



Robert Schuman

**Pedagogy of Peace:
The Contribution of Jean Monnet to the
Construction of the European Union**

Karine de Souza Silva



Jean Monnet/Robert Schuman Paper Series

Vol. 9 No. 5

March 2009

Published with the support of the EU Commission.

The Jean Monnet/Robert Schuman Paper Series

The Jean Monnet/Robert Schuman Paper Series is produced by the Jean Monnet Chair of the University of Miami, in cooperation with the Miami-Florida European Union Center of Excellence, a partnership with Florida International University (FIU).

These monographic papers analyze ongoing developments within the European Union as well as recent trends which influence the EU's relationship with the rest of the world. Broad themes include, but are not limited to:

- ◆ EU Enlargement
- ◆ The Evolution of the Constitutional Process
- ◆ The EU as a Global Player
- ◆ Comparative Regionalisms
- ◆ The Trans-Atlantic Agenda
- ◆ EU-Latin American Relations
- ◆ Economic issues
- ◆ Governance
- ◆ The EU and its Citizens
- ◆ EU Law

As the process of European integration evolves further, the Jean Monnet/Robert Schuman Papers is intended to provide current analyses on a wide range of issues relevant to the EU. The overall purpose of the monographic papers is to contribute to a better understanding of the unique nature of the EU and the significance of its role in the world.

Miami - Florida European Union Center

University of Miami
1000 Memorial Drive
101 Ferré Building
Coral Gables, FL 33124-2231
Phone: 305-284-3266
Fax: (305) 284 4406
Web: www.miami.edu/eucenter

Jean Monnet Chair Staff

Joaquín Roy (Director)
Astrid Boening (Associate Director)
María Lorca (Associate Editor)
Maxime Larive (Research Assistant)

Florida International University
Elisabeth Prugl (FIU, Co-Director)

Inter-American Jean Monnet Chair Editorial Board:

Carlos Hakansson, Universidad de Piura, Perú
Finn Laursen, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Canada
Michel Levi-Coral, Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar, Quito, Ecuador
José Luis Martínez-Estay, Universidad de los Andes, Santiago de Chile, Chile
Félix Peña, Universidad Nacional de Tres de Febrero, Buenos Aires, Argentina
Stephan Sberro, Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México
Eric Tremolada, Universidad del Externado de Colombia, Bogotá, Colombia

International Jean Monnet Chair Editorial Advisors:

Francesc Granell, University of Barcelona, Spain
Ramūnas Vilpišauskas, Vilnius University, Lithuania

Pedagogy of Peace: The Contribution of Jean Monnet to the Construction of the European Union*

Karine de Souza Silva*

I. INITIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Jean Monnet was one of the most celebrated figures of the 20th Century. He was the most influential strategist to work behind the scenes in the institutions of power following the Second World War, and his concrete action paved the way for the construction of the European Union.

Europe was at the epicenter of an unparalleled crisis, brought by the Great War, which devastated the regional economy, caused the failure of the traditional methods of diplomacy to resolve disputes, and imposed an environment of pain and destruction in the territories affected. The self-esteem, hope and the spirit of solidarity of the Europeans were showing signs of fragility, while the walls – both physical and imaginary – raised by the cold war, signaled the imminent danger of another world conflict.

It was in the context of this catastrophic scenario that Jean Monnet demonstrated his determination to propagate the idea of integration as a means of ensuring peace and reestablishing the old continent, politically and economically. The great enthusiast of a united Europe found a formula that would defuse the Franco-German rivalry, through a method capable of gradually achieving a single market.

It was Jean Monnet who wrote the text of the Schuman Declaration of 9th May 1950, which promulgated the States and founded a supranational International Organization to overcome the dangerous rivalries, and which eventually led to a new state of truce. It was on that day that the European Union was formally born, and the name of Monnet went down in the History books, for his evident action on behalf of the unification of the peoples around a single flag.

The objective of this article is to present the leading role of Jean Monnet in the process of emergence and consolidation of the European Union (EU). Thus, the work first describes the efforts of the French designer to construct the union on a sector-by-sector basis, through an innovative method, and to overcome the barriers to achieving those objectives. Next, it explains Jean Monnet's main theses, which support the building of the Community structures. Finally, it explains the development of the European bloc, and its consecration as the boldest and most complex integration model in the world.

* Article in commemoration of the 30th anniversary of the death of Jean Monnet. This research was carried out with the support of the European Commission, and is part of the activities of the "Jean Monnet Chair" Study Group, which is linked to the Master's and Doctorate programs in Legal Science at UNIVALI.

*Karine de Souza Silva – Holder of the Jean Monnet Chair. Doctor of Law (UFSC). Professor of the Master's and PhD programs in Legal Science at the University of Vale do Itajaí – UNIVALI / SC / Brazil. E-mail: karinesilva@univali.br

II. JEAN MONNET AND THE IMPULSE FOR THE CREATION OF EUROPEAN INTEGRATION

Jean Marie Gabriel Monnet¹ was one of the most skilful designers humanity has ever known.

Monnet worked enthusiastically for the reconstruction and reconciliation of the old Europe, ravaged by the festering wounds of hatred and rancor². He was not among those who held political and economic sway in France, and he never held a political position³. But even though he was far from the typical honors of power and dignified titles, he exerted, like few others, a high degree of influence in the decisions of public men, taking advantage of his pedagogy of peace with a strong *kantian* influence⁴. He was a figure who worked behind the scenes⁵ to cement the bases of European integration, though the neutralization of the Franco-Germanic rivalry. While Alcide de Gaspari, Konrad Adenauer and Robert Schuman were the fathers of the European Union, Monnet was, without doubt, its mentor.

Monnet was the true architect of European unity. The international media recognized him as the “inspiration” behind the new Europe, a nickname conferred on him by General Charles de Gaulle. Recognition of his importance gave him other nicknames, such as: “pragmatic visionary” coined by Jacques Delors and “pacific revolutionary” as he was called by François Fontaine⁶.

Jean Monnet was an active figure in the construction of the Society of the Nations, and for this reason, was nominated Assistant Secretary General, at the foundation of the International Organization in 1919. On that occasion, he began to bring to the fore the need for peaceful dialog between peoples of the world, and to reinforce the principles of cooperation between the States. The Second World War gave him an internationally prominent role once again, when he took over the function of the President of the Franco-British Coordination Committee, with the task of negotiating the supply of arms to the allies.

But it was at the end of the Second World War that he was thrust into a leading role in the European scenario. Monnet was Commissioner for the Plan for Modernization and Equipment of

¹ Jean Monnet was born in the French city of Cognac in 1888. The international business vocation of the family, which sold brandy, gave him the opportunity to visit different countries. These cultural exchanges prompted in him a vocation for themes which were sensitive to international relations. To open the doors of trade to his production, he lived and worked in London. During the First World War, he received from his government the incumbency to coordinate, in the city of London, the treaties for economic cooperation between the allied countries. He died on 16th March 1979.

² Tony Judt claimed that Jean Monnet was “no ordinary man (...). His dedication to the economic planning and the contribution he later made to the Schuman Plan for European cooperation, therefore, were based on his familiarity with management on a large scale, and international collaboration which at that time, were extremely rare in a Frenchman of his social class.” JUDT, Tony. *Pós-guerra: uma história da Europa desde 1945*. Trad. de José Roberto O’Shea. Rio de Janeiro: Objetiva, 2008. p. 84.

³ “Nowadays it is difficult to imagine the influence he had on his country, in Europe and in the world, this small, calm man who never appeared on radio or television, who was never found at dinner parties, who worked – with concentration and carefulness: the only way to ensure a good product”. DUVERGER, Maurice. *A Europa dos cidadãos: uma aventura inacabada*. Lisbon: Asa, 1994.

⁴ Immanuel Kant, in 1795, proposed an integration of the European States, founded on the state of peace as an immediate duty, whose realization would be linked to the signing of a contract between the peoples, which, among themselves, would constitute a bond of peace. For the author, only peace would be capable of banishing all wars forever. See: KANT, I. *À paz perpétua*. Tradução de Marco Antonio de A. Zingano. São Paulo: L&PM Editores, 1989.

⁵ Robert Schuman gave his opinion of Monnet that: “the two world wars gave him an international vocation. He was successively in the service of various allied governments, beginning with the first world war, and afterwards with the Society of Nations. What characterized him, what distinguished him from so many others with inventive spirit, is that he did not restrict himself to conceiving and launching his ideas, then abandon them to chance; he was concerned to see that they were fulfilled, himself taking on part of the responsibility for applying the plans that he had created”. BRUGMANS, Henri. *L’idée européenne 1920–1970*. 3^a ed. Bruges : De Tempel, 1970, p. 159.

⁶ GUICHAOUA, Elsa. Jean Monnet entre mémoire, célébration et Histoire. In: BOSSUAT, Gérard & WILKENS, Andreas. *Jean Monnet: l’Europe et les chemins de la paix*. Paris. Publications de la Sorbonne, 1999, p. 437.

France, aimed at the economic reconstruction and recovery of the country in the context of the Marshall Plan. In the exercise of this mission, he revived⁷ and re-elaborated important theses on regional integration, which served as the impetus for the creation of the European Union.

The “pragmatic visionary” was deeply concerned with the chaotic situation of Europe⁸, which presented a scenario of notable political and economic devastation, with high levels of inflation, lack of agricultural supply, and major difficulties in attracting the foreign resources necessary to restructure the national parks. Likewise, he feared that the North American capital injected by the Marshall Plan would leave the European powers eternally dependant and lethargic. The only way to escape this trap was through the promotion of a common effort of the States that would collectively guarantee a future of peace and economic stability.

The new World division, between the capitalist West and the socialist East, fuelled suspicions of a potential of new conflict with even crueler effects. In this context of crisis, Germany was like the dividing door that separated two worlds,⁹ which would inevitably clash¹⁰. Monnet observed that the “East-West dialog knows no rule other than that imposed by force”. In his understanding, the cold war constituted “the first phase of the true war”.¹¹ Therefore, it was urgent to formulate a concrete, peaceful solution that would transform the course of events, and strategically alter the given conditions¹². For this, “Germany would not be the cause, but what would be at stake. It was necessary for Germany to cease being the object of dispute and become, on the contrary, the binding link”¹³. To reach this objective it was imperative to “change the minds of men”, which meant doing away with the German fear of once again becoming the

⁷ The European Community project was preceded by significant antecedents, particularly at the start of the 20th Century, marked by the birth of various associations and publications which propagated federalist theses. Among these was the Pan European Manifesto of 1923, of Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi (1894-1972) and his project to form a European confederation, which caused important impacts on the academic world. The broadest movement originated in France, through its minister of Foreign Affairs, Aristides Briand, who in 1929, proposed the creation of a federation called “European Union”. The proposal was matured and taken to the Society of the Nations, in 1930. The intention was to found a federation based on the idea of union, not unity. The only countries that responded negatively were the United Kingdom and the former USSR (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) of Stalin, for whom the “European Union would be a war machine” against his country. The formula of economic crisis, together with the exacerbated nationalisms resulted in the Second World War. The intents, although timid, persisted and the federalist idea remained alive and was indicated as the only way of achieving peace within the map of Europe. It was in this atmosphere of struggles, in 1943, that the unification agreement emerged between Holland, Belgium and Luxembourg – the so-called BENELUX, as a development of the Belgo-Luxembourgish Economic Union of 1921, and which, from 1945, constituted an Economic Union. Cf. MANGAS MARTÍN, A.; LIÑÁN NOGUERAS, D. J. *Instituciones y Derecho de la Unión Europea*. 2. ed. Madrid: McGraw-Hill, 1999, p. 4-5; TRUYOL Y SERRA, A. *La Integración Europea: Idea y Realidad*. Madrid: Tecnos, 1972, p. 13-28. See: SILVA, Karine de Souza. *Direito da Comunidade Européia: fontes, princípios e procedimentos*. Ijuí: Ed. Unijuí, 2005.

⁸ Many of Jean Monnet’s ideas are written in his work *Memórias*. This is a rich historical report on the dramatic years following the Second World War. In twenty one chapters, the author discusses in detail the fears and incredulities that affected the peoples and governments of the old continent, and sheds light on the routes taken by the European political powers towards regional integration. Without doubt, the author presents a privileged view of the initial steps of the integration, since from the outset, he was directly involved in the negotiations, since he had always worked behind the scenes in the institutions of power. See: MONNET, Jean. *Mémoires*. Paris: Fayard, 1976. In Brazil, the work was published in 1986 by the Publishers of UnB. MONNET, Jean. *Memórias: A construção da unidade européia*. Trad. de Ana Maria Falcão. Brasília: EdUnB, 1986.

⁹ “The cold war became a climate of life that was unbearable for hundreds of thousands of people”. MONNET, Jean. *Op. cit.*, p. 254.

¹⁰ “another war would approach if we did nothing”. MONNET, Jean. *Op. cit.*, p. 256.

¹¹ P. 257.

¹² “the German situation would quickly become a cancer for the country in the near future, and for France immediately, if its development was not directed to the Germans in the sense of hope and collaboration with the free peoples. It is not necessary to seek to resolve the German problem with the current data. It is necessary to change the data, transforming them”. MONNET, Jean. *Op. cit.*, p. 258.

¹³ MONNET, Jean. *Op. cit.*, p. 256.

victim of humiliation, and dissipating the French fear of the uncontrollable reemergence of Germany. This was the key for the creation of the European Union.

The situation was extremely delicate, since the restructuring of Germany, on one hand, would serve as a contention barrier against the expansionist goals of the former Soviet Union, and on the other, would become a threat to the titanic resurgence of the German industrial power during war, which would enable it to go beyond foreign borders.

With this in mind, the “inspirer” proposed “a solution that would place the French industry on the same base of departure as that of Germany, and at the same time, liberate it from the discrimination resulting from its defeat, reestablishing the economic and political conditions necessary for an understanding that was indispensable for Europe. Furthermore, it would serve as the very tool for European unity.”¹⁴

Therefore, it was a time to reunite what the action of man had separated. The reintegration of the region of the Saar and Ruhr in the same moulds that nature had married together – and history had tried to separate – was the only solution for pacification. Thus, the natural resources involved in it could be placed in the service of peace and not war. Only in this way would the States be removed from the potential of the war industry. “The joint wealth was, first and foremost, that of the coal and steel, whose natural basins set within a geographic triangle which the borders artificially cut through were repeated in an unequal, but complementary way, by France and Germany. These incidental borders had become, in the industrial era, whose emergence coincided with that of the national doctrines, obstacles to exchange and afterwards, lines of confrontation. Neither of the two peoples felt safer because neither alone had all the resource, i.e., all the territory. The rivalry was decided by the war, which would only resolve the problem for a limited time – the time to prepare and get revenge. Now, the coal and steel were, at the same time, the key to economic strength and the arsenal where the weapons of war were forged. This double power had given them huge symbolic significance that we have forgotten, similar to that attributed to nuclear energy nowadays. To merge them beyond the borders would be to remove from them their harmful prestige and transform them into a guarantee of peace”.¹⁵

The proposal consisted of removing from the hands of the States the capacity to manage the energy resources – coal and steel – the raw materials that prompted the war industry. The production of these energy resources would be controlled by an “International Authority, open to the participation of the other European countries. This (authority) would have the task of unifying the base conditions of production, and thereby enabling the gradual extension of the other domains of an effective cooperation for peaceful purposes”.¹⁶ In other words, the intention was to integrate the States through a sector-based International Organization (IO), which would be responsible for administrating the production of coal and steel by the member States.

The seed had already been sown, all that needed was to give it a body. With the help of his co-workers—Étienne Hirsch, Pierre Uri and Paul Reuter—Monnet began to design the French plan for the creation of the International Organization responsible for administrating the Franco-Germanic production of steel and coal. The proposal was revolutionary, and Monnet was well aware of this. This proposal, which followed an innovative method, was immediately taken on board by the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Robert Schuman, who in turn, served as interlocutor with the Charles de Gaulle Government. The latter, having been convinced that the plan was feasible, granted to his Minister the credentials needed to implement the project with the other governments.

It is important to highlight that the ideas that the “pacifistic revolutionary” borrowed from France was the response Schuman needed¹⁷ to present to his American and British peers who had

¹⁴ MONNET, Jean. *Op. cit.*, p. 259.

¹⁵ MONNET, Jean. *Op. cit.*, p. 260.

¹⁶ MONNET, Jean. *Op. cit.*, p. 261.

¹⁷ “In order to unravel this web of difficulties where traditional diplomacy was proving powerless, Robert Schuman called upon the inventive genius of a man as yet unknown to the general public but who had acquired exceptional

entrusted him with a mission from which he could not escape: to formulate a proposal for the reintegration of Federal Germany in the pact of the western powers. Monnet's idea saved Schuman from the pressure of a calendar that announced two important dates: May 10th, 1950, the fatal period granted by the United Kingdom and the United States for the French to disclose the solution in a meeting scheduled between the three nations; and, May 18th, a ministerial conference took place in the heart of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), on which occasion France declared its incumbency.

The Schuman-Monnet operation was therefore mathematical in essence, and came about to follow a spartan agenda of international pressures that gave France the responsibility for integrating Germany, in the attempt to destroy the advance of communism on the continent. It was within this context that the European Union was born.

Thus, Robert Schuman obtained the whole diplomatic apparatus necessary to give life to the integration and overcome the avalanche of political difficulties that would be encountered, both internally and externally. The first step was to seek the membership of the German government which, in the person of its Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, proved sensitive and joined the cause.

With the approval of Schuman, the "inspirer" engineered the whole plan and wrote the lines of the known Schuman Declaration¹⁸, which was officially presented as a Franco-Germanic proposal to the press, at 4 pm on May 9th, 1950, in the Clock Room of the *Quai d'Orsay* in Paris, general headquarters of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The Declaration was the foundation stone of the European integrationist construction¹⁹. It was on this date that the European Union was born, and this paved the way for the signing of the Treaty that would create the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) in 1951, and the founding Treaties of the European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM) and the European Economic Community (CEE) in 1957, which over the years, formed the pillars of the present-day European Union.

Influenced by the atmosphere of optimism arising from his endeavors, the "pragmatic visionary" declared that "in 1950, the men of Europe began to see their past with plenty of confidence to dream new forms in their reciprocal relations. With the Schuman plan, this dream would become a reality, peace seemed possible, the cold war became distant."²⁰

The Schuman Plan, as it became known, was adhered to by six States: France, Germany, Italy, Belgium, Holland and Luxembourg. During the agreements, all these countries were persuaded to join the initiative. It should be noted, at this point, that this was not an easy process to achieve. The negotiations were permeated by times of difficulty and uncertainty which were gradually dispelled thanks to the astuteness and skill of the diplomats. The exception was the British who, from the start, showed adamant reservations. Great Britain positioned itself strongly against the transfer of parcels of sovereignty. It only signed up to the proposal of integration through special conditions, which were immediately opposed by Monnet: "the Schuman proposals (...), are revolutionary or else they are nothing. The fundamental principle is the delegation of sovereignty in a limited, but decisive domain."²¹ Thus, Great Britain continued to take part in the negotiations, but without committing itself to the principles of the union²².

experience during a very long and eventful international career". Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/publications/booklets/eu_documentation/04/txt02_en.htm Accessed on 21 Feb. 2009.

¹⁸ FONTAINE, P. *Una Nueva Idea para Europa: La Declaración Schuman, 1950-2000*. Luxembourg: Oficina de Publicaciones Oficiales de las Comunidades Europeas, 2000.

¹⁹ Given its importance, the presentation date of the Schuman Declaration is called the Europe Day.

²⁰ MONNET, Jean. *Op. cit.*, p. 299.

²¹ MONNET, Jean. *Op. cit.*, p. 277.

²² "The British made their preference for intergovernmental cooperation very clear and subscribed to the argument that they had three spheres of influence: Britain had an important role in Europe, a Commonwealth and a special relationship with the United States. [...] Whilst the Britain also cleared desired peace, prosperity and the containment of Germany, they did not feel threatened to the same extent as continental Europe". ARMSTRONG, David; LLOYD,

Effectively, the European Union originated from a merging of the interests of the countries which most suffered from the catastrophe of the world wars. France and Germany, which were pivotal in the hostilities, signed a peace treaty which was then joined by Belgium, Holland and Luxembourg – recurring battle fields of the powers of the Rhine – and Italy, which alternated between being an ally of France and Germany in the two great wars.

A spirit of optimism swept through the powers involved, and led to the signing of the Treaty which made way for the ECSC, on April 18th, 1951, in the Clock Room of the *Quai d'Orsay* in Paris, practically one year after the proposal was launched on 9th May. Jean Monnet explained the symbolism of the occasion, stating: “one of our collaborators of the plan, the faithful Lamy, a creative man, and totally trustworthy, had reserved a surprise for us, presenting members a copy of the treaty which he had ordered to be made up by the National Press, on Dutch paper, with German ink. The binding was provided by Belgium and Luxembourg, the silk bookmarks by Italy”²³.

The text of the treaty²⁴ reflects the importance of the creation of an IO to maintain peace²⁵ and for the economic growth of Europe.

The Treaty which created the ECSC was an important milestone for Europe, but the work of the “pacifistic revolutionary” did not end with this phase of integration. His ambitious political and economic objectives were gradually concretized with the formation of the other European Communities.

Monnet’s dedication to the European peace process gave him the position of President of the High Authority, an institution with executive and legislative powers, which governed the ECSC.

The principal theses idealized by the “pacifistic revolutionary” formed the support base of the Community structure and gave a degree of originality to European regional integration, as shall be shown below. These proposals served as ballast for the foundation of a lasting union, which was the world’s boldest and most complex integrationist process.

III. THE BASES FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF EUROPEAN UNION

The model of integration defended by Jean Monnet sought to achieve the following objectives: to construct a lasting peace on the continent; to raise the region politically and economically²⁶, restoring its key role in international relations, and to stem the advance of the communist threat²⁷.

The means idealized by the mentor of the Schuman Plan to reach the proposed goals was integration, legally “co-substantiated” through the formation of a supranational International Organization. But this IO would not be limited to promoting cooperation between its members. It

Lorna; REDMOND, John. From Versailles to Maastricht: international organization in the twentieth century. Hampshire: Palgrave, 1996, p. 142-143.

²³ MONNET, Jean. *Op. cit.*, p. 313.

²⁴ The treaties took one year to be ratified. The “Conference of the Six”, held on 23rd July 1953, in Paris, elected a headquarters (a small town in Luxembourg, provisionally) and four official languages.

²⁵ “Considering that world peace can only be safeguarded by means of creative efforts at the level of the dangers that threaten it”. See: Preamble to the ECSC Treaty.

²⁶ The strong economy, besides guaranteeing well-being, was also seen as a “condition for national independence and the maintenance of democracy” MONNET, Jean. *Op. cit.*, p. 240.

²⁷ Thomas Christiansen points out the influences that led to the creation of the supranational power of the European Union: the post-war conditions of physical, economic and social devastation in the region, the desire to create a federal model, developed following the war, the division caused by the cold war, the desire of the United States to reinforce the Western European countries politically and economically. The strength that directed the States more precisely towards integration was, without doubt, the “reconciliation between France and Germany, which has been the consequence and the guarantee of European integration”. CHRISTIANSEN, T. European Integration and regional cooperation. In: BAYLIS, J. & SMITH, S. (eds.) *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*. 3rd edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005. p. 582.

would receive parcels of sovereignty of its member states to manage common interests more effectively. This was a new model that immediately created a novel and different profile.

To reach these goals, some theses were created which sustained the integration, and which in terms of their methodology, can be listed as follows: 1. The International Organization would move away from the traditional model of intergovernmentality, and would inaugurate a model of Federal, supranational operation; 2. It would be formed by a permanent institutional framework; 3. The institutions would receive from the States some parcels of sovereignty, in limited spheres, but which could be gradually extended to other spheres; 4. The IO would be open to all the European States, without guarantees, meanwhile, of the right of succession by unilateral decision of the parties; 5. Federalism would be reached through the functionalist method which recognized the sector-based integration that would gradually move towards a generalized integration.

Monnet's merit was to guarantee the primacy of the functionalist method for achieving the federalist objectives. The federation was the way to a *pax mercatoria*, i.e. a peace achieved through by integration of the markets which was restricted, in the first instance, to the energy resources, and then extended to other sectors, until a single market was formed.

The fundamental principle of integration lay in the delegation of sovereignty "in a limited, but decisive domain"²⁸, in other words, definitive, without the possibility of return to the hands of the State. The reason for this option was based on the notion whereby: "cooperation between the nations, important though it is, does not resolve anything. It is necessary to look for a merger of interests of the European peoples, and not simply to maintain a balance between their interests".²⁹ The experience of the "pragmatic visionary" taught him that national effort alone was not sufficient, i.e. the action of the States in isolation was doomed to failure.³⁰

A distance was sought, from the model used in the European Organization for Economic Cooperation (EOEC), for example, to understand that true cooperation could only be achieved if it was armed with instruments for attacking the unified sovereign head on³¹, i.e. a scheme that did not go beyond simple intergovernmental cooperation would be too fragile to resolve the historical stalemates that existed in Europe. This was the doorway that would enable the horizon of a European Federation to be glimpsed.

The merger of common interests would be enabled through the foundation of a political and legal architecture capable of accumulating and managing the powers derived from the

²⁸ "A plan which does not depart from this principle cannot bring any useful contribution to the solution of the major problems that are destroying us". MONNET, Jean. *Op. cit.*, p. 277

²⁹ *Idem, ibidem.*

³⁰ "Jean Monnet had watched the various unsuccessful attempts to move towards integration which had followed in the wake of the solemn plea, launched at the congress organised by the European movement in The Hague in 1948, for the union of the continent. The European Organisation for Economic Cooperation, set up in 1948, had a purely coordinative mission and had been powerless to prevent the economic recovery of European countries coming about in a strictly national framework. The creation of the Council of Europe on 5 May 1949 showed that governments were not prepared to surrender their prerogatives. The advisory body had only deliberative powers and each of its resolutions, which had to be approved by a two-thirds majority, could be vetoed by the ministerial committee. Jean Monnet had understood that any attempt to introduce a comprehensive institutional structure in one go would bring a huge outcry from the different countries and was doomed to failure. It was too early yet to envisage wholesale transfers of sovereignty. The war was too recent an experience in people's minds and national feelings were still running very high. Success depended on limiting objectives to specific areas, with a major psychological impact, and introducing a joint decision-making mechanism which would gradually be given additional responsibilities." In: http://ec.europa.eu/publications/booklets/eu_documentation/04/txt02_en.htm

³¹ "The idea that seventeen sovereign countries would cooperate effectively is an illusion. I believe that only the creation of a federation of the West, with the inclusion of England, would enable the war to be prevented, within the desired time, if we resolved our problems. MONNET, Jean. *Op. cit.*

delegation of sovereignty³². The transfer of sovereign powers, in turn, would lead to a supranational authority that would be exercised by the institutions.

Institutionalization was essential for the progress of integration. Strong, independent and permanent institutions would be the body that would give life to the spirit of the union, since “nothing is impossible without men, nothing is permanent without institutions”³³.

In the final text of the Treaty of 1951, the new mark of representation had already been established: 1. The High Authority³⁴, representative of the interests of the IO; the council of Ministers, which would be the speaker of the will of the States³⁵; the common parliamentary Assembly, and the Court of Justice of the European Communities, which would reflect the concern to establish a system of democratic guarantees. Thus, the backbone of the Community was initially formed. The supranational tonality was evident with the formalization of these four institutions.

The birth of the Council of Europe was also a proposal of Monnet which, in the 1970s, was concerned with the precarious functioning of the institutions of the Community, which did not have the necessary powers to fulfill their designated tasks. In this scenario, the proposal for the creation of a “provisional European government” emerged, formed by the high authorities of each member State, and a “European Assembly elected by universal vote”.³⁶ In yet another lesson in diplomacy and political articulation, the “architect” of the interaction led the national authorities to a proposal for the institution of the Council of Europe in which the Heads of State and Government would meet, three times a year, to give the necessary impulse to the integrationist process and discuss the European problems³⁷.

The federalist sentiment was materialized as the European Community was built day after day. In the conference of the six member countries, the character of solidarity of integration was repeatedly reinforced; it was not a question of negotiating advantages, but rather, the aim was to look for the “common advantage”³⁸. The objective would only be reached if there was engagement “without time restriction and without expecting anything in return.”³⁹ At this

³² “The essential thing is to remain faithful to the few fixed points that have served as a guide since day one: to gradually create among the men of Europe the widest common interest administrated by democratic institutions to which the necessary sovereignty is delegated”. MONNET, Jean. *Op. cit.*, p. 460.

³³ MONNET, Jean. *Op. cit.*, p. 269. “The tragic events of the past, those which we watched perhaps make us more prudent. But men pass away, and others will come who will replace us. What we can leave for them will not be our personal experience, which will disappear along with us; what we can leave for them is institutions. The life of institutions is longer than that of men, therefore institutions can, if well-constructed, accumulate and transmit the good sense of successive generations”. *Op. cit.*, p. 337.

³⁴ “The supranational authority is not only the organism most able to resolve the economic problems; it is the start of a federation.” MONNET, Jean. *Op. cit.*, p. 287.

³⁵ On the competencies of the Council and the High Authority, Jean Monnet affirmed that: “we see from now on two sets of problems: those inherent to the High Authority itself, described in detail in the treaty and transferred to this institution by a collective mandate of parliamentarians; followed by the problems that question the responsibility of the governments, common problems for which there is interest in foreseeing the intervention of these governments, with the condition that they act collectively. The two bodies can come together in clearly-defined cases. In fact, the Council of Ministers had just been created”. MONNET, Jean. *Op. cit.*, p. 290.

³⁶ MONNET, Jean. *Op. cit.*, p. 443.

³⁷ The European Council was born from the Summits of the heads of State or Government of the Members States of the Community. The first meeting of the Council was held in Paris, in 1961. In 1974, it was formalized. With the enactment of the Treaty of the Single European Act of 1986, the European Council was integrated into the European structure, and its existence recognized, and today it is covered by article 4 of the Treaty of the European Union. See: SILVA, Karine de Souza. *Direito da Comunidade Européia: fontes, princípios e procedimentos*. Ijuí: Ed. Unijui, 2005. p. 33 and ss.

³⁸ MONNET, Jean. *Op. cit.*, p. 283. Prompted by Taviani, representative of the Italian Government, which demanded equal treatment for the iron and steel industry in his country, Jean Monnet ratified the federalist sentiment: “I agree that the conditions of competition are the same. But we have lost the habit of speaking of Italian or French iron and steel, etc., as there will only be a European iron and steel industry. This is the very objective of the Schuman plan”. *Op. cit.*, p. 287.

³⁹ MONNET, Jean. *Op. cit.*, p. 286.

moment, the “inspirer” emphasized a rule commonly found in the federal models: “the removal of a State which was engaged in the Community should only be possible with the approval of all the others on this removal and its conditions. This rule in itself only summarizes the fundamental transformation that the French proposal seeks to present. Besides the coal and steel, it forms the bases of a European federation. In a federation, there is no succession by unilateral decision”. This statement reveals the fear that some member State could desert and abandon the international origination.

These proposals constitute a *true diplomatic revolution*⁴⁰. This was how Jean Monnet managed to give life to the idea of dematerializing the Franco-Germanic rivalry, and at the same time, favor the economic growth of the European countries by means of regional integration. However, the materialization of his plan depended on the existence of a common sovereignty. It was necessary to “propose the placement of the coal and steel of various countries under a common sovereignty”.

The basic premise for the institution of the High Authority therefore led to a re-dimensioning of the institution of sovereignty. It was a question of reformulating it and transforming it into a Community with sovereign capability to integrate the nations and peoples, in place of a national sovereignty that separates borders and continents. Sovereignty should be “approached without a spirit of revenge or domination”. For this, it was imperative that “conquerors and conquered reach an agreement to exercise it, in common, over part of their joint wealth”. This would create a solid link between the parties and the way would be made free for new mergers in other domains.

It was also Jean Monnet who coined the term “European Community”. It was at the conference inaugurated on 20 June 1950 that he gave the name “Community” to the vision that he sought to build: “We are here to fulfill a common work, not to negotiate advantages, but to seek our advantage in the common advantage. We can only find a solution if we eliminate from our discussions every private sentiment. As we, gathered here, can change our methods, it will be the state of spirit of all Europeans that it will change gradually. Therefore, I asked that the word negotiation not be used in reference to our meetings which, both among us and in relation to public opinion, would be those of the conference of the Schuman plan. I seem to recall that on this day, for the first time, I gave the name of European Community to the objective we are striving to reach”⁴¹.

Finally, it is observed that it was Monnet’s desire that the example of unity be inclusive, offered to other peoples. “I saw the conflict always read to spark off in the Middle East, and the confrontation between Israel and the Arab nations seemed no more insurmountable than the opposition between France and Germany for two thirds of a century. From now on this opposition belonged to the past, and it was neither weapons nor diplomacy put an end to it, but a method that changed the way of thinking, transforming the very causes of the rivalry. What divides men could become common to them in every part of the world; (...) what we had obtained in Europe, contrary to all expectations, should also be possible wherever men still think in terms of domination and seek to resolve their rivalries by force. These reflections persuaded me that the union of the Europeans was not only important for them, but also had value as an example to other peoples”.⁴²

Below, I shall outline the development of Jean Monnet’s legacy, which gave a degree of originality to the European Union and constituted the boldest and most complex process of integration in the world.

⁴⁰ JUDT, Tony. *Pós-guerra: uma história da Europa desde 1945*. Trad. de José Roberto O’Shea. Rio de Janeiro: Objetiva, 2008. p.169.

⁴¹ MONNET, Jean. *Op. cit.*, p. 283.

⁴² MONNET, Jean. *Op. cit.*, p. 449.

IV. JEAN MONNET AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF EUROPEAN INTEGRATION

The legacy left by the “inspirer” of the new Europe offered a solid foundation that enabled the consistent development of the integration model.

Subsequent to the creation of the ECSC, in 1957 the Treaties of Rome created the European Economic Community (EEC) and the European Atomic Energy Community (EAEC). In 1992, the group of Communities, together with the forms of cooperation established between the member States, came to be known as the European Union, consolidated after the ratification of the Maastricht Treaty which inaugurated “a new stage in the process of creating a union with increasingly closer ties between the peoples of Europe”.⁴³

The Amsterdam Treaty of 1997 consolidated the design of the European architecture envisaged since Maastricht, through the formation of the three pillars on which the European Union rests: the first is the Communities, i.e., the EAEC and the European Community⁴⁴; the second relates to collaboration in matters of foreign policy and common security; and the third pillar is cooperation in the legal and policing spheres with regard to penal matters.

The International Organization evolved with its doors open to membership by new European States, according to the guidelines given by Jean Monnet.

Over the last five decades, a gradual process of membership was seen, which

widened the space of integration of the Communities, with the addition of new member States: the United Kingdom, Ireland, Denmark, Greece, Portugal, Spain, Austria, Sweden, Finland, Cyprus, Estonia, Hungary, Poland, the Czech Republic, Slovenia, Lethonia, Lithuania, Malta and Slovakia. In 2007 Romania and Bulgaria joined the bloc, which is now made up of 27 member States. The eastward expansion was based on mutual recognition of the historical importance represented by the end of the division of the European Continent. In this sense, it is worth remembering that in 1989, the date on which the Wall of Berlin fell, Germany was no longer the country of borders that had separated the capitalist from the communist “worlds”.

The European Community became a reality, thanks to an ingenious and articulated legal and political structure, which served as the base⁴⁵. The legal architecture, basically constituted by the Community Law, gained life with the objective of regulating relations within the Union, and with the aim of resolving any difficulties that arose.

The megastructure of the Communities was materialized through the body of an international organization *sui generis*, which was separate from those of the classical court known up until that time. The EU has a special structure comprised of its own Institutions, which receive, from the member States, some competencies to outline supranational policies that serve as the basis for the concretization of its objectives.

The re-dimensioning of the States in the European context accompanied the emergence of the supranational power, corollary to the process of transfer of parcels of sovereignty of the State to the Institutions. Thus, Monnet asserted: “the sovereign nations of the past are no longer the

⁴³ Cf. Preamble of the Treaty of the European Union.

⁴⁴ The TCECA states, in its article 97, the duration of this Community for a period of fifty years, therefore the ECSC became defunct in 2002.

⁴⁵ The crucial importance of the legal apparatus for the consolidation of the European integrationist process has been highlighted by Klaus-Dieter Borchardt as an essential mechanism for the integration, as it managed to achieve “that which, for centuries, the bloodshed and weapons could not”. Also, according to the author, this corresponds to “the decisive novelty that distinguishes the previous intentions to achieve European unity. The means used are not violence and submission, but strength of the Law”. In: BORCHARDT, K. D. *El ABC del Derecho Comunitario*. Luxembourg: Oficina de Publicaciones Oficiales de las Comunidades Europeas, 2000, p. 57.

framework in which the problems of the present can be resolved. And the Community itself is just one step towards the forms of organization of the world of tomorrow.”⁴⁶

The supranationality proposed by Monnet guaranteed the maintenance of peace in the region historically known as a stage of catastrophic conflicts, and neutralized the Franco-Germanic rivalry. After Monnet, Western Europe never again witnessed the emergence of international conflicts.

The supranational wave created the dynamism of the model of European Community integration, redesigning the old scheme of definition of sovereignty, the understanding of which relates to the fullness of the exercise of power over a territory safeguarded, exclusively, for a determined subject. Thus, significant development was seen in the form outlined by the classical authority which presented the notion of sovereignty as an absolute, perpetual, inalienable, untouchable and indivisible entity. The model of European integration enabled the reinterpretation of State sovereignty, as it created a supranational entity marked by the idea of sovereignty. Here, there is an evident distancing of the classical International Public Law, and space is opened for the emergence of the so-called Community Law, founded in the transfer of parcels of sovereignty from the States to the EU.

The original objectives surrounding the period of conception of the ECSC were expanded considerably. In the current article 2 of the European Community Treaty, it is seen that the community’s mission is to “promote the harmonious, balanced and sustainable development of the employment and social protection, equality between men and women, sustainable and non-inflationist growth, a high level of competitiveness and convergence of the behaviors of the economies, a high level of protection and improvement in quality of the environment, in increase in quality of life, economic and social cohesion, and solidarity among the member States”.

To reach these goals of a political, economic and social nature, it is necessary to establish different mechanisms of operation⁴⁷, the execution of which is entrusted to the States and the Institutions.

The institutional Community body underwent some changes. In 1967, the Merger Treaty was signed⁴⁸ which unified the Institutions of the three Communities, in an attempt to minimize operating costs and guarantee greater operating efficiency.

Currently, the execution of the Community tasks is the responsibility of the Council of Europe⁴⁹ and the following Institutions: the European Parliament, the Council of Ministers, the Commission, the Court of Justice of the European Communities and the Court of Accounts. In addition to these, the EU also has important bodies, namely: the Central European Bank, the Economic and Social Committee, the Committee of the Regions and the European Investment Bank, all of which play an auxiliary role.

Likewise, it should be noted that the gradual fulfilment of the economic objectives culminated in the consolidation of the Economic⁵⁰ and Monetary Union, and as a consequence, in

⁴⁶ MONNET, J. *Op. cit.*, p. 461.

⁴⁷ See articles 3 to 6 of the TCE.

⁴⁸ The Council and the Commission were unified in 1967, but the Court of Justice and the Parliament had already been unified since the signing, in 1957, of the TCEE and the TCEEA. This means there were not three Parliaments or three Courts, but three Councils and three Commissions.

⁴⁹ The European Council was born from the Summits of the heads of State or Government of the member States of the Community. It is not a Community Institution, in technical terms. It is an intergovernmental body of the European Union which beside those institutions, acts as an agent whose main role is to politically promote the process of integration. This Council consists of the European heads of State and Government of the Community member States, at summit conferences, as well as the President of the European Commission.

⁵⁰ In the current stage, the form of operation in which the European Community is inserted is the *Economic Union*, i.e. the most complex phase of economic integration, highlighted by the adoption of common policies, particularly monetary and fiscal. See: OLIVEIRA, O. M. *União Europeia: processos de integração e mutação*. Curitiba: Juruá, 1999, p. 39.

the formation of the world's largest free trade area, facilitated by the adoption of a single currency – the Euro.

The functionalist union, by means of the markets, extrapolated the limits of energy integration and expanded to other fields, such as agriculture, fishing, education, citizenship, etc, and became involved in guaranteeing the liberties of circulation of people, goods, services and capitals.

The successive processes of expansion were accompanied by a permanent strengthening of the cultural and linguistic diversity and education for tolerance among peoples.

However, it should be noted that despite the advances in the economic, social and cultural areas, the realization of the Community objectives still remains considerably limited for various reasons, such as the great pre-eminence of national identities on the European identity⁵¹, the democratic deficit that is devastating the supranational institutions,⁵² the worsening of poverty, the increase in levels of unemployment and the growing number of cases of xenophobia within the EU.

However, despite the diversities sometimes presented, in times of global financial crisis, it is imperative to recognize the efforts of Jean Monnet on behalf of regional integration, and consequently, world peace. It was with this purpose that the Council of Europe, gathered in Luxembourg in 1976, unanimously attributed the title of Honorary Citizen of Europe on what would be the last great homage in his life. Also in recognition for his dedication to the European cause, the Commission instituted the Jean Monnet program, which grants funds for the development and diffusion of studies on regional integration.

V. FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The pragmatism of the architect of the integration was decisive for the concretization of the European model. It was Monnet who most emphasized the profound need for Franco-Germanic reconciliation, through the formation of the European Communities.

The current stage of Europe leads us to believe that Monnet was right—as only a unification inspired by *Kantian* federalism can guarantee peace. The dissipation of the typical egoisms of the retrograde nationalism was the fuel which fed the motor of the union. After two world wars, the parts of the divided continent were reconstructed and realigned.

The formation of the single market was translated into a unique historical initiative for Europe and for the world. The supranationality redesigned the scenario of the existing societies, which were fundamentally based on the national legal systems.

The European Community became a reality, due to a set of variables, highlighting the conformation of an inherent, *sui generis* law, which delineated a complex scheme involving the redefinition of the old national sovereignty, in a process that enables some competencies historically held by the State sphere to be transferred to the Institutions.

The wheels of the European locomotive continue to grind, albeit with signs of wear. The incessant political disputes between the forces that interact within the Community – civil society, parties, States, Institutions, etc – emphasize the main difficulties faced in each stage of any process of integration, but at the same time, inspire us to fight for it.

The Community architecture is still not complete, and there are many structural problems which, in turn, shake the very support beams of a model in development. But the persistence of the “pacifistic revolutionary” indicates that it is necessary to continue walking in defence of the common interest, and the ultimate goal being always peace.

⁵¹ CHRISTIANSEN, T. European Integration and regional cooperation. In: BAYLIS, J. & SMITH, S. (eds.) *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*. 3rd edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005. p. 582

⁵² On the democratic deficit in the European Union, see: TAIBO, Carlos. *Crítica de la Unión Europea*. Madrid: Ed. Los libros de la catarata, 2006.

VI. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ARMSTRONG, David; LLOYD, Lorna; REDMOND, John. *From Versailles to Maastricht: international organisation in the twentieth century*. Hampshire: Palgrave, 1996.
- BORCHARDT, K. D. *El ABC del Derecho Comunitario*. Luxemburgo: Oficina de Publicaciones Oficiales de las Comunidades Europeas, 2000.
- BRUGMANS, Henri. *L'idée européenne 1920–1970*. 3ª ed. Bruges : De Tempel, 1970.
- CHRISTIANSEN, T. European Integration and regional cooperation. In: BAYLIS, J. & SMITH, S. (eds.) *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*. 3rd edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- FONTAINE, P. *Una Nueva Idea para Europa: La Declaración Schuman, 1950-2000*. Luxemburgo: Oficina de Publicaciones Oficiales de las Comunidades Europeas, 2000.
- GUICHAOUA, Elsa. Jean Monnet entre mémoire, célébration et Histoire. In: BOSSUAT, Gérard & WILKENS, Andreas. *Jean Monnet : l'Europe et les chemins de la paix*. Paris. Publications de la Sorbonne, 1999, p. 437.
- JUDT, Tony. *Pós-guerra: uma história da Europa desde 1945*. Trad. de José Roberto O'Shea. Rio de Janeiro: Objetiva, 2008.
- KANT, Immanuel. *A paz perpétua*. Trad. de Marco A. Zingano. Porto Alegre: L&PM, 1989.
- MANGAS MARTÍN, A.; LIÑÁN NOGUERAS, D. J. *Instituciones y Derecho de la Unión Europea*. 2. ed. Madrid: McGraw-Hill, 1999.
- MONNET, Jean. *Memórias: a construção da unidade europeia*. Tradução de Ana Maria Falcão. Brasília: Editora da UNB, 1986.
- OLIVEIRA, Odete. M. *União Europeia: processos de integração e mutação*. Curitiba: Juruá, 1999.
- REDMOND, John. *From Versailles to Maastricht: international organisation in the twentieth century*. Hampshire: Palgrave, 1996.
- SILVA, Karine de Souza. *Direito da Comunidade Europeia: fontes, princípios e procedimentos*. Ijuí: Ed. Unijuí, 2005.
- SILVA, Karine de Souza; BLANCK, Fernanda Joos. A contribuição de Jean Monnet para a construção da arquitetura da União Europeia: reflexos em cinquenta anos de integração. In: *Produção Científica CEJURPS*, v. 3, p. 55-64, 2008.
- TAIBO, Carlos. *Crítica de la Unión Europea*. Madrid: Ed. Los libros de la catarata, 2006.
- Tratado da União Europeia. Disponível em: www.europa.eu
- TRUYOL Y SERRA, A. *La Integración Europea: Idea y Realidad*. Madrid: Tecnos, 1972.
- UNIÃO EUROPEIA
http://ec.europa.eu/publications/booklets/eu_documentation/04/txt02_en.htm