

Schuman Lecture - Oct 10/5/93.

---

The Relevance of the Schuman  
Declaration for the Year 2000

---

In Luxembourg,  
in the shadow of the  
plateau on which the  
European Court now  
stands, is the  
birthplace of Robert  
Schuman

On the other side of  
the valley —  
on a wall overlooking the  
old Fish Market  
a Luxembourgish <sup>has written</sup> / ~~inscribed~~  
the words that have  
become ~~the~~ Luxembourg's  
unofficial motto

Mir wölle Bleiwe  
Wat Mir Sin

(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 birth place is symbolic,  
not only because of the  
man who was born there,  
but also because it is  
where it is.

— How come it that a  
man born in Luxembourg  
of German parents became  
Prime Minister and  
Foreign Minister of France?

in 1950,  
— Why did he make the speech  
that is now known as  
the Schuman Declaration?

— And what is its  
significance for us  
today?

And the motto —

Why should the  
Luxembourgers —  
apparently the most  
"European" 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 /

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  
~~and~~ 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  
since /

since  
/ 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 /

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 judge, to appear to be entering the political debate about Norway's relationship with the 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 /

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.

Had Norway joined then, both the Danes and the British would have felt more comfortable - and, within Britain, especially the Scots.

The North Sea would have been ~~the "Middle Sea"~~ <sup>Middelhavet</sup> for ~~of~~ 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 /

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 recognise the very special character of your country and people.

You/

You, like the Luxembourgers  
and, for that matter, the  
Scots, want to remain what  
you are.

You are entitled to do so, and  
I do not believe that anyone  
in the City seriously wishes  
it to be otherwise.

The question you must answer  
for yourselves is whether —  
if you stand apart from the  
experiment on which the rest  
of us, however hesitantly, are  
engaged,  
you can indeed remain what  
you are.

To/

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 & liberty.

For that, ultimately, is what  
the debate is about,  
and I wonder whether, if they  
see it in that light, the  
compatibilists of Neoinstitutionalism and  
Trygve Lie would <sup>really</sup> prefer to  
stand apart and play no  
part in that endeavour.

The Emo-sceptic, hearing what I have just said, would at once object that I have misrepresented the choice before you.

~~The Emo-sceptic~~ <sup>He</sup> would <sup>machine</sup> say that the Community L 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 joining in the game and standing on the sidelines — but between ~~staying~~ ~~more than one~~ two or more possible types of game. The Community is not entitled ~~to~~ ~~would say~~ 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 <sup>churches</sup> ~~clergy~~ down the ages without convincing sceptics of their truth.



To some extent, I accept the reproach.

The Community has made, and continues <sup>in some quarters,</sup> 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 square 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 ~~let me explain~~ why I believe this to be so, let me go back <sup>(Luxembourg, alas to)</sup> to Robert Schuman, the man born in Luxembourg who became the leader of France.

It is indeed a remarkable story.

~~Down~~ The GD of Luxembourg, as you probably know, is a tiny country wedged between Germany on the E., France on the S. and Belgium on the W. It has a population rather less than that of Oslo, and a surface area not much larger than Oslo Fjord.

Its independence is, historically, due to the fact that Luxembourg City was once the greatest fortress of N. Europe.

In other words it stands at what was <sup>once</sup> a strategic point in the great land battles of earlier days.

If you go a little further west, you will come to another great fortress - Verdun

where, in 10 months, between March and December 1916,

40 million shells were fired, and 700,000 people were killed.

( $\frac{1}{6}$  the pop'n of Norway)

Between Verdun & 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 Lux. 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~~ driven 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  
a relatively small area  
in the centre of W. Europe,  
~~around~~ <sup>around</sup> Luxembourg,  
should have been the scene  
of such horrors and  
such destruction.

~~It lies~~ The area is watered  
by the 2 greatest rivers of N.  
Europe - the Rhine + the Moselle. —  
natural frontiers — but also  
natural waterways — a  
means of transport for  
heavy industrial production

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

in the Plain of Lorraine,  
in the Saarland,  
~~also~~ in Luxembourg and  
Wallonia and, further  
North, in the Ruhr —  
the richest deposits in  
W. 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, there  
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 <sup>new</sup> 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 demilitarisation of  
the Rhineland, (to Germany)

— The return of the Saarland in 1935

— Hitler's defiance of France &  
her allies in 1936 & his  
march into the Rhineland,

— and <sup>so</sup> inexorably the 2nd WW

The wealth of the area was  
the cause of its destruction

And so to Robert Schuman

Robert Schuman's father was born in a French town near the border with Luxembourg, in the area annexed by Germany <sup>(after)</sup> ~~After~~ the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71. ~~That part of 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 Lorraine.

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

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

In spite of a press campaign to brand him a collaborator, he was elected, and <sup>he</sup> remained a member of the French Assembly until, in 1940, he /

he was imprisoned by the Germans, and kept prisoner for 6 months.

After the Second World War, ~~there was~~ an attempt was, once again, made 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. of 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 his life was not exceptional in the sense that millions of other Europeans, before and since, have shared the same experience of war and its consequences.

By /  $\longrightarrow$

~~the 1949-50, the tensions that had led to former wars had built up again.~~

France's resources of coal within her own frontiers were insufficient for her int. needs. ~~she France~~ occupied the Saarland and ruled it in proconsular style. ~~Her resources of coals~~  
within  
the

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 indl. resources of the Saarland which, under the allied occupation, she ruled "in proconsular style".

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

~~The emerging new democratic Germany - an essential bulwark for the West against Stalin's Russia - could not accept this such an economic infringement of sovereignty.~~

- So the ingredients for renewed conflict were there.

The solution proposed by Schuman was, in the words of the S. Declaration, :-

"to place Franco-German production of coal & steel as a whole under a common higher authority, within the framework of an organisation open to the participation of the other countries of Europe".

[? continue]



From the Schuman Declaration  
came the ECSC Treaty,  
and from the experience of  
six years later,  
that 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 more  
for others than we can <sup>achieve</sup> alone.

Second/

Second, that protectionism  
is ultimately self-defeating,  
~~and that the freedom of people  
to buy what they want where  
they want~~

It is both more conducive to  
prosperity, and more consistent  
with human freedom and  
dignity, that people should  
be able

- to buy & 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 protectionist.

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 clear and enforceable legal framework
- in other words, within the framework of a constitution, however embryonic



The bargain between the Member States depends upon each giving up something for the greater good

- and the States must be held to the bargain they have made

To a very considerable extent these aims have been achieved.

There is a community of purpose, and a community of action, that was not there 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, "not merely unthinkable, but materially impossible".

It is not accidental - or pure luck - that the choice of food and goods in the shops is more 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 ~~French~~ <sup>Danes</sup> have become less ~~French~~ ~~the Danes less~~ Danish, or the Scots less Scotch, maddeningly French.

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

And Mrs Thatcher's nightmare of identikit Europeans regimented in a European super-state 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 Cty, 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 the <sup>big ones.</sup> ~~big countries~~

Sadly, however, this trend is not wholly 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 have~~ ~~had~~ drunk.

"They know how to be grateful; they are direct; and they enjoy <sup>argument</sup> ~~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."

"Why are they like that?"

"You must remember that their country was occupied for nearly 4 centuries.

"Resistance became for them a way of life.

"They were not allowed to meet for religious services except on their Saints' days, and the Church became the accomplice in their fight for independence, while it fought to maintain the faith of its people."

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  
hardly tell you, the people  
of whom he was writing  
were the SERBS.

One of the frightful  
consequences of the collapse  
of Communism and the  
fall 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 ~~etc~~ this is so  
lies in the United States.

There you will find the  
descendants of every race and  
tribe in Europe

But whatever the sources of  
unrest 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 on our part

— But to the conscious 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 & 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 régime of any international organisation.

We have also, I think, found a reasonable basis ~~of~~ on which to reconcile <sup>the</sup> desire of producers and providers of services to find new markets in other ~~part~~ <sup>(and in their edginess)</sup> countries ~~to be demanded~~ to be protected ~~against~~ in their home market.

Adam Smith observed these contradictory attitudes 200 years ago

and, within limits, they are accommodated, within the Community, by the Treaty rules on free movement and fair competition.

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 works 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 we must address this problem and should do so now rather than later.

and in doing so we must take account of the rapidly growing disillusionment - seen most obviously in Italy - with the people and methods of modern democratic politics.

If that disillusionment is dangerous in W. 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 - to talk about creating a market economy while <sup>(of our markets)</sup> keeping out the only products - steel, coal, heavy goods and agricultural products - of which <sup>most of</sup> the Eastern economies are capable.

We cannot react adequately to the problems of E. Europe unless we put in place institutional mechanisms for reacting in a co-ordinated, rational way.

The same is true of our attitude to the Third World, the depletion of natural resources, ~~and~~ the avoidance of environmental disaster, ~~drugs and terrorism.~~

In each case, there are conflicts of interest: virtuous instincts and

less worthy instincts  
Even worse is the <sup>corrosive force of</sup> ~~drugs and terrorism.~~

If you believe that these can be reconciled by conferences of experts and intergovt. conferences, then/

then you are not likely to believe that the institutions of the ERM City have much to offer.

Perhaps it is just possible — because of Norway's geographical position, her terrain, her natural resources, and the qualities of her people, —

that Norway can go it alone, while others proceed together without you.

~~That~~ That was the line taken by Britain in the 1950's. We thought we were special and that we didn't need to belong.

That does not mean that ~~you have to~~ all the Community policies are set in stone, and that you must accept all of them too.

Indeed, we — that is the Community, must

When we discovered we were wrong, we found that others had made the rules which we had to accept.

Many of the rules have now become firmer and any candidate country, incl<sup>y</sup> Norway, must accept ~~them~~ the basic rules.

~~But some rules are not set in particular, the rules that will be necessary to respond to the new challenges - E. Europe, the environment, the Third World and management of resources.~~

If you come with us now, you can contribute to <sup>development</sup> policies the ~~making~~ of those ~~rules~~.

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

You have much to contribute and, ~~I believe, very little to lose.~~

in my belief, for what it is worth, you have nothing to lose.