David Ramiro Troitiño · Tanel Kerikmäe
Archil Chochia   *Editors*

Brexit

History, Reasoning and Perspectives

Brexit

David Ramiro Troitiño • Tanel Kerikmäe •
Archil Chochia

Editors

Brexit

History, Reasoning and Perspectives

 Springer

Editors
David Ramiro Troitiño   Tanel Kerikmäe
Tallinn Law School   Tallinn Law School
Tallinn University of Technology   Tallinn University of Technology
Tallinn, Estonia   Tallinn, Estonia

Archil Chochia
Tallinn Law School
Tallinn University of Technology
Tallinn, Estonia

Foreword

Every time we have to decide between Europe and the open sea, it is always the open sea we shall choose

These words were spoken by Winston Churchill to Charles de Gaulle during a ferocious row in the lead up to the Allied invasion of France in 1944. Churchill wanted to make it clear that Britain would only act in conjunction with the USA. During the UK referendum, those words were hijacked by the Leave campaign, which stuck them together with sentences written by Churchill in 1930, and then claimed they were spoken in Parliament in 1953. The aim being to give the impression that Churchill was opposed to joining the European project, which was not true.

This act of subterfuge and the importance attached to it by the Leave campaign, is illustrative of the false thinking that runs through much of the British debate about Europe. Membership to the EU is not an either/or choice. Since joining in 1973, the UK has continued to be an influential voice in global affairs. It has retained its special relationship with the USA, which receives 17% of UK exports. The UK remains one of the most competitive economies in the world. It is true that by being in the Customs Union, the UK's trade is governed by the rules of the Union, but those rules have given the UK easier access to one third of the world's markets by value, and access to more markets than countries like Canada and Switzerland. EU mutual recognition agreements facilitate trade with China and the USA, among others. EU membership does not appear to hinder German's trade with China, which is three times bigger than the UK's. More important trade deals are in the pipeline. The reality is that far from being an either/or choice, EU membership is the best way for the UK to "have its cake and eat it."

Long ago, I concluded that the UK simply does not "get" the EU. It does not comprehend the EU's very nature. In particular, it has never really understood that the EU is not just an economic project, but also a political one.

When I first went into the European Parliament, I found myself among people who still had their concentration camp numbers tattooed on their arms. One of my

neighbours in the Socialist group had been a leader of the Luxembourg resistance to the Germans. I once heard a Greek MEP apologise for his English, explaining that he had taught himself while he was in solitary confinement during the dictatorship of the Colonels. I became acutely aware of being surrounded by a driving determination that the awful history of Europe in the first half of the twentieth century must never be repeated. The UK mainland, for all its suffering during two World Wars, was never occupied, and has not had a dictatorship in modern times. Consequently, the UK approach to the European project is more detached, less emotional, and more pragmatic.

The failure to understand that the EU is a political project, as much as an economic one, explains some of the more delusional statements made by politicians in the UK. We are constantly being told that because Germany sells lots of cars to the UK, then Germany will be desperate to do a quick deal. It is true 7.5% of Germany's exports go to the UK, but that means 92.5% do not. British commentators cannot grasp just how seriously Germany takes its leadership role in Europe. It would be very reluctant to upset the other 26 Member States, even if that meant eventually agreeing to a deal that was not beneficial to Germany. Former Chancellor Helmut Kohl was often quoted as saying that the EU was in Germany's interest even when it was not in Germany's interest. That is a view most British would find incomprehensible.

Another aspect of the British psyche, which is important to understand, is that UK politics is confrontational. There is always a winner and a loser. Continental politics tends to be conciliatory, always trying to compromise and bring people together. This is a difficult lesson for British politicians to learn when they first enter the European Parliament, as I know very well. Some can never lose their confrontational attitude, and as result, make little practical impact on the Parliament. This is important because any negotiations about the future will be accompanied by the constant drumbeat of accusations of betrayal from the fundamentalist wing of the Leavers. Every compromise will be painted as a defeat.

The UK narrowly voted for Brexit for a myriad of reasons, some rational, some not. The British, as I have mentioned, lack an emotional attachment to the Project, and so have always been reluctant Europeans. We have a rabid anti-EU right press that helped blow up a firestorm over immigration, which drowned out all rational debate on the subject. The Leave campaign was based heavily on distorted information and downright lies. Their slogan "Take back control" had a resonance that the Remain campaign based on economics could not match.

Two aspects of the Brexit vote though stand out. Firstly, this was as much a vote about austerity as about the EU. Since the crash of 2008, real wages of the average British worker have fallen 10%, the longest sustained fall in average pay since the Great Depression. In addition, following the 2010 election, the Conservative Chancellor of the Exchequer, George Osborne implemented cuts in services and benefits, which have hit the poorest very hard, including those in work. People at the receiving end were angry and frustrated, particularly, as they believe governments were following policies that made their situation worse, notably not controlling immigration.

The second important aspect of the Brexit vote can be found in opinion polling done into voter's values and how they affected their vote. People in England were asked whether they felt mainly British or English. The more they said they felt English rather than British, the more likely they were to vote for Brexit. Similarly, people who strongly wanted the restoration of capital punishment or were anti-feminist or anti-gay rights or anti-environmental politics, voted for Brexit regardless of age, wealth, or education. In this sense, the vote represented a backlash against the modern world and modern politics. This was like the forces at work in the victory of Donald Trump in the USA.

Neither of these aspects are exclusively British. They form the backdrop of politics throughout the EU. Brexit should be a wakeup call to the European political establishment to act now before the populists sweep all before them.

The Brexit vote has left Britain divided and uneasy with itself. An increase in hate crimes being the worst manifestation of this. Sterling plummeted in value, which while it should help exports, is undoubtedly fuelling inflation so putting more pressure on the less well-off. The new Chancellor of the Exchequer, Philip Hammond, revealed in his Autumn Statement that there is a £59 billion "blackhole" in Britain's finances caused by economic growth weakening following the leave vote. Business is uncertain about the future that could affect investment plans. The Government got itself involved in an unnecessary constitutional battle with Parliament over who should trigger the Brexit process. Perhaps the worst consequence of the Leave vote is the way it dominates all political discourse in the UK at a time when attention should be focussed on some very big challenges facing the country.

The Brexit vote was clearly a vote against the status quo. What is less clear is what it was a vote for. Throughout the referendum campaign, the Leave camp were allowed to avoid setting out what the alternative to EU membership was. Consequently, the Government of Prime Minister Theresa May reached the end of 2016 without being able to articulate what it believes the future holds beyond repeating that "Brexit means Brexit." At times, it all seems straight forward. The Government has said it rejects free movement of labour, it rejects making any contributions to the EU budget and it rejects the jurisdiction of the European Court of Justice. All that points towards a straight forward clean break or "Hard Brexit". Yet, at the same time, the Government wants access to the Single Market. Those demands seem to be mutually incompatible.

Naturally the Government wants to ensure that the British economy will thrive after Brexit. It is the 6th largest in the world. That bold fact rather obscures some worrying weaknesses. The UK is heavily reliant on Foreign Direct Investment, which is equal to half its GDP. That is the largest proportion of any of the world's leading economies. The UK has a big trade deficit as it consumes a lot more than it produces. UK productivity is only 90% of the EU15 average, which is a consequence of poor skills and weak infrastructure. Most importantly the UK's economy is unbalanced. Manufacturing has declined dramatically, and services now make up 80% of the economy with financial services being the most important. Interestingly the strength of financial services in the UK is largely a consequence of the success of the Single Market. Economic theory states that in a single market, economic

activities will become specialised in geographic areas where they enjoy most advantage. The City of London with its streamlined regulatory regime, flexible markets and, of course, English as a first language enjoys such economic advantages and so financial services have gravitated there.

A financial service company needs a passport to do business inside the EU. Around 5500 firms registered in the UK, with a combined turnover of £9 billion, rely on passporting. Clearly, if the UK were to leave the Single Market those passports would be lost, dealing a huge blow to the industry. There are alternative strategies companies can pursue, but they are all likely to result in a weaker and less dynamic industry.

There is another side to the issue of financial services. The Governor of the Bank of England, Mark Carney in November 2016 stated "The UK is effectively the investment banker for Europe. More than half the equity and debt raised (for European governments and business) is raised in the UK, quite often from investors based in the United Kingdom." Meaning, a weakening of the UK financial sector could weaken the EU as a whole.

Mark Carney's words remind us that Brexit is not just going to affect the UK. Economically, the withdrawal of the EU's second largest economy would be a shock to the system. The Euro would come under even greater pressure, at a time when most commentators feel the ECB has reached the limit of what it can do to protect the currency. The withdrawal of the UK's contributions would leave a €10 billion hole in the EU budget.

There would be compensations. There would be no British rebate, which will leave the largest financial contributors like France better off. All Member States would hope to benefit from any diversion of Foreign Direct Investment that could occur.

Politically, the damage done by Brexit to the EU could be considerable. As already mentioned, the forces that led to Brexit are present in most Member States. They could drive forward the populist revolt against the status quo destabilising European politics. Those forces could drive a wedge between Member States bringing forward ancient tensions, and dragging the European project backwards. At the time of writing, we are awaiting the outcomes of the Dutch, French, and German general elections, which will show us the likely future direction of the EU.

Perhaps the Member State with most to worry about is Ireland, which is closely tied to the UK. Ireland's 17% global trading relationship is with the UK. Anglo Irish trade is worth £1.2 billion a week. Most of Ireland's energy comes from the UK. The greatest concern though is with the border with Northern Ireland. If frontier and custom controls must be re-established, it could be immensely damaging economically and politically. There could also be a knock-on effect to the Peace Process. The Good Friday Agreement assumed that all parties would be EU members.

The loss of the UK will affect the EU in other ways. The UK has usually been a major player in the political processes of the Union. British pragmatism and focus on outcomes, rather than process, has helped drive forward the European agenda. In particular, the UK has prioritised the drive to complete the Single Market, and to reform the way the EU works. In the field of security, the UK has a key

role, notwithstanding its complicated opt ins and opt outs. Britain is a major player in the sharing of intelligence and police cooperation. Further, the UK is a major military force.

The real danger for the EU is that it now must focus energies on the internal management of the Brexit process, at a time of so many external threats. Syria, Turkey, terrorism, future relations with the Trump Presidency, and the refugee crisis, all demand the undivided attention of Member States. Perhaps none more so than Russia where Putin has made no secret of his desire to break up the EU.

On the other hand, many will welcome the fact that the UK will no longer be able to obstruct future EU integration. Unfortunately, EU integration will possibly be the biggest casualty of this saga. Governments are likely to further embrace inter-governmentalism as a protection from domestic populist forces.

The EU is caught between two contradictory forces. On the one hand, the need to tame globalisation demands greater integration. For example, in stopping multinational companies playing Member States off against each other as a way of avoiding taxation. Yet, this very integration is anathema to the forces of nationalism growing throughout the continent. The danger for the EU is that it could be torn apart by these opposing forces.

It is obvious that it is in nobody's interest for Brexit to be an acrimonious divorce. The future prosperity of all concerned depends on finding a mutually acceptable way out of this crisis. It will not be easy. No big country has ever left the EU before. Nor for that matter does the World Trade Organisation have any experience of a major country leaving a customs union. We are all operating in the dark. We will stand or fall together.

The chapters of this book look at the evolution of the UK's relations with the EU, including Brexit in greater detail. When studying what inevitably will be dry facts, it will be worth remembering that politics is about people. The people whose vision built the EU, the people whose suffering was the motivation for those early visionaries, and the people whose livelihoods are at stake if we get this next phase wrong.

Gary Titley was a British MEP 1989–2009. Vice President of the Socialist Group responsible for Enlargement 2002–2004. Leader of the British Labour Group 2002–2009.

London, UK   Gary Titley

Introduction

Brexit is currently a crucial issue in Europe and beyond and its impact to the current but also further European integration cannot be underestimated. While the discussions around Brexiters mainly focus on the referendum of 2016 or David Cameron's "great miscalculation" and its results, this book looks at Brexit as a process that started decades earlier. The current academic contribution analyses the EU-UK relations from a new global perspective, considering the historical background, political aspects, legal, and economic matters. The book provides a holistic understanding of Brexit, seeing the referendum and its outcomes as a culmination of a long process rather than a separated political occurrence designed within the corridors of Westminster or Downing Street 10. The book, therefore, contains main thematic issues, historical patterns of political and economic behaviour both within and beyond of kingdom, as well as possible future outcomes in the relations between the Union and one of its most important members.

The research is divided into different areas, as a historical approach of the UK in its relations with the EU to understand long-term political and economic patterns in their relations. Finally, the book discusses possible future scenarios of current events, analysing different fields of the relations between the EU and the UK, outlining key elements, important aspects and variety of possible options.

As the historical reasoning of the Brexit goes far beyond the *realpolitik* of British Islands, the co-authors of the book chapters come not only from UK, but also from other European Union Member States. Furthermore, they represent different disciplines such as history, law, political science, and economics—therefore providing expert views from different key fields of the whole process of Brexit and the EU-UK relations. Finally, the authors have a different background of being academic scholars and practitioners. Therefore, such composition of the contributors to the book and their fields of expertise allow covering variety of essential aspects of the EU-UK relations and combining multifold opinions on the process of Brexit.

The contribution is an attempt to explain why pro-Brexit "taking back the control" rhetorics met the fertile soil or, at least was taking the advantage of the narrative John Bull has believed in.

Tallinn, Estonia   David Ramiro Troitiño
Tallinn, Estonia   Tanel Kerikmäe
Tallinn, Estonia   Archil Chochia

Contents

Part III The UK Inside the European Communities/Union

Part IV The British and European Future

List of Contributors

Ondrej Blažo Institute of European Law, Faculty of Law, Comenius University in Bratislava, Bratislava, Slovakia

Archil Chochia Tallinn Law School, Tallinn University of Technology, Tallinn, Estonia

Andrea Circolo Faculty of Law, University of Naples Federico II, Napoli, Italy

Rasa Daugėlienė Institute of Europe, Faculty of Social Sciences, Arts and Humanities, Kaunas University of Technology, Kaunas, Lithuania

Ondrej Hamuľák Faculty of Law, Palacký University Olomouc, Olomouc, Czech Republic

Thomas Hoffmann Tallinn Law School, Tallinn University of Technology, Tallinn, Estonia

Andrea Hrebickova Faculty of Law, Palacký University Olomouc, Olomouc, Czech Republic

Liisi Keedus Department of Politics, University of York, York, UK

Tanel Kerikmäe Tallinn Law School, Tallinn University of Technology, Tallinn, Estonia

Nicole Lindstrom Department of Politics, University of York, York, UK

Davids Lipsens Sorainen Riga, Riga, Latvia

Holger Mölder Tallinn Law School, Tallinn University of Technology, Tallinn, Estonia

Paulius Puskunigis Institute of Europe, Faculty of Social Sciences, Arts and Humanities, Kaunas University of Technology, Kaunas, Lithuania

David Ramiro Troitiño Tallinn Law School, Tallinn University of Technology, Tallinn, Estonia

Rafał Riedel Institute for European Studies, Chemnitz University of Technology, Chemnitz, Germany

Lehte Roots Tallinn Law School, Tallinn University of Technology, Tallinn, Estonia

Christoph Schewe Faculty of Law, University of Latvia, Riga, Latvia

Olga Shumilo Yaroslav Mudryi National Law University, Kharkiv, Ukraine

Gary Titley Former Member of the European Parliament, London, UK

Andres Tupits Estonian Business School, Tallinn, Estonia

Part I
Historical Approach of UK to the European Integration

First European and Pan-European Integration Efforts and British Reluctance

David Ramiro Troitiño, Tanel Kerikmäe, Archil Chochia, and Andrea Hrebickova

Abstract The following chapter is about coherence between European countries during centuries and first proposals how to unify whole Europe in one big project as a cultural, political, and historical community. These tendencies were strong during First World War, when Europe had to face military conflict. This chapter therefore returns to Jean Monnet, the father of Europe, who was active in integration process together with Robert Schuman, who adopted the integration proposal, today known as the Schuman declaration. Second part of submitted chapter is dedicated to Coudenhove-Kalergi's pan-European movement, which organized first Pan European Congress with the aim to unify all European nations together to avoid war conflict. In this part, we can find also the attitude of UK towards the European organization and its reluctance to be one part of supranational organization.

1 The First European Integration Proposals

The process of building a European association or community is not something new, or just an idea of the twentieth century. There have been different ideas about Europe throughout history and from different cultures. The name Europe comes from different traditions, such as Greek or Jews. The Greek Europa was a Phoenician princess who was very beautiful, and the main god of the Greeks, Zeus, fell in love with her. But the father of Europa took care of her very carefully making the loving advances of Zeus impossible. The princess used to walk on the beach, Zeus transformed himself into a white bull, and Europa was tricked into riding the bull when suddenly Zeus started running over the sea until he reached Crete. There he

D. Ramiro Troitiño (✉) · T. Kerikmäe · A. Chochia
Tallinn Law School, Tallinn University of Technology, Tallinn, Estonia
e-mail: david.troitino@ttu.ee; tanel.kerikmae@ttu.ee; archil.chochia@ttu.ee

A. Hrebickova
Faculty of Law, Palacký University Olomouc, Olomouc, Czech Republic
e-mail: aabecedaa@gmail.com

restored his shape and made her his mistress. Europa gave birth to Minos, Rhada-manthus, and Sarpedon.

The word Europe is also recorded in the Bible. After the great flood sent by Yahweh, when Noah and his children were to repopulate the world, Japheth, son of Noah, who was assigned the repopulating of Europe, was told by his father to populate the territories of Europe, and became the father of the Europeans.[1]

Other traditions link Europe with Semitic, Phoenician, or Arab words. The shape of Europe and its borders were defined according to how different people spoke about it, and meant that the borders of Europe were, and in fact are, more cultural than geographical. Europe became a Greek creation where Greek people lived. The Romans widened the concept, including more northern territories and more peoples in the concept of Europe.

Britain had established diplomatic and trade relations with the Romans over a century since the expeditions of Julius Caesar in 55 and 54 a. C. and economic and the cultural influence of Rome was a significant part of the late pre-Roman Iron Age Britain, especially in the south. Between 55 a. C. and 40, the policy of payment of taxes, exchange of hostages and vassalage of the British tribes, which began with the Roman invasion of Britain commanded by Julius Caesar during the Gallic War, remained without undergoing little change. Cesar Augusto prepared the invasion of the island three times (34 a., 27. C. and 25 a. C.). The first and third were aborted because of riots produced in other regions of the empire and the second because the British leaders seemed willing to reach an agreement to avoid war. According to Augustus Res Gestae, two British kings, Dumnovellauno and Tincomarus, traveled supplicants to Rome during his reign, and Strabo said that Britain paid more in taxes that could have course in total if the island had been conquered. After Claudio's invasion, Britain became a part of the Roman Empire, even if all the island was never occupied and revolts and social unrest were common, and part of the roman concept of Europe.[2]

The fall of the Roman Empire and the consequent chaos meant a period of social and political instability and a change for the concept of Europe, when finally, the rise of the Muslim religion and its occupation of the eastern and southern shores of the Mediterranean gave again a cultural identity to the concept of Europe, Christianity. This religion reached Roman Britain in the third century, the first martyrs registered in Britain are Saint Alban and Julius and Aaron Caerleon, during the reign of Diocletian (284–305). Gildas date the arrival of faith at the end of the reign of Tiberius (14–37), although the stories that connect with Joseph of Arimathea, Lucio, or Fagan are generally regarded as pious forgeries. Restituto, Bishop of London, is registered as attending the Council of Arles in 314, along with the Bishop of Lincoln and the Bishop of York. After the Romans left Britain, Christianization intensified and evolved into Celtic Christianity.

---

[1] van der Hulst (1999).

[2] Higham (1992).

The Christianization of Anglo-Saxon England took place mainly during the seventh century and was because of the combined action of the Gregorian mission of 597 and the missionary efforts of Irish and Scots who had started in the 30s. From the eighth century, British Anglo-Saxons missionaries would play a crucial role in the conversion of the inhabitants of the Frankish Empire. Ethelbert of Kent was the first king to accept baptism around 601. Shortly after would follow Raedwaldo (East Anglia) and Saeberto (Essex) in 604. However, Ethelbert and Saeberto were succeeded by pagan and hostile kings to Christianity who drove the missionaries and encouraged his people to return to their old ways. Christianity survived only with Raedwaldo, who worshiped pagan gods old with Jesus Christ.[3]

The turning point for the incorporation of Anglo-Saxon England to Christianity was the death of Penda of Mercia in 655 during the Battle of Winwaed. This made Mercia officially a Christian state, and allowed the return of Cenwalh of Wessex from exile, strengthening Christianity in Wessex. After 655, only Sussex and the Isle of Wight remained pagan, although occasionally Wessex and Essex would return to paganism. Arwald, the last pagan king, died in battle (686) and from then on, all the Anglo-Saxon kings were Christians, at least nominally. It incorporated Britain to the cultural idea of Europe.

As the two religions were reaffirming their influence over different areas, Europe became the main area for Christians, Africa and Asia for Muslims. The Europeans took over Al-Andalus in current Spain from their Muslim rulers after centuries of fighting led by different Christian kingdoms located in the north of the Iberian Peninsula with important help from fellow Christians from the rest of Europe, especially from France and England. Their main ideological justification for the war was liberating Europe from Muslim occupation. England participated actively expanding the Christian religion over Europe in different war scenarios, as the Iberian Peninsula or East Europe.

Europe was defined again as a cultural space more than a geographical area, and this helped to expand the concept of Europe eastwards, to areas populated by pagan tribes to convert them to Christianity. The idea that Europe was once Christian is obvious, and it has been an important fact in developing the European identity, but to link the origins of Europe with this religion is difficult because it does not consider the previous Greek legacy. Christianity has been very important in shaping the current concept of Europe, but has not been the only source, and the debate that has been opened with the rejected European Constitution and the possible inclusion in it of a reference to the Christian roots of Europe,[4] is completely wrong. The current Europe has had other influences, as from the French revolution and the separation of religion and politics, so the debate is completely sterile and demagogic, because Christianity is one of the roots of Europe, but not the only one.

---

[3]Lynch (1998).

[4]Kalyvas (1996).

The Speech to the College of Europe ("The Bruges Speech") of Margaret Thatcher emphasized the idea of Europe as a cultural, political, and historical community where United Kingdom has been a key actor during centuries:

> We British are as much heirs to the legacy of European culture as any other nation. Our links to the rest of Europe, the continent of Europe, have been the dominant factor in our history. For three hundred years, we were part of the Roman Empire and our maps still trace the straight lines of the roads the Romans built. Our ancestors—Celts, Saxons, Danes—came from the Continent. Our nation was—in that favourite Community word—"restructured" under the Norman and Angevin rule in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. This year, we celebrate the three hundredth anniversary of the glorious revolution in which the British crown passed to Prince William of Orange and Queen Mary. Visit the great churches and cathedrals of Britain, read our literature and listen to our language: all bear witness to the cultural riches which we have drawn from Europe and other Europeans from us. We in Britain are rightly proud of the way in which, since Magna Carta in the year 1215, we have pioneered and developed representative institutions to stand as bastions of freedom. And proud too of the way in which for centuries Britain was a home for people from the rest of Europe who sought sanctuary from tyranny. But we know that without the European legacy of political ideas we could not have achieved as much as we did. From classical and mediaeval thought we have borrowed that concept of the rule of law which marks out a civilized society from barbarism. And on that idea of Christendom, to which the Rector referred—Christendom for long synonymous with Europe—with its recognition of the unique and spiritual nature of the individual, on that idea, we still base our belief in personal liberty and other human rights. Too often, the history of Europe is described as a series of interminable wars and quarrels. Yet from our perspective today surely what strikes us most is our common experience. For instance, the story of how Europeans explored and colonized— and yes, without apology—civilized much of the world is an extraordinary tale of talent, skill and courage. But we British have in a very special way contributed to Europe. Over the centuries we have fought to prevent Europe from falling under the dominance of a single power. We have fought and we have died for her freedom. Only miles from here, in Belgium, lie the bodies of 120,000 British soldiers who died in the First World War. Had it not been for that willingness to fight and to die, Europe would have been united long before now—but not in liberty, not in justice. It was British support to resistance movements throughout the last War that helped to keep alive the flame of liberty in so many countries until the day of liberation. Tomorrow, King Baudouin will attend a service in Brussels to commemorate the many brave Belgians who gave their lives in service with the Royal Air Force—a sacrifice which we shall never forget. And it was from our island fortress that the liberation of Europe itself was mounted. And still, today, we stand together. Nearly 70,000 British servicemen are stationed on the mainland of Europe. All these things alone are proof of our commitment to Europe's future[5]

On the field on the field of integration one of the first proposals of a European organization was linked with the concept of Christianity. George of Poděbrady, 1420–1471, king of Bohemia, tried at joining Christian forces against the Turks. The king had a problematic relationship with Catholics and especially with the Pope, as he was member of the Hussites, a Christian movement based on the teaching of Jan Hus, and at the same time he was under threat from the Turks who had conquered Constantinople and most of the Balkan area in 1453. The Bohemian king through the Treaty on the Establishment of Peace throughout Christendom, proposed a European

---

[5]Thatcher (1988).

organization including the main Christian powers to settle disputes by peaceful means and act together against the Turkish threat. The European organization would work with common institutions, as a common parliament, a common secretariat, a supranational insignia, and a defense treaty. The main idea was an organization to protect Europe from external pressures, the Turkish, to protect Christian lands from Muslim conquer. Nevertheless, his proposal was not accepted by the other powers of Europe and never came into effect.

Another plan came from Charles-Irénée Castel, Abbot of Saint Pierre, 1658–1743. This French writer and politician can be included among the first men supporting the Enlightenment. His chief work, *Le Projet de paix perpétuelle* (1713; A Project for Setting an Everlasting Peace in Europe), exercised influence up to the twentieth century. Saint-Pierre proposed a European peace based on the Peace of Utrecht and assured by a European confederation that would name a permanent arbitration council. He thought about a European organization as a peace system by which to avoid conflicts between European states.[6] The organization would be based on different social improvements and common institutions, as a permanent secretariat where the main powers of Europe, as the King of France, the emperor of the German Empire, the King of Spain, the King of England, and the Pope would have a permanent seat, and other less powerful states would have a rotated seat in this council. He also proposed a Court of justice to solve the differences between the Member States peacefully. His idea based on a confederation rather than integration respected the national sovereignty but created diplomatic tools for solving European conflicts.

Immanuel Kant, 1724–1804, a German philosopher, also made his contribution to the development of a political organization in Europe as a peace system. He published his 1795 essay *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch* pointing out that peace could be granted only if the following conditions were followed:

- No Treaty of Peace shall be held valid in which there is tacitly reserved matter for a Future War
- No independent states, large or small, shall come under the dominion of another state by inheritance, exchange, purchase, or donation
- Standing armies shall in time be totally abolished
- National debts shall not be contracted with a view to the external friction of States
- No State shall by force interfere with the Constitution or Government of another State
- No State shall, during War, permit such acts of hostility that would make mutual confidence in the subsequent peace impossible: such are the employment of assassins, poisoners, breach of capitulation, and incitement to treason in the opposing State

Kant believed that a perpetual peace could only be reached by a federation of Free states, a league of nations with a civil constitution, but not a state of nations, because

---

[6]Pentland (1973).

it could reproduce the conflicts between nations. The idea of the federation was based in common interest, peace, and development, with a big emphasis on freedom and cooperation without domination by any power inside the League.

The Influence of Kant's Philosophy on Europe has been outstanding, but not just in the cultural aspects, but also in politics. The foreign policy of Lord Palmerston to promote peace and commerce is highly influenced by the German philosopher, and several other British authors have developed the idea of peace and trade in the European, and world level.

United States of Europe was also the name of the concept presented by Wojciech Jastrzębowski in *About eternal peace between the nations*, (1831). The project consisted of 77 articles. The envisioned United States of Europe was to be an international organization rather than a federation.

Victor Hugo in 1847 used the term United States of Europe during a speech at the International Peace Congress (Paris in 1849). He favored the creation of "a supreme, sovereign senate, which will be to Europe what parliament is to England" and added "A day will come when all nations on our continent will form a European brotherhood . . . A day will come when we shall see . . . the United States of America and the United States of Europe face to face, reaching out for each other across the seas." His references to England and its exemplary parliamentary democracy shows the importance of the British democratic model for the rest of Europe and for the European integration process.[7]

The period including the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the WWI was very active in proposals integrating Europe where the focus was on cooperation rather than integration, even though the most used expression referred to the United States of Europe. John Stuart Mill, English philosopher, and one of the most influential thinkers in the history of liberalism, who contributed widely to social theory, political theory, and political economy, also joined Victor Hugo in his aspirations for a peaceful cooperation among the European states. The British philosopher participated actively in the Congress of the League of Peace and Freedom as member of the League's Organizing Committee.

An active period of ideas pursuing the European integration to united Europe against conflict, instability, and wars, was followed by the most terrifying war in human history, the First World War. More than 70 million military personnel, including 60 million Europeans, were mobilized in one of the largest wars in history. Over 9 million combatants and 7 million civilians died because of the war. It was one of the deadliest conflicts in history, and paved the way for major political changes, including revolutions in many of the nations involved.[8]

---

[7]Stirk (1996).

[8]Keegan (2014).

2 The WWI, Jean Monnet and the Allied Maritime Transport Council

Jean Monnet, 1888–1979, has a crucial influence in the creation of the first European Community and in the further development of the organization towards the current European Union. He is known as the father of Europe because of his commitment to the European integration and his active participation in the development of the process. Monnet was born in the region of Cognac, France, and soon started working in the family business related to the drink called after the region it was produced, Cognac. His relations with United Kingdom started at the age of sixteen, when he abandoned his university entrance examinations and moved to the United Kingdom, spending several years in London as an assistant in his father's company.

Because of his professional activity as merchant he travelled all over the world to sell its product, as the internalization of the Cognac was fundamental for its profitable activity. The concept of luxury united to Cognac was a great marketing operation that last until nowadays, and allowed Monnet to have contact with the higher part of the society, the customers of Cognac, wherever he travelled. This period of his life had a big influence in his further intellectual development, as he learnt from different cultures different understanding of the organization of the society.

It is remarkable how important was United Kingdom and the Anglo-Saxon world in his life and in his source of power. At the age of 16 he moved to London, during the First World War he was sent to London by the French Government. Right after the war he was appointed as Deputy Secretary General of the League of Nations with the support of Arthur James Balfour, 1st Earl of Balfour, a British Conservative politician who was the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom from July 1902 to December 1905, and later Foreign Secretary. Balfour had worked previously with Monnet when he was Foreign Secretary in David Lloyd George's wartime administration and Monnet was working in the Allied Maritime Transport Council.

Monnet travelled to Canada where he could examine the federal constitution of the country and its multinational internal composition. Monnet also lived several years in USA, where he developed a business career and political contacts in the highest level of the American administration. The United States was a model of integration for those who supported the creation of a European organization, and Monnet understood the American country best than most of his contemporary fellows. During the Second World War he was again sent to London by the French Government and was working all the war in close collaboration with the British and American authorities. He always supported the participation of United Kingdom in the European Communities and promoted the British enlargement as a key expansion for the success of the European dream.[9]

---

[9]Duchêne (1994).

Jean Monnet as a father of Europe, was involved in all the major event regarding the European integration after being involved in the League of Nations, as left the organization frustrated by its working system, mainly the decision making based in cooperation that made impossible almost any common decision. After the Second World War, Jean Monnet was designated by the French government as Commissar of equipment and modernization, coordinating the economic help of the USA via the Marshall Plan to aid in the recovery of the French economy. His strong relation with Robert Schuman, then Foreign Minister of France, helped to shape the first European Community. Then Jean Monnet presented his plan of an integrated community to Schuman, who adopted it; it was published in what we know today as the Schuman declaration.

Jean Monnet was appointed as the first president of the High Authority of the European Coal and Steel Community, embryo of the current European Union, and oversaw the development of the Community. Eventually, his confrontation with the president of France, Charles de Gaulle and the personal veto of the French president made him resign. Their confrontation was link with a different vision of the European project, basically integration versus cooperation.

Monnet followed his work in the European building process with other positions, less public but still influential as became the president of the Action Committee for a United States of Europe, a very persuasive private lobby. He was also active in pushing for the enlargement of the community to the UK, Ireland, and Denmark and was an important backstage figure in the creation of the European Communities established by the Treaty of Rome, especially with the EURATOM.[10] Monnet finally promoted the creation of the European Council, the meeting of the highest political representatives of the Member States of the Community. Jean Monnet was involved in all the major steps of the European building process, but mainly as a secondary actor, behind the scenes, using his influential relations to determine the mechanism of the integration. His intentions were clearly good, building a united community of states to avoid wars and increase the living standards of its citizens. He even wanted to expand the organization, when minimal requirements could be fulfilled by the candidates, to other parts of the world, in a process that could end with a World Federation, something like a World Union to substitute an inefficient United Nations.

Nevertheless, he has been criticized many times for is lack of democratic background because he never was appointed to any position in his life by democratic elections, being always designated by his influential friends. It means that somehow, he did not represent the people of Europe, that he was giving the Europeans what they needed but without consulting them. However, currently Jean Monnet is well respected symbol all over Europe, and his image evokes more an idealistic person than a totalitarian one.

---

[10]Helmreich (1991), pp. 387–410.

2.1 The Allied Maritime Transport Council

When Monnet, just 26 years old, met in 1914 with René Viviani, French Prime Minister in a private interview, he exposed his ideas regarding tight cooperation between the Allies, especially between the United Kingdom and the French Republic, as a basic requirement to win the WWI. The French government supported the vision of Monnet and the change in the French premiership from Viviani to Aristide Briand and further cabinet changes did not change the support he obtained from the French government.

His basic idea was the development of a multinational navy to manage the common external help in the war effort. He thought that as the Allies were facing a common enemy, they should have common answers to it. Cooperation was the basic theoretical concept behind the Allied Maritime Transport Council, an established functional organization respecting the sovereignty of the Member States with an executive body and common rules. As in later occasions, Monnet presented a plan in a moment of necessity to achieve his goals.

The Allied Maritime Transport Council was organized in February and March 1918. The members of the Council were ministerial representatives from the three main Allies and delegates from USA. Robert Cecil and Sir Joseph Maclay represented United Kingdom, Étienne Clémentel and Louis Loucheur France and Giovanni Villa and Silvio Crespi Italy. Raymond B. Stevens and George Rublee were the delegates of the United States of America.[11]

Rober Cecil was later involved very actively in the creation of the League of Nations. It was an intergovernmental organization base on cooperation acting as a forum where to solve the disputes between states without violence. It was founded on 10 January 1920 and was the result of the Paris Peace Conference that ended officially WWI. It was the first international organization whose main target was to keep world peace and respect the established international order. The disputes between Member States were to be solved inside the organization through negotiations and arbitration. It also included other aspects, as labour conditions, the relations towards native inhabitants in w world still dominated by Europe by vast colonial empires, and other issues related with criminality, security, and protection of minorities. The peak of Member States was between 1934 and 1935 with 58 affiliate states.

The idea of the League of Nations was appropriate for the British desires and necessities following the British tradition based on cooperation and unanimity in the international politics as the best way to protect the British Empire and the leading position of the United Kingdom in the world affairs. Obviously, there was no interest in UK sharing sovereignty in an organization based on integration with other states because the country was in the zenith of its power. Nevertheless, the League of Nations was inefficient, decision making based on unanimity was slow and ineffective, and the organization obviously could not attain its primary goal, world peace, as

---

[11]Guichard (1930).

the world faced another wide violent confrontation between 1939 and 1945. Hence, the organization was a complete failure.[12]

Robert Cecil soon afterwards was against the plan of Aristide Briand for a united Europe although the organization was also based on cooperation between its members, because it could influence negatively in the British colonies. Hereafter, the British Empire was the main priority in terms of international organizations, and a European organization could not interfere in the British common wealth even if UK was not going to be a Member State.

Sir Joseph Maclay was businessman and public servant. His business was related to shipping and therefor thanks to his expertise he was appointed Minister of Shipping from 1916 to 1921. His technical profile based on shipping made him appropriate for the Allied Maritime Transport Council but his later involvement in European integration affairs was zero.

The Allied Maritime Transport Council was divided in four main committees, but its leading entity was the Chartering Committee James Arthur Salter and Jean Monnet, the real directors of the organization. Salter was a public servant working previously in the worked in the transport department of the Admiralty. In 1919 he was appointed secretary of the Supreme Economic Council in Paris, an organization created to advise the conference on economic measures to be taken pending the negotiation of peace. The Supreme Economic Council was divided in several commission focus on particular issues, within the organization highlighted the commission responsible for the creation of the League of Nations. Next Salter was appointed as head of the economic and financial section of the League of Nations secretariat, and in the League secretariat at Geneva. His involvement in international politics went on as deputy director-general of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Arthur Salter was a renowned economist highly respected in British politics holding numerous governmental positions in the British government and as external member of the Iraqi government's Development Board.[13]

Salter as one of the designer of the League of Nations, defended a model of cooperation in the field of economy without political integration. His ideas were against the creation of a European exclusive economic area because it would reduce the inter connection of the different European economies with the rest of the world. Despite his concerns of limited national markets in Europe unable to cope with a mass production modern industry he advised against the creation of a European common market proposed by the French government.[14] He defended an alternative inside the League of Nations promoting world trade, abolishment of national obstacles to trade and other measures to create a world market. The ineffectiveness of the organization unable to impose any rule over its members because of its decision-making system based on unanimity fostered the national barriers to trade in other to protect the local industry against foreign products, and hence reducing the

---

[12]Ramiro Troitiño (2008), pp. 139–152.

[13]Ramiro Troitiño (2017).

[14]Walters (1965).

market size and increasing the economic tensions between states. Nevertheless, besides his differences with Monnet regarding European Integration, their work relation was fluid and effective in what they themselves called international administration.

The Allied Maritime Transport Council held four formal meetings while the executive body carried on the daily business of correlating shipment requirements and allocating the resources. The high necessity of resources during the WWI increased the number of committees inside the organization to reassure that American resources were put to the best use in the war efforts. The AMTC had not a higher status of other committees during the Great War, but as it controlled the transportation, took a leading position over other entities.

The Council played a decisive role in the war efforts and was designed following the cooperation theory were unanimity or consensus was mostly needed to take decisions. It respected the national sovereignty of its members and theoretically all of them stood equally inside the Council. However, Great Britain was the only member that had tonnage beyond its own requirements because of its formidable navy merchant navy, obtaining a decisive voice in the decision making. The British Merchant Navy included the British merchant ships that transported cargo and people during time of peace and war. The facts that United Kingdom is an island, the world extension of the British Empire and the intensive economic relations with USA, made the British the merchant navy the largest merchant fleet in the world.[15]

The Allied Maritime Transport Council was operational until 1919 when was absorbed by the Supreme Economic Council and its executive committees were disbanded, but its prominence was reaffirmed with the appointment of Salter, functional leader with Monnet of the AMTC as head of the Supreme Council.

The importance of the Allied Maritime Transport Council was to reaffirm the effectiveness of international cooperation. Besides being a model for future developments in the field of international relations. The people involved in the highest positions of the Council later occupied high responsibilities concerning the process of European construction, as promoters or detractors. The British position towards any kind of European organization was also influenced by those who worked in the Allied Maritime Transport Council. Nevertheless, the active British role in the Council as a leading country because of the importance of UK in the WWI and its predominant merchant navy, proved the British capacity collaborating with other states in the international arena and its predominant vision for the following years based on cooperation rather than integration.

---

[15]Lewis (1959).

3   Coudenhove-Kalergi's Pan-European Movement

A Hungarian Count, Coudenhove Kalergi, 1894–1972, founded, in 1923, the Pan-European movement, and in 1926 organized the first Pan European Congress held in Vienna. He considered the Great War as a conflict between nations, provoked by the animosity between them. He proposed to avoid further conflicts and the collapse of Europe uniting all the European nations in a Union. In a supranational organization all its members could be acquainted with each other, understand each other, collaborate, and settle their disputes in a peaceful way. His political analysis situated France and Germany as the main obstacle and challenge to achieve this Union because of their rivalry. Any European organization should have included the most populated nations of Europe and major economies of the continent.

Europe is the birth land of political nationalism; its geography has allowed an important cultural diversity and the creation of a great variety of social cultural groups or nations. Nation is a concept coming from the American independence and the French revolution. A nation needs people, a group of population with an ethnic and cultural identity living in a geographical space essentially defined. These people are united by some cultural aspects creating a community with a common identity. Therefore, the nation unites the people and gives them the feeling of belonging to a group organization. From a politic and territorial approach, the nation is the space where men and women speak, generally, the same language; belong to the same ethnical group, share culture and history. In a world divided in nations, each one of them has an idea of itself and about the other nations because of their history and traditions. The nation must look for icons as a necessity in a psychological union of its members. It can be charismatic person belonging to the history of the nation, when the nation was pure, like El Cid in Spain, Robin Hood in England, Roland in France, Sigfrid for the German nation, Owain Glyndŵr in Wales or William Wallace in Scotland. Monarchy can also play the iconic role for a nation, as in the case of UK or Japan. Nations also are link with religion as they normally have their own national saint, as Saint George is the patron saint of England or Saint Andrew in Scotland, Saint David in Wales or Saint Patrick in Northern Ireland. Another important element for a nation is the home land, a local feeling that creates deep emotions among the members of the nation. It is normally represented by an iconic landscape, as meadowlands and pastures in England, the Highlands in Scotland, or hills in Wales.[16] The roots of the nation are collective egoism and pride. The nation represents the relation of 3 elements:

1. A part of the humanity: A Folk
2. A part of land: Geographical space
3. Spiritual conscience

The nation creates a strong emotional link between its members and a high level of loyalty.

---

[16]Elgenius (2010).

On a different scope, the state is a geographical space organized with a political system that cannot exist without land. The state is the political association of citizens (political subjects) to live in a community. The citizens share their freedom to create common rules allowing the live in a common society. The sovereignty is the will of the people to share their freedom to organize a common settle of rules that in some cases will restrict their personal freedom, but will allow a functional society life. To be a member of a State the only requirement is to become a citizen, a political subject without any cultural, religious, or ethnical implications. The relation between the citizen and the state is more aseptic as it is based on an agreement related to some specific interest, the common wealth.[17]

National state is a combination of nation (culture) and state (politics). Its function is giving political expression to the ideas of the nation and looking forward the good of the nation. Europe developed the idea of the identification of the nations with the political state, merging the cultural and political spheres, and exporting it to the rest of the world. Then the people are part of the society because they belong to a nation rather than being political subjects. The aggressive behavior of the national political states in Europe was understood as the main reason for the WWI by outstanding European intellectuals, as Einstein, Thomas Mann, Freud, Rilke, or Unamuno, and policy makers as Aristide Briand.

The best proposal to overcome the conflicts generated in Europe by the competition between national states was breaking the identification between nation and politics creating a supra national organization. However, a multinational state, as United Kingdom that entails different nationalities in a common political entity, has been traditionally the most reluctant state in the process of creating a European political entity based on the concept of citizenship rather than nationality. Hence, the British identity, above the national level, could be complemented with a European identity in a higher level, without competing with British, English, or Scottish identities.

Still, nationalism is still currently seen as the main source of social loyalty from the citizens towards the state because it is based on feelings and ideals, providing a strong cohesion to the society, and hence strong support to the political state. The lack of European national identity is one of the reasons of the low cohesion in social terms in Europe, and a handicap for the so much needed popular support of the European society to the European integration process, as it is based more on a rational approach rather than feelings and emotions.

The idea of Coudenhove-Kalergi was link with the aggressive behavior of nations and their constant confrontations. He proposed a European political organization with no a single nation backing it, but several nations working together in a common political environment to avoid conflicts, as a peaceful solution to the endemic wars of Europe.[18] His vision was supported by his personal situation, as on his father's side he was of mixed European descent (Flemish. Czech, Hungarian Greek), a

---

[17]Ramiro Troitino (2013).
[18]Coudenhove-Kalergi (2011).