

THE UNITY OF THE DRIVE FOR EUROPE

Address

by

Professor Dr. WALTER HALLSTEIN

President of the Commission  
of the  
European Economic Community

at the opening session of the  
Seventh Conference of European Local Authorities

ROME

15 October 1964

11274/X/64

My thoughts turn first, in deep respect, to the absent President of the Republic, Antonio Segni, the scholar and European politician who has so decisively influenced and assisted the establishment and subsequent development of the European Communities. It is painful for us that the very man who has striven so loyally and indefatigably for the unity of Europe and who has rendered invaluable service to our work of unification should be absent today. We all hope that good health and complete recovery may soon be vouchsafed him.

And then I salute Rome, the Eternal City which for us Europeans is the ultimate embodiment of eternal Europe. I salute Rome, a natural home for all Europeans, a city whose history is a reminder that we must never relax our efforts to build a great future for Europe.

I salute too the whole land of Italy, which has given us all so infinitely much in culture, in law and in statecraft. In doing so I greet the country which gave us the first European universities.

My thanks go out to the Council of European Municipalities and particularly to the Organizing Committee of the Congress here in Italy, to the Italian section of the European Municipalities and to all other representatives of the European movements who have worked to organize this Congress. Is it not a sign of the strength of the European idea, of the idea of European unification, that the invitation to this Congress should come from bodies which are closest to the strongest European reality, the citizen of Europe? The European Municipalities, as forms of

organization in which public life first assumes concrete form, the European movements in which the European will becomes an immediate reality - these are the reservoirs from which flow the currents which again and again bear us forward to our common aim, the unity of Europe.

Three subjects are to be dealt with by Congress: Municipalities as centres for promoting a European outlook, the necessity and objectives of regional planning in Europe, and the safeguarding of the achievements of European unification by permanent institutions. All these subjects are variations on the single theme which dominates this Congress and which is before us Europeans: the completion of the unity of Europe? However, these three subjects do not mean only an appeal to action; they are at the same time a proof that the unification of Europe has already attained a degree of concrete reality which is both unmistakable and irrevocable.

The task of unification which we have begun and at which we work daily is no shadowy idea projected haphazardly on to the future, it is no pipedream. Rather is it a reality - because it has been shaped by the realities of Europe. In our work of unification the foremost realities of Europe are the European man and woman, the European as an individual, as a member of his family, of his parish, of his homeland. For this reason the European Communities, in the words of one of their unforgettable creators, Robert Schuman, are a "solidarity of facts", i.e. a solidarity born of common action and common human striving.



Such action must be understood in its spatial context. To state this would be a platitude if it were only repeating that the area we call "Europe" is the decisive criterion for our policy. But more is meant than that. Space, like time, is one of the factual conditions of human life and action. The European Communities, which have set out to order better the way in which we live together in this Europe, have therefore also been given a responsibility for regional policy. For if, in setting up a common market, our only aim were to unleash powerful economic forces and move masses of men to the places where their labour would be most rapidly transformed into economic gain, we should be forgetting that Man is not merely a homo oeconomicus or a homo faber. However, we do not regard maximisation of the national product as the be-all and end-all of human relations. It is exactly on this point that we differ from the régimes of the unfree. We must therefore not confine ourselves to abolishing traditional frontiers and introducing free movement for men, goods and capital. Rather must we tackle the long-established imbalances between the régions and even more the new imbalances. Otherwise we will find ourselves in contradiction with the aims of the Rome Treaty, which requires that the disparities between the individual regions be reduced. In this connection the Community's responsibility in regional policy does not apply only to areas where there is an incipient threat of overdevelopment, but also to those regions which are economically less highly developed. Thus when we apply our economic or social policy, there must always be an element of regional policy in what we do. Regional



policy must, as it were, permeate all these policies. Conversely it is also true that whenever we pursue regional policy, the whole of economic and social policy is also involved.

"We" means first those vested with responsibility in the institutions of the European Communities. The Preamble to the Treaty states expressly that the harmonious development of the national economies shall be ensured and that the differences between the various regions and the backwardness of the less favoured shall be reduced. We are required to take into consideration the regional effects of all the measures we take in the agricultural, trade, economic or customs fields.

The Community's institutions have not indeed been given any specific powers in connection with regional policy. The Community can co-ordinate, suggest, assist, indicate the main lines, but it rests primarily with those immediately concerned, with the European municipalities, to take action. They must be the scaffolding on which regional policy can be built up. The tasks that face the regions are a challenge to their creative ability and their readiness to collaborate.

We must therefore all measure up to our responsibility in the field of regional policy. This does not only mean preserving pleasant local customs and traditions which, converted into tourist attractions, can serve as a gaily coloured wrapping for our Community. No, we aim at something more: when we speak of the variety that is Europe,

we are thinking of a Europe with its rich spiritual and moral heritage, in which the multiplicity of the forms of its thought and action can unfold in resonant harmony. Our quest is not for dreary emptiness or levelling, the hollow reverberation of drab perfectionism. Nor are we seeking to build towers of Babel, or create a centralistic Leviathan. Would such a monstrosity be the true countenance of the new Europe that is coming into being in the European Communities? If this were so, how could the municipalities and the many European movements, which would be among the first to suffer, be the ardent champions of a cause to which they are here and now proclaiming their loyalty afresh?

No, there is no reason to fear this danger. The fear of losing your own identity when you come up against others, against your neighbour, is a sign of weakness. A group which has a strong personality of its own and which has developed over the years has no cause to fear confrontation with its neighbours, indeed it will invite such confrontation. For a man's personality can mature fully only when he is in contact with his fellows, and the same is true of peoples. "Talent thrives in tranquillity; character is formed in the turmoil of the world". The hurly-burly of life tempers the qualities of peoples, as well as of people. Those, on the other hand, who sever themselves from the living will atrophy. "Are not our safest moments the most barren, and our richest those fraught with greatest danger?" asks the poet. And this Congress of ours is also proof of the vigour of the European peoples, proof that variety is no bar to unity. The peoples of

Europe know that any independence and self-determination they are surrendering in this European merger will be returned to them at a higher level.

Whenever we set our hand to a European task we must at the outset recognize that the aim of preserving the sources from which the European nations draw their strength, or even of increasing still further the vigour they can impart, cannot be attained if we cling to the political structures of today. They are structures which in the past, in circumscribed periods of history, had their value and their dignity. But we cannot hold up the flight of time. If we tried, it would move on without us, over us. Hidden behind the veil of time are immense dangers: technology, and its egalitarian elements, the development of nuclear power, automation - forces which bring us unprecedented freedom, but which could just as well enslave us - the opening-up of the cosmos, the population explosion, and the new forces maturing in the developing countries. All these are problems from which there is no escape. We live in a time of revolutionary change, which is divined by the arts and which is leading science to a new conception of the world. We cannot make ourselves masters of these times with political methods and procedures geared to the concepts of the past. Time must be taken by the forelock - and this applies in particular to politics, above all to European politics.

And so I come to the third topic under discussion in this Congress, the question of the institutional safeguards for what has been achieved in the unification of Europe.



The desire for further progress has revived strongly in the course of this year. This certainly shows how deeply the cause of Europe is rooted in the thoughts and hearts of Europeans. But there are also signs of impatience, uncertainty and even disappointment. Let us not dramatize this psychological malaise: it is nowhere laid down that the year 1964 must see the completion of political unification; but at the same time there is a mood of uneasiness. That does not, of course, mean that we are giving way to despair. We all know, and history teaches, that set-backs are always the springboard for further successes. Only when man encounters resistance does he discover his real strength. The same is true of the great movements of history. Even the short history of practical European unification confirms this teaching. Are not our own European Communities of today a result of the failure of the European Defence Community and of the European Political Community? And have they not become much more than mere stopgaps and substitutes, have they not become powerful, independent forces of world-wide importance?

We must keep all this before us if we are to understand and to appreciate at its true value the demand for "political union", to use the current expression. So, before we brace ourselves to overcome the forces of resistance, let us assess our state of readiness, let us review our forces and survey our opportunities.

Our first observation is a surprising one for many who are less familiar with the work that has really been

done for Europe. The existing European Communities are called economic. But it is not the decisions of producers, employers, workers, farmers, bankers and merchants which are integrated in these Communities; what is integrated, bound together, merged, is policy - the economic policies, the social policies of the Member States, in other words policies which, if there were no Communities, would be entirely a matter for the political institutions of the Member States: customs and commercial policy, transport policy, agricultural policy and short-term economic policy, to mention only what is most obvious. Consequently our Communities are in themselves already a piece of the complete "political union". I say "piece", not "preparation". They are not creations existing in a quite different dimension from the "political" creation which is to come later. No, they are the centre piece, the finished section of an edifice which when completed will be the political federation of Europe.

What I am saying is not merely theory. It is daily experience in the workshop of European unity - in the Council of Ministers, the Parliament and the Executives. Here a further piece of European political unity is forged every day. These institutions are Community organs, federal organs. Every day something is added to our economic, to our social union, that is, to the federation. These developments and achievements must be examined if we wish to ask the right question about what remains to be done.

Naturally, this policy has had economic and social consequences, and highly impressive ones at that. Even the most impatient person cannot deny them. Between 1958 and 1963 the gross Community product increased by 30%, against only 23% in the United States and 16% in the United Kingdom. Trade between the Member States is nearly two and a half times what it was. Trade between the Community countries and non-member countries has risen by 53%, while world trade has gone up by only a quarter. Per capita wages and salaries of those employed in the Community have risen by 56%, while consumer prices have gone up only 16%.

There is a further point that must be appreciated: the Communities which lie behind this development are a legal institution. With the advent of the Communities a "new legal order" - to use the lapidary phrase of the European Court of Justice - has come into the world. It takes the form of a complete system of legal provisions which independently and exclusively governs the sphere subject to it. This legal order does not apply only to governmental bodies, but also to the citizens of the Member States themselves, establishing their rights and defining their duties.

This is something new which differs from the established forms of classic international law. It is no mere collection of international agreements. Nor is it a part of or appendix to the national systems of law. Its significance is rather this: the legal acts of the Community bodies can be judged only according to Community



law; only thus can their validity be tested and their meaning interpreted. The Community legal order, nevertheless, has many points of contact with law in the Member States. Administrative bodies and the courts in the Member States apply Community regulations together with their national law, which continues to be valid. Here again we are faced with a development where federal organizations can give us examples. Each side legislates in its appointed sphere. But if in an individual case there is a conflict of laws, the law of the higher-ranking organization - here the Community - has priority. Community law, then, takes precedence over national law. National law cannot just brush Community law aside. "The Member States," as the European Court of Justice pronounced recently in a basic judgment, "have transferred to the jurisdiction of the Community rights and duties which had until then been subject to their own jurisdiction. They have thereby established once and for all a limitation on their sovereignty."

There is a third point that we must not overlook: European integration is of a dynamic nature. We say that economic integration, as it is called, is the core of a full political federation.

Each Community action in itself creates the ground and the need for further Community action, both within the Community and beyond. One thing leads to another. If we wish to pursue a Community customs policy we must collate our economic policy. If we agree on a

Community economic policy and, on account of the customs union, we also have a Community external customs tariff, then we must have a Community concept for our external trade policy, etc. And we cannot stop short when we come to the boundaries of the spheres covered by our Community Treaties. A Community external trade policy extends far into traditional foreign policy, and foreign policy is always bound up with defence policy.

This brings us to the first thing that people mean today when they demand a "political union": the extension of political unity beyond the fields of economic and social policy to other spheres of policy. I will illustrate the type of problem involved here by taking defence policy as an example.

Many will object: "But we have got NATO." That is true, and no one can ignore this fact. European unity, as far as we have achieved it, is one of the things that need to be upheld and protected. And for this protection we have to thank NATO. But the one thing does not exclude the other. NATO and its leading powers have therefore never opposed efforts to find a defence solution in the European Community. The attempt to set up a European Defence Community was undertaken with their full approval. Nor is a common European defence effort superfluous. The Europeans wish to provide Europe again with a voice in world affairs, to which it is entitled on the grounds of its history, its capabilities and its unimpaired vitality. But a problematic situation of a psychological nature has now arisen within NATO: one giant has access to the most

modern and at the same time completely indispensable means of defence, while many small partners around it increasingly have the feeling that their share in what goes on in this organization is insufficient and unsatisfactory. That in a nutshell is the NATO problem today. I wish only to state here today that this problem is recognized and that no one considers it out of order to draw attention to it. On the contrary, everyone is seeking a solution. Here, too, the pragmatic method may be the answer. A number of pragmatic solutions can be thought of; they need not be final solutions in themselves, but simply transitional stages. Here I am thinking of the multilateral nuclear force.

At any rate we can see that, like other questions, the defence of Europe can no longer be considered in isolation now that the process of European integration has got under way. Just as economic and social union grows day by day, brick by brick, the need for a common approach to external and defence policy makes itself felt more strongly every day. This development will certainly not come about automatically. Nothing happens of its own accord in history or in politics. All political action is human action and springs from the human will. Nevertheless, the closer the European Communities come together in the sphere of customs policy, economic policy and social policy, the stronger does the psychological pressure become. We find that there is a powerful "inclination" which lends momentum to the inclusion in the integration process of those areas not yet subject to Community discipline, not yet ordered by European rules. We are doing no more, then,



than obeying a law of political logic if we expand the present partial political union into a full union.

But the call for "political union" means something more: we must achieve a better distribution of political weight between the various organs of the European Communities.

I refer to the burning question of merging the Executives and to the alignment of the three Community Treaties in the light of the experience which the unified Executive will gain. We have always felt the fact that there are three different Communities to be a historical accident for which there is no inherent justification.

Above all I am thinking of the role and the powers of the European Parliament. We must strengthen our constitution. We must give our Parliament more weight. This is what we mean when we speak of "democratization".

But here too the first question is: What is the situation today? The Community Treaties are like maps, set in a firm frame. The areas at the edges are clearly defined, their extent is exactly delimited. But in the middle there are still many blank spaces waiting to be filled in. The Treaties of Paris and Rome - the whole of our map - were subjected to democratic control, to ratification by the six Parliaments. The necessary surveying and filling in of the blank spaces is now going ahead under arrangements that more than any other organizational provision of our Community betray their provisional

character. This is especially true when we consider parliamentary control. This control is not lacking, but it is artificially divided between the national Parliaments of the Member States and the European Parliament. Legislative initiative lies essentially in the hands of the Executive, that is, the Commission. As you know, the Commission is completely independent of the Member Governments and is responsible only to the European Parliament. The latter can overthrow it by a vote of no confidence. Legislative decisions, however, are taken by the Community's Council of Ministers, each member of which is responsible to his national Parliament. As a rule, however, the European Parliament must be consulted before Community regulations are issued by the Council of Ministers. That is the present position. On the other hand we find that Community legislation increasingly impinges on legal affairs in the Member States. In addition, the budget resources and special funds allocated to the Community are constantly growing. And the Treaty by which the Community was established states that the Members of the European Parliament, who are at present delegated by their national Parliaments, shall one day be chosen by direct suffrage.

It is understandable that the parliamentary forces, and not they alone, feel that the present constitutional situation is unsatisfactory. As integration advances and more and more responsibilities are transferred from the individual countries to the Communities, the demand that the position of the European Parliament should be approximated to that of a national Parliament will become more

insistent. The European Parliament has taken a whole series of initiatives to this end, the most important being its proposals for the introduction of direct elections, but these have for years lain pigeonholed in the Council. The Commission has supported all these initiatives to the full.

If, then, we survey the general situation we see a multitude of precise and topical questions awaiting answers. Here are the concrete objectives to which we must direct the demand for a political union.

Naturally, the answer to them cannot be to point complacently to what we have already achieved. The work of European unification as it has begun with the Community Treaties is not a static condition but a dynamic process. The political union which we understand as the natural prolongation of the road already trodden must come immediately, not tomorrow, but preferably today. When we exhort people to become conscious of what has been achieved, we do this only because of the opportunities for progress offered by what has already been won. And our warning to take no risks with what has been achieved in Europe stems only from our concern lest the future of the European edifice be distorted and exposed to threat through lack of planning in the further work.

This danger exists. Already we hear the hasty suggestion that "if economic union and political union are interconnected, political union must surely be the precondition for the further pursuit of economic integration". No words could be more dangerous than these.



The correct conclusion, that the road already covered demands its natural prolongation in political federation, must not be inverted. It must be unequivocally asserted that the fulfilment of the Treaties by which Europe is being integrated does not depend on the creation of further organizations. The Treaties list at length the conditions for their implementation, and we cannot escape from their behest by setting up new and supplementary conditions for their fulfilment. Of course political decisions are needed for the fulfilment of the Treaty of Rome, but these decisions are being taken daily in the organs of integration. Let us be on our guard against false prophets who conceal under the cloak of European progress their intention of rendering the unification of Europe more difficult.

Does this mean that the new powers in fields other than economic and social policy should be transferred to the existing European institutions? Not necessarily. It is just as feasible to create for the fields concerned new institutions which could later be merged with those already in being - just as, we hope, the institutions of the various Communities existing today will soon be merged.

The only important point - if there is to be success - is that the Community interest should in some way find its own independent embodiment as it does in the Commissions. It is also essential that the organization to which we give the name of "political union" should not act as a brake on the work already begun but should promote unification. For to hold up the movement towards completion of the economic community is to will its collapse. The

Community can only continue to exist as a dynamic entity; to impair its vitality is tantamount to destroying all chances of attaining complete political union. European unification needs motors, not brakes. For, let it be said again, the process of European integration is not an automatic one.

The road from perceiving that further steps forward are necessary to actually deciding on the adoption of common measures can be short or long in individual cases and also in general. The time it will take cannot be calculated beforehand. We must therefore also have the fortitude to accept a period of transition so long as this proves unavoidable, but must always be on the lookout for our chance. There is no great development which is safe from upsets and even crises. We must meet these with patience and firmness. Fine phrases about Europe and promising push-button solutions will not get us anywhere. Institutional formulae, no matter how subtle, are not miracle-workers. We see this wherever there is a lack of agreement on substance, of community of interests. This is why the linking and interweaving of individual interests is so important among the tasks we have to tackle. Here, after all, lies the mysterious and yet so very evident effect of having taken the road of economic integration. The circle of tasks which can be mastered only by Community co-operation becomes wider with every passing day. Every day therefore sees a growth of interest in this co-operation. Thus the wishes, requirements and aims of individuals and of the several States are constantly intertwining, constantly merging.

This creative growth is rarely the product of spectacular actions and never the product of firework displays. It is a pedestrian affair, a matter of concrete, solid and logical work, in which attention, the closest attention, must be paid to detail.

Let us not forget finally that the European world is threatened by political forces whose aim is to destroy our way of life. These forces are still strong. A crypto-religious, proselytizing crusade is still bent on forcing upon us its life-destroying principle. The means at its disposal to overthrow our order have lost nothing of their military, political and economic strength. To these forces we must oppose our success: an impressive achievement of peaceful, free and progressive work, an achievement which threatens no one and brings benefit to all.

Europe is still partly the object of other people's political decisions. We still have not yet reached the point at which we can play a full part in political events. Please do not get the idea that I am here preaching the doctrine of "Europe as a third force". For Europe does not stand between the free world and the unfree: it stands right in the midst of the free world, but in this free world it must be an important and an equal partner.

Let me sum up.

Nothing has changed in the conditions which moved the first generation of European statesmen to take action after the last war.



First, the world is still getting smaller and smaller, the peoples and human beings closer to each other and everyone on earth is more and more everyone else's neighbour. What we call development policy is only one expression - the most striking expression - of this fact.

Second: It is still true and it becomes truer from day to day that the political form our continent has inherited, its division into a large number of small States, is unsuited to our age - the global, atomic age, the dawning epoch of huge powers of continental scale, real "world powers", which have begun to open up outer space for Man. To yesteryear belongs the political concept of national sovereignty, the idea that the national unit relying on itself, its own strength and skill, should be the final and only valid yardstick of the historical process. In two frightful world wars this concept has succumbed to the flames of European self-destruction.

And thirdly: Our European world is still threatened - by internal decay and by subjection from outside. We are challenged at every turn to defend ourselves, and the forms assumed by the instruments of destruction are legion - physical exhaustion or violence, seduction or threat, nihilism or rodomontade. We are never left in peace.

Despite all this, the aim which we have set ourselves - the political unity of Europe - has not changed.

We call for it first and foremost in the interest of peace, and this is the argument by which our efforts most command respect. Twice in this century our continent has been led to the brink of complete annihilation, and half the world has been plunged into the maelstrom of inter-continental wars - on each occasion for reasons which had their origin in Europe. We want to put an end to this balkanization of Europe. We want not only to forbid the outbreak of such world-shaking conflicts - this has long been attempted in vain - but to make them impossible. We want to put the means for making war - and not only the economic potential - in common European keeping, under common European administration, and thus ensure peace once and for all, peace within Europe and defence against attack from without - against attack from without only.

But we also call for the unity of Europe because of the value which this Europe embodies and whose prestige must not suffer - for the sake of Europe and for the sake of the world at large. It is true: terrible things have happened, have been done by men to their fellow men, in Europe as elsewhere. But it is also true that this continent has given infinite benefits to humanity and made it greater, more noble and more human. In philosophy and the other sciences, in poetry and the pictorial arts, in all forms of technical progress, in statecraft - how much poorer we would all be without the genius of Europe. Particularly in the field of the political ordering of human destiny. What would the world be without the recognition of freedom, the imprescriptible dignity of the individual personality, the responsibility of human beings

for their own destiny. What would the world be if these values had not been embodied in the organization of public powers, without the right of peoples to self-determination and without the constitutional principles of democracy? It is therefore no base egoism when we demand that this Europe shall have the right to an equal say in the political affairs of the world. In the middle of the twentieth century stupidity and blindness led European policy into a situation in which this continent ceased to take part in the shaping of world history or even to be master of its own fate. We were the subject of decisions taken by other people, of other people's favour or disfavour. We will never cease to be thankful for the generosity which was shown to us from outside at that time of deepest humiliation - and in saying this, I am thinking principally of our American friends. But it could not escape anyone who really knew Europe that this situation, frightful and deeply humiliating as it was, could only be an accident in the great and venerable history of Europe, an event, but no permanent state of affairs, a wound, but not death. No, it was from this condition of profound demoralization that sprang the beginning of that creative policy which is to make Europe, having pooled its strength, an active participant in world history.

Unchanged, too, are the forces, means and methods with which this aim is to be reached.

The first is our unshakable belief in the European cause, the belief in eternal Europe. Despite all decadent fatalism, all highbrow talk of decline, we believe in the



unimpaired vigour of this old continent which is yet so young, in its will to survive, its self-respect and its pride, its trust in its own capacity to master the problems set by a world which is preparing to become one world.

We also believe in the power of reason. True, Man is not only a creature of reason; he is certainly as foolish as he is reasonable, and in the life of peoples, as of individuals, we will always come across those incomprehensible aspects which make life on earth so unpredictable - and often so attractive. But it is not unreasonable to assume that people can appreciate that the changed criteria which now apply to political communities are facts which no people and no State in Europe can evade. Of course, we also hold fast to the opinion that the conclusion from this does not have to be, and indeed should not be, that the existing political order in Europe, the order of nation States, is being extinguished and replaced by a European supernational State. The richness of Europe, its real strength, is its variety, and this variety of characters, temperaments, inclinations, spiritual and mental make-up and abilities is something we wish to maintain. For this reason we have never considered as a model for the political shape of the future Europe a monolithic and centralized State but a federation, with all the respect that this implies for the personality, special characteristics and needs of its constituent parts. Happily, the lessons learned in federal systems furnish us an abundance of models for such a solution.

.../...

We shall moreover continue - and on this third point no concession can be made - to recognize as the only element which gives an assurance of lasting unity the power of the law, the majesty of the law; it is on this firm foundation that we shall continue to build our European edifice. In the history of Europe attempts have often been made to establish unity through force, through conquest and subjection. But every attempt, with its accompaniment of blood and tears, has proved to be in vain. In the end the conviction has triumphed that the only civilized method of forming a unity out of the segments of Europe is also the only safe one. It involves negotiation and agreement between the European States, negotiation between democratically responsible governments and a treaty ratified by the Parliaments of the Member States. This path is long and laborious. There are delays and set-backs, resistance and disappointments. But do we not possess, in the very existence and success of our Communities, tangible proof that this path is the path of progress? They have been created and their machinery works as laid down in the Treaties. Is not the whole world astonished at this almost unbelievable phenomenon of a continent, that had been utterly given up for lost, rising out of the ashes of the greatest holocaust ever known and girding itself once again for further achievements, this time as a Community?

With what I have said, the main points on the strategy and tactics of unification have already been made. Here too we must continue on the path we have so far trodden. Our method is called "pragmatic". Many things are meant by this, but what is not meant is an attempt to conjure up

a united Europe with a wave of the wand - with a readymade constitution, and with the powers, bodies and other attributes of a full federation. For the last fifteen to twenty years the time was never ripe to attempt this by some such method as the convening of a European National Assembly and, however much we may regret it, the chances of success would be no greater today. What has, on the contrary, proved successful is the method of advancing step by step. We have been building brick by brick. We turned down a policy of all or nothing. We preferred to do little rather than nothing at all. When we could not bring in everyone we should have liked to have with us - either because they were not all willing or because we ourselves did not do what was needful - we were satisfied with less. When we had first harmonized our policy on heavy industry, we thought the time had come for a common defence policy and even for a "Political Community". Disappointed in this, we returned to economic policy, this time with a success that surpassed all expectations.

Of course - and this is a no less important and dynamic aspect of our pragmatic method - we have always taken care to include in our constructions an evolutionary element. They are so conceived that their progress is constantly creating new grounds for yet further advances: customs union creates incentives for establishing an economic union, that is, common policies covering, for instance, agriculture and trade. Economic union calls for what is known as political union, that is, a merging of external policy and defence policy - for how can we in the long run picture a common trade policy without a common external policy?



Few words are needed now to list the qualities that we in Europe need if we are to come through the great test of this century - and on whether or not we pass it will depend the survival or non-survival of this continent as a historic power. We need drive and initiative, a creative imagination, an instinct for the right moment, readiness to take a dynamic decision, even a little youthful love of adventure - for there are always risks. But we also need an iron will, tenacity and persistence, an enthusiasm for work even in the apparently trivial everyday things. It is easy to be enthusiastic when the flags are fluttering in the wind and the ship is forging ahead. It is less easy to maintain this enthusiasm amid the monotony of the daily round, when the common tasks pile up, when self-interest stalks abroad and pusillanimity extends its hold. Then it becomes evident that patience is not only a great virtue, but one which is quite indispensable for such a long-term task as European unity. If, despite our wishes, 1964 brings no spectacular advances in the political sphere, we can comfort ourselves with the thought that the remodeling of Europe at which we are aiming is too fundamental and too drastic to be completed in fifteen years, and that even the economic and social union inaugurated by the Treaty of Rome under the name of the European Economic Community has reached only the halfway mark. We shall not blame those realists who content themselves this year with taking modest steps.

Who are the "we" of whom all these qualities and attitudes are required? Let me conclude by answering this question.

If our great task is to be carried through to success, we need the wisdom of the Governments and institutions concerned, the political fervour of the Parliaments, the finesse and cool objectivity of the diplomats, the expertise and devoted service of the officials - including our European officials! - and the criticism and encouragement of the organs of public opinion. But what we need above all, as the indispensable basis for any European activity, is the approval of the European peoples. We need it for the future, in the same way that it is the final and decisive explanation of our success in the past. The approval of the peoples, however, the general will which gives the final sanction to our actions, means in a free Community the approval of the citizens. It gives us fresh courage that we are able to sense this approval in such a representative meeting as today's, and for this we are grateful.

Not quite two thousand years ago in an extensively unified order of almost the whole known Old World, which was based on domination and obedience, membership of this empire was expressed in the proud and haughty expression "Civis Romanus sum" - "I am a Roman citizen". May the time not be far distant when, in a more noble sense, in the sense of participation in an order based on the approval of all Europeans, it can be said with no less pride but with the awareness of sharing in a great responsibility: "Civis Europaeus sum" - "I am a citizen of Europe".

-----