemble the image of a ‘marble cake’ as various components of an individual’s identity cannot be neatly separated on different levels<sup>31</sup>. This relationship is further complicated

---

<sup>31</sup> T. Risse, ‘Neofunctionalism, European Identity and the Puzzles of European Integration’ in: *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 12, No. 2, 2005, p. 296.

by the fact that the European identity has always been a work in progress. As a consequence, European identity came to signify different things to different people at different points in time. One possible explanation resides in the very ‘cultural and social topography’ of Europe, which is ‘fragmented, lacking clear unifying principles and shared experiences around which people could identify’<sup>32</sup>. Under these circumstances the European identity can be defined in a wide variety of keys between an exclusivist and an inclusivist one<sup>33</sup>. In an exclusivist perspective European identity could only appear slowly through the formation of shared memories and traditions, myths and symbols similar to those that helped the formation of nation states<sup>34</sup>. This would require a high degree of compatibility between popular traditions, values, symbols and experiences of those belonging to this project the more difficult to be reached with every new increase in the number of members. At the other end of this continuum we find those who interpret the European identity in an inclusivist manner. For them, the only way to develop a European identity ‘might well be to turn our backs to European history and develop a community that is oriented toward the future’<sup>35</sup>. This post-national construction of a European identity will also require a ‘new sense of belonging’, based not on shared memories, but on ‘sedimented experiences, cultural forms which are associated however loosely with a place called Europe’<sup>36</sup>. This interpretation posits also that only by means of a ‘continuous redefinition of itself’ not against the other<sup>37</sup>, but through relationships with others<sup>38</sup> Europe can preserve ‘its celebrated diversity, its openness and inclusiveness’<sup>39</sup>.

---

<sup>32</sup> P. Van Ham, *European Integration and the Postmodern Condition: Governance, Democracy, Identity*, London: Routledge, 2001, p. 59.

<sup>33</sup> L. Hooghe and G. Marks, ‘Does identity or economic rationality drive public opinion on European integration?’ in: *Political Science and Politics*, Vol. 37, No. 3, 2004, p. 415-420.

<sup>34</sup> A. D. Smith, *Nations and Nationalism in a Global Era*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995, p. 139-140.

<sup>35</sup> P. Van Ham, op. cit., p. 70.

<sup>36</sup> Ibidem, p. 72.

<sup>37</sup> See for instance I. B. Neumann, ‘Self and Other in International Relations’ in: *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 2, No. 2, 1996, p. 139-174 and J. T. Checkel and P. J. Katzenstein, ‘The Politicization of European Identities’ in: Jeffrey T. Checkel and Peter J. Katzenstein, *European Identity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009, p. 8.

<sup>38</sup> See P. Van Ham, op. cit., 2001, p. 72 and J. H. H. Weiler, *Constituția Europei*, Iași: Polirom, 2009, p. 256-257.

<sup>39</sup> P. Van Ham, op. cit., p. 72.

The present essay will try to evaluate based on the above-mentioned considerations how the latest round of enlargement influenced the ongoing discussions on European identity. In doing so we proceed from the assumption that the European identity in-the-making is not going to supersede national identities and that although the others matter in terms of forging an identity they can bring useful inputs as long they share the members' fundamental values.

### **The Europeanness and the accession of the Central and Eastern European states**

After the Cold War years when a number of statements of policy-makers from the member states governments or European institutions while deplored the division of the continent and the absence of Central and Eastern European states from the European project, asserted that, without them, the project remain incomplete, a sense of moral responsibility seemed to prevail in the highly emotional atmosphere of the beginning of the '90s, only to be reinforced in the years to come. This was best expressed by Joshka Fischer when saying that enlargement is not just a supreme national interest of Germany, but a moral obligation due to the fact that 'following the collapse of Soviet Union the EU had to open to the East otherwise the very idea of European integration would have undermined itself and eventually self-destructed'<sup>40</sup>. In the face of the events of 1989, the European Community decided to assume a leading role in relation to the CEE states. This idea was best expressed in the Declaration of the European Council held in Strasbourg in December 1989: 'the Community remains the foundation of a new European architecture'. The idea was enthusiastically greeted by the CEE states who insisted on the idea of their 'return to Europe' which from a rationalist perspective may sound as a hollow construction for advancing the cause of EU membership, but from a socio-constructivist perspective involved a natural right to accession based on moral arguments in favor of the enlargement. However, the solutions concerning how to handle the relations with the CEE countries evolved only gradually from the beginning of '90s to the end of the century – from avoiding the issue of enlargement to increasingly accepting it on the price of its own

---

<sup>40</sup> J. Fischer, 'From Confederacy to Federation – Thoughts on the Finality of European Integration', Speech on 12 May 2001 at Humboldt University Berlin on [http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/8\\_suche/index.htm](http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/8_suche/index.htm) [accessed 20 March 2002].

embarking on a difficult process of internal reform. By then the most outstanding problems of the early '90s had been settled: the reunification of Germany, the ratification of the Maastricht Treaty and the fate of the financial deal proposed by Jacques Delors.

The decision on Eastern enlargement was favored by the gradual development of idea of *shared values* understood not only as collective identity constructions about Europe, but at the same time as common cultural traditions and historical experiences, common development of distinct Western constitutional and political principles, a definite sense about what constitutes Europe's 'others' that started to forge their way and to shape the discussion on Eastern enlargement. This *shared values* paved the way to the criteria laid down at Copenhagen seen as a precondition for embarking on the process of accession, whereas the *acquis* came to provide the normative basis for this latest round of enlargement. The criteria bear the imprint of the shared foundation of the European culture and Western Christianity. They proceed from the assumption that liberal human rights are the fundamental values of this community. In the domestic sphere they are translated in a social and political order based on social pluralism, the rule of law, democratic political participation and representation as well as private property and a market based economy<sup>41</sup>.

European Union proved to be a powerful magnet shaping the aspirations of candidate countries<sup>42</sup>. As far as the CEE states were concerned the enlargement set in motion a very complex and profound set of adjustment processes with the aim of socializing applicant countries into the dominant mores and values of the EU thus enabling them to achieve 'democracy by convergence'. In order to accurately evaluate these processes EU has developed a policy of *democratic conditionality*<sup>43</sup>. This conditionality tool set hurdles in the accession process of the CEE countries. The underlying idea would be to induce them to comply with specific standards. These hurdles originate in the Copenhagen criteria that were further elaborated on in the European Commission's *avis* of 1997 and from 1998 in the annual regular reports on candidate

---

<sup>41</sup> G. Ciceo, 'The Merits and Limits of Socio-Constructivism in Explaining Eastern Enlargement' in: *Studia Europaea*, Vol. L, No. 4, 2005, p. 97-8.

<sup>42</sup> H. Wallace, 'EU Enlargement: A Neglected Subject' in: Cowles, Maria Green and Michael Smith (ed.), *The State of the European Union: Risks, Reform, Resistance, and Revival*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000, p. 151.

<sup>43</sup> G. Pridham, 'Enlargement and Consolidating Democracy in Post-Communist States – Formality and Reality' in: *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 40, No. 3, 2002, p. 953-973.

countries. They were also tied with EU programs of financial assistance, the accession partnerships, twinning for the secondment of pre-accession advisers from the Member States' civil services to the applicant countries<sup>44</sup> in return for the compliance with the imposed standards. As gaining international approval is an important way of legitimizing political choices in the post-communist context, the conditionality tool proved to be a very powerful one in determining the CEE states to embrace the European values. Aware of this reality, EU has used this policy of *democratic conditionality* in different ways: timing the accession process (starting of negotiations, determining the date of full accession), ranking the applicant's overall progress, benchmarking in specific policy areas, providing examples of best practice, assessing the applicant's administrative capacity and institutional ability to implement and enforce the *acquis communautaire*<sup>45</sup>.

Accession to the EU by new members has generally been also part of a broader process of Europeanization<sup>46</sup> that went hand in hand with the process of domestic transformation of their communist regimes and rigid command economies in democratic pluralistic regimes with market economies. As the idea of enlargement gained momentum the two processes - the regime transformation and advancing towards full-EU membership – became increasingly not just simply parallel, but deeply interconnected. They came to be so intricately linked that they depended on each other and even more they fed each other<sup>47</sup>. The reform process of the Central

---

<sup>44</sup> Their task was to help the CEE countries in importing know-how on the implementation of the *acquis* to national and local administrations and the whole pre-accession strategy.

<sup>45</sup> H. Grabbe, 'How does Europeanization affect CEE governance? Conditionality, diffusion and diversity' in: *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 8, No. 6, 2001, p. 1028-9.

<sup>46</sup> By Europeanization it was usually understood a two-way interaction between the 'national' and the 'European' level, with Member States assuming the role of both contributors and products of European integration. See D. Papadimitriou and D. Phinnemore, 'Europeanization, Conditionality and Domestic Change: The Twinning Exercise and Administrative Reform in Romania' in: *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 42, No. 3, 2004, p. 621. The Europeanization alters the process of domestic politics within individual countries leading to a convergence of politics of member states. This Europeanization – it is conventionally assumed - is especially pronounced in countries that are already member states of the European Union. However, a process of Europeanization takes place already when the candidate countries start to incorporate the *acquis* into their own legislation. See G. Pridham, op. cit., p. 953-5.

<sup>47</sup> W. Matli and T. Plümper, 'The Internal Value of External Options – How the EU Shapes the Scope of Regulatory Reforms in Transition Countries' in: *European Union Politics* Vol. 5, No. 3, 2004, p. 307-8.

and Eastern European countries has taken thus a particular form due to the foreign policy decision they made in favor of accession to the EU and the necessity to meet the Copenhagen criteria. They had anything else to do but to align themselves to the standards imposed on them by the European Union. What it remained very debatable from this perspective was the extent to which the EU was able to impact on the reform of the CEE states. It is already commonly agreed that its effectiveness depended on the domestic political costs of compliance and on governmental cost-benefit calculations<sup>48</sup>. This raised fears that the imperfect shape of the institutions created in the CEE states would add to the already significant democratic deficit of the EU.

However, it was not only the preparedness of the candidate countries that mattered for the enlargement. Also the absorption or extension capacity of the EU turned to be an essential precondition for this process, as EU became increasingly aware that it lacks the institutional infrastructure for accommodating the CEE countries<sup>49</sup>. It was obvious from the very beginning that the reforms would have to include the whole European construction – from institutions to finance, agricultural policy and structural funds. CEE states played thus even before their full accession a central role in any political calculations on the future shape of the Union. They were in the background of all the difficult negotiations that took place on the occasion of the Intergovernmental Conferences from Amsterdam (1997) and Nizza (2000), of any bargain on Agenda 2000 and of the discussions on the future Constitution of the European Union.

In sum, the latest rounds of enlargement were primarily centered on the constitutive values of the European political order, reflecting a common identity and manifested as such in the Copenhagen criteria. In comparison with the previous rounds of enlargement when the political and economic factors played key roles in the decision making process, this time the driving forces were generated by the moral responsibility of bringing the other Europe within a comprehensive European order and the necessity of adapting the countries of the region to the

---

<sup>48</sup> F. Schimmelfennig, S. Engert and H. Knobel, ‘Costs, Commitment and Compliance: The Impact of EU Democratic Conditionality on Latvia, Slovakia and Turkey’ in: *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 41, No. 3, 2003, p. 495-6.

<sup>49</sup> G. Voruba, ‘Debate on the enlargement of the European Union. The enlargement crisis of the European Union: limits of the dialectics of integration and expansion’ in: *Journal of European Social Policy*, Vol. 13, No. 1, 2003, p. 45.

core values of the European Union<sup>50</sup> given their long exposure to a set of values fundamentally different from the one accepted in Western Europe. What is also important to be mentioned in this context is the fact that in the case of the latest rounds of enlargement we speak about the accession of countries whose belonging to Europe could not be denied but raised fears concerning a possible altering of the core European values. Their admission triggered an inward looking search for defining what is defining for those belonging to the European family, what differentiates them from others. These searches were further intensified by the post-modern climate in which they took place. So, the admission into the European club of the CEE countries bore some particular features that altered the previous pondering on enlargement and left durable imprints for future discussions on this issue as it led to an *enlargement fatigue* and resilient question marks concerning the absorption capacity of the European Union.

## Conclusions

In the post-modern nowadays' atmosphere, Europeanness tends to play an ever-increasing role in the way in which the peoples of Europe evaluate the future shape of the continent or come to offer their support for the European Union. However, the concept did not manage to become sufficiently elaborated as to afford its transformation into an analytical tool able to provide satisfactory answers to questions as to who deserves to be brought in and who needs to be left out. Member countries need also to agree to the fact that identity-related factors despite their high degree of sensitivity in the eyes of the public opinion represent no official accession criterion and are open to biased assessments on further enlargements. The narrower the understanding of identity, the lower are the chances of accepting any new members into the club. Especially in the context of the latest rounds of enlargement because of an extensive focus on identity with its still indefinite contours, the discussion on Europeanness has become

---

<sup>50</sup> Frank Schimmelfennig (1999: 1-11) wrote under these circumstances about a ‘double puzzle’ of the Eastern Enlargement given the fact that neither a rationalist power-based analysis nor a neoliberal interest-based study cannot explain how the countries of the European Union came to embark themselves in a process whose costs exceeded by far its benefits and left socio-constructivism as the better equipped theoretical framework to explain this round of enlargement.

increasingly politicized<sup>51</sup>. In comparison to the Cold War period, when economic and political considerations prevailed in any discussion concerning the enlargement, nowadays the discussion is very much centered on identity-related issues.

In the case of the Central and Eastern European countries who find themselves within the natural boundaries of Europe and whose history is tightly intertwined with that of Western Europe it would have been impossible to deny them a European identity. This would have meant also a departure from all those ideals it is supposed that the Europeans put up with throughout the entire period of the Cold War. Despite deep concerns with regard to their economic backwardness and deficiency of their democratic institutions the underlying consensus was that these countries just like Greece, Spain and Portugal before them need help for overcoming their past and establishing themselves as full-fledged members of the European Union. As a consequence the Copenhagen criteria were interpreted in a relaxed manner and the economic and political factors were played down in all the deliberations on their enlargement. Their European vocation and the Western feelings of responsibility for these countries appeared to have mattered most. The CEE countries were however induced to comply with the European standards as they had to adopt the entire *acquis communautaire* without having any power to influence it. Irrespective of their diligence in adopting the European standards the accession of the CEE countries intensified the debates on Europeaness and set in a feeling of *enlargement fatigue* with long-term effects on any future enlargements.

## Bibliography

Anastasakis, Othon, ‘The Europeanization of the Balkans’ in: *The Brown Journal of World Affairs*, Vol. XII, No. 1, 2005, p. 77-88.

Checkel, Jeffrey T. and Peter J. Katzenstein, ‘The Politicization of European Identities’ in: Jeffrey T. Checkel and Peter J. Katzenstein, *European Identity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009, p. 1-28.

Ciceo, Georgiana, ,The Merits and Limits of Socio-Constructivism in Explaining Eastern Enlargement’ in: *Studia Europaea*, Vol. L, No. 4, 2005, p. 91-105.

---

<sup>51</sup> J. T. Checkel and P. J. Katzenstein, op. cit., p. 11.

Fischer, Joschka, ‘From Confederacy to Federation – Thoughts on the Finality of European Integration’, Speech on 12 May 2001 at Humboldt University Berlin on [http://www.auswaertigesamt.de/8\\_suche/index.htm](http://www.auswaertigesamt.de/8_suche/index.htm) [accessed 20 March 2002].

Gehler, Michael, *Europa: Ideen, Institutionen, Vereinigung*, München: Olzog, 2005.

Grabbe, Heather, ‘How does Europeanization affect CEE governance? Conditionality, diffusion and diversity’ in: *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 8, No. 6, 2001, p. 1013-31.

Hedetoft, Ulf, ‘National identities and European integration “from below”: bringing people back in’ in: *Journal of European Integration*, Vol. 18, No. 1, 1994, p. 1-28.

Hooghe, Liesbet and Garry Marks, ‘Does identity or economic rationality drive public opinion on European integration?’ in: *Political Science and Politics*, Vol. 37, No. 3, 2004, p. 415-420.

Kumm, Mathias, ‘The Idea of Thick Constitutional Patriotism for the Role and Structure of European Legal History’ in: *German Law Journal*, Articles: Special Issue Confronting Memories – Constitutionalization after Bitter Experiences, Vol. 6, No. 2, 2005, p. 319-354.

Matli, Walter and Thomas Plümper, ‘The Internal Value of External Options – How the EU Shapes the Scope of Regulatory Reforms in Transition Countries’ in: *European Union Politics* Vol. 5, No. 3, 2004, p. 307-30.

Morin, Edgar, *Gândind Europa*, Iași: Institutul European, 2007.

Neumann, Iver B., ‘Self and Other in International Relations’ in: *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 2, No. 2, 1996, 139-174.

Neumann, Iver B., *Uses of the Other. “The East” in European Identity Formation*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.

O’Neill, Michael, ‘Explaining the ‘Crisis’ Over the European Constitution: An International Debate’ in: O’Neill, Michael and Nicolae Păun, *Europe’s Constitutional Crisis: International Perspectives*, 2-nd edition, Cluj-Napoca: EFES, 2008, p. 7-18.

Papadimitrou, Dimitris and David Phinnemore, ,Europeanization, Conditionality and Domestic Change:The Twinning Exercise and Administrative Reform in Romania’ in: *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 42, No. 3, 2004, p. 619-39.

Păun, Nicolae, Ciprian-Adrian Păun and Georgiana Ciceo, *Europa Unită, Europa Noastră*, Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitara Clujeană, 2003.

Păun, Nicolae, ‘Europe’s Crisis – A Crisis of Values?’ Debate’ in: O’Neill, Michael and Nicolae Păun, *Europe’s Constitutional Crisis: International Perspectives*, 2-nd edition, Cluj-Napoca: EFES, 2008, p. 91-116.

Pridham, Geoffrey, ‘Enlargement and Consolidating Democracy in Post-Communist States – Formality and Reality’ in: *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 40, No. 3, 2002, p. 953-73.

Risse, Thomas, ‘Neofunctionalism, European Identity and the Puzzles of European Integration’ in: *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 12, No. 2, 2005, p. 291-305.

Rüsen, Jörn, ””Cultural Currency”” in: Sharon Macdonald (ed.), *Approaches to European Historical Consciousness. Approaches and Provocations*, Hamburg: Körber Stiftung, 2000, p. 75-85.

Schimmelfennig, Frank, ‘The Double Puzzle of EU Enlargement: Liberal Norms, Rhetorical Action, and the Decision to Expand to the East’ in: ARENA, Working Paper 99/15 (Oslo: Universitetet i Oslo), 1999 on <file:///C/Documents%20and%20Settings/user.USER-O3...20The%20Double%20Puzzle%20of%20EU%20Enlargment.htm> (1 of 68) [accessed 08.11.2004].

Schimmelfennig, Frank, Stephen Engert and Heiko Knobel, ‘Costs, Commitment and Compliance: The Impact of EU Democratic Conditionality on Latvia, Slovakia and Turkey’ in: *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 41, No. 3, 2003, p. 495-518.

Smith, Anthony D., *Nations and Nationalism in a Global Era*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995.

Van Ham, Peter, *European Integration and the Postmodern Condition: Governance, Democracy, Identity*, London: Routledge, 2001.

Voruba, Georg, ‘Debate on the enlargement of the European Union. The enlargement crisis of the European Union: limits of the dialectics of integration and expansion’ in: *Journal of European Social Policy*, Vol. 13, No. 1, 2003, p. 35-62.

Wallace, Helen, ‘EU Enlargement: A Neglected Subject’ in: Cowles, Maria Green and Michael Smith (ed.), *The State of the European Union: Risks, Reform, Resistance, and Revival*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000, p. 149-163.

Weiler, Joseph H.H., *Constituția Europei*, Iași: Polirom, 2009 [Romanian Translation of the 1999 edition].

Western European Union, European Security and Defence Assembly, *European security and enlargement:shifts in public opinion*, Report A/2054, 3 December 2009 on

[http://www.assemblyweu.org/en/documents/sessions\\_ordinaires/rpt/2009/2054.pdf](http://www.assemblyweu.org/en/documents/sessions_ordinaires/rpt/2009/2054.pdf) [accessed 20 March 2010].

Zetterholm, Staffan, 'Why is cultural diversity a political problem? A discussion of cultural barriers to political integration' in: Staffan Zetterholm (ed.), *National Cultures and European Integration. Exploratory Essays on Cultural Diversity and Common Policies*, Oxford: Berg, 1994, p.65-82

## **"European ideas in the mirror of the inter-war Romanian generation"**<sup>52</sup>

**Dr. Dorin Dobra**

Faculty of European Studies, UBB

Email: dorin\_dobra@yahoo.com

**Keywords:** *Inter-war ideologies, traditionalism – modernism, Romanian synchronization, Europeanism*

### **Abstract. European ideas in the inter-war Romanian generation**

*In his theory of synchronism published in the mid 20s, E. Lovinescu actually acknowledges that the entire inter-war ideological debate is an accurate reverberation of the cultural clashes in Western Europe. The phenomenon proves once again that in that specific period of time, Romania was tightly connected to the general flow of European ideas. Moreover, Lovinescu's theory itself corroborates the synchronism uttered in the principle, the construct and the theses that he was asseverating.*

Outlooked beyond the synchronism that Lovinescu imposed as a sociological theory, the Romanian cultural surrounding, in which he publishes his work about "The history of the modern Romanian civilization", is tightly connected to the European culture. The ideological phenomena that occur in our country are radiographed retorts of the European ones, so that, the

---

<sup>52</sup> The writing renders a subchapter from the doctor's degree thesis, publicly defended in December 2009;

main movements of this type register the accurate reverberations of the Western Europe. The premises were the same for Romania, too, that means, a century of rationality and technique and then ,a world war which subverted all the beliefs and all the constructions imposed by the human reason. “The great values of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, which humanity conquered after 1789, through an amazing strain, seemed to be swept off for good.”<sup>53</sup> After Oswald Spengler announced the beginning of “Western Europe’s decline” and the joining to civilization in culture’s detriment, Europe was looking for spiritual outlets in the Oriental cultures.

But all the ideological phenomena derived from a special century that humanity hadn’t had before, the 19<sup>th</sup> century, in which society discovered, once with the French Revolution, values that brought it forward and gave it the right to rediscover itself. Liberty, democracy, equality, were all, one by one, wishes to which humanity could only dream of after it had opposed itself to the Renaissance spirit that idealized the history and the past and less the future of mankind. “Entire generations of artists, poets, scientists, or mere dilettantes raise in the Antiquity’s cult, pretending to exactly reproduce the forms of ancient life, looked in its ideals and realities as well.”<sup>54</sup> But, at the half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, the “modernists”, respectively those who were looking to rediscover the strength of originality and the ability to predict the future, started rising against such a vision. Here and now, the great fight between traditionalism and modernism that will govern the human ideology is sketching. “The domain that “modernists” laid down was the Cartesian idea of progress; since, under all means, humanity does not stand on, it is inadmissible, that only in art, the present does not represent, in the main, a progress towards Antiquity.”<sup>55</sup>

Against such a background of past idealization and so of the ancient forms in art (which was also a reaction against Middle Age), the spade age of the great revolution from 1789 is materializing. “Between 1740 and 1789, the spirit of the time is characterized by a reaction against tradition, under all its forms, in state, church, philosophy, economy, politics, justice, education.”<sup>56</sup> The French people and then the whole Europe rise against tradition and tyranny,

---

<sup>53</sup>Zigu Ornea, *Traditionism și modernitate în deceniul al III-lea*, 1980, Ed. Eminescu, București, p. 238;

<sup>54</sup>E. Lovinescu, *Istoria literaturii române contemporane*, VI, 1929, Ed. Ancora, București, p. 102-103;

<sup>55</sup>Ibidem, p. 111;

<sup>56</sup>Idem, *Istoria civilizației române moderne*, 1997, Ed. Minerva, București, p. 265;

offering to the world new beginnings and outlooks from the mankind's fulfillment perspective. E. Lovinescu, in his turn, puts the event from 1789 in the centre of his synchronistic theory, considering it a moment that reverberates in the entire European culture. "The French Revolution brought us the principles under which the contemporary life is developing."<sup>57</sup>

New values, about which, mankind, through its important representatives, had not spoken until then, started to appear. Concepts like democracy and liberty were introduced by J.J. Rousseau. "It is not right for laws to be executed by those who elaborated them, or the sovereign people to estrange its will from the general causes and waste it in the particular ones."<sup>58</sup>

The entrance in the great 19<sup>th</sup> century is made under the imperative of the Cartesian rationalism and rationality. The belief that man can rule the world through the power of his mind outlines the entire "modernist" ideology from that age. According to this one, man can rationalize everything, from any kind of resources to the social institutions, with the help of human mind put in the service of technology. Being a reaction against the ancient society, the revolutionary movement creates new institutions to serve its precepts: liberty, equality, democracy, etc. The results of the Industrial Revolution, that profoundly changes the vision of the human being in relation to the nature and resources that it can offer, are added to this ideology. The revolution is set up, step by step, in Europe's life and thus, it becomes the dogma that rules the whole mankind. Modernity and modernization are assumed concepts in all countries, so that the ancient social order and its defenders transform themselves in reaction against revolutionism. From this point, all the ideologies about traditionalism and modernism, which would confront in the inter-war period in Europe, will sketch up.

Returning to the world of the 19<sup>th</sup> century ideologies, we have to stress another important aspect for the inter-war sociology: in the century in which sociology became a science, Biology was the main fundament of studying the social life. More exactly, the main social theories (traditionalism and revolutionism) emerged from biological theories that explained the evolution of the human species. And this fact is well instituted by Lovinescu, who announces it explicitly when he proves scientifically his theory. "The theory of social transformation through organic

---

<sup>57</sup>Ibidem, loc.cit.;

<sup>58</sup>Jean Jacques Rousseau, *Contractul social*, 2000, Ed. Monden, Bucureşti, p. 79;

rise has always had a support in the biologic transformation. According to Lamarck and then to Darwin and Lamarck's disciples, the existing polymorphism of species is explained through slow, progressive and imperceptible changes.<sup>59</sup> In other words, the sociologic traditionalism emerged from the Darwinist theory of "the evolution of species" which scientifically proved the slow, continual and without sudden changes social evolution, whose theoretician was E. Durkheim. Lovinescu also attentively points out this fact, precisely to give importance to his theory. This evolutionism had, during that period, opponents that tried to prove the sudden changes from society through examples from Biology. "An age ago, E. Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire was the opponent of Lamarck's theories; studying the animals and the plants brought from the Egypt's graves, he acknowledged their identity. Thus, he opposed the theory of species' transmutation through sudden variations to the theory of progressive transformation."<sup>60</sup> In this context, Lovinescu presents his theoretical source of supporting his social synchronism: the Dutch professor Hugo de Vries and his theory of "sudden mutations". Without dwelling on it, we only stress the ideological lines and the connections between Biology and Sociology. The first one, starting from Lamarck and Darwin and being adopted by Durkheim and his sociological school, defended the social evolutionism and, implicitly, the traditionalism, from an ideological point of view. The second one, starting from Biology, from Saint-Hilaire and Hugo de Vries, adopted by Gabriel Tarde in sociology and Lovinescu in the theory of imitation, asserted the possibility and the existence of the revolute transformations even in Biology and especially in society and which, ideologically speaking, substantiated the 19<sup>th</sup> century's modernism.

In such a debate with profound implications and scientifically proved origins, the dispute evolutionism-revolutionism acquired new interpretations that intensified especially after the First World War and were rediscovered in antinomies like „Orient-Occident”, „conservatorism-modernism”, culture and civilization”. And because all of them found their origins in the 19th century, we start from the aspect that Zigu Ornea generically called „Reason and Rationalism arraigned”. "Everything seemed (and it was!) in dissolution, instability and provisional state. (...) The main guilty person was immediately identified. Reason and especially rationalism that triumphed in the 19<sup>th</sup> century were considered dangerous enemies. (...) It was, pure and simple,

---

<sup>59</sup> E. Lovinescu, op.cit., p. 300;

<sup>60</sup> Ibidem, loc cit.;

about a total rejection and a furious chasing.”<sup>61</sup> In an atmosphere of deep disappointment of mankind towards itself, also reinforced by the results of the last World War, the trust in reason, that Descartes had promoted, alarmingly diminished. Statements like “...standing again our spirit towards all the objects that I have ever seen, I dare to assert that I have not found anything that cannot be easily explained by the principles I had discovered.”<sup>62</sup> became obsolete as long as the same reason was not able to stop the horrible things that the world had brought. It seemed that the spirit itself, evolved through science into technical progresses, is to blame about the negative stage that mankind had reached. Actually, it is about a lack of mankind’s spirit, about its inclinations towards technique and civilization, neglecting the true spirituality and culture and allowing reason and rationality to have too much power over the world.

As a result of world and society’s rationalization, democracy was also blamed for mankind’s results. And in his famous writing “The Social Contract”, J.J. Rousseau warned about its risks. “I will add that there is no government so exposed to civil wars and agitations as the democratic and people’s one, because there is no government that seeks so much and so perseveringly to change its form and that asks more watch and more courage to hold out. (...) Only a nation of gods would govern itself democratically- because such a perfect government does not suit people.”<sup>63</sup> The prophecies of the father of the democratic revolution became true, after only one century, and the phenomenon was well intercepted and intuited even in the postwar Romania. “There is no wonder that democracy, thanks to its progress in so many areas, was, as a political system or as simple ideal, rising in the entire 19<sup>th</sup> century.”<sup>64</sup>, said the Romanian philosopher P.P. Negulescu. In a piece of writing with a suggestive title for the problems of the time, (opened by Oswald Spengler with “The Occident’s decline”), the philosopher reached the same conclusion, generalized at the level of postwar ideologies. “And yet, only few years after the settlement of peace (after the First World War), democracy suddenly passed through a critical period, not only unexpected, but also very serious.”<sup>65</sup>, P.P. Negulescu wrote, after a laborious work concerning the setting up of democracy in the whole Europe in the

---

<sup>61</sup>Zigu Ornea, op.cit., p.239;

<sup>62</sup> René Descartes, *Discurs despre metoda...*, 1990, Ed. Academiei Române, Bucureşti, p. 148;

<sup>63</sup> J.J. Rousseau, op.cit., p. 80;

<sup>64</sup> Petre P. Negulescu, *Destinul omenirii*, 1994, Ed. Nemira, Bucureşti, p. 141;

<sup>65</sup> Ibidem, p. 142;

19<sup>th</sup> century. “It was not only the fact that it was accused of the worst things, in the light of which it seemed a political system that brought misfortune to peoples, but it was also replaced, in some states, with authoritarian forms of government, which could have been considered as bringing to life the old monarchic absolutism, in all it had essential.”<sup>66</sup>

The important problems of the inter-war period are structured on this generalized atmosphere that was felt in all corners of Europe. First of all, the intellectual Europeanists seek to rectify the mistake of excessive rationalization and neglecting of spirit, as Petre Andrei observed in his sociology course. “Even if in certain ages the spirit seems obsolete, neglected or compressed because of other forces, one must not believe that it had been annihilated.”<sup>67</sup>, said the sociologist about the age that mankind has just passed. The problem was still at the reason’s level, which transformed into technique exclusively the humanity that seemed to dominate the world. “It is true that all spirit’s creatures, even those who are likely to have a very subjective, ideal and immaterial character are materialized in certain objective forms, still living after their creator has disappeared.”<sup>68</sup> Even so, it is the power of word that stands beyond all the results of science and technique, the Romanian sociologist confirmed. “If, in this technical-practical atmosphere, the spirit seems dominated, subordinated and suppressed, it is not a proof of technique’s autonomy, but, it exemplifies, at the most, the disequilibrium and the disorientation state we are living in.”<sup>69</sup>

Thus, the rehabilitation and the launching of spirit in mankind’s life were necessary, and this movement rapidly changed into an inclination towards mysticism and oriental’s, having effects in the Romanian journalism, too. “On the background of this incertitude, a sudden, impetuous wave of mysticism, which was important in the Orient’s insensible world (in which, apparently, nothing essential had changed, so the values were stable) and in some European tendencies that were gaining ground, appeared.”<sup>70</sup>, the historian of ideologies, Zigu Ornea, observed. The entire work of the historian and philosopher Mircea Eliade can join this

---

<sup>66</sup> Ibidem, loc.cit.;

<sup>67</sup> Petre Andrei, *Sociologie generală*, 1997, Ed. Polirom, Iași, p. 10;

<sup>68</sup> Ibidem, p. 10;

<sup>69</sup> Ibidem, p. 11;

<sup>70</sup> Zigu Ornea, op.cit., p. 239;

frsmework, and its European success can be explained through its spectrum. And that is because, at the European level, thinkers oriented towards Oriental's were the first in the ideological and philosophical debates. "Spengler, Berdiaev, Merejkovski, Tagore (...), Keyserling, the neo-Thomists Maritain and Massis, Ludwig Bauner, Klages and many others became philosophers and thinkers in fashion during those years."<sup>71</sup> This movement is soon detected by the Romanian ideologists, so that people like N. Bagdasar (who dedicates a piece of writing to this current<sup>72</sup>), or E. Lovinescu (in "The history of modern Romanian civilization"), and others, like C.R. Motru or V. Madgearu, take it over and substantiate their options in agreement with it. If we are to refer only to E. Lovinescu, we should point out two aspects in this sense: the moment he brings up his options about the "culture and civilization" dilemma, Lovinescu appealed to some theories of thinkers like Humboldt, Chamberlain, Herder, Bouglé, Durkheim, Condorcet, G. Le Bon, Spengler, Rambaud, etc; three years later, in the framework of the same dispute, but this time raised at the level of the antinomy "Orient-Occident", Lovinescu wrote a whole chapter, entitled "Culture and Civilization: Chamberlain and Spengler", about the thinkers in vogue from that period.<sup>73</sup>

Starting from the Europe's culture lack of spirit in favour of the environment's rationalization and its conquering through technique, in the context of the catastrophic situation that existed after the First World War, the European philosophy achieves a return and seek of the ancient cultures that seemed to have been kept the mystical charge that Europe lacked. "Buddhism, Brahmanism, Yoga and all Asiatic philosophies are embraced with the desperate excitement of some shipwrecked people."<sup>74</sup> In this way, the debate's concept is defined by the antinomy "Occident-Orient" and the defenders of the first one acclaimed the history of that part of the world which has not given up culture, whereas the Occident joined the technique side of life, excessively developing civilization in the detriment of the lost spirit. Spengler's work, suggestively entitled "The Occident's decline" is very important in this sense. It starts from the idea that civilization is the last step of a culture and the remoteness from the spiritual leads to an inherent decline that predicts its end. "The decline of the West is, first of all, a limited

---

<sup>71</sup> Ibidem, p. 240;

<sup>72</sup> It is about Nicolae Bagdasar's work, *Teoreticieni ai civilizației*, 1969, Ed. Științifică, București;

<sup>73</sup> E. Lovinescu, *Istoria literaturii...*, p. 65-69;

<sup>74</sup> Zigu Ornea, op.cit., p. 239;

phenomenon in space and time, as well as the Antiquity's decline, to which a philosophical theme corresponds, as one can see; if it is understood in all its gravity, it entails the great problems of the human being.”<sup>75</sup> Based on a morphological conception, in which the chronological criterion of cultures' appearance is replaced by a systematic one, in which the cultures are equivalent in time, Spengler's writing started from the antinomy between culture and civilization. It is necessary to mention that Spengler assimilated culture to the spiritual creation and civilization to the material one; the first one is organic and specific, expressing the creative capacity of the human genius and the second one is artificial, easy to reproduce through imitation and import, monotonous and never original.”<sup>76</sup> The antinomy was thus total, and taking into consideration Spengler's vision about cultures, the destiny of the European one was already configured. “For him, the culture of a nation is a closed circle, an organic whole with an independent life, subjected to the biological phases of any type of life, that means with a limited duration, around one thousand years, inside which there are a spring, a summer, an autumn and a winter, each one lasting two or three centuries.”<sup>77</sup> In this way, the cultures' morphology make them appear in different places of the world and have a life that knows reciprocal equivalents, no matter the period they show themselves. “So who knows that there is a deep formal connection between the form of the antique polish and the Euclidian Geometry, between the spatial perspective of oil painting from West and the space conquest through railway, telephone and fire guns, between the instrumental counterpointed music and the economical system of credits?”<sup>78</sup> According to these facts and to the cultural level of Europe, its decline as an organic process is, thus, inherent and demonstrated. So, the antinomy between the two terms derives from this fact, as long as, particularly the inclination towards civilization to culture's detriment, brought this decline. The debate on this theme was only opened by Spengler, this one being followed by almost all the theoreticians of the period. The whole problem lies precisely on the opposition between them. “N. Bardiaev adopts himself Spengler's theory about the organic nature of cultures, also assuming the difference that Spengler made between culture and civilization, the

---

<sup>75</sup> Oswald Spengler, *Declinul Occidentului*, 1996, Ed. Beladi, Craiova, vol.I, p. 13;

<sup>76</sup> Zigu Ornea, op.cit., p. 243;

<sup>77</sup> E. Lovinescu, op.cit., p. 66-67;

<sup>78</sup> Oswald Spengler, op.cit., p. 15;

last one being considered, by the German thinker, the culture's decadent phase.”<sup>79</sup> From now on, there was only one step to assert, in Spengler's pessimistic tone that “civilization is, through its nature, - bourgeois, industrial-capitalist, atheist. It does not love, but hates eternity.”<sup>80</sup> The opposition “culture-civilization” became more and more important and its understanding depended on the response of mankind's destiny. Consequently, the theme became general and any cultural personality stood according to it. “For Chamberlain, for example, culture means all the phenomena from arts, philosophy, creative and speculative science, ethics and religion, whereas, civilization does not mean but the phenomena of the collective life, of the social and economical structure of the state. Civilization is not an advantage or a progress, only if the intensity of the spiritual and artistic life is growing. Civilization and culture are not dependent notions.”<sup>81</sup> As a result of the preoccupation for civilization in mankind's history, A.J. Toynbee dedicates a monumental writing to the history in which “civilization” is seen as an essential factor of its entire evolution. “Rejecting the idea of “civilizations' unity , A.J. Toynbee suggests that one shall replace the stem shaped scheme, that is used nowadays, with a tree shaped one with many branches, in which civilizations come into being”, scheme that would reflect in a more appropriate manner the existence of a plurality of civilizations.”<sup>82</sup> Having a dynamic role in history, human civilization is on end studied from the perspective of genesis, development and disintegration of all these circumstances in history. During the postwar period, Toynbee proposed as a final solution the return to spirituality. “The occidental man placed himself in the dangerous situation of losing his soul, through the simple fact that he clenched all his powers in order to increase his prosperity.”<sup>83</sup> The return to spirituality through religion would be the last chance to retrieve the distance between culture and civilization. “The question about the role of mankind's superior religions, in their action to enlighten both sides in order to achieve a mutual agreement, is difficult to answer here.”<sup>84</sup>

---

<sup>79</sup> Nicolae Bagdasar, *Teoreticieni ai civilizației*, 1969, Ed. Științifică, București, p. 168;

<sup>80</sup> Ibidem, p. 169;

<sup>81</sup> E. Lovinescu, op.cit., p. 65;

<sup>82</sup> N. Bagdasar, op. cit., p. 18;

<sup>83</sup> Arnold Joseph Toynbee, *Studiu asupra istoriei*, 1997, Ed. Humanitas, București, vol. II, p. 467;

<sup>84</sup> Ibidem, p. 467;

The antinomy culture-civilization was, however, one of the dichotomies brought on the ideological scene once with the pessimistic atmosphere from after the Second World War and Lovinescu does not hesitate to give his opinion on this topic. The dilemma “Orient-Occident” was another inter-war topic and the author of “The modern Romanian civilization” prefers the second term as long as he considered that Romania lacked institutional culture and western civilization as well, especially that “the way from civilization to culture is not irreversible”, as he, himself, claimed. But, maybe, the most important dilemma was known under the name “Evolutionism-Revolutionism”, respectively “traditionalism-Modernism”. Because of this reason precisely, we have dedicated a subchapter to this matter, too, entitled “Revolution or evolution in the development of civilizations”, looking to identify Lovinescu’s opinion on this topic, with all its substantiations.

As a consequence of the fight between the two groups (the evolutionist and the revolutionary ones), two tendencies gained advantages in the European political level: first of all there was the national-socialism with its representatives in Germany and Italy and then, the mysticism. Especially in Romania, where the ideological current was a keen reflection of the European one, the mysticism’s movement initiated by the magazine “Gandirea” outlined until 1927. “It was almost natural for a mystic and obscurantist current to appear during this period of a conscience crisis.”<sup>85</sup> Authors like Nichifor Crainic, Nae Ionescu and here and there Lucian Blaga defend, in this magazine, on orthodoxy’s idea that, in their opinion, could have represented the saving of the Romanian spirituality in comparison with the brutalizing civilization taken from West.

We have tried in the few pages dedicated to the cultural atmosphere of the century to express the major and fundamental philosophical implications of the inter-war’s period ideologies, for the purpose of sketching, as well as we can, the controversial background in which Lovinescu publishes the work that is the object of our investigation, and that is because Lovinescu’s work is deeply integrated in this background, having the quality of its contemporaneity (or synchronization) with the period in which it was published. We say that because Lovinescu did not hesitate to give his opinion on the great topics of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, being seen as an incubator of the inter-war debates. More than that, the art critic who meanwhile

---

<sup>85</sup> Zigu Ornea, op.cit., p. 282;

became a sociologist, adopted trenchant attitudes about each of the topics of his time, often coming with original conceptual or ideological notions that were in a deep agreement with his sociological theory of synchronism. Seen through the inter-war debates, Lovinescu's theory of synchronism was synchronous, especially that it eloquently emphasized the way in which the European debate itself faithfully reverberated in the Romanian space of ideas. And this establishment confirms once again the premise that the inter-war period represents a standard of European integration, especially from the perspective of the cultural debates on the great ideologies that confronted in that period.

### **Bibliography:**

BAGDASAR, Nicolae - *Teoreticieni ai civilizației*, 1969, Ed. Științifică, București;

DESCARTES, René – *Discurs despre metoda de a ne conduce bine rațiunea și a ne căuta adevărul în științe*, 1990, Ed. Academiei Române, București;

LOVINESCU, Eugen – *Istoria civilizației române moderne*, 1997, Ed. Minerva, București;

Idem - *Istoria literaturii române contemporane*, vol. I-VI, 1925-1929, Ed. Ancora, Bucuresti;

NEGULESCU, Petre P. – *Destinul omenirii*, 1994, Ed. Nemira, București;

ORNEA, Zigu - *Tradiționalism și modernitate în deceniul al III-lea*, 1980, Ed. Eminescu, București;

PETRE, Andrei – *Sociologie generală*, 1997, Ed. Polirom, Iași;

ROUSSEAU, J. Jacques – *Contractul social*, 2000, Ed. Mondero, București;

SPENGLER, Oswald – *Declinul Occidentului* (vol. I și II), 1996, Ed. Beladi, Craiova;

TOYNBEE, Arnold J. – *Studiu asupra istoriei*, vol. I și II, 1997, Ed. Humanitas, București;

## **Euro - a success story of European integration**

Asis. univ. drd. DRAGOŞ PĂUN,  
Faculty of Business, Babes-Bolyai University

If in general, costs have to do with macroeconomic management of the economy, macroeconomic benefits are likely. Remove currencies and moving to a common currency is expected to result in increased economic efficiency. These increases have two sources: the elimination of transaction costs related to exchange rate risk and eliminate the legal uncertainty of exchange rate fluctuations.

### **Direct benefits of the elimination of transaction costs**

Reduce foreign exchange costs of a currency to another is the most visible and easily measurable gain of a monetary union. The conversion costs disappear when moving to a single currency.

About how big would be the benefits? The European Commission has estimated the gains in amounts from 13 to 20 billion. This represents between one quarter and half of 1% of the Community budget. Although seemingly small, the increase should be considered in conjunction with the other benefits of the single market. It should be noted also that these benefits have some losses, which can be found in the banking sector - roughly 5% of revenues were fees for foreign exchange banks. The amount of income disappear with the establishment of the single currency. However, it must be concluded that the obvious public benefits are offset by banks losses. Commissions involved in the exchange rate had the meaning of a fee paid by the consumer that get nothing in return. Thus, banks have faced a problem in transaction - the search for profitable activities to compensate. When they reached this goal, the society has won. Banking employees which recently dealt with the exchange rate, are now forced to engage in profit-making activities,

economically and socially. One important aspect to this context is that as long as payment systems are not fully integrated, bank transfers between banks in the euro zone remain more expensive than within the same country. This is the current situation in the euro zone.

The reason is that, although national payment systems are connected through so-called TARGET system, these national systems are still functional. As a result, transfers across national borders is way different and more expensive than the national.

### **Indirect benefits – transparency**

Remove transaction costs has indirect benefits which are relatively more difficult to quantify. Introduction of the Euro has resulted in a clear increase transparency - to facilitate comparisons between the prices of the same product in different locations of the euro area. This actually increases competition and ultimately the beneficiary is the same consumer who will be faced with lower prices. This analysis, already performed, it may be concluded that there is but one major price-related discrimination.

This is particularly the case of the supermarket products, where the differences are 5 to 10 times lower than prices between countries. A similar phenomenon was observed in the study of prices in the U.S. and Canada. Thus, both in Europe and in America there continues to generate border impediments to trade, despite the fact that customs duties and other explicit barriers to trade were removed. The question that arises here is whether the introduction of the Euro is a force strong enough to reduce these obstacles so that accessed price differences disappear.

Although it is relatively early for a conclusion, recent studies claim that price differences were still removed. Engel and Rogers have analyzed convergence for over 100 identical items of 18 cities within the Eurozone. Note the most important in this analysis relates to the fact that the issue price convergence is available since before 1999 and ceased after 1999. The same phenomenon has been located in the European Commission reports too. It can be concluded that if the Euro contributes to convergence, this is not so much due to the fact that ensures the comparability of prices, but because the Euro contributes to deepening economic integration. Euro becomes the main event of integration in many fields such as legal, political or social.

## **Welfare increase due to the reduction of uncertainty**

Uncertainty regarding exchange rate changes affect the same sense of uncertainty and company revenues. Generally accepted appearance is that such uncertainty creates reducing welfare in a world populated by individuality that shows enmity towards risk. They will generally prefer a more secure future income against one less certain, at least equal to their values. Thus eliminating the legal risks of foreign exchange should generate more wealth. There is an important element in the theory of the company that can invalidate this conclusion.

In the case that a comparison of welfare levels is wanted, between a regime characterized by uncertainty and the other marked price certainty, the positive effect of uncertainty on the average profit to be compared with greater uncertainty affecting these profiles. Higher profits increase the utility company and higher uncertainty reduces the utility due to risk aversion. It is thus quite unclear whether welfare decreases when uncertainty increases the exchange rate, or conversely, if we can certainty say that welfare increases when the monetary union is achieved.

From another perspective, exchange rate changes is not just a risk, but is also profile opportunities. When the exchange rate becomes more variable, increases the likelihood of significant profits. From a certain perspective, exports may be seen as an opportunity. When the exchange rate is very favorable, the company exercises the export-related option. It is known from option theory that its value increases with increasing variability value considered. Thus, the company which has the opportunity to export, is favorable when the exchange rate variability increases. The same argument can be developed in terms of the consumer.

Its surplus is higher under conditions of uncertainty. Motivation is the same as for company profits. Thus, on average, the consumer wins when prices fluctuate. The positive effect of the price has to be compared with the risk. In extent that the consumer is risk opponent, it will give a lower utility to higher surplus, but less uncertain than that obtained under conditions of certainty.

## **Exchange rate uncertainty and the price mechanism**

Another area in which the reduction of the exchange rate's uncertainty produces positive effects is the one of goods and services prices. Traders base their production decisions, investment and consumption on information provided by the price system. If these prices become unsecure, the quality of the decisions have to suffer.

These theoretical considerations can be supported more concrete if we consider the example of a company which decides to invest in a foreign country, and their investment decision based on several variables. One such variable is whether the exchange rate.

We can observe that there are forecast errors because the exchange rate has changed and it no longer corresponds to initial estimates, which makes investing unprofitable and determined to stop it. Such errors are costly and frequently under conditions of high uncertainty.

In this sense, the price system that provides output signals or investment becomes a less certain mechanism for allocating resources. Should be emphasized that exchange rate uncertainty is actually considered the real exchange rate. A reduction in the real exchange rate volatility following the establishment of monetary union can reduce these costs. These gains in efficiency are hard to quantify, but this does not diminish the importance. The magnitude of these benefits is clear in particular analysis of the situation of countries facing a major inflationary phenomenon. It can be noted that investment decisions and production in these countries suffer widespread. Although often occurring's booming production and investment, they show the line of products in sectors such inappropriate and a waste of resources occurs in this process.

There is a second reason for the greater uncertainty in prices and exchange rate may reduce the quality of information provided by the price system. Increased risk due to price variation generally causes an increase in real interest rates. This is because when there is reduced forecast profile for a project, investors will require a higher premium to offset higher risk of investment project. Thus, exchange rate volatility which causes such a high systemic risk, causes and growth rate, which in turn has implications for the efficient selection of investment projects. These problems are two different concepts, namely moral hazard and adverse selection.

Moral hazard problem arises because the increase of the interest rate determines the degree of the attraction for borrowers. They are considered more advantageous investment projects increased risk, which is due to the asymmetry between profit and loss forecast. If the investment project is successful, additional profiles shall go to the debtor, and if the project proves a failure, the debtor goes bankrupt, its loss is limited to its participation share in the

project. In a higher interest rate, the problem of moral hazard becomes more intense. This asymmetry gives the debtor the motivation to select riskier projects. The creditors in turn will try to protect demanding a higher premium, which in time lead to the amplification problem. In general, the problem of moral hazard may cause lenders to apply credit ceilings to reduce this risk.

The adverse selection problem determines similar results. When interest rate increases, the supplier of low-risk investment project tends to leave the credit market. Lending will be less attractive to a higher interest rate, especially for riskier projects. Both phenomena cause more serious selection of investment projects, thereby increasing systemic risk. Removing this risk by introducing the single currency will determine the reduction of risky projects selected by the market. It can be concluded that switching to single currency will eliminate the exchange risk and thereby determine a more efficient pricing mechanism. Although this effect cannot be quantified easily, it is a clear benefit of introducing the single European currency - Euro.

It should be noted that while not all points of view on this are uniform, there are opinions that eliminating exchange rate risk may induce greater risk in other areas of economic system. Cost-benefit analysis of this perspective may be reduced to a choice between joining the monetary union (the irrevocable fixing of exchange rates) and stay out of it (keeping a flexible exchange rate).

Consider first shock came on the goods market and services (shocks on output and business cycle, for example). In first phase we're assuming that the state is a member of the monetary union. Thus, there should be considered interest rate and domestic interest rate is therefore equal to the interest rate set by the central bank union. If the central bank keeps interest rates steady, the production will fluctuate, national income will increase, which increases domestic demand for money, thus resulting in attracting money from the rest of the union. It should be noted that the country considered is small in relation to monetary union, otherwise national boom causing increasing pressure on interest rates. If your country is not within the monetary union and if the interest rate fluctuates freely, then domestic interest rate tends to increase. Interest rates being flexible, can be a growth stock money flows to us from capital. In contrast, growth of interest rate causes appreciation, a process that will continue until the domestic interest rate returns to baseline.

It can be concluded so that the membership of monetary union led to a greater variability of the products market (and in the same time the labor market), comparing to than outside the maintenance and variability of interest rate option. Joining the monetary union and fixing the interest rate, does not necessarily reduce the systemic risk because it causes changes in other areas of economic system. Suppose a shock affecting the demand for money. If the country is part of the monetary union and the interest rate is fixed, there is no change in production. Thus, domestic supply is fully protected from disturbance of any shock to the money market. If the country could ally outside the monetary union, money market should be protected from these shocks, and production would vary, leading to exchange rate appreciation, given that domestic supply of money remains unchanged.

### **Exchange rate uncertainty and economic growth**

Analyzing the implications of exchange rate volatility and the introduction of the euro on economic growth may start from the neoclassical growth model and extends to the dynamic economies of scale. This analysis appears in both the European Commission reports on monetary union and in the literature. According to neoclassical growth model, equilibrium is achieved when the marginal productivity of capital equals the interest rate that the consumer uses in the reduction of future consumption. The interest rate following the establishment of monetary union increases the growth rate of production.

This model was developed by introducing the dynamic economies of scale. Assuming that there is an increase in capital productivity and capital stock, which may occur because of the learning and knowledge gained. This knowledge further increase labor productivity in the next period and can intervene and issue a public good in their case. Once used a new installation knowledge contained therein are freely available worker is using. All they increase labor productivity during the accumulation of capital. One interesting aspect of this analysis into the transition to endogenous and model sensitivity to initial conditions. Thus, an economy that begins with large stocks of capital per worker can always move on a slope upward growth.

### **Long-term costs and benefits**

Cost-benefit analysis of single currency requires adding a research of the phenomenon's dynamic to obtain a complete and accurate picture of how these will evolve over time. This can be done on the connection between the degree of monetary integration and the emergence of asymmetric shocks. This relationship anticipates the possibility that the integration progress will determine economic convergence. We considered significant the European Commission model and Krugman model.

Optimal currency area is the combination of divergence and integration, that makes an equalization of costs with benefits in the monetary union. Increased integration leads to reduced level of economic divergence between the countries involved. At the same time, when divergence level increases, the cost of monetary union increase too. The two phenomena considered independent, allow us to determine the evolution of optimal currency areas: the difference in growth results in increased costs, or in other words, increasing the level of integration reduces costs. Monetary union seems to be perceived as a positive phenomenon for all EU members and it becomes inevitable.

These are optimistic forecast on long-term prospects of European monetary integration. There is a pessimistic perspective derived from analysis by Krugman that integration leads to a greater degree of divergence between countries. In this case must be considered two possibilities regarding the prospects of monetary union. For the first scenario, EU countries tend to monetary union membership and the integration determines specialization and increased asymmetric shocks.

The benefits of monetary union increase gradually with the integration. As a result, despite rising asymmetric shocks, the integration will determine the transition to optimal currency area. The second case presents a situation where increased integration is the removal of optimum currency area's perspective.

This is due to the lower growth rate of earnings generated by the monetary union compared with that of integration. As a result, the costs outweigh the benefits of monetary union, and forecast for a full monetary union is dire. This case however lead to an anomaly: implies that a reduction of trade integration could bring us in the situation of optimal currency areas, if EU member states would be far outside this form of integration, monetary union would be more attractive. The result is at least strange.

Following Krugman model can be concluded that, even if integration causes increased asymmetric shocks, it may increase due to net gains of monetary union. Another aspect of the dynamics of long-term cost-benefit in monetary union is that the independent decision of states to join the monetary union may hasten the integration process. This is generally based on the idea that different national currencies led market segmentation. The decision of a country to join the monetary union, even if not under optimal monetary area, is a positive one which speeds up the integration. There is thus also an endogenous component of optimal currency area criteria, in other words, even the decision of joining the monetary union change the cost-benefit.

### **Compared costs and benefits**

Separate evaluation of costs and benefits of introducing the single currency may not bring a complete perspective on the issue examined. From this perspective, we considered relevant the compared analysis of these, analysis that can clearly show how inspired the UE states were when they decided to launch the implementation of the European Monetary Union. The first step in achieving this compared analysis can be represented by the connection between costs and benefits of the single currency and the opening of the economy.

The point of intersection of the costs and benefits is considered to be the critical level of the economic opening that justifies the joining of a country and its trading partners to a monetary union. On the left side of this point, the monetary union is not justified, the use of national currency being more effective and on the right side of this point, the beneficial situation is that in which the state waves the national currency and adopts the one of its trading partners as a common currency. This also allows drawing some quantitative conclusions regarding the magnitude of these costs and benefits. The form and planning costs of the monetary union depend mostly on the effectiveness of the monetary policy, including the exchange rate policies in the correction of certain developments relating to the request and cost of the countries involved.

At one extreme is situated the monetary vision that considers the monetary politics to be an inefficient instrument in correcting asymmetric shocks, either permanently or temporarily.

In the monetary vision, the cost curve is very close to its origin and implicitly, and the point from which joining a monetary union becomes efficient is also very close to that origin. According to this view, many countries would benefit if they would adopt the single currency. At the other extreme is the keynesist view according to which the costs and benefits situation of the monetary union must be considered in the context of wages and prices rigidities and labor immobility so that national monetary policies and exchange rates are able to absorb asymmetric shocks.

In this view, the cost curve is relatively far from its origin, so that few countries would be able to find themselves in the beneficial situation of joining the monetary union. Also according to this view, there is the variant in which many of the major states that are part of the monetary union would evolve better economically outside this union, or even if inside the state would exist different currency areas.

It is clear that monetary has gained some ground, thus explaining the turning into reality of the 90s European monetary union. The European monetary union balance of the costs and the benefits seems to tilt differently depending on the country considered. Some countries, such those of the Benelux, appear to be clear in light of the benefits of this process, just as some of the most recent EU members such as Czech Republic, Slovakia, Estonia, Hungary and Slovenia. The considerable differences between the arise also from the different degree of economical opening, presented by the following table with data on intra-union percentage of GDP. It is rather astonishing the finding that the most recently attached to the EU countries are at least as integrated as the old members. The states situated at the other end of the league, United Kingdom and Greece, are less likely to become part of an optimal currency area with the rest of the European Union.

The costs-benefits rapport of the monetary union is also very much influenced by the degree of price and wage rigidity. If the states face asymmetric shocks that lead to changes in price, exchange rate loss can be a handicap because it aggravates the adjustment to these shocks. As a result, the countries with a low level of rigidity concerning the prices and the wages face lower costs when moving to the implementation of the monetary union.

Similarly, an increase in labor mobility determines monetary union to seem more attractive. Therefore, one can say that the single market will become more attractive for EMU EU member states if it can determine an increase in the labor mobility. It should be noted also

that not every type of integration has these effects. Integration can also lead to a regional concentration of industrial activities. This feature of the integration process changes the result of cost-benefit calculations making monetary union less attractive.

Labor market flexibility is not the only determinant of the degree of attractiveness that monetary union has for the states. Equally significant are the size and frequency of asymmetric shocks which subject they are. Countries that are confronted with very different shocks of supply and demand will bear higher costs of adopting the single currency.

The higher the degree of real divergence, the greater the need for flexibility in the labor market to enable the best possible functioning of monetary union. Some countries may participate in monetary union without excessive costs, that is greater than the benefits, while others will be faced with high adjustment costs. In other words, these latter countries have a very low degree of labor market flexibility considering the degree of divergence, so all should retain a degree of exchange rate flexibility. All this does not mean they cannot join the monetary union, but the theory predicts negative economic effects.

Most theoretical studies have concluded that the EU15 is not an optimal currency area. Recently, another series of studies have questioned the situation analysis for the European Union with 27 members and the conclusion was that the union has not yet, but it is possible to proceed to the status of optimal currency area. However, there is a subset of EU countries forming an optimal currency area. The minimum set of such states are assumed to include Germany, Benelux and France.

But there are also opinions that tend to broaden this group of EU states which would benefit from the effects of monetary union, because of improved production cycles correlation of Member States after the onset of monetary union. This merely confirms the earlier assertion that integration tends to reduce the occurrence of asymmetric shocks.

The “center-periphery” vision of monetary integration seems to be doubted by the fact that in most EU states, the monetary policies are ineffective in terms of influencing real variables such as production or employment. So, since monetary policy instruments appear to be inefficient, then their loss cannot be a significant cost.

Many of the asymmetric shocks occur at branch and not so much nationally – many changes regarding the production level and employment in a country are the results of various

developments in some sectors (changes in demand, technological differences, etc.) and these changes cannot be resolved by the exchange rate.

It can be said that the exact size of optimal currency areas within the European Union is unclear. Thus the EU27 has to face the challenge, with two basic strategies: reducing the divergence, increasing flexibility. The difficulty regarding the first strategy is that the difference is too much dependent on factors over which monetary policy hasn't so much influence. For example, the degree of industrial specialization is an important factor in determining the importance of asymmetric shocks, and economic policy can do less, in terms of changes in patterns of regional specialization. The area in which economic policy can act, is that of political union. To reduce asymmetric shocks should be continuous coordination at institutional and economic policy. The second strategy consists in increasing labor market flexibility, involving institutional reform of this market. Although these reforms are difficult to implement, they are necessary if we want to extend monetary union across the EU.

## Bibliography

1. Allsopp Christopher, Vines David, *Fiscal Policy, Intercountry Adjustment and the Real Exchange Rate*, Economic Papers 344, Noiembrie 2008;
2. Barber, Lionel; Mallet, Victor, *BBVA makes case for sole European regulation*, 19 ianuarie 2009, [www.ft.com/conversations](http://www.ft.com/conversations);
3. Breuss, Fritz, Roeger Werner, Jan in `t Veld, *Global Impact of a Shift in Foreign Reserves*, Economic Papers 345, Noiembrie 2008;
4. Döhring, Björn; Temprano, Heliodoro, *Implications of EMU for Global Macroeconomic and Financial Stability*, Economic Papers 343, Octombrie 2008;
5. Nuti, D. Mario, *The Costs and Benefits of Euro-isation in Central-Eastern Europe Before or Instead of EMU Membership*, William Davidson Institute Working Paper 340, Octombrie 2000;
6. Papaioannou, Elias, Portes, Richard, *Costs and Benefits of Running an International Currency*, Economic Papers 348, Noiembrie 2008;
7. Păun, Nicolae, *Istoria construcției europene*, Editura EFES, 1999;
8. Peterson, J, Shackleton M., *The Institutions of the European Union*, Oxford University Press, 2003;
9. Portone Daniel, *The Costs and Benefits of the Euro in European Monetary Union Countries*;
10. Silasi, Grigorie, *Integrarea monetară europeană între teorie și politică*, Editura Orizonturi Universitare, 1998;
11. \*\*\*, *Monthly Bulletin- 10th Anniversary of the ECB*, European Central Bank, 2008;
12. \*\*\*, *Trecerea la euro subțîză buzunarele*, 5 Ianuarie 2007, [www.EurActiv.ro](http://www.EurActiv.ro);

13. \*\*\*, *Slovenia: nemulțumiri față de trecerea la euro*, BBCRomanian.com;
14. \*\*\*, *Din 2008, Comisia Europeană analizează capacitatea României de a adopta euro*, EU-RO Newsletter-ul Guvernului României, 11 Iunie 2007;
15. \*\*\*, *Comisia Europeană sprijină statele membre în pregătirea pentru adoptarea monedei unice*, 21 Ianuarie 2008,  
[www.euractiv.ro/uniunea-europeana/articles|displayArticle/articleID\\_12322/Comisia-Europeană-sprijină-statele-membre-in-pregătirea-pentru-adoptarea-monedei-unice.html](http://www.euractiv.ro/uniunea-europeana/articles|displayArticle/articleID_12322/Comisia-Europeană-sprijină-statele-membre-in-pregătirea-pentru-adoptarea-monedei-unice.html);
16. \*\*\*, *Comunicarea Comisiei către Parlamentul European, Consiliu, Comitetul Economic și social European, Comitetul regiunilor și Banca Centrală Europeană*, Bruxelles, 2008;
17. \*\*\*, *Concluziile Președinției Consiliului European de la Bruxelles*, 11-12 decembrie 2008, [www.europa.eu.int](http://www.europa.eu.int);
18. \*\*\*, *Euro, moneda nr. 1 pe Pamant*, Evenimetul zilei, vineri 29 dec 2006;
19. \*\*\*, *One Currency for One Europe, The Road to the European Union*, European Commision, [http://ec.europa.eu/economy\\_finance/publications/publication6730\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/publication6730_en.pdf);
20. \*\*\*, *Cross-border Euro payments, now significantly cheaper*, Bruxelles, 2007;
21. \*\*\*, „Părintele” euro vrea o monedă globală, Gardianul, 6 ianuarie 2004;
22. \*\*\*, *Un euro puternic: monstru sau binecuvântare?*, [www.EurActiv.ro](http://www.EurActiv.ro);
23. \*\*\*, *Pesimism privind adoptarea monedei Euro*, Ghiseul Bancar.ro, 7 dec 2006;
24. \*\*\*, *Vosganian: Romania ar putea adopta moneda euro de la 1 ianuarie 2014*”, [www.EurActiv.ro](http://www.EurActiv.ro), 26 Mai 2008;
25. \*\*\*, *Promoting prosperity and stability: The EMU anchor in candidate and potential candidate countries*, Directoratul General pentru Afaceri economice și financiare, Economic Papers 342, Octombrie 2008;
26. \*\*\*, *Quarterly Report on the Euro Area*, Comisia Europeană, DG Afaceri economice și financiare, vol 7, nr. 4, 2008;
27. \*\*\*, *The International Role of the Euro*, Banca Centrală Europeană, iulie 2008;
28. \*\*\*, *Romanian Journal of European Affairs*, Institutul European al României, vol 8, nr 4, decembrie 2008;
29. \*\*\*, *The Cash Changeover and the Production and Issue of Euro Banknotes*, Raportul annual ECB din 2001, [http://www.ecb.int/pub/pdf/other/p113-119\\_ar2001en.pdf](http://www.ecb.int/pub/pdf/other/p113-119_ar2001en.pdf);
30. \*\*\*, *Slovacia spune „da” monedei euro*, [http://ec.europa.eu/news/economy/081231\\_1\\_ro.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/news/economy/081231_1_ro.htm)
31. \*\*\*, *Deputații europeni slovaci sunt mulțumiți de introducerea monedei euro în țara lor*”, [http://www.euractiv.ro/uniuneaeuropeana/articles%7CdisplayArticle/article\\_ID\\_15991/Deputati-europeni-slovaci-sunt-multumiti-de-introducerea-monedei-euro-in-tara-lor.html](http://www.euractiv.ro/uniuneaeuropeana/articles%7CdisplayArticle/article_ID_15991/Deputati-europeni-slovaci-sunt-multumiti-de-introducerea-monedei-euro-in-tara-lor.html);
32. [http://ec.europa.eu/economy\\_finance/emu10/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/emu10/index_en.htm);
33. <http://2008.informatia.ro/10 ani de Uniune Economica si Monetara UEM -245099>;
34. [http://www.compact.info.ro/index.php?section=articole&screen=articol&art\\_id=55088](http://www.compact.info.ro/index.php?section=articole&screen=articol&art_id=55088);
35. [http://www.financiarul.com/articol\\_11482/avantajele-si-dezvantajele-introducerii-monedei-unice-europene-.html](http://www.financiarul.com/articol_11482/avantajele-si-dezvantajele-introducerii-monedei-unice-europene-.html);
36. [http://ec.europa.eu/news/economy/080507\\_1\\_ro.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/news/economy/080507_1_ro.htm);
37. [uld%20the%20euro%20be%20the%20reserve%20currency.html#article](http://uld%20the%20euro%20be%20the%20reserve%20currency.html#article);
38. <http://theoryandscience.icaap.org/content/vol001.001/03rolf.html>;
39. <http://www.eu4journalists.eu/index.php/dossiers/romanian/C23>;
40. <http://www.euromoneda.ro/tratate.asp>;

41. [www.biblioteca.ase.ro](http://www.biblioteca.ase.ro)
42. [www.piatavalutara.ro](http://www.piatavalutara.ro)
43. [www.ecb.int/emi/htm\\_icom.htm](http://www.ecb.int/emi/htm_icom.htm)

## **European Integration Premises in The IIInd World War Resistance Movements' Thought**

Dr. Dan Zbuclea

The process of European unification, which is underway today, is widely perceived as a result of the intellectual emanation of the '50's of the twentieth century, following the end of the Second World War. Indeed, the international context and the European historical legacy have facilitated the start of the factual construct mentioned before in this temporary period, but its early origins and its beginig at the thinking level are more advanced in timeline. Inspiration for the experiment underwent with the setting up of the first European community and later with the birth of continental political institutions comes from the elaborations of visionary thinkers, living centuries ago. Much closer to nowadays, during the years of Nazi occupation of European countries, the political attitudes of those who opposed the national-socialist ideology were directed to this area, namely, the continental unification. Even if the ideas put forward by political thinkers of the Resistance Movement of the Second World War remained at the level of theoretical development, they have the merit to have continued a tradition begun much earlier.

Research on texts prepared by members of Resistance Movements on the postwar organization of the continent remained somewhat at the edge of the interest shown by researchers in European history and may be still in our years, an element of novelty for many of them. Usually, the term "resistance" is treated as referring to armed resistance, sabotage, espionage and disinformation, carried out by civilians or military staff of the countries under fascist occupation. Not to diminish the importance of this sector, it must be added that Intellectual Resistance played a role at least equal to the armed one. We will see the context in which

**Resistance ideas were articulated and the degree to which they were received at the time of their launch, in the lines to come.<sup>86</sup>**

Understanding Resistance writings on the future of Europe must be made amid the collapse of nation states. All European countries except Britain and four other neutral countries fell under the control of fascist ideology tributary forces, at the peak of their expansion. Europe's population once again reached the conclusion that old form of social organization could not provide military and political viability. The experience of twenty interwar years demonstrated that national state could not ensure the, so much desired, peace and could not provide safety to agents or to individuals, from the economic point of view. The management of the economic crisis occurred in 1929 is the most concluding argument. Nineteenth century, called "The Century of Nations" has created preconditions for the outbreak of two global conflagrations, for which overseas interference was necessary. "Resistance leaders felt they were living at the end of an epoch in Europe."<sup>87</sup>

European fascist groups (the German one enjoying greatest public success) supported the imposition of intransigence and discipline in order to cure social shortages experienced within state. The fervent demagogic, conducted by occupiers, led people in invaded countries to show openness to collaboration and the desire for fulfillment of orders issued by invaders without deviation, in a first phase. The brutality, which the Nazi regime was imposed with, however, left no room for any kind of cooperation or openness to start a dialogue. Nazi thinking was settled in the frameworks of nationalism and differentiation based on ethnicity or race, which shaped their actions until the last moment of the domination they have exercised.

The third factor that must be considered when making an assessment of resistance writings, as Walter Lipgens sustains, is the understanding of movements' nature. Control imposed by military invasion of the Nazis was tough, with an effective repressive police apparatus, which reduced almost to zero conduct para-military actions of the opposition groups

---

<sup>86</sup> Any research in this field must take into consider, besides the primary sources, the analyses carried out by Walter Lipgens or Charles F. Delzell. For the lines inhere I have greatly benefited by two valuable articles by the authors: Walter Lipgens, „European Federation in the Political Thought of Resistance Movements during World War II”, in *Central European History*, vol. 1, no. 1 (Mar., 1968), pp. 5-19 and Charles F. Delzell, „The European Federalist Movement in Italy: First Phase 1918-1947”, in *Journal of Modern History*, XXXII (1960), pp. 241-250.

<sup>87</sup> Walter Lipgens, „European Federation in the Political Thought of Resistance Movements during World War II”, in *Central European History*, vol. 1, no. 1 (Mar., 1968), p. 7.

in Central and Western Europe between 1939-1944. After 1944, German control began to weaken and resisters could carry out armed actions. But, until then, there was one passive resistance, translated in keeping safe the oppressor's targeted for persecution persons and the producing subversive literature.<sup>88</sup>

Throughout several years, Resistance has been constituted by writings. Contents of writings revolve around three central themes of equal importance, which interconnect: the rejection of totalitarianism, rejection of nationalism and the formation of a federal government in Europe. Henri Frenay, leader of the French movement "Combat", said in December 1943 "We are united from the North Pole to the Pyrenees, from the English Channel to the Aegean Sea, in the same struggle against the same enemy: the struggle for freedom against slavery, justice against injustice, law against force".<sup>89</sup> Adjacent to dismissing the totalitarian tendencies of the state, came the wishes to restore human rights in detriment of any kind of collectivism, the establishment of justice and the guarantee of freedom of opinion and conscience. As alternatives to the centralized nation-state, decentralization, regional federalism and self-government of districts and regions were proposed. As an Italian Resistance member affirms, democratic principles of self-governing are the only guarantees against absolute power, usually deriving from a centralized nation-state.<sup>90</sup> The resists' bid was the establishment of a new political order and the total elimination of nationalism. The fight against Nazism was the fight against nationalism for them, and therefore sought the establishment of a new world and not the return to old forms of organization, experienced before the war. Resistance was primarily the fight against all controlling State in which's hands lies the power to decide war or peace, control armies and divide the world into separate economic areas; the state which has levers to initiate despotic rule within its borders without possibility of intervention from outside, all have become components or destruction, barbarism and repression.<sup>91</sup> The ongoing war was seen as a nation state-generated crisis.

---

<sup>88</sup> Lippgens, *op. cit.*, pp. 6-8.

<sup>89</sup> Idem (ed.), *Europa-Federationsplane der Widerstandsbewegungen 1940-1945*, Oldenbourg, Munich, 1968, doc. no. 77, Henri Frenay, dec. 1943.

<sup>90</sup> Idem, „European Federation...”, p. 9.

<sup>91</sup> Idem (ed.), *Documents on the history of European Integration*, vol I, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, New York, 1985, „Movimento Federalista Europeo: Political Theses and General Directives”, 27-28 aug. 1943.

The old state-owned power was to be transferred to a higher, superior authority. European Federation imagined by some resisters was to take its place into a world peace organization. Nationalism inevitably gives rise to totalitarianism. Demand for European unification is now made of the need to counter the destructive nationalism, experienced by Resistance members, unlike in the interwar time, when political visionaries launched the idea of unifying the continent out of geopolitical or economic reasons. The doctrine of national sovereignty supplemented by noninterference policy destroyed European democracy as the publication *L'Unita Europea* claims.<sup>92</sup>

The degree of national sovereignty was not a matter of common ground, to lead to unequivocal expression of all Resistance members. Smaller groups, such as O.C.M. in Paris or at the Beck-Goedler generals group in Berlin, have decided to retain some power levers for the state, as in foreign policy, resulting a European confederation rather than federation from out here. They were pleading for a European Directorate for the Prevention of War and European Economic Council, possessing “police power” and the means necessary for their decisions to be put into practice.<sup>93</sup> But most text authors have supported the idea of full withdrawal of state sovereignty even in areas like foreign policy, economy or defense. The negative experience of League of Nations in 1919 should have been avoided in the time that followed. A widely shared view among the various Resistance groups shows that League’s failure was caused by a lack of autonomy as an independent power form over the nation-states to form it, and one lack of political authority or power to enable the material implementation of its decisions, over the state. Given the historical reality and the context in which they were living, Resistance members wanted to avoid further testing with reduced chances of success, as recent deployments to date have been examples. Italian Resistance goes up to condemn any simple union to be doomed, making a comparison with North American Confederation of 1776, which after thirteen years, concluded that peace and economic prosperity couldn’t be achieved this way, forming an effective federation in 1789.<sup>94</sup> Comparison of twentieth century Europe with the eighteenth century American situation is however, inaccurate and exalted. Premises in a war engaged Europe were significantly different to those the American colonies had had at that time.

---

<sup>92</sup> Idem, „European Federation ...”, p. 10.

<sup>93</sup> ibidem, p. 11.

<sup>94</sup> Idem, *Documents on ...*, Luigi Einaudi, „For a economic federation of Europe”, 1 sept. 1943.

Most daring ideas advocated granting independence to the last European colonies and the European Federation, once formed to be included in a world peace organization, along with other regional federations. However, this step was not foreseen in the near future, taking into account the reluctance of U.S. and Soviet Union to take part in such a global body. Formation of a European federal government was seen as an essential step, though. Nations were to become federate states of the European super state, which would be composed of representatives elected by the citizens. Perhaps the most important aspect of the European state, as the conservative German aristocracy envisioned it, was its ability to settle up any conflict that could begin within, out of nationalist outbursts, in addition to authority in foreign policy, defense and economic areas.

One of the most vocal opposition movements that rose against the oppression policy in Europe was the Italian one. Luigi Einaudi, a professor at the University of Turin and later, in 1948, the President of Italy, criticized the plans for the League of Nations since 1918, for the fact the state sovereignty was to be left intact. He insisted instead on the need for Europe to get a constitution inspired by the one of the United States of America or by the British Union and Scotland Federation.<sup>95</sup> European state was to be endowed with power to levy taxes, to operate an army for its defense, to regulate the boundaries, postal communication and railway infrastructure.

Altiero Spinelli, Ernesto Rossi and Eugenio Colorni founded the first federalist group formed on the Italian territory and perhaps, the best known in Europe, on the island-prison Ventotene. They were all three Democratic Socialists. Rossi, a veteran of World War I, helped print the first anti-fascist newspaper in Italy, *Non Mollare*. Later he became a conspirator, affiliated to “Giustizia e Liberta” movement, until his capture by the oppressive regime. Spinelli was a member of the Communist Party apparatus in youth, attracted by Lenin and Trotsky's internationalism. He explained he was significantly influenced in the embrace of federalist ideas by the English thinkers of the '30's, which proposed the transplantation of the American experience in Europe. Colorni was a pivot of the Socialist Party until his capture by the Fascists.<sup>96</sup>

---

<sup>95</sup> Charles F. Delzell, „The European Federalist Movement in Italy: first phase, 1918-1947” in The Journal of Modern History, vol. 32, no. 3, (sep. 1960), p. 241.

<sup>96</sup> Ibidem, p. 243.

Witnessing the decline of the League of Nations, all three reflected on Einaudi's essays, compiled twenty years before. The handy solution for Europe was the federalist one. From Spinelli and Rossi remained for posterity the most popular text prepared during the war, regarding the upcoming situation in Europe. Since June 1941, when the war was not predictable, the two imprisoned men drafted the "Towards a free and united Europe" text, better known as the "Ventotene Manifesto", as the place where it was articulated. Divided into three sections, "The crisis of modern civilization", "postwar Themes: European Unity" and "Society reform", it advocated for federal unity of the continent, as a matter to be cared of, after the war. This way, only, the problem posed by Germany could be solved effectively and there could have been provided a framework for the development of socialism. Their argument was that federalism does not require a socialist structure to ensure its existence, but vice-versa, socialism would die outside the frameworks imposed by the federalist organization. The difference between progressive parties and the conservative ones was given by their acceptance of the proposed new statutes at continental level. The system of sovereign nation states of Europe led to the inevitable formation of alliances and outburst of war, eventually. The Manifesto was written on cigarette foils, wrapped on the bottom of boxes, and transported to mainland Italy, where it has been multiplied and distributed among the organizations that opposed the fascist oppression. In 1943, with the establishment of "Movimento Europeo Federalista" by Spinelli and Rossi, the manifesto was established as its program.

An important moment for resisters was May 1944 when, in Geneva, there was held a clandestine meeting of opposing organizations from nine countries. Work of the Geneva Conference ended with a series of conclusions, which were submitted to the Allies. The most important one of all was the creation of a European federation.

Allied side was not favorable, however, to the proposed plans. Soviet leaders have expressed a clear position to reject any form of European unification. Stalin issued even claims for a return to the status quo he had agreed with Hitler in 1939, proposing the inclusion of Estonia, Latvia, the eastern half of Poland, Bessarabia, Lithuania and also eastern parts of Finland into USSR. For the remaining European countries, he proposed the reconstruction based on sovereignty. Since spring 1942, the Soviets have adopted a firm stance on a federation of European countries, classifying it as a "bourgeois movement against the Soviet Union". After the victory of Stalingrad in January 1943, Stalin resorted to a diplomatic offensive to articulate his

stand more acute. Thus, he has broken relations with the Polish Government exiled in London, who supported the proposed continental federation, has withdrawn his ambassadors from London and Washington, and has even threatened to end a separate peace with Hitler. Any attempt to discuss the federal issue was seen as a threat to the Soviet Union.<sup>97</sup>

Moreover, the United States of America, walked towards the Soviet options and agreed their position. President Roosevelt remained tributary to the idea of “great powers” and sustained the global order being dominated by four policemen, represented by U.S.A., U.S.S.R., Great Britain and China, to which the smaller states were subordinated. US-Soviet cooperation was to provide the skeleton on which future peace would have been built.

The Resistance ideas did not influence in any way the decisions adopted at the Tehran Conference, in November 1943, which foreshadowed the decisive reality settled by the peace conferences that followed. American concessions continued and generated a return to the old order as well as a blow applied to the Europeans changing expectations.

Towards the end of the war it became evident that Resistance programs did not weighed in value since they did match those of the Allies. Resisters became the bearers of ideas that no longer corresponded to reality, taking shape. Disappointment pushed the federalist supporters back into resistance position, even after the war.<sup>98</sup>

The idea of European unity was articulated during the war from a pragmatic need to restrain expansive tendencies generated by destructive nationalism. The idea was not novel, but the conditions in which it was expressed again gave it an increased level of justification. Amid the failure of the League of Nations and the collapse of the national state, all anti-fascist, noncommunist Resistance groups, have developed programs expressing its options on the future of the continent. With all the efforts of their members, Allies have not expressed common views. Lacking the support of political decision power and consequently the possibility for practical transposition, the texts remained at theoretical development, which can much express an option for policy makers today.

## **References:**

---

<sup>97</sup> Lipgens, „European federation...”, p. 15.

<sup>98</sup> Ibidem, p. 19.

Delzell, Charles F., „The European Federalist Movement in Italy: First Phase 1918-1947”, în *Journal of Modern History*, XXXII (1960), pp. 241-250.

Einaudi, Luigi, „For a economic federation of Europe”, 1 sept. 1943, în Lipgens, Walter (ed.), *Documents on the history of European Integration*, vol I, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, New York, 1985.

Lipgens, Walter, „European Federation in the Political Thought of Resistance Movements during World War II”, în *Central European History*, vol. 1, no. 1 (Mar., 1968), pp. 5-19.

Lipgens, Walter, *Europa-Federationsplane der Widerstandsbewegungen 1940-1945*, Oldenbourg, Munich, 1968, doc. no. 77, Henri Frenay, dec. 1943.

\*\*\*, „Movimento Federalista Europeo: Political Theses and General Directives”, 27-28 aug. 1943, în Lipgens, Walter (ed.), *Documents on the history of European Integration*, vol I, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, New York, 1985.