

JEAN MONNET BEFORE THE FIRST EUROPEAN COMMUNITY: A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE AND CRITIC

David Ramiro Troitiño

Tallinn University of Technology

Abstract. Jean Monnet is known as the father of the European Union. His involvement in the early stages of the European integration process was crucial for the later development of the European Communities. His previous contributions to the international cooperation through the League of Nations, or his support to the Allied Naval Forces during WWI and the Franco-British Union during WWII, can provide a wider historical perspective to the work of Monnet pursuing a united Europe. As the European Union is an organization in a constant evolution with periods of stagnation, knowing more about the original design of the mastermind of the process could also provide hints for further steps in terms of integration. This research presents the work of Jean Monnet in terms of relevance to the EU development.

Keywords: Jean Monnet, European Union, European politics, European integration, EU history

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3176/tr.2017.3.01>

1. Introduction

Jean Monnet commands a prominent position among the *Fathers of Europe*, his influence in the creation of the first European Communities and further development of the organization is well known and documented. Several scholars have researched his involvement in the European Communities, but there is not much literature on his previous attempts regarding European integration before the European Coal and Steel Community. Kevin Featherstone made an excellent contribution to the debate about the influence of Monnet in the democratic deficit of the current EU from the point of view of the functional capacity of the EU. Douglas Brinkley researched Monnet's influence in the first European Communities and how it has influenced the current European Union, underlying the

outstanding impact of Monnet on the process of integration in Europe. Birkenmeier, Paula Phillips Carson and Kerry D. Carson published an essential research about supranationality and Monnet in 2003. Their research focused on the debate about whether the EU is an international or supranational organization based on cooperation or integration, the influence of Monnet in the internal organization of the EU and its development into the current hybrid organization. Giandomenico Majone investigated the economic importance in Monnet's actions in terms of European integration, especially regarding the political spillover effect generated by the economic integration. But his research lacks an analysis of the original economic positions of Monnet, taking into consideration the influences of several British economists, it does not regard his work in the international financial market, or his time in China either. Claudio Maria Radaelli conducted an examination on the technocratic approach of Monnet in the first European Communities and its influence in the current EU, but does not analyze deeply the previous actions of Monnet before the ECSC that provide important hints about Monnet's position regarding the independence of the supranational institutions.

Also, the Memoirs of Monnet are an interesting source for this research, even though they have to be treated very cautiously as the author himself could have tried to influence the future by omitting some facts or underlining minor aspects of his real involvement in the process of integrating Europe. Several articles published in the prestigious journal of the Common Market Studies begotten by Monnet also provide useful information about his intentions and his actions, but especially about his wishes.

The this research is more complicated because of the inclusion of several aspects that have not been properly addressed in the context of the European integration from a retrospective approach regarding Monnet's earlier actions involving international integration. Also it is important to understand Monnet's real economic influences and private development as an international financier because economy is a key element in his way to develop the European integration. The personal and intellectual development of Monnet from a schoolboy of 16 to the influential man mastering the first European Communities is also a research question included for analysis in this paper.

The research methodology is based on an historical analysis of primary and secondary sources based on social history from the Annals school perspective (Burke, 1990). The methodology deployed will provide a thorough picture of the dynamics that are the centre of this research. In this respect it is intended to produce a comprehensive picture of the theory of European integration and the political amalgamation of Europe, based on the contributions of Monnet from his direct and indirect actions plus his previous and later involvement in integration projects. Deeper insights offer qualitative elements to secure a complete investigation leading to new material and theory generating descriptions.

2. Jean Monnet: personal and historical context

Jean Monnet was born in a merchant family dealing with international trade of cognac, a luxury and expensive drink consumed by high class people. He soon joined the family business and moved to London, capital of the British Empire, one of the main markets for his product, and worked closely with an associate of his father. The cosmopolitan clients and the international atmosphere of the city influenced Monnet's global vision of humanity, far from the dominant nationalism prevailing in European societies. He made trips to Scandinavia, Russia, Egypt, Canada and the USA, increasing his total image of the world in general and Europe in particular. The time spent in the family business also encouraged Monnet's international understanding of the world based on greater units than the national states implemented in Europe following the example of the United States of America. This trade also helped him to create an important social agenda including powerful individuals involved in public affairs and private industries (Lefort 2006:103). His relations with high-class customers developed into an outstanding social skill that would help him subsequently in his different political actions looking forward to the creation of international/supranational organizations.

The world at the beginning of the 20th century was dominated by Europe, with important British and French colonial empires all over the world with the exception of America, previously a Spanish area of influence and at the time, by the Monroe doctrine (Perkins 1995), under the growing influence of the USA. The expansion of the European power around the globe was conceivable thanks to a higher economic development and greater social cohesion based on the idea of nationalism.

In terms of politics, democracy was the dominant model of organization of the state in Western Europe with its roots in the Athens of Pericles under different models, such as the French Republic, the British monarchy or the German Empire. The Austro-Hungarian Empire was a different case in terms of politics because of its multi-national essence. Market economy was an important factor of the European identity influenced by the industrial revolution and the necessity to create bigger market units in order to absorb larger production. The economic necessities of the European states generated conflicts as mercantilism based on national protection of the national economic actors from the international competition. It was the most usual policy applied by the European governments, but insufficient to create scale economies and solve the structural problems of the European industrialized economies (O'Connor 1997).

Europe was the homeland of political nationalism; its geography 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 more or less defined. These people are united by some cultural aspects creating a community with a common identity. Therefore the nation unites people and gives them the feeling of

belonging to a group. 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 and share culture and history. In a world divided in nations, each one of them has an idea of itself and about the other nations as a result of their history and traditions (Tilly 1994:131–146).

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) in order to live in a community (Elgeniu 2010). The citizens share their freedom to create common rules allowing the life in a common society. The sovereignty is the will of the people to share their freedom to organize a common set 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.

National state is a combination of nation (culture) and state (politics). Its function is providing 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 nation and the political state, merging the cultural and political spheres, and exporting it to the rest of the world. Hence individuals are part of the society because they belong to a nation rather than because being political subjects. The aggressive behaviour of the national political states in Europe was understood as the main reason for WWI by outstanding European intellectuals, such as Einstein, Thomas Mann, Freud, Rilke, or Unamuno, and policy makers as Aristide Briand (Perez 2005)

To overcome the conflicts generated in Europe by the competition between national states it was necessary to break the identification between nation and politics creating a supranational organization. Different ideas developed in Europe pretended to break the national cohesion by the division of the society in social classes rather than cultural groups. It generated internal conflicts as the traditional cohesion was weakened, but in all the cases the concept of nation prevailed over other international understandings of the world in Western Europe. Nevertheless it created a period of internal instability at the beginning of the 20th century in Europe with numerous conflicts all over the continent, as the Russian Revolution or the Finnish Civil War (Mearsheimer 1990:5–56).

3. Monnet and the idea of integration

Jean Monnet was not a scholar, an intellectual or a philosopher developing theories or analysis of the society. He was more a man of action with a vigorous involvement in integration engagements rather than the creator of a political movement. As Monnet soon joined the family business and moved to London at the age of sixteen, he complemented his education with an active reading and was aware of the main ideas regarding nationalism and European integration at his early time in the UK (Monnet 1978).

Among the leading intellectuals regarding European integration, Immanuel Kant, 1724–1804 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 which 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 it could reproduce the conflicts between nations on a larger scale. The idea of the federation was based on common interest, peace and development, with an immense 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. It was still fashionable in the 20th century and influenced many leading figures. The foreign policy of Lord Palmerston to promote peace and commerce was highly influenced by the German philosopher, and several other British authors developed the idea of peace and trade in the European, and world level. Jean Monnet knew the ideas of Kant, and was highly inclined by them as the key factor for integration according Monnet's understanding was common trade and common economic integration. Hence, Kant's influence is felt in Monnet by the intermediation of Lord Palmerston.

The United States of Europe was also the name of the concept presented by Wojciech Jastrzębowski (Brock 1967) 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, an option not feasible for Monnet as the member states would have kept almost intact their economic independence.

Victor Hugo in 1847 used the term United States of Europe during a speech at the International Peace Congress (Paris in 1849). He favoured 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.*¹

His references to England and its exemplary parliamentary democracy show the importance of the British democratic model for the rest of Europe and for the European integration process (Stirk 1996). The French author was known by Monnet and his ideas had a relevant impact on Monnet's work, as he himself pointed out on several occasions.

The period including the end of the 20th century and the beginning of WWI was very active in proposals for integrating Europe where the main focus was on cooperation rather than integration. John Stuart Mill, the English philosopher, and one of the most influential thinkers in the history of liberalism, who contributed widely to social theory development, 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 a member of the League's Organizing Committee and his ideas influenced Monnet regarding the economic impact of peaceful cooperation between the European states. The idea of a common integrated economy based on liberal principals became the main pillar of Monnet's contribution to the integration process.

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 supra-national 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 underlined France and Germany as the main obstacle and challenge to achieve this Union because of their rivalry. Any European organization should have included these most populated nations of Europe and the major economies of the continental area. The idea of France and Germany as the centre of any European organization influenced Monnet but most of the proposals of Coudenhove Kalergi were too eccentric to inspire a young Monnet, strongly practical rather than theoretical. Both men had high social skills and the support of relevant politicians and businessmen, but just Monnet succeeded.

Jean Monnet was influenced by these different men and ideas but his practical soul led him to implement real organizations based on sectorial integration that could lead to further integration in the future. In that sense the theory of integration, Neofunctionalism, seems to be developed to provide a theoretical backbone to the actions of Monnet rather than being an original theory based on an intellectual ground. It obviously raises questions about the whole development of the EU as a designed process.

¹ International Peace Congress papers, Paris 1849.

4. Monnet and the allied maritime transport

Monnet, just 26 years old, had a private interview with the French Prime Minister René Viviani in 1914, where he revealed his ideas regarding tighter cooperation between the Allies, especially between the United Kingdom and the French Republic, as a basic requirement to succeed in WWI. The French government supported the vision of Monnet and the substitution in the French government of Viviani by Aristide Briand did not change the support to his idea (Dutton 1981:46–59).

Monnet already in his youth started working for the integration according to a pattern repeated further in his life; a practical idea, contacts with high-level politicians able to provide the tools to implement the idea, and the creation of an organization with autonomous management. It proved to be more effective than any other way of integration or any other proposal for uniting Europe, but it was done without popular support avoiding democratic means of integration. As a consequence, the current European integration process is haunted by a poor popular support, low democratic record and insignificant involvement of the European citizens in the development of the process. Obviously the integration is reaching a certain level where the participation of the citizen must be higher and more active, otherwise the whole EU risks a collapse.

Nevertheless, Monnet's basic idea, back in WWI, 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 responses 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 in order to achieve his goals. It is another important characteristic of Monnet to use external facts to foster the internal integration. An idea without the right international conditions would never succeed or would be transformed so radically by its members that its essence would be lost.

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 the USA. Robert Cecil and Sir Joseph Maclay represented the 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 (Guichard 1930).

Robert Cecil was later involved very actively in the creation of the League of Nations, embryo of the current United Nations. But he was not a supporter of the European integration, as he 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 the British dominions. Hereafter, the British Empire was the main priority in terms of international organizations,

and a European organization could not interfere in the British commonwealth even if the UK was not going to be a member state (Troitiño 2013).

The Allied Maritime Transport Council was divided into four main committees, but its leading entity was the Chartering Committee led by James Arthur Salter and Jean Monnet, the real directors of the organization. Salter was a public servant working previously 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 into several commissions focus on particular issues. Next Salter was appointed as head of the economic and financial section of the League of Nations secretariat. 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 national government and also as an external member of the Iraqi government's Development Board.

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

The Council played a decisive role in the war effort and was designed following the cooperation theory where unanimity or consensus was mostly needed in order to take any decision. 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 due its formidable merchant navy, thus obtaining a decisive voice in the decision-making. The British merchant navy included the British merchant ships that transported cargo and people during the time of peace and war. The facts that the United Kingdom is an island, the world extension of the British Empire and had intensive economic relations with the USA, made the British merchant navy the largest merchant fleet in the world (Lewis 1959).

The Allied Maritime Transport Council was operational until 1919 when it 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. It was also a model for future developments in the field of international relations. The people involved in the highest positions of the Council held later on high responsibilities in the process of European construction, as promoters or detractors. The work of Monnet as a co-leader of the project and co-manager of the organization was brilliant and

effective, praised by the French and British governments because of his diligence. Monnet also made contacts during his work in the Allied Maritime Transport Council that will help him to be included in further organizations, such as the League of Nations or the proposal of the Franco-British Union.

5. Monnet and the League of Nations

The League of Nations was an intergovernmental organization based on cooperation acting as a forum where to solve the disputes between the member states without violence. It was founded on 10 January 1920 and was the result of the Paris Peace Conference that officially ended WWI. The importance of the organization lies in the fact that 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. The tremendous horror of WWI triggered different processes to avoid further confrontations between European states and was the real effective beginning of the European integration. Nevertheless, the League of Nations was dominated by the Allies with a predominant role for the United Kingdom. The idea of the League of Nations was definitely to satisfy the British wishes 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 (Walters 1965). Obviously there was no interest in the UK to share sovereignty in an organization based on integration with other states because the country was in the zenith of its power.

The organization also included other aspects, such as labour conditions, the attitude towards native inhabitants in a world still dominated by European 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.

Nevertheless the League of Nations was inefficient, decision-making based on unanimity was slow and hopeless, and the organization obviously did not attain its primary goal, world peace, as the world faced another wide violent confrontation between 1939 and 1945. Hence, the organization was a complete failure (Northedge 1986).

The participation of the UK and France was fundamental in the organization, a British citizen, Salter, and the French Monnet occupied prominent positions in the development of the new organization. Salter, as one of the designers 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 connections of different European economies with the rest of the world and the British dominions. 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 (Walters 1965). He defended an alternative inside the League of Nations promoting world trade, abolishment of national obstacles and other measures to create a world market. The ineffectiveness of the organization unable to impose any rule over its members due 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 market size and increasing the economic tensions between states. However, despite his differences with Monnet regarding European integration, they had good relations and their work association was fluid and effective in what they themselves called international administration.

Monnet influenced the French proposal looking for a more integrated economy in order to achieve the fundamental goal of the organization – peace. His position relied on the concept that war was based more on economic potential than any other element. If the states could not control exclusively their economy because it was integrated with other states and under the surveillance of a supranational organization, their possibilities to participate in a violent conflict against each other were minimal.

At the Paris Peace Conference, Monnet, as an assistant to the French Minister of commerce and industry, Etienne Clementel, directly influenced the French economic proposal of a European market (Walworth 1986). Monnet again pushed for his ideas through an influential politician, but himself not holding any democratic elected position. Soon after the conference, Jean Monnet was chosen by its government to hold a high position in an international organization seeking integration because of his personal contacts and his excellent work in the Allied Maritime Transport Council. Hence, Monnet was appointed at the age of 31 as Deputy Secretary General of the League of Nations, upon its creation in 1919, with the support of the British Premier and the French president.

The working system of the League of Nations was based on unanimity and consensus and its essence constructed on common agreements (Kerikmäe 2014). It made difficult to reach agreements between its members in case of conflict of interest. Monnet worked in the League of Nations just during its first years, the most successful, but soon recognized its weakness and lack of real authority. Obviously Monnet was a supporter of the organization and thought of cooperation as a way to establish new international organizations. But his experience in the League of Nations changed his view radically because its debility came from the unanimity and consensus, and afterwards Monnet just supported initiatives based on integration. The main difference between both options lies in the concept of sovereignty, cooperation means that the national sovereignty is kept intact. But in the case of integration, all the members share a part of their national sovereignty between them, creating a new multinational level holder of a new sovereignty. Hence, the member states of the organization do not surrender their sovereignty but share it, and create a new autonomous institution to manage it. Therefore the

experience of Monnet in the League of Nations was fundamental to include to his vision based on shared economy the concept of integration.

Jean Monnet resigned in 1923 from his position in the League of Nations and fully dedicated to his family business.

6. America and China

Monnet moved to USA in 1925 and became a partner in an American bank with international interests. New York had already become the world financial centre instead of London, and the influence of the American city was felt all over the planet. As an international financier, he was involved in the reconstruction of different countries located in Central and Eastern Europe after the war. He helped to stabilise the Polish currency in 1927 and the Romanian in 1928. His success and his experience managing American support to European states was crucial for his later appointment in the French government in the period after WWII as manager of the American post-war aid. His connexions in the USA helped him to sign in 1946 the Blum-Byrnes agreement with the USA helping enormously the French economy to recover. The agreement cleared France from almost 3 billion dollar debt and obtained additional funding for France with a low interest loan of 650 million dollars (Chira-Pascanut 2014).

The work of Monnet as an international banker increased his influential social circle, and provided him with practical experience on international finance, crucial for his project of integrating Western European economies. It also provided Monnet with a closer vision of the USA, an example of a wider integrated market and of integration of different European immigrants into a single social unit. The American cohesion and its capacity to absorb so many different nationalities into a new social entity impressed Monnet who thought of the economic integration of the American market as the key element in integrating its citizens into a single unit.

The private banking activity of Monnet was very successful until the crash of 1929 when the financial sector was severely hit. Then Monnet moved in 1932 to China invited by its government to become the chairman of the East-West non-political committee. His friendship with the Chinese finance minister and his contacts in New York made his appointment possible. His main responsibility was to develop the Chinese economy into a functional single market as it was still highly fragmented and attract foreign investment through the Chinese Development Finance Corporation (Bromberger 1969). The issue of the market was mainly addressed by Monnet organizing the transportation system into a coherence unit, especially the railway. The interconnection of different areas, due to the vastness of China, was a basic requirement for the economic development of the country. On the other hand, the foreign investment and its organization became a speciality of Monnet, as he had done previously and after WWII when he managed the American financial aid to France and the UK.

The activity of Monnet in China also improved his international connections, fundamental in his later activity in the European integration, as he associated with a former colleague in New York, George Murnane, obtaining financial support from the leading world capitalists of the time. Monnet, obviously a liberal in economics, showed again in his Chinese adventure the importance of scale economies and the necessity to create single markets to reduce poverty and increase the cohesion of the social actors involved. His former European strategy was formed by his experience in international trade and his expertise in international finance.

Nevertheless, Monnet also believed in the capacity of the market to adjust itself and correct its problems, and the already proved wrong perception that economic integration brings political integration in a long term. Currently the European Union has a single market and a common currency, but the political integration is reduced and the role of the citizens, the essence of any political integration, is minimal. Hence, Monnet's economic approach could be said was insufficient to reach his political goal based on integration.

7. WWII and the Franco-British union

Despite the signals, efforts and projects, Europe entered again into a deadly conflict in 1939–1945. The contenders were similar to those of WWI, a bad peace agreement, irresponsible behavior of the Allies, nationalism, economic crisis and the Nazi rise led to the European resurgence of violent conflict in its maximum expression.

The Allies, again under the umbrella of France and the United Kingdom were facing mighty Germany under the rule of the ruthless German National Socialist Party. Reediting the previous agreements and situations, the French government sent Jean Monnet to London in an effort to increase the effectiveness of the cooperation between both countries. Monnet's influential contacts in British politics and his previous work in the Allied Maritime Transport Council and the League of Nations were fundamental to nominate him as head of the Anglo-French Coordinating Committee in December 1939, just 5 months before the German occupation of France (Gates 1981).

The function of the Anglo-French Coordination Committee was harmonizing the war economies of both states. It was divided in several executive thematic committees. The British contribution was calculated at 60% of the total economic effort; France backed the remaining 40%. The value of currencies of both countries was to be fixed in order to provide as much stability as possible to the agreement. It was a clear common economic solidarity going beyond the traditional alliances. Jean Monnet worked again hand in hand with Salter, who was his colleague during similar task in WWI. After his experience in the League of Nations, both men were convinced of the futility of intergovernmental institutions

that kept intact the national sovereignty of the member states of the organization and were supporters of integration rather than cooperation.

Also working with them was René Pleven, a supporter of the European integration who as the French Prime Minister in 1950 proposed a European Defense Community. His plan was based on the success of the first European Community proposal just a few months before, the European Coal and Steel Community (Troitino 2014). The European states were willing to cooperate among themselves because of the benefits of integration and because an important external reason, the American idea of Europe as one more scenario of confrontation in the world war against communism. Europe was an important area that needed to be strong to resist the communist expansion, as the Soviet Union wanted to spread its political system to Western Europe at a time when there were important communist parties in such relevant countries as France and Italy (Young 1984).

Another British individual involved in the Anglo-French Coordination Committee was Lord Stamp, economist expert on taxation and statistics killed in a German bomb raid in London in 1941. He was assisted by Henry Clay, a close associate, and by H. D. Henderson, an economist and adviser to His Majesty's Treasury in 1939–44.

The Franco-British collaboration was enhanced with other initiatives, such as the Supreme War Council, the Anglo-French Industrial Council, and collaboration between their colonial forces.

The leadership of Monnet was uncontested because of his contacts in British and French politics, his expertise in the field and his connections with the USA. The idea of Monnet was to establish the closest possible economic integration between France and the United Kingdom. The short term results would have been more economic efficiency in the war, and in the long term, after the war, the tight economic collaboration between France and Britain should have led to the political integration of both states and finally of Europe.

As the war events were fast evolving into a desperate situation, Jean Monnet with the essential collaboration of Salter, his vice-chairman on the Coordination Committee, presented a draft on an Anglo-French unity, following the Vansittart draft in June 1940. The proposal was influenced by previous statements of Alfred Duff Cooper, 1st Viscount Norwich and prominent conservative politician, who had argued about sharing resources with France already in 1938 as the only way to keep the independence of both states and Europe.

Arnold Toynbee, a leading specialist on international affairs, professor of international history at the London School of Economics and director of studies at the Royal Institute of International Affairs in London, who even had a private meeting in 1936 with Adolf Hitler, wrote in September 1936 about a hypothetical Anglo-French union as the center of a mighty European Union. Sir Orme Sargent, one of the most important civil servants in the Foreign Office during the 1930s, proposed in February 1940 a permanent system of collaboration between the UK and France in politics, economy and defense to counter-balance the German power in the post-war period. He was aware that his idea of a European federation with

France and UK at its nucleus would generate tensions among the British citizens, but he thought as a solution to increase the educational work among the British citizens about the positive effects of such a union, meaning by that peace. The ideas of Sir Orme Sargent reached the highest level of British politics and also influenced Jean Monnet. The period was also very active among French intellectuals, politicians and business men supporting the idea of an Anglo-British Union.

Edward Frederick Lindley Wood, 1st Earl of Halifax, Foreign Secretary between 1938 and 1940 and from 1941 to 1946, British Ambassador in Washington, took seriously the idea presented by Sir Orme Sargent. The British Foreign Secretary asked the minister of information to promote the Anglo-French union among the British citizens, and created an expert committee to discuss about how the idea could be applied in reality. It would have taken years to apply the idea of first educating the British about the benefits of an Anglo-French Union and develop the effective tools for it. Hence, it was seen as a notion to be developed in the long term, especially in the post war period (Beloff 1970).

The German invasion of France began in May 1940, just four weeks after the French army was overwhelmed by the circumstances and close to absolute collapse. The French authorities were seriously thinking about an armistice, rejecting the idea of any desperate defense because it would destroy the country without serious chances of success rather than delay the defeat. But the British authorities, especially Winston Churchill, were trying to influence the French government to resist at any cost and continue the war, even if the mainland was occupied, from North Africa.

On 14th June the German troops conquered Paris and the French government moved away from Tours to Bordeaux. It increased the pressure over the French government to reach an armistice with Germany unilaterally leaving the UK alone against the German threat. Leo Amery, a British Conservative Party politician and journalist, secretary of State for India, drafted a paper the same day Paris surrendered, where he reaffirmed the Anglo-French Union as the only practical solution to keep France in the war. The main concerns of the British government were links with the French navy and its vast colonial empire that under the German power would have been lethal for the British aspirations in the war.

According to Churchill:

In these days the British War Cabinet were in a state of unusual emotion. The fall and the fate of France dominated their minds. Grief for our ally in her agony, and desire to do anything in human power to aid her, was the prevailing mood. There was also the overpowering importance of making sure of the French Fleet. It was in this spirit that a proposal for an 'indissoluble union' between France and Britain was conceived.²

² Churchill, Winston, and Robert Rhodes James. Winston S. Churchill: His Complete Speeches, 1897–1963. Chelsea House Publications, 1974.

Also, on 14 June, Sir Robert Vansittart, the Principal Private Secretary to the British Prime Minister from 1928 to 1930 and Permanent Under-Secretary at the Foreign Office from 1930 to 1938 and later Chief Diplomatic Adviser to the British Government, had a meeting with Jean Monnet, Plevin and Morton to discuss the Anglo-French Union under the supervision of Lord Halifax. Sir Robert Vansittart was known for his fierce contempt for Germany, as he saw the Germans as an aggressive nation since the times of the Roman Empire, Nazis being nothing but the expression of the German spirit. According to this idea he proposed that Germany after the WWI must be stripped of all military capacity, including its heavy industries, and re-educating the German people intensively for at least a generation to change their aggressive behavior. Sir Robert Vansittart was himself a strong British nationalist and truly believed that the hegemonic role of the United Kingdom in the European affairs should be defended at any cost. Morton, a British civil servant, was Churchill's personal assistant when he became prime minister in 1940, after the war he served at the UN in the Middle East in 1949 (Troitiño 2015).

The four men with such different backgrounds produced a draft about the Anglo-French Union to be used as the foundation for the final proposal by the British government. At first Churchill did not welcome the proposal because according to his own words:

My first reaction was unfavorable. I asked a number of questions of a critical character, and was by no means convinced. However, at the end of our long Cabinet that afternoon the subject was raised. I was somewhat surprised to see the staid, stolid, experienced politicians of all parties engage themselves passionately in an immense design whose implications and consequences were not in any way thought out. I did not resist, but yielded easily to these generous surges which carried our resolves to a very high level of unselfish and undaunted action.³

General de Gaulle, recently appointed Under-Secretary of State for National Defense, arrived in London on 16 June in order to arrange the transportation of French troops to North Africa, and met with Jean Monnet and the French Ambassador (Troitiño 2008). Both men presented the Anglo-French Union as the only possibility to avoid the French defeat and urged the French general to express his support to the plan to the British Prime Minister (Dinan 2004).

De Gaulle informed his government and prepared a final version of the declaration of Union with Jean Monnet, Plevin and Vansittart. The French General later on would be the main obstacle to British participation in the European Communities, a nationalist inside the European Communities, but accepted the Anglo-French Union as the only hope for France to keep on fighting. He presented the draft to Churchill and convinced him that it was the only possibility to keep France in the war. Finally the British government accepted the idea, and after making some modifications to the draft, the Prime Minister of the

³ Churchill, Winston, and Robert Rhodes James. *Winston S. Churchill: His Complete Speeches, 1897–1963*. Chelsea House Publications, 1974, supra note 2.

United Kingdom Winston Churchill made an official proposal for an Anglo-French Union on 16 June 1940:

At this most fateful moment in the history of the modern world The Governments of the United Kingdom and the French Republic make this declaration of indissoluble union and unyielding resolution in their common defense of justice and freedom against subjection to a system which reduces mankind to a life of robots and slaves.

The two governments declare that France and Great Britain shall no longer be two nations, but one Franco-British Union.

The constitution of the Union will provide for joint organs of defense, foreign, financial, and economic policies.

Every citizen of France will enjoy immediately citizenship of Great Britain; every British subject will become a citizen of France.

Both countries will share responsibility for the repair of the devastation of war, wherever it occurs in their territories, and the resources of both shall be equally, and as one, applied to the purpose.

During the war there shall be a single War Cabinet, and all the forces of Britain and France, whether on land, sea, or in the air, will be placed under its direction. It will govern from wherever it best can. The two Parliaments will be formally associated. The nations of the British Empire are already forming new armies. France will keep her available forces in the field, on the sea, and in the air. The Union appeals to the United States to fortify the economic resources of the Allies, and to bring her powerful material aid to the common cause.

The Union will concentrate its whole energy against the power of the enemy, no matter where the battle may be.

And thus we shall conquer.⁴

The proposal was enthusiastically received (Foucher 2012) by the head of the French government, Reynaud, but not by its War Cabinet, as an important part of its members thought better to reach an agreement with Germany than become a part of the British dominions. Reynaud lost the support of his cabinet and Mariscal Petain seized the power, reaching an armistice with Germany, meaning the demise of the project.

The Anglo-French Union proposal was vague as a consequence of the short time the British government had at his disposal in order to influence the French government. Nevertheless the main ideas of the Union were included in the declaration, as common citizenship for the British and French people that in practical terms meant the unification of their political systems. The concept of a citizen, as a subject, is the main pillar of a democratic state, hence the British parliament and the French National Assembly would have united in a single chamber or at least being formally associated. It also established a single currency for the new political entity, as economy was a crucial art of the Union, including

⁴ Churchill, Winston, and Robert Rhodes James. *Winston S. Churchill: His Complete Speeches, 1897–1963*. Chelsea House Publications, 1974, supra note 2.

foreign trade and a customs union. It also involved defense aspects with a common war cabinet and common military command.

The Anglo-French Union had some similarities with the previous proposal of Briand after WWI, but was less clearly defined and could be considered more as a declaration of intentions than a specific plan for uniting the United Kingdom and France into a single state. The historical context of the declaration and the vital necessities of the British under the German threat highly influenced the proposal. The Anglo-French Union probably would not have worked as most of France was under German occupation, and perhaps would have dissolved after the resolution of the war as for some was just a temporal solution for a temporal necessity and was not meant to be indissoluble as it was written in the formal declaration.

Nonetheless, the plan was a long term solution for a short term necessity. It failed in his primary target, i.e. to prevent the surrender of France. Its long term implications as an embryo of a future European Union or just a war time resolution that would expire after the conflict belong to the realm of speculation (Shlaim 1974).

The role of Monnet in this proposal was crucial, as a promoter and active player, but intellectually he did not father the idea. As in other occasions, he just adopted an idea, used the external events and increased the economic perspective to develop a plan regarding integration. Again, as previous times and later on, Monnet was at the center of the action without holding any political position chosen by democratic means, but his personal connections, social and professional skills paved his way to the leading position of a project not designed by himself and not representing people.

Democracy in the case of the Anglo-French Union is a fundamental issue (Braghiroli, 2015), Monnet's proposal would have taken the sovereignty away from the citizens of France and the UK without their consent. Probably the citizens of both states would have rejected the plan in a referendum, the only way to include the citizens in the decision, because as the British said, the citizens needed to be educated before in order to understand the benefits of the Union, and because the French saw the Union as a British dominance over a defeated France, something unacceptable for the French people.

Another important fact in Monnet's involvement in the Anglo-French Union was his support of the involvement of the UK in the European integration process. When the first European Communities were founded he invited the British to participate as a founding member. He also supported the British enlargement and worked to achieve it against the will of de Gaulle, president of France. Monnet's association with the UK in particular, and with the Anglo-Saxon world in general, was a constant in his life, especially in the economic field based on liberalism, and the creation of scale economies, as the British Empire or the USA market.

When France surrendered, the plan was forgotten and the idea was never again popular in the UK or France, outlining its temporal essence and most likely reversal once the war was over if approved. But Monnet was appointed by the British government as a member of the British Supply Council, with the

responsibility to negotiate the purchase of war supplies. Monnet, a French citizen, was working for the UK in the USA, in a high responsibility position. Monnet impressed the American president, Roosevelt, and became his personal advisor, increasing his contacts in the American politics. It encouraged the American support to the first European Communities, as most of American Monnet's contacts were still in power in the 1950s.

8. Conclusions

The research has analyzed the earlier works of Jean Monnet and his impact in the transformation of the so-called Father of Europe into a basic element in the history of Europe and one of its most influential architects.

A common pattern to all his earlier actions, and also followed during his involvement in the development of the European integration, was based on the concatenation of:

1. An idea: In most of the occasions not his own idea.
2. Positive external conditions for its implementation: A bigger threat to the state than the partial loss of sovereignty.
3. Contacts with high level political representatives: It included contacts in several states, mainly France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.
4. Practical development: Monnet plans were always practical to make them real.
5. Autonomous institutions: The management of the new association/organization had to be independent in order to implement the plan properly without the national interference of the member states.

It shows clearly the way Monnet conducted his achievements in the field of cooperation and integration. It was applied in the first European Communities and further developments of the organization. This pattern has been abandoned in the current integration and could be a sign of failure or a change in the necessities of the organization. Monnet's arrangements and its application to the current EU development should be researched further to understand if it is still applicable or just a relic from the past. Nevertheless, Monnet was never an intellectual and all his practical ideas (not his personal beliefs) are taken from other people. Hence, Monnet can be seen as an opportunist using other people's ideas to implement his conviction, a European organization. The research has analyzed the originality of Monnet's actions, and in almost all the cases the idea was fathered intellectually by other individuals. Monnet has obtained the historical credit as he was the man who implemented them, the man of action, but his credibility as a Father of Europe is reduced by this finding.

Related to the first conclusion, following the research, democracy was never a priority for Jean Monnet, as perhaps he never thought the European people able to understand the importance of integration to avoid further deadly conflicts in

Europe. Not a single earlier action of Monnet was conducted according to democratic principles. This way of working followed during his development of the current EU and obviously the organization lacks popular support to work as a federation or a politically integrated area. Perhaps Monnet was right not involving the European people in his actions and the EU should analyze alternative paths to follow the integration without the European citizens, as a confederation where the member states control the popular participation. On the other hand, if it is thought that popular support is needed in order to increase political integration, Monnet's heritage should be kept in the history of the organization and a completely new alternative for the future should be suggested.

The third relevant conclusion of the research is Monnet's contribution to the European integration. His involvement in the all the facts explored by this research produce a pattern, without any single exception, based on international influence for advancing in the integration of Europe. It raises a relevant concern about Monnet; did he have a plan or just a goal? Did he follow an established designed route or did he just react to the external stimulus to achieve his goal of an integrated Europe? This research, based on the findings, supports the second option, Monnet as the main architect of the European integration, lacked a route plan and the current European Union is the consequence of an organized chaos. The light tower, the European integration, kept the process in the right direction, but the path has been irregular and in some occasion tortuous. This conclusion opens the possibility of a new research in the field of European integration and its theoretical backbone because none of the current theories can explain the development as an organized chaos, as water overcoming external natural obstacles pursuing the final destination, the sea, rather than a human built channel canalizing the water.

Another crucial conclusion is the importance of economy in Monnet's approach to the European integration. His earlier economic influences, his work as a cognac businessman, his proposals for a common Navy during WWI and the partial economic integration of France and the UK during WWII, his work as an international financier and his policies in China reveal a Jean Monnet strongly linked with a liberal conception of the economy. Hence, the importance of this conclusion is not the role of the economy in Monnet's sensitivity but its liberalism. His believed in the market force with the capacity to auto-regulate, resolve its problems and remove obstacles, is the key in Monnet's idea of developing the integration via economic fields. The indication of Monnet could be translated as the market reaching some level of integration that would need a common political framework to regulate the basis of its functional capacity, leading inevitably to certain political integration. The current situation of the European Union proves it wrong as there are different levels of economic integration between its members, and the needed political integration cannot be foreseen in the future, or will just affect a hardcore of member states but not the whole organization. And obviously will not be as a consequence of the demands of the market forces. Hence the idea of Monnet regarding economic integration as the key factor for the creation of the

European organization is incomplete and needs to be accompanied by other measures that Monnet did not foresee.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the Jean Monnet module Functional Capacity of the European Union, under grant VERT672, European Community Framework Programme Erasmus + Jean Monnet.

Address:

David Ramiro Troitiño
Tallinn University of Technology, TSEBA (Estonia)
Niine 2A-3
10414 Tallinn, Estonia

E-mail: david.troitino@ttu.ee

Tel.: +37253333160

References

- Beloff, Max (1970) *Imperial Sunset*. Vol. 1: *Britain's Liberal Empire, 1897–1921*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Birkenmeier, Betty, Paula Phillips Carson, and Kerry D. Carson (2003) “The father of Europe: an analysis of the supranational servant leadership of Jean Monnet”. *International journal of organization theory and behavior* 6, 3, 374–380.
- Braghiroli, S. (2015) “Voting on Russia in the European Parliament: The Role of national and party group affiliations.” *Journal of Contemporary European Studies*, 23(1), 58–81.
- Brinkley, Douglas (1991) *Jean Monnet: path to European Unity*. New York: Springer
- Brock, Peter (1967) “A pacifist in wartime: Wojciech Bogumił Jastrzębowski”. *The Polish Review* 1, 68–77.
- Bromberger, Merry and Serge Bromberger (1969) *Jean Monnet and the United States of Europe*. New York: Coward-McCann,
- Burke, Peter (1990) *The French historical revolution: the Annales School, 1929-89*. Cambridge: Stanford University Press.
- Chira-Pascanut, Constantin (2014) “Discreet players: Jean Monnet, transatlantic networks and policy-makers in international co-operation”. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 52, 6, 1242–1256.
- Churchill, Winston, and Robert Rhodes James, eds. (1974) *Winston S. Churchill: his complete speeches, 1897-1963*. London: Chelsea House Publications.
- Coudenhove-Kalergi, Richard (1931) “The pan-European outlook”. *International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1931-1939)* 10, 5, 638–651.
- Dinan, Desmond (2004) *Europe recast: a history of European Union*. Vol. 373. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Dutton, David (1981) “Paul Painlevé and the end of the sacred union in Wartime France.” *The Journal of Strategic Studies* 4, 1, 46–59.
- Elgenius, Gabriella (2010) *Symbols of nations and nationalism: celebrating nationhood*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Featherstone, Kevin (1994) “Jean Monnet and the ‘democratic deficit in the European Union.’” *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 32, 2, 149–170.

- Foucher, Michel (2012) "European times: from one crisis to another." *Schuman Report on Europe*. Paris: Springer, 85–87.
- Gates, Eleanor M. (1981) *End of the affair: the collapse of the Anglo-French alliance, 1939-40*. Oakland: University of California Press.
- Guichard, Louis (1930) *The naval blockade, 1914-1918*. New York: D. Appleton & Company.
- Immanuel, Kant (1991) *Perpetual peace*. Berlin: Reiss Hans 93–130.
- Kerikmäe, Tanel (2014) "Introduction: EU Charter as a dynamic instrument." *Protecting human rights in the EU*. Berlin Heidelberg: Springer, 1–4.
- Lefort, Corinne (2006) "Jean Monnet (1888–1979) La diplomatie du cognac." *Revue du vin de France* 503, 103.
- Lewis, Michael Arthur (1959) *The history of the British navy*. London: Essential Books.
- Majone, Giandomenico (2009) "Dilemmas of European integration: the ambiguities and pitfalls of integration by stealth." *OUP Catalogue*.
- Mearsheimer, John J. (1990) "Back to the future: instability in Europe after the Cold War." *International security* 15, 1, 5–56.
- Mill, John Stuart (2005) *Sobre la libertad*. Madrid: Edaf.
- Monnet, Jean (1978) *Memoirs*. New York: Garden City.
- Moravcsik, Andrew (1993) "Preferences and power in the European Community: a liberal inter-governmentalist approach." *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 31, 4, 473–524.
- Northedge, Frederick Samuel (1986) *The League of Nations: its life and times, 1920–1946*. Leicester: Leicester University Press.
- O'Connor, James (1967) *The meaning of economic imperialism*. London: The Radical Education Project.
- Pérez Sánchez, Guillermo A., and Ricardo M. Martín de la Guardia (2005) En el cincuentenario de la muerte de Ortega y Gasset: el europeísmo de Ortega y el proceso de integración europea. Valladolid: UVA ediciones.
- Perkins, Dexter (1955) *A history of the Monroe Doctrine*. Vol. 17. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Radaelli, Claudio Maria (1999) *Technocracy in the European Union*. Boston: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Salter, James Arthur (1921) *Allied shipping control*. Gloucestershire: Clarendon Press.
- Shlaim, Avi (1974) "Prelude to downfall: the British offer of union to France, June 1940." *Journal of Contemporary History* 9, 3, 27–63.
- Spinelli, Altiero (1972) *The growth of the European movement since the Second World War*. London: European integration, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Stirk, Peter M. R. (1996) *A history of European integration since 1914*. New York: Pinter Pub Limited.
- Tilly, Charles (1994) "States and nationalism in Europe 1492–1992." *Theory and Society* 23, 1, 131–146.
- Toynbee, Arnold Joseph (1946) "Civilization on trial." London: Oxford University Press.
- Troitiño, David Ramiro (2008) "De Gaulle and the European Communities." *Proceedings of the Institute for European Studies. Tallinn University of Technology* 4, 139–152.
- Troitiño, David Ramiro (2013) "The current economic crisis of the EU: genesis, analysis and solutions." *Baltic Journal of European Studies* 3, 1, 6–28.
- Troitiño, David Ramiro (2014) "The British position towards European integration: a different economic and political approach." *Baltic Journal of European Studies* 4, 1, 119–136.
- Troitiño, David Ramiro, and Archil Chochia (2015) "Winston Churchill and the European Union." *Baltic Journal of Law & Politics* 8, 1, 55–81.
- Walters, Francis Paul (1965) *A history of the League of Nations*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Walworth, Arthur (1986) *Wilson and his peacemakers: American diplomacy at the Paris Peace Conference, 1919*. New York: Norton.

