On the other side of the valley —
on a wall overlooking the
old Fish Market
was written
a Luxembourgish
inscription
the words that have
become the Luxembourg’s
unofficial motto

Mir Welle Bleive
Wat Mir Sëi

('we want to remain
what we are')
Taken together, the birthplace and the motto are symbolic of the hopes and the difficulties of the European experiment in which, directly or indirectly, we are all engaged.

The birthplace is symbolic, not only because of the man who was born there, but also because it is where it is.

— How came it that a man born in Luxembourg of German parents became Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of France? in 1939.
— Why did he make the speech that is now known as The Schuman Declaration?
— And what is its significance for us today?
And the media —
why should the Luxembourgers —
apparently the most
“impeccable” of nations —
assert that they want to
remain what they are?

Does it even make sense,
in the modern world, that
they should do so.

In this lecture, I will try to
answer these questions.

But, before doing so, may
I say what a great
honour it is for me,
to have been asked to
deliver this lecture
in Oslo

at a moment which
I believe, we shall come
to see in retrospect as
a turning point of
history

— for good, or for ill.

— It’s an honour, but also
a pleasure to be here
once.
There can be few nations who feel such a natural affinity to each other as the Norwegians and the Scots.

My first holiday outside the British Isles in 1949 was spent in Norway, and my wife and I have many friends here — including some who have been induced — by the promise of better things to follow — to come and listen to me this morning.

It is an honour and a pleasure to be here — but also a responsibility.

Those of us who work in the European institutions are all too conscious of the sensitivity of public opinion in the Nordic countries on the "European" issue.

Negotiations...
Negotiations are just beginning, and it would be wrong for me, as a fudge, to appear to be entering the political debate about Norway’s relationship with the E.E.C.

In any case, I am not in a position to define or even to comment upon, the terms on which Norway might join the Community.

What I can say – because I have said it before in print – is that I believe it to be a great tragedy that Norway did not find it possible to join with us in 1973.

And – insofar as that was due to the failure, on the part of the Original Six, to take account of the needs and concerns of a country far from the rich heartland of mainland Europe – it was a great folly on their part.
Road Norway joined them, both the Danes and the British would have felt more comfortable — and, within Britain, especially the Scots.

The North Sea would have been the Mediterranean for the Community — what the Mediterranean was for the Romans.

The focus and context of thinking about the Community and its future would have been subtly different.

and many of the tensions that have plagued the City since 1973 might have been avoided.

So I personally hope fervently that, this time, you will find it possible to join — and that the Community, for its part, will not make that impossible by refusing to recognize the very special characteristic of your country and people.

You/
To put the question in other terms, borrowed from the Preamble to the Treaty of Rome, the question is whether you are prepared to join with us, who share your ideals, in a common endeavour to preserve peace and liberty.

For that, ultimately, is what the debate is about.

And I wonder whether, if they see it in that light, the compatriots of Nazism and Fascity will be able to stand apart and play no part in that endeavour.
The Euro-sceptic, hearing what I have just said, would at once object that I have misrepresented the choice before you.

He would say that the Community is not the only, and certainly not the best, means of preserving and strengthening peace and liberty —

Those who prefer to stand apart from the Community can make just as great a contribution in other and more effective ways.

The choice is not —

The sceptic would say —

between jumping in the game and standing on the sidelines — but between jumping into one, two or more possible types of game.

The Community is not entitled to arrogate to itself the right to call itself "Europe", to pretend that it offers the only route to salvation.

Claims such as that have been made by the energy down the ages without convincing sceptics of their truth.
To some extent, I accept the approach.

The Community has made, and continues to make, extravagant claims for itself. Community Europe is not all of Europe.

The Community institutions are not perfect, and it is possible that, if we all went back to European one, we could negotiate a package better adapted to the needs of the next century.

Perhaps so, but I believe that...

the package we have...

the package that grew out of the Schuman Declaration contains certain elements which are indispensable to any solution to the problems of our continent.

In order to explain why I believe this to be so, let me go back.

To Robert Schuman, the man born in Luxembourg who became the leader of France.

It is indeed a remarkable story.
If you go a little farther west, you will come to another great fortress—

Verdun.

There, in 10 months, between March and December 1916, 40 million shells were fired, and 700,000 people were killed.

(As the poet of Norway)

Between Verdun et lux., in the quiet market town of Charleville-Mézières, the Basilica was destroyed and rebuilt 3 times in the life of my grandfather.
To the East of dux. is

Trier — the Northern
Capital of the Roman
Empire.

The Cathedral of Trier,
the oldest cathedral North
of the Alps, was bombed
almost to destruction
within the lifetime of many
of us here.

In Luxembourg alone — out of
a population smaller than
that of Oslo —

32,000 were interned, deported
or forced into forced
labour

and — by the end of the war —

6,000 were dead.

Bosnia today

is still only a taste
of what happened
in W. Europe then.
It is not accidental that this
relatively small area
in the center of N. Europe,
known as Luxembourg,
should have been the scene
of such horrors and
such destruction.

And this is explained by the two greatest rivers of N.
Europe, the Rhine and the Meuse —
natural frontiers but also
natural waterways — a
means of transport for
heavy industrial production

And millions of years ago —
these were laid down in the
valleys of these rivers — their
tributaries —

in the Plain of Lorraine,
in the Saarland,
in Luxembourg and
Bavaria and, further
North in the Ruhr —
the richest deposits in
N. Europe of iron ore
and coal.
One does not have to be a Marxist to believe that conflicts between peoples have economic causes, even if these are human causes as well. In earlier centuries, France was the desire to secure rich agricultural land.

More recently, there has been the desire to secure oil fields.

From the middle of last century to the middle of this, there was the desire to control — and have more of — the basic elements of industrial production — coal, iron, and steel.

Hence the conflicts between old France and Germany which led to the annexation by Germany of Alsace-Lorraine in 1871, its return to France in 1919, France's occupation of the Saarland in 1919, the demilitarization of the Rhineland, the Saarland, etc. Germany's defiance of France and its allies in 1936, its march into the Rhineland in 1936, and inevitably the 2nd War.

The wealth of the area was the cause of its destruction.

And so to Robert Schuman.
Robert Schuman's family was born in a French farm near the border with Luxembourg, in the area annexed by Germany during the Franco-Prussian War of 1870-71. After France was annexed by Germany, the Schuman family moved to Luxembourg where Robert was born and brought up.

His native languages were Luxembourgish and German. His nationality was German. He went to University in Germany, qualified as a lawyer in Germany, and...

and set up in practice in Metz - then part of German

At the outbreak of the First
War, he was recruited into the German
Army.

At the end of that war, when
Alsace-Lorraine returned to France, Schuman
stood for election to the French
Parliament. Assembly.

In spite of a press campaign
to brand him a collaborator, he
was elected and remained a member of the French
Assembly until, in 1940, he was
he was imprisoned by the Germans, and kept prisoner for 6 months.

After the Second World War, France made an attempt to brand him a collaborator, but de Gaulle saw his quality and he was allowed to resume a political career.

Between 1946 and 1953, he was, at various stages, Minister of Finance, Prime Minister, Minister of Foreign Affairs, and Minister of Justice.

It was as M. J.F.A. that, on 9 May 1950, he made the speech now known as the Schuman Declaration.

Schuman was a great and exceptional man.

But this life was not exceptional in the sense that millions of other Frenchmen before and since have shared the same experience of war and its consequences.

By 1945-50, the France that had led to former wars had built up again.

France's resources were inadequate to its own needs. She therefore occupied the Saarland and called it in her own words a "reparations area."
By 1949, the tensions that had led to former wars had begun to build up again. France's resources of coal & steel within her own frontiers were insufficient for her industrial needs.

France needed the indubitable resources of the Saar, Rhine, which, under the allied occupation, she ruled in protectoral style.

For the emerging German democracy - an essential bulwark agt. Stalin's Empire - such an arrangement was, in the long term, unacceptable.

So the ingredients for renewed conflict.

The solution proposed by Schuman was, in the words of the S. Declaration, "to place French-German production of coal & steel as a whole under a common supra-authority, within the framework of an organization open to the participation of the other countries of Europe."
From the Schuman Declaration came the ECSC Treaty, and from the experience of those years came the Treaty of Rome.

The system thus created rests on a few key ideas:

First, that of "Community" in its fullest sense.
- The idea that by acting together, and by sharing the strengths that each of us has, we can achieve more for ourselves and for others than we could alone.

Second, that protectionism is ultimately self-defeating, and that the freedom of people to buy what they want where they want is both more conducive to prosperity, and more consistent with human freedom and dignity, that people should be able:
- to buy and sell where they like,
- to go where they like,
- to work where they like,
- to live and bring up their families where they like,

That is not possible if we are all protectionists.
The third key idea is that the rights and interests of small, as well as large, countries should be respected.

And, fourth, that you cannot achieve this in a lasting way without institutions of a new type — operating within a clean and enforceable legal framework.

In other words, within the framework of a Constitution, however embryonic.
To what considerable extent these aims have been achieved.

There is a community of purpose, and a community of action, that was not true before.

It is not accidental — or pure luck — that nearly half a century has passed without a Franco-German war, and that such a war is, in Schuman’s words, “absolutely unthinkable, but materially impossible.”

It is not accidental — or pure luck — that the choice of food and posts in the shops is now varied than it has ever been before.

It is not accidental — or pure luck — that the students of today have the opportunity to travel, and to study in other countries, with a freedom that has not been known since the late Middle Ages.

And — with all that — there is not the slightest evidence that the Germans, however, have become less French, the French less German.

Domini, in the Scots less Scotch, the French less French.

The Luxembourgers, in the words of their motto, remain what they are.

And Marx Thoreau’s nightmare of identical Europeans, united in an Iron Dome, — that remains what it always has been — a figment of an overheated imagination.
It is one of the apparent
contradictions of modern
Europe that, as the City, the
EEA and other institutions
draw us closer together,
the nationalism of sovereign
states gives way to a new —
and in some respects healthier —
form of nationalism:
the pride in regional identity.

It is not, I believe, purely by
chance that a very large
number of those who work in
the European institutions
small countries or from
come from the provincial
areas of life.

Sadly, however, this
friend is not usually
admirable in all respects.

To illustrate the point,
let me quote briefly from
an article written, in
Feb. of this year, by an
Englishman about the
people to whom his
wife’s father belonged.

(He wrote in French)

He said of these people —
"They are warm, generous, obstinate and passionate when sober, and all the more so when they are drunk."

"They know how to be grateful; they are direct; and they enjoy opposition."

"The more others tell them what to do, to keep them down and criticise them, the more they hold to their position, resist more fiercely and are even more convinced of the justice of their cause."
The writer's wife was 
1/2 Montenegrin & 1/2 Bosnian;
She was educated in Belgrade;
practised law in Croatia —
and, I suppose I need
hastily tell you, the people
of whom she was nothing
were the SERBS.

One of the frightful
consequences of the collapse
of Communism and the
collapse of the Berlin Wall has
been to reveal to us
Europeans what we ought
to know, but have
conveniently forgotten, about
ourselves.

That war in W. Europe should be
unthinkable is not due to
any inherent virtue which
we enjoy, but the Serbs, the
Croats and the Bosnians do not.

The proof that this is so
does not lie in the United States.
These are the last remnants of
every race and
ideology in Europe.
But whatever the sources of
violence in that country,
little or none of it is due
to tribal hatred between
the peoples of Europe.
The stability of western Europe is not due, not to any moral virtue in our past.

-Put to the conscientious effort of men like Robert Schuman to create and maintain an institutional structure for political and economic stability.

What does that involve?

It involves, I think, identifying the forces that are likely to bring people together, and those that are likely to drive them apart—and to find ways of harnessing the one, and preventing the other from operating.

Traditionally, in Europe, the forces that have brought people together AND have driven them apart have been race or nationality, language or religion.

The Community has, I think, found a reasonably satisfactory solution to two of these—nationality and language.

The Community system is based upon the principle that discrimination on grounds of nationality is illegal.

And, at not inconsiderable cost, we maintain the most complex language regime of any international organization.
we have also, I think, formed a reasonable basis on which to reconcile the desire of producers and providers of services to find new markets in other fields with their own home market.

Adam Smith observed these contradictory attitudes 200 years ago:

The Community institutions are far from perfect structurally or operationally— but they do offer a fairly sophisticated balance between the interests of the large, medium and small Member States.

Qualified majority voting in Council of Ministers "qualified proportional representation" in the E.P.

"Qualified equality" amongst the members of the Commission and total equality amongst the judges of the Court.
The balance would reasonably well at the moment, but and may continue to work without major adjustment in a Community of 16.

I don't think it can work in a City of 20 or more.

So he must address this problem and should do so now rather than later.

and in doing so we must take account of the rapid growing disintegration - seen most obviously in Italy - with the hostile and methods of modern democratic politics.

If that disintegration is dangerous in its, Europe, it is infinitely more dangerous in the collapsed economies of the East.

It cannot, seriously, be enough - in a climate more suited to the Mafia, than to Harvard Business School. If we talk about creating a market economy while keeping out the only products - steel, coal, heavy goods and agricultural products - none of which the Eastern economies are capable.
we must react adequately to the problems of E. Europe unless we put in place institutional mechanisms for reading in a co-ordinate rational way.

The same is true of our attitude to the Third World, the depletion of natural resources, the occurrence of environmental disaster, and so on.

In each case, there are conflicts of interest: viatical instincts and does worthy impulses even worse is the symbiotic forces: how violence and terrorism. If you believe that these can be reconciled by conferences of experts and interpreting conferences, then you are not likely to believe that the institutions of the EEC can do much to offer.

Perhaps it is just possible — because of Norway's geographical position, her terrain, her natural resources and the inclines of her people — that Norway can go it alone, while others proceed together without you.

At least Engels hoped for the line taken by Britain in the 1950s. he thought we were special and that we didn't need to belong.

That does not mean that all the Community's beliefs are set in stone, and that you must accept all of them too.

Indeed, we — that is the Community — must
When we discovered that
new order, we found that
others had made the rules
which we had to accept.

Many of the rules have now
become familiar and any
Candiate country, itself
Norway must accept them:
the basic rules.

But some rules are not set:
infrastructure, the market
does not necessarily to
respond to the new challenges:
E. Europe, the environment,
the Third world, and
management of resources.

If you come with me now,
You can contribute to
development policies
the increasing of those rules.

for our part, I believe we
need your insights
and your help.

You have much to
contribute and
in my belief, for
what it is worth,
You have nothing
to lose.