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Introduction

In what follows, you will read the thesis which concludes my bachelor degree Liberal Arts and Sciences, major Humanities with a focus on European History and Culture. The theme that I have chosen is the European Union and its alleged identity. The focal point will be Jacques Delors’ theory on a ‘soul for Europe’. Jacques Delors was the president of the European Commission (EC) from 1985 to 1995. He was the first president of the EC to have such a great influence and at the same time he introduced new ideological views, that of a ‘soul for Europe’ and the ‘European Family’. As will become clear in the first chapter a lot of changes occurred within the EU during Delors’ presidency. In these changes Delors’ influence can be seen clearly. These changes increased the integration of the member States of the EU. As a result of this increased integration there was a crisis, fear of losing national identity, too much power for the EU, etcetera.

After the rejection of the Constitutional Treaty in 2005 the EU is in a crisis again. It receives a lot of criticism. Euroscepticism is one of the most common views concerning the EU, its influence and its goal. During his presidency Jacques Delors has taught a number of lessons that we seem to have forgotten today. However, forgotten might not be the right word, as his vision is exactly that which is criticized by eurosceptics. Where would the EU be today if the lessons Delors´ tried to teach us would still be taken into account? This thesis is about remembering these lessons.

First of all a basic overview of the history of the EU will be given, this to provide the reader with basic knowledge that will be helpful throughout this thesis. In this chapter it will become clear that the EU is the result of a changing society. After the end of the Second World War the European Coal and Steel Community was created and it is commonly acknowledged to be the predecessor of the EU. When this Community was created there was not yet a notion of the EU, nor of its exact fields of integration. The EU cannot be seen as a logical conclusion of societal problems, but has been created throughout time according to the necessities of the member States. In the first chapter it will become clear what the developments of the EU have been and thus how the EU helps to realize the European society. In the second chapter a description of the ‘Delors period’ will be given. This period can be seen as the period 1985-1995 and it is here that the lessons mentioned earlier will be provided. In the third part the Delors period will be compared to what throughout my thesis is called ‘today’/’nowadays’: the time period 2001-
2011. This comparison is important, as without it it is not possible to implement the lessons that the EU must have ‘learned’ from Delors. By comparing the two time periods it becomes clear that the EU has not evolved in such a sense that society demands different levels of integration as those mentioned by Delors. The final and concluding chapter is called Lessons not Learned and here I will analyze what those lessons are.

The sources used are not all in English. All the quotations in the text have been translated by me and the original quote will be given in the footnote indicating the source.

I would also like to thank some people who have helped me while writing this thesis: first of all my thesis coordinator Prof. Dr. Borgman, the second reader Dr. Janssens, mister Lubbers for giving me the opportunity to interview him twice, Europarlementarian Lambert van Nistelrooij who enabled me to go to the central library of the European Commission in Brussels and finally my fellow student Henk Bovekerk who has endured my many comments, questions and frustrations while writing this thesis.
1. The History of the European Union

We must now face the difficult task of moving towards a single economy, a single political entity...
For the first time since the fall of the Roman Empire we have the opportunity to unite Europe.

Romano Prodi

As mentioned in the introduction this thesis focuses on studying the lessons Delors taught us that could have been learned and that should be applied to the crises we are in today. To be able to place everything in an historical context a short overview of the history of the European Union (EU) will first be given below.

We can define two different phases in the history of the making of the EU, namely:

1. The phase of the European Communities (1957-1993)


The first phase starts when in the post war period (1945-1950) the whole of Europe was destroyed. The heads of State realized that the Second World War had been a result of the unscrupulous penalties that Germany had received after the First World War. All agreed that a similar situation, and above all another war, had to be prevented.

Already during the Second World War international relations were shifting and new alliances were created:

---
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One is the shift of global leadership from Great Britain to the United States, in which... the decisive moment was the fall of France in 1940. Another transition is the emergence of a wartime alliance between Britain and America, on the one hand, and the Soviet Union, on the other...³

In 1948 Berlin and in 1949 the Eastern part of Germany were blocked by the Soviet Union, the world was divided. As a result of this division and the wartimes alliances created, the world was formed into two blocs: communist and capitalist. Both blocs organized defensive organizations (NATO and the Warsaw Pact) and hence the Cold War was born.

The United States and the United Kingdom turned to France for military support, with the goal of stabilizing the rest of Europe. Jean Monnet (the commissioner of economic recuperation) and Robert Schuman (Foreign Minister) were given the responsibility to create order in the occidental part of Europe. The main priority of this undertaking was establishing and maintaining peace. Schuman and Monnet created a vision and a plan for a European Federation. Monnet was of the opinion that co operational organizations were too voluntary and that more was needed. The result hereof was the establishment of a 'High Authority' whose decisions would be binding for the member States. The High Authority would be an organ that the member states were to name themselves, after which it would be located above the national governments. The organ would have authority and decision-making competences since this High Authority alone would see the common interest. To stabilize Europe in principle only France and Germany had to accept the creation of this High Authority. Monnet however proposed it with the idea of a European organization that would be open to the participation of other European States. Due to Monnet’s vision it becomes clear that this is the first step in the process of European unification.

On May 9th 1950 the Schuman Declaration was signed and accepted by the Germans. Other free and democratic (the prerequisites at the time) European States that joined were Italy, Belgium, Luxemburg and the Netherlands. The High Authority would be embodied within the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) which came into effect on July 23rd 1952 through the Treaties of Rome and would expire after 50 years.
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The ECSC was created to maintain peace and did thus not show signs of political integration. However, as international integration was promoted through the High Authority the ECSC did have a political essence. The political essence can be seen in its different organs: representatives of Parliaments and Governments and a judicial system. In the five years following the creation of the ECSC different projects were proposed, of which some were rejected, that show the urge and the necessity to intensify political integration.\(^4\)

In 1954 two projects, in which we can see the roots of the political ideal for a European federation, were rejected by France. The European Defense Community (EDC) and the European Political Community (EPC) treated elements of integration that would not return to discussion until the Treaty of Maastricht (1992). The main cause of France’s rejection was the fear of rearming Germany. Also, in 1953 Stalin died and the tensions decreased in Western Europe. Both of these projects might have been overly ambitious for the time being as significant progress was required too soon.

In 1957 two other projects were formalized in the Treaties of Rome as the European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM\(^5\)) and the European Economic Community (EEC\(^6\)) were created. With the creation of these two organizations the phase of the European Communities started. At this time in history there are three international organizations (ECSC, EURATOM, and the EEC) but there is still a limited amount of political visibility.

\(^4\) My grandfather, Dr. H.J. van Oorschot, often lead the Dutch delegation in these negotiations. So it is in my blood.

\(^5\) ‘To tackle the general shortage of “conventional” energy in the 1950s, the six founding States (Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg and the Netherlands) looked to nuclear energy as a means of achieving energy independence. Since the costs of investing in nuclear energy could not be met by individual States, the founding States joined together to form EURATOM. The general objective of the Treaty is to contribute to the formation and development of Europe’s nuclear industries, so that all the Member States can benefit from the development of atomic energy, and to ensure security of supply. At the same time, the Treaty guarantees high safety standards for the public and prevents nuclear materials intended principally for civilian use from being diverted to military use. It is important to note that EURATOM’s powers are limited to peaceful civil uses of nuclear energy.’ Retrieved from: [http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/institutional_affairs/treaties/treaties_euratom_en.htm](http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/institutional_affairs/treaties/treaties_euratom_en.htm).

\(^6\) ‘After the failure of the EDC, the economy, which was less subject to national resistance than other areas, became the focus of consensus in the field of supranational cooperation. The establishment of the EEC and the creation of the Common Market had two objectives. The first was to transform the conditions of trade and manufacture on the territory of the Community. The second, more political, saw the EEC as a contribution towards the functional construction of a political Europe and constituted a step towards the closer unification of Europe.’ Retrieved from: [http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/institutional_affairs/treaties/treaties_eec_en.htm](http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/institutional_affairs/treaties/treaties_eec_en.htm)
Three enlargements took place in the phase of the European Communities, the first one being in 1973 when the United Kingdom, the Republic of Ireland and Denmark joined. In 1981 Greece became a member State as well and in 1986 Spain and Portugal also became part of the European Communities.

The first sign of democratic legitimacy, through direct democracy, surged in 1979 when the first direct parliamentary elections took place (European Parliament). With elections every five years it is the only international organization which has an elected parliament with legislative powers. Direct democracy is mentioned since the citizens of the EU choose their representative directly.

On July 1st 1987 the Single European Act (SEA) came into force. The SEA was in fact the result of Jacques Delors’ efforts to create a single market. The SEA assigned more legislative power to the European Parliament, formally recognized the European Council and created the juridical basis of European political cooperation. The SEA united the three treaties that were in vigor in 1957 (Treaties of Rome) and an interior market was created.

The fall of the Berlin wall on November 9th 1989 caused the development of the Treaty of Maastricht. Ruud Lubbers explains that with the end of the Cold War all the heads of State of the European Communities experienced a sense of unity and strength that united them all. Lubbers explains this as a shared idealism which resulted into globalization. A new map of Europe emerged and with it came new international relations and the end of the Cold War. The Soviet Union was dissolved almost immediately and close to all of the oppressed States had proclaimed themselves free and had rejected Communism by the final months of 1990. After forty years of division Germany was united again and the reaction to this new order of international relations was the Treaty of Maastricht. This Treaty modified and improved the

---

7 ‘The chief objective of the SEA was to add new momentum to the process of the European construction so as to complete the internal market.’ Retrieved from: http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/institutional_affairs/treaties/treaties_singleact_en.htm

8 Interview with Ruud Lubbers on May 21st 2011. Ruud Lubbers was Minister President of the Netherlands from 1982-1994 and cooperated closely with Jacques Delors. The interviews that I had for this thesis have been recorded and can be presented on request.

9 ‘The European Council meetings are essentially summits where EU leaders meet to decide on broad political priorities and major initiatives.’ Retrieved from: http://europa.eu/about-eu/institutions-bodies/european-council/index_en.htm

10 Interview with Ruud Lubbers on May 21st 2011.

three constituent treaties of the EC (ECSC, EURATOM, and EEC). With the Treaty of
Maastricht the period of the construction of the EU, and thus the phase of the EU mentioned
above, was started. The phase of the European Communities was based on economics whereas
during the development of the EU the focus was more on the political dimension. The three
constituent treaties starting European integration resulted into the creation a Federal European.
Forty years after the rejection of the EDC security and military cooperation were discussed
again. The development of the European defense is the most visible development of the past 11
years of the EU.

The EU now includes the European Communities, the Common Defense and Security Policy
(CDSP) and the Justice and Home Affairs (JHA). These three aspects form the three pillars of
the EU:

1. The Integration (The three European Communities)
2. The exterior security (CDSP)
3. The interior security (JHA)

The first pillar entails the elements of integration of the EU whereas the second and third pillars
concern the areas of cooperation. As the EU increasingly became a supranational organization
more policies were moved from the second and third to the first pillar. Each development in the
phase of the EU can be seen as elements relocating in the first pillar. While the SEA served to
create a single market, the Treaty of Maastricht created a single economy and this process is the
first visible political formation which can be seen in the first pillar: economics became subject
to integration.

In 1995 the EU expanded with three more member States: Austria, Sweden en Finland. Four
years later the Treaty of Amsterdam was signed. The most important development was that the
content of the third pillar (JHA) was moved to the first pillar (integration) and the third pillar is
renamed: Police and Judicial Co-operation in Criminal Matters (PJCC). The EU turns into a
space of free circulation, security and justice. Also it is no longer required that all member
States are to develop at the same pace. Under the title of ‘reinforced cooperation’ different
levels of progress are now allowed internally.

In December 2001, as result of the attacks on 9/11, the European Council of Laeken reformed
the constituent texts. The result of these reforms was the proposition of the Treaty establishing a
Constitution for Europe (Constitutional Treaty). This Treaty was presented to the European
Council of Thessalonica in July of 2003. At the same time the Charter of the Fundamental Rights of the EU12 (the Charter) was created.

In February 2003 the Treaty of Nice was established. The institutions are reformed preparing the entry of the new member States. This enlargement took place in 2004 and the new member States were: Poland, Hungary, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Slovenia, Estonia, Lithuania, Malta and Cyprus. Thus far it is the biggest enlargement the EU has known and with it came a political charge: the ‘Divided Europe’, as a consequence of the Cold War, no longer existed. In the Treaty of Rome new goals are also set to eliminate the competition between the EU and its member States, to involve national governments more, and to find a place in the treaties for the Charter. Additionally the structures of the treaties are simplified.

The proposed Constitutional Treaty resulted into referenda in numerous countries. Spain was the first to call for one in February of 2005. After this the Netherlands and France did the same and these last two referendums resulted into a rejection of the Constitutional Treaty. The ratification process was vastly harmed by this outcome and led to a new phase of crisis of credibility and of direction. The Constitutional Treaty was to be a new Treaty in general, which would replace the other treaties structurally – up until this moment there had still been numerous constituent texts. There would be no distinction between the EU and the European Communities and one single organization would come into being. A crucial result of this development would be more visibility for the citizens of the EU and thus also more democratic legitimacy.

The Constitutional Treaty consisted of four parts.

1. The EU identity and European values which are the foundations of the EU;
2. The Charter of fundamental rights;
3. Politics and actions;
4. Reform procedures.

The second, third and fourth part are based on the identity of Europe and its values. Better said, the EU’s identity and values form the premises within which the other parts were to be based.

12 “Human rights, democracy and the rule of law are core values of the European Union. Embedded in its founding treaty, they have been reinforced by the adoption of a Charter of Fundamental Rights. Countries seeking to join the EU must respect human rights. So must countries which have concluded trade and other agreements with it.” Retrieved from: http://europa.eu/pol/rights/index_en.htm
One of the first values mentioned is Christianity and Christianity can, together with humanism, can be seen as the building block of the Constitutional Treaty.

With the rejection of the Constitutional Treaty the idea of a European Identity and European Values were also rejected, especially the notion of a common European heritage (Christian, cultural and philosophical).

During the EU Council presidency of Germany in 2007, Germany proposed a vote for new foundations for the EU. The 27 member States reached the agreement of eliminating all traces of a process of a European Constitution and common politics. All symbols of constitutionalism disappeared and the new constituent text was signed December 13th, 2007: the Treaty of Lisbon. The Treaty of Lisbon consisted of three legal texts: The Treaty on European Union (TEU), the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) and the Charter. On the 12th of December, only one day before the Treaty of Lisbon was signed, the Charter was ratified and obtained the legal validity of a Treaty through a referral in the Treaty of the European Union. Whereas EURATOM is still in vigor, the European Communities as established in the Treaties of Rome officially do not exist anymore.
2. Jacques Delors and European Identity

*History is knocking at our door.*

*Are we going to pretend we cannot hear?*

Jacques Delors\(^{13}\)

**Biography\(^{14}\)**

Jacques Delors is a French politician; he became member of the Socialist Party of France and was involved in both French and European politics from 1979 on. Jacques Delors has strongly been influenced by his Catholic background:

> Delors has been described as ‘a pure product of social-Catholicism’. His Catholicism certainly plays a role in his life and he acknowledged it publicly… The May 1992 *Heure de Vérité* programme began with the presenter telling viewers that he had to hurry and get on with the interviews as Delors had just come from Mass which had gone on longer than expected.\(^{15}\)

That social-Catholicism influenced Delors’ policy also becomes clear from an anecdote of Ruud Lubbers:

---

\(^{13}\) *President Delors has defined the new Commission’s broad lines for the future of the Community.* In: EUROPE DOCUMENTS English edition. Brussels. No. 1542-1543. 26 January 1989. pp. 1-11, p. 1


I can still see myself sitting at a European council in Madrid. I am sitting next to Delors. So I say to Jacques: “Jacques, do you figure that she, and that was Margaret Thatcher, knows what the principle of subsidiarity means?” “Well,” Jacques said: “I doubt it”, so I took the opportunity to say at the table, I had a good relation with Margaret Thatcher, I said: “I want to take two minutes to explain something I think you don’t know. I’m Catholic, Jacques Delors here is also Catholic, we grew up with the principle of subsidiarity, do you know that?” “No,” she said: “Not a clue.” So then I explained what the principle of subsidiarity is. “Oh well yes of course, that would, that makes sense.” So that is interesting, because this way it also became known that we as Catholics were connected as well.\textsuperscript{16}

Subsidiarity is one of the elements that can be seen as Delors’ ideology. This will be explained further along, for now a short description should suffice:

The social teaching of the Church is based on the human person as the principle, subject and object of every social organization. Subsidiarity is one of the core principles of this teaching. This principle holds that human affairs are best handled at the lowest possible level, closest to the affected persons.\textsuperscript{17}

Delors became president of the European Commission in 1985 and was in this function for two periods until 1995. During his presidency the European Community enlarged with the member states Spain and Portugal (1985) and Austria, Finland and Sweden (1994). He played an important role in the process of European integration as he was involved with the Single European Act (1986) and the Treaty of Maastricht (1992) which resulted in the European Union. He was one of the first to speak of a ‘European people’ and emphasized the importance

\textsuperscript{16} Interview with Ruud Lubbers on May 23\textsuperscript{rd} 2011. Original: 
Ik zie mij nog zitten in een Europese raad in Madrid. Ik zit naast Delors. En ik zeg tegen Jacques: “Jacques, zou zij (dat was dan Margaret Thatcher) wel weten wat subsidiariteitsbeginsel betekent?”, nou zei Jacques: “Ik betwijfel het”, dus ik greep die kans ik zeg dan aan tafel, ik had een goede relatie met Margaret Thatcher, ik zei: “Ik neem even twee minuten om iets uit te leggen wat u geloof ik niet kent. Ik ben Katholiek, Jacques Delors hier is ook Katholiek, wij zijn opgegroeid met het subsidiariteitsbeginsel, kent u dat?” “Nee,” zegt ze: “Geen flauw idee”. Toen heb ik in een paar zinnen uitgelegd wat dat is, dat subsidiariteitsbeginsel. “Oh ja, dat zou natuurlijk toch wel, dat, daar zat wel iets in.” Dat is dus interessant, daardoor werd bekend dat wij ook als Katholieken ook iets met elkaar hadden.

\textsuperscript{17} Subsidiarity. Catholic Culture. Retrieved from: 
http://www.catholicculture.org/culture/what_you_need_to_know/index.cfm?id=84
of social dialogue; something that he felt was missing in the European public sphere until that moment. He was a public figure and:

...he was the first Commission president... [to] significantly ...redefine his role, and consequently ... create a model for European supranational political leadership.\(^{18}\)

Delors was an important figure for the EU for multiple reasons, as he not only changed the direction of integration of the EU, and its predecessor the European Communities, but also influenced the importance the European Commission had internationally. He was, as some have mentioned, the first to give the EU ‘a face’\(^ {19}\) on an international level. How he achieved all this will be discussed in this chapter.

**Delors on European Identity**

Throughout the following pages it will become clear that Delors spoke more of why European identity is important and what effects this identity has on the EU than creating a static definition of European identity. There are different elements that are crucial in Delors’ theory. The most important ones will be discussed below.

**Delors’ inspiration: de Tocqueville**

When studying Delors’ ideology it becomes clear that he is inspired by the French thinker Alexis de Tocqueville. De Tocqueville explains in his work Democracy in America\(^ {20}\) that material well-being has a great influence on political actions and opinions. Delors realizes that we cannot ignore this crucial part of human well-being. Delors also realizes the importance of the involvement of the people in actual policy making:

Europe will never be built if working men and women – white-collar workers, managers, farmers, industrialists, professional people – are not among the first to be

---


\(^{19}\) Idem. p. 155

involved… Europe will never be built if young people do not see it as a collective undertaking that will shape their future.²¹

He explains how De Tocqueville understood democracy to the fullest and the importance of public opinion and the influence of the media²². This is crucial for the European public sphere²³, as both these aspects are the building blocks of the European public sphere. The idea of a European public sphere also implies that there are European public intellectuals, European media, European development and etcetera – that there is a European identity that is to be discussed.

De Tocqueville emphasizes the importance of civil participation. He states that free democratic liberal society can only exist if there is a strong civil society and a high level of solidarity and mutual responsibility. De Tocqueville considers the success of the USA in the beginning of the 1800’s only possible if those conditions are fulfilled. So his reasoning states that modern democratic society with a strong solidarity can only exist with a strong civil society. This can be translated into the concept of a European family: all have the responsibility to practice solidarity towards each other. The future of Europe is in the hands of the European people:

…the immense responsibility of the present generations, the duty which is theirs to rediscover the political project for a united Europe, to explain it, to obtain the active support of citizens…²⁴

The active support of the citizens is that which will enable Europe to advance. Delors even quotes De Tocqueville in one of his works:

The human spirit can only with difficulty draw, as it were; a big circle around the future; but within the circle stirs chance – chance which eludes all efforts. In the image


of the future, chance always forms as a dark point where the eye of the intellect cannot penetrate.\textsuperscript{25}

Delors makes clear that the future is uncertain, but even so we can direct the future and hope that chance will be on the side of the European family. In the meantime, all must be done to better the circumstances of this family. This is necessary not only for us, but also for the world: the world needs a strong Europe. We must remember and reflect upon the European values as history teaches us, we must practice solidarity and respect the diversity of our different family members, we must educate and stimulate our economy – we must live up to the vocation of Europe, we must make Europe European again.

The Interdependent World

Delors emphasized the actual importance of a strong European Union before anything else; above all it has to be a strong community\textsuperscript{26}. The European Union\textsuperscript{27} was created to maintain peace and economic stability. Even though the goal or the importance of the EU might have changed, there still is a common element: the interdependent world. Delors explains that with an interdependent globalized world come difficulties, ‘...the globalization of difficulties is a no less obvious underlying trend: the frontiers are coming down and we must work together’\textsuperscript{28}. Also there is the necessity to compete with great powers as the United States and Asia. The strong economies that these countries strived for during the Delors Cabinet added pressure to the

Original: ‘L’esprit humain parvient avec peine à tracer en quelque sorte un grand cercle autour de l’avenir; mais au-dedans de ce cercle s’agitent le hazard, qui échappe à tous les efforts. Dans le tableau de l’avenir, le hazard forme toujours comme le point obscure où l’oeil de l’intelligence ne saurait pénétrer.’

\textsuperscript{26} Delors explains the following in Barriga Bravo, J (2010) Europa desde Yuste. Centro de Estudios Ramón Acéres: Madrid, p.41: I have always regretted that we abandoned the term ‘Community’... we have taken all the beauty, richness, and philosophical value away from the word ‘community’.
Original: ‘Siempre he lamentado el abandono del término “Comunidades”...Hemos privado la palabra “comunidad” de toda su belleza, su riqueza, y su valor filosófico’

\textsuperscript{27} In the beginning, as in the time of the Founding Fathers and the creation of the ECSC, the European Union as we know it today did not yet exist. Throughout this paper I will use the name EU. This because I will be talking of phases of the creation of the European Union even though it still might have been called the European Communities.

creation/survival of a strong Europe\textsuperscript{29}. Besides the survival of Europe in the globalized world it is also a necessity for the great powers mentioned before that the European Union thrives. Delors argues that the United States:

\begin{quote}
...have nothing to gain from a politically impotent and economically subordinate Community...The Transatlantic Declaration...lays the foundations for a revived partnership based on increased transatlantic solidarity and acknowledges the existence of a European identity...\textsuperscript{30}
\end{quote}

I would like to add that the European culture and civilization is based on humanism, the principle of subsidiarity and Rhineland capitalism\textsuperscript{31}. Europe has special values which can influence the future of the world; its heritage concerns values that should be lessons for the entire world.

In his essay ‘The Idea of Europe’\textsuperscript{32} George Steiner states that:

\begin{quote}
This ideal of unison is undeniable. It inspires important elements of European thought and statesmanship since Charlemagne.
\end{quote}

Steiner also names axioms of the unique European heritage. Two axioms four elements can be derived which have resulted into the values that are common to all member States can be deduced: the inheritance of Athens, Judaism, Christianity, and utopian socialism.


\textsuperscript{32} Steiner, G. (2004) \textit{The Idea of Europe}. Nexus Institute: Tilburg
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These values are of importance for the entire world. In my opinion not only on a practical level does Europe contribute to the world, its rich heritage can morally have an impactful influence on the world as well.

**European Identity**

Delors almost takes it as a given that there is a ‘European Identity’ and makes no distinction in his speeches between Europe and the European Union: it is natural and how it should be. He speaks of a European people on numerous occasions and connects an identity to this *people*, nearly without giving an explicit explanation of who he refers to with those words. Throughout this work it will become clear that Delors took many aspects of the ‘Soul for Europe’ as a taken. He does however undertake certain rhetorical steps before reaching the notion of a European Identity. First of all he speaks of the *People’s Europe*[^33]. He continues with the notion that a European union is important for all, first of all for the world (e.g. the United States), then for the European countries in themselves, and finally for the individuals who live in Europe. Delors creates construction in which all layers (the entire world, the member States and the inhabitants of Europe) are equally important for the development of a truly united Europe and all are faced with the same threats and possibilities.

**The European Family**

Instead of speaking of a European people Delors chooses to use the metaphor ‘the European family’[^34]. With this choice of words Delors creates an intimacy and closeness between the member States. When speaking of a family there is a direct association with love, forgiveness and solidarity. It seems as though he is saying: ‘we are in this together’, ‘we will get through this’. He creates a closeness that up until Delors had not been expressed within the EU. But of course with this European family there comes a new notion, a ‘family name’ and a ‘family identity’. Nuclear families as we know them share a family tree, a history, a future, and an undeniable connection; consequently Delors implies that Europe has a family tree, a history, a future, and an undeniable connection as well. Staying within the metaphor of a family Europe must also have a common parentage. Delors does not specifically mention what this parentage


is, however, it can be concluded that this is history and the values that we share. This heritage is mentioned below.

In the light of Delors’ idea of the European family there surely must be a European identity. The most important aspects of this European identity can be found in the European values which according to Delors are the following:

... [The] rich heritage of our history, from Greek democracy to Roman law, from ancient philosophy to Judeo-Christian religions, from the Enlightenment to contemporary philosophies, and not to mention the footprint of Muslims and Islam have left in our history. Our spiritually and cultural values are still the best remedy against the imposed uniformity.  

History becomes the most important element, as in forgetting about the history of the European family we have forgotten our family history and values. Delors shows clearly in his speeches that Europe is in a crisis (when stating that Europe needs a soul it becomes apparent that this was lacking at the time). In the Delors period the EU was going through changes of political integration. As was mentioned in chapter 1 the SEA and the Treaty of Maastricht changed the intensity of integration. There was more common policy for the member States. These changes however had to be supported within all the member States as well. An ideology had to support these new changes in integration. The people of Europe had to understand why these changes were being made. Delors´ ideology shows that the European identity is the European family and that this family shares a history. Delors´ notion of the European family and the importance he gives to the acceptance of this family lay at the base of the integrational changes of the EU in that period of time. Or the other way around actually, the integrational changes lay at the base of Delors´ views on the European family. Even though Delors was an idealist who was hopeful about the EU, and I by no means want to imply that he himself did not believe in his ideology, but Delors was a politician and there is a reason he stated what he stated in that specific period of time. This European family is why the European people should support the EU and the European identity, which is a logical result of the European family, is thus inherent to all

Europeans. We base our European identity on the history we share. We must reflect upon this history and only this way can we acknowledge the European identity. Had we reflected upon history correctly we would have seen the next step in the creation of the EU as a logical one and there would not have been an identity crisis. We must return to the ideals that the Founding Fathers Schuman and Monnet had when writing the Schuman Declaration. If we do not do so, if we do not remember why the base of the EU was laid and why it was important, we will never be able to correctly reflect upon the developments that are occurring today. As Delors frequently states we must ‘catch up’ with history. Catching up with history can be interpreted as being active, as not letting history ‘happen’ to oneself but by creating a future. We must follow the line of history. When we put this in context of what was mentioned earlier concerning the necessity of finding support of the European people it becomes clear that what Delors meant by catching up with history. The changes in integration of the EU did not have enough popular support, not enough support of the media or of public intellectuals. We, the European family, are not evolving the way we should. We are not following the line of history; that is the newest developments within the EU did not have the necessary support (yet). As a family we are to grow, up until now however, we have prevented that growth – out of a concern for comfort or out of ignorance – now the time has come to accept our vocation:

European’s vocation… can be clearly defined. It is to unite its people in accordance with their true genius, which is that of its diversity, and in the conditions of the 20th century, which are those of the Community, in order to open up for the world the way it is seeking the way of organized freedoms…

We must unite; it is our calling, our vocation, as a European family. As a family we all carry the responsibility to revitalize Europe. Delors gives priority to solidarity: ‘Since Europe must serve all its members, its policy must be based on consistency, cohesion, and solidarity’. Different member States should ‘take care of each other’ and do so without a doubt. As a family we all carry responsibility for our ‘family name’ – the European Union. Only if we truly live this

---


38 Idem. p. 3
solidarity will we be able ‘reanimate the forces which gave birth to European civilization and revive its humanist inspiration’.

…We have been suffering from a deficit of cooperation, we are confronted with the threat of a regression of the spirit of solidarity, and hence of responsibility.

It is important to realize that Delors notion of a European family and the unity it implied can be seen directly in the Treaty of Maastricht (1992). This Treaty in which a higher level of integration and unity were established can be seen as the embodiment of Delors’ ideals concerning the EU. Delors was successful up to the point that his views were implemented in the Treaty that established the EU as we know it today.

The Importance of Solidarity

Solidarity within the EU implies that not all member States are identical. Here again the metaphor of a European family can be applied. Never will all members of a family have the same personality nor should that be a goal strived for. Solidarity within the EU implies that all family members have the space to develop their own ‘twist’ of the common European heritage.

As will be explained more elaborately later on, that which makes Europe unique is that the historical and cultural heritage that all member States share has been applied distinctly in each of the member States’ national heritage. There are thus commonalities in all the member States concerning for example the great thinkers that have created the base of European thinking. At the same time each member State has had the space to develop their own application of these thinkers on their national society. At the same time the model of Rhineland Capitalism also shows the solidarity within Europe as it is a market economy with a high level of societal protection. The Catholic principle of subsidiarity results high involvement of individuals within society and a high level of solidarity in one’s own closest societal structures. Subsidiarity also results into high demands of society: that which is expected on between individuals is also expected of member States.

Europe’s strength and beauty lie in her diversity:

---


Europe was in danger of being paralysed by internal division. Europe's diversity, by contrast, makes it prodigiously rich. This diversity must be preserved, so that it can bear fruit for the common good. When all is said and done, our feeling of being involved in the shared adventure of European integration can only strengthen our sense of belonging to one of our ancient nations. Europe must choose between pluralism and extinction. Europe must be European, or Europe will be nothing.

Through this comment Delors explains that Europe and pluralism are intertwined in such a manner that they must be seen as one. Our family is diverse; diminishing this diversity is ‘breaking up’ our family. If Europe is not European, if Europe is not diverse, Europe is not.

A Soul for Europe

Delors emphasizes that Europe needs a soul. We need to cultivate the European identity since ‘you cannot fall in love with the single market’\(^41\) and that 'the aspiration is for a cultural Europe'\(^42\). The way to cultivate this soul is ‘lifelong learning’. This is another one of Delors’ most important goals, as he realizes that the future of Europe is in the hands of those who are studying now. The European students form the future of the European Union; therefore they must be well informed concerning the values that have been mentioned above (Greek democracy, Roman law, ancient philosophy, Judeo-Christian religions, Enlightenment, contemporary philosophies, and the footprint of Muslims and the Islam). These historical influences have resulted into our spiritually and cultural values which are still the best remedy against the imposed uniformity. Delors explains however that education must not stop at the age of 25, or whenever one leaves the university. He believes in the importance of, as he calls it, \textit{lifelong learning}\(^43\). Learning is important for all and during one’s entire life. Here the aspect of solidarity returns: the European family’s main responsibility is to ensure all family members have equal opportunities, thus also an equal access to education.

\(^{41}\) Idem. p. 6


Economics

Delors is known for his focus on economics, and some eurosceptics might be of the opinion that Delors focused solely on economics. However:

As always during a period of economic recession, there is the temptation to draw within oneself and to seek a scapegoat. And, naturally, (the) European construction is targeted and is experiencing one of its most serious crises ever.44

It has been mentioned before that we live in a world in which interdependence is growing quickly. One of the aspects of interdependence is a common market and economy. As Delors explains there are four principles of management of interdependence45:

1. The principle of exchange and cooperation between peoples. The lack of this principle can be seen in the failure of collective memory. The creation of the ECSC was the result of exchange and cooperation, not applying these two forms of communication to the EU today is the result of ‘forgetting how it all started’.

2. The principle of the control of economic interdependence, where competition, cooperation and solidarity are ‘the inseparable aspects of the organization of Europe’46

3. The principle of the importance of law, only if all the member States accept the same fundamental laws can all the member States be equal.

4. The principle of an effective decision-making process, this is necessary to be able to achieve results, or as Delors says it: ‘we are forced to achieve results’47

Even though economics do play a large role in a globalized world; it is by no means the only one. Delors realized that a good economy is necessary for the well-being of the people, and that

---


46 Ibid. p. 3

47 Ibid.
only if the people are materially provided for will they be able to invest in their European family. Besides this, Delors introduced the process of European integration through first a common market (SEA) and thereafter a common currency (Treaty of Maastricht and the Euro)\textsuperscript{48}.

When observing the SEA it becomes clear that Delors was trying to achieve more than just a common market:

In his vision the internal market was equally important as the social cohesion, always through the threefold \textit{compétitivité, coopération, solidarité}: market and competition; cooperation between member States; and solidarity between societal forces.\textsuperscript{49}

And one must not underestimate the binding power the Euro has in Europe:

The introduction of Euro bills and coins has already begun to affect Euroland citizens’ identification with the EU and Europe in general… Existing collective identities pertaining to the nation-state explain to a large degree how comfortable people feel using and dealing with the Euro.\textsuperscript{50}

The spring 2002 Eurobarometer introduced a new question asking people what the EU meant personally for them… The answers are remarkable: at the top of the list are ‘freedom of movement and travel’ (50 per cent) \textit{and the Euro} (49 per cent)… This is a strong indicator that the Euro has quickly become an important symbol of European integration. When citizens think ‘EU’, they appear to also think ‘Euro’. In this sense, the new currency has already reached the status of an identity marker.\textsuperscript{51}

\textsuperscript{48} Interview with Ruud Lubbers on May 21\textsuperscript{st} 2011.

\textsuperscript{49} Jersel, J.P. van, \textit{Leerzame aspecten voor de EU van de periode-Delors}. In: Internationale Spectator, September 2004, LVIII, nr. 9, pp. 451-454. p. 452. Original: ‘In zijn visie was parallel aan de interne markt evenzeer de sociale cohesie aan de orde, steeds volgens de triptiek \textit{compétitivité, coopération, solidarité}: markt en concurrentie; samenwerking tussen lidstaten; en solidariteit tussen maatschappelijke krachten.’

\textsuperscript{50} Risse, T. \textit{The Euro between national and European identity}. In: Journal of European Public Policy 2003, v. 10, n. 4, pp. 487-505. p. 487

\textsuperscript{51} Ibid. p. 493
3. Comparison

Now we are increasingly aware of the crisis within our civilisation and democracy, there are opportunities to make further progress.

Europe. A Beautiful Idea?52

In the introduction the goal of this paper was presented. First of all the crisis that the EU found itself in during the presidency of Delors has to be analyzed to be able to derive Delors’ lessons that could and should be applied to the crisis the EU is in today.

In the former chapters it has become clear that during the Delors cabinet the EU was at a turning point in its history. Integration was intensified and Delors needed the support given to the EU by its member States. Delors stimulated the view of the EU as a result of common history as he illustrated that the EU was nothing more than a logical step in history, the result of the societal changes that Europe has undergone. European countries form a family and this family must be cared for. The only way to respect this family connection is by closer integration and the only way to make this possible was through the SEA and finally the creation of the EU through the Maastricht Treaty.

The next necessary step to derive Delors’ lessons is to explain the crisis the EU is in today. It can be stated that the EU is in two different crises at the same time, namely an identity crisis and an economic crisis. The identity crisis is the result of the rejection of the Constitutional Treaty and the economic crisis forms part of a global financial crisis. The two are related in the sense that with the economic crisis stronger solidarity is required. As will become clear throughout this chapter the financial aid that is necessary to avoid bankruptcy in Greece, Ireland, and Portugal requires solidarity which should be a logical result of the acceptance of the European family. As soon as there is an identity crisis the existence of the European family is

doubted, and with that lack of doubt comes a lack of solidarity. So even though the two crises are intertwined, this is a result of the nature of the crises, the reasons for their existences are not directly connected.

First of all the discussions concerning European identity of today will be presented. Here it will become clear what the exact identity crisis mentioned before is. Following the economic crisis will be analyzed after which an accurate comparison of the two time periods can be made. In the next chapter Delors’ lessons that we could have learned will be presented and explained.

The Identity Crisis

In 2004, during the Dutch EU presidency, Nexus Institute organized a series of conferences discussing the idea of Europe. These conferences were published under the name ‘Europe. A Beautiful Idea’, which is now an official EU document. Since at the Nexus conferences 155 public intellectuals and politicians of different nationalities and political backgrounds were present these conferences can be seen as an analysis of the general situation the EU is in today.

In the preface of ‘Europe. A Beautiful Idea?’ Jan Peter Balkenende explains with three questions what the issues are that the series of conferences tried to resolve:

What is the significance and political relevance of the idea of Europe? How can we revitalise the core European values for the citizens of Europe? What can we do to make these values a powerful inspiration for the politics of the European Union?

The emphasized problems, the question of the significance of the EU and European values, are exactly those elements Delors believed were important. Delors presents these elements in a different manner than is customary in today’s discussions. He did not defend the fact that there is a common European cultural heritage but he stated this. His rhetoric implies that this heritage is something that should be accepted and developed instead of confirmed. This confirmation is something we see in today’s discussion on a European heritage: most debates are based on defending the fact that there is a common culture instead of accepting that there is one. Exactly this is what Delors refers to when speaking of a European identity. As can be seen in the former
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54 Jan Peter Balkenende is member of the Dutch Christian Democrat party and was minister president from 2002-2010.
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Chapter Delors focuses on the ideal of a European family, a family which according to him is a given. At the moment the debates surrounding Europe concern the possibility of the existence of a European identity. As soon as this identity is doubted, in essence the European family Delors refers to, the binding factor of the EU is questioned. According to Delors it is not relevant to discuss if there is a European identity. He states that history confirms the existence of a European family and with it the European identity. When the plausibility of a roughly defined European identity is analyzed a fundamental and, according to Delors, given truth is being denied. The question we should ask ourselves is not whether there is a European identity and what this identity might be, but what the effect of an existing European identity is on our daily life. This theme will be discussed more detailed in the final chapter.

It is stated clearly in ‘Europe. A Beautiful Idea?’ that Europe (and thus the European Union) and its member States lack cultural policy. This is confirmed by the European Parliament, which recently urged the European Commission to:

…strengthen the role of culture in the EU’s external policy… to secure Europe’s role as a global player… (and) to celebrate the EU’s cultural diversity and anchored in European values such as the respect for human rights, freedom and democracy.

Cultural policy is not enforced strongly enough within the EU, just as during the period of Delors in which he found it necessary to emphasize the need for a ‘soul for Europe’. A soul for Europe, as explained earlier, implies a European identity. Culture forms a necessary part of identity and the same can be concluded in the situation of Europe.

In ‘Europe. A Beautiful Idea?’ ten conclusions are given for the political leaders of the EU. These conclusions are the following:

56 In ‘Europe. A Beautiful Idea?’ these two terms are used interchangeably.


1. The debate on the European model of civilization is of fundamental importance to the European Union, now and in the future. There must be an ongoing debate on the meaning of the idea of Europe in a twenty-first century context, both at a European and a national level.

2. Europe’s fundamental values are inviolable and common to all member States: respect for human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, the rule of law and respect for human rights.

3. Europe’s wealth is its diversity, its variety of traditions, languages and cultures. Europe’s strength is its openness to culture, knowledge and social progress.

4. European consciousness begins with pride in Europe’s values, cultural heritage and natural environment.

5. The European model of civilization demands leaders with vision and citizens with self-confidence: European political leadership is hampered by the absence of a European people and shared language and media. A shared language does not imply that Europe should only have one language; one can imagine what effects this would have on the diversity of Europe. This does imply that there should be a lingua franca which can be used and which should result into a larger feeling of belonging to the EU.

6. European citizenship begins with education in the spirit of Europe.

7. Culture is the key to self-knowledge, empathy, tolerance, solidarity and political and economical renaissance.

8. Debate is the means, only through debate can these ‘lessons be taught’.

9. Europe’s greatest weapon is its good example. This refers to the soft-power that Europe exercises. This refers to soft-power in contrast to the hard-power enforced by the United States: example as opposed to force.

10. Goethe’s notion that ‘general ideas and great conceit always tend to create horrible mischief’, referring to the principle that ideas must always be assessed by their human standard.

These conclusions refer to the same problems as identified by Delors. We can compare Delors’ ‘Soul for Europe’ and Nexus’ ‘Beautiful Idea’, both focus on the common cultural and political aspects of the member States of the EU. Delors stated that, without a soul for Europe, there can
be no true political integration. Similarly the lack of an ‘idea of Europe’ implies that without the acknowledgement of a common European cultural heritage there is no connection between the member States that enables political integration. The similarities between Delors’ ideas about a ‘Soul for Europe’ and Nexus’ ‘Beautiful Idea’ will be discussed in the following paragraphs.

Delors also accords great importance to solidarity and the necessity of culture to enforce it. A shared culture will result into solidarity as only with a shared culture, history, identity, family and etcetera will the European people feel united. This (feeling of) unison should result into solidarity. In both time periods there has been a mention of fundamental values, values that even through the diverse cultural atmosphere of the EU stands and forms a unifying character.

He explains that the first step to create a ‘soul for Europe’ is by creating a true European education and that this should be combined with his notion of lifelong learning. Delors articulates the sine qua non of a European history book that all students will study within the EU. The emphasis on education can be seen in conclusion number six of ‘A Beautiful Idea’: ‘European citizenship begins with education in the spirit of Europe.’ Another element of the importance of education can be seen in the importance Delors attributes to the fact that all European citizens should speak another EU language. A common language for Europe might not be possible, but speaking multiple languages will enable the debate that allows communication. The importance of language also comes forth in the conclusions of ‘A Beautiful Idea’: ‘Europe’s wealth is its diversity, its variety of traditions, languages and culture and European political leadership is hampered by the absence of a European people and shared language and media.’

Reading this it becomes clear we are still struggling with the same issues Delors struggled with during his presidency. It seems as though the EU is still at the same point as it was during the Delors period. Ruud Lubbers60 is of the opinion that the biggest mistake made throughout the period of political integration of the EU has been not continuing with Delors’ program. In the light of this comment it becomes clear that we are indeed facing the same issues. We are ‘now’ continuing where Delors left off.

The political philosopher Larry Siedentop defends that:

---

60 Interview with Ruud Lubbers on May 21st 2011.
In Europe we are dealing with a moral crisis, a crisis of legitimacy.  

Siedentop tries to explain that the ‘moral crisis’ Europe is in today is a crisis that could have been predicted a long time ago. In his opinion the first step in this crisis happened in 1979 when the first direct elections for the European Parliament took place. The EU should be lived more at a national level and that national elite should be involved in the process of European integration, more that is the case now. This also can be compared to the importance de Tocqueville assigned to civil participation, public opinion and the influence of the media. De Tocqueville believed that not only national elite was important but at the same time he does emphasize how crucial the national elite can be in all three of the elements of his theory mentioned above. Siedentop makes a good point as the support for Europe should come from the politicians and public intellectuals of a member State. He explains that the EU is blamed for national problems as it is an easy scapegoat. There is no solidarity left for the EU, on the one hand the national elite and national parties show little compassion for the ‘European cause’ and therefore citizens do not ‘live’ the European spirit as they see the EU as the guilty party for the crisis their own countries are in as a result of a lack of solidarity shown from their governments.

José Manuel Barroso, the current president of the European Commission, partially agrees with Siedentop as in an interview he states that:

Dutch politicians do not explain… enough to the Dutch people… There are considerable cuts in social security. Many blame Europe. Politicians are scared that they will not be reelected if they defend Europe.

The people of Europe have no faith in the EU as they do not know why Europe is important for them. There is no sense of belonging or togetherness in the public opinion because there is no openly proclaimed support to be found in many political parties.

---


As mentioned before Delors realized the importance of closer integration through the establishment of the SEA and the Maastricht Treaty of which both were motivated and enabled by him. These two major changes strongly increased the level of political integration of the EU.

Today we are also at a turning point concerning European integration. The Constitutional Treaty was rejected and thus an intensified integration of the member States was hampered as:

…to some degree that common ground can be found in the values and related fundamental rights now enshrined in the Constitutional Treaty. Those values are fundamental and unite us in our diversity.64

The important values mentioned by Delors are still held high. The Constitutional Treaty was rejected after difficulties in the ratification process. Some explain that the reason of the rejection can be found in the ambiguity of the statement unity in diversity:

Debates about European identity have intensified in the context of EU enlargement and the Union's Constitutional and Lisbon Treaties. Although the motto "unity in diversity" is generally seen as best describing the aims of the EU, opinions differ widely as to how it should be understood.65

However, there is no doubt about the fact that there is a common point of departure, namely:

The point of departure of most discussions on European identity is the idea that a political community needs a common set of values and references to ensure its coherence, to guide its actions and to endow these with legitimacy and meaning.66

The identity crisis can be found at the point where these two statements intersect. How can diversity be protected in a community which has (/needs) a common set of values and references? And vice versa: how can a common set of values and references be defined in a community that wants to protect diversity? The beauty of Europe is its diversity; this is


66 Ibid.
something that sometimes seems forgotten in the current debate. The way that I see it European cultural heritage stems from numerous influences that have had a great effect both socially and economically. Each member State of the EU has been inspired by these influences and has given them its own ‘twist’. The great thinkers of Europe are represented in each member State. Exactly these nuances, these ‘twists’, are what make Europe unique. So the unity within the EU can be defined as the common influences and the diversity as the different interpretations of these influences. The common ground that Delors refers to in some points is important for the feeling of belonging; however, the nuances and differences between European cultures are of importance as they embody a truly unique characteristic of Europe. The different colors of the member States are what make Europe what it is. Delors intended to find the balance between the generally accepted notion that there are some commonalities but that the diversity of the member States must be protected. Delors never tried to create a united Europe in sense of a Europe where all member States have the same characteristics. Exactly the opposite is what he intended to explain when he used the metaphor the European family. There is an overarching element that all share, culture, history, identity, but at the same time each family member is unique. Trying to even out the differences between the family members would not do justice to exactly that which makes the family beautiful: its diversity.

When Delors became the president of the European Commission the EU was in a state of eurosclerosis67 - eurosclerosis refers to the criticism the EU received since the beginning of the 80’s because of its ‘calcification’, its slow non-proactive way of functioning. The EU was not evolving and Delors found it his responsibility as president of the EC to further the process of European integration.

The Economic Crisis

In both discussed periods there is (/was) an economic crisis. During the Delors cabinet there was, as is today, a weak real estate market, there was a high level of unemployment, there were high State debts and little faith in the economy. Even though these crises were not identical there were many similarities. The effects of the economic crises of both periods on the social debate concerning Europe are discussed below.

During his presidency Delors presented the ‘Delors’ White Paper on Growth, Competitiveness and Employment’ which was created to resolve the problem of unemployment:

67 Interview with Ruud Lubbers on May 21st 2011.
Europeans began to fear that the high levels of unemployment found in most countries could become permanent and might grow even higher during each cyclical downturn in the economy.\footnote{68 \textit{The EES: The Emergence of an Alternative Governance Paradigm for EU-level Social Policy.} Retrieved from: \url{http://centers.law.nyu.edu/jeanmonnet/papers/01/011501-03.html}}

As Siedentop argues, Europe is blamed in times of crises, and the unemployment crisis in the times of Delors was no exception. Delors starts his White paper with the following sentence:

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}

To overcome europsclerosis Delors found it of utmost necessity to stimulate employment and the White Paper presented an eightfold of undertakings to improve the economic situation of the EU\footnote{70 This eightfold was taken from: Hen, P.E., Hovenkamp, L.,Keiser, H. \textit{Europese malaise.} FEM Financieel Economisch Magazine. Amsterdam. Jaarg. 24. Nr. 15. 10 juli 1993. pp. 32-35, 38-39}:

\begin{enumerate}
  \item The creation of an Economical and Monetary Union with one single currency would be profitable for foreign investors.\footnote{71 The Uruguay round was a round of negotiations which resulted into the transformation of the GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) to the WTO (World Trade Organization). The Round started in 1986 and has resulted in the biggest trade organization. “The Uruguay Round brought about the biggest reform of the world’s trading system since GATT was created at the end of the Second World War. And yet, despite its troubled progress, the Uruguay Round did see some early results. Within only two years, participants had agreed on a package of cuts in import duties on tropical products — which are mainly exported by developing countries. They had also revised the rules for settling disputes, with some measures implemented on the spot. And they called for regular reports on GATT members’ trade policies, a move considered important for making trade regimes transparent around the world.” Taken from: \url{http://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/whatis_e/tif_e/fact5_e.htm}}
  \item A single currency would also force the member States to cooperate more intensely.
  \item The GATT meetings in the Round of Uruguay\footnote{71} had to be concluded quickly to improve the competences of the WTO.
  \item Cooperation between companies in different member States must be stimulated.
\end{enumerate}
5. Transportation and communication networks must be improved to enhance the competitive power of the EU.

6. Education must be improved.

7. A new economical model must be improved to enhance the European industry.

8. The labor market must be more active and offer either jobs or education.

Delors realized that to enhance an economy, not only the traditional elements of national economy should be stimulated. All the elements (for example education and cooperation between companies of different member States) which influence the supranational elements of the EU should be treated:

The proposals of Delors strongly represent the possibility of social engineering. There is no doubt that he has created an important task for the European Commission. Even so he will have to keep in mind that current member States want more and more own responsibility. That however, goes in contrary to the necessity of convergence in the economic policy, which is the base of the European Monetary Union. After all, without a mutual approach of objective and means there is no strengthened effect of dealing with the problems together. 

Even though Delors had big expectations of supranational integration, during this crisis the member States wanted to enlarge national influence and wanted to supervise policy at a local level. In the following chapter it will become clear how Delors endeavored to resolve this problem with the principle of subsidiarity.

Today there is a global financial crisis which has strongly impacted European economy as well. The financial world collapsed leaving millions without work and destabilizing, among others, the euro zone. The EU has had to create three ‘rescue’ plans as Greece, Ireland and Portugal were incapable of managing their debts and had to be bailed out. All three member States signed an EU and Monetary Fund bail-out agreement which counts on the solidarity from the


Original: ‘De voorstellen van Delors staan nog sterk in het teken van de maakbaarheid van de samenleving. Het lijdt geen twijfel dat hij voor de Europese Commissie een belangrijke taak zal wegleggen. Toch zal hij er rekening mee moeten houden dat de lidstaten er steeds meer op gebrand zijn zelf de touwtjes in handen te houden. Dat gaat echter in tegen de noodzaak van convergentie in het economisch beleid, dat het fundament van de EMU is. Immers, zonder wederzijdse toenadering van doelstellingen en middelen is er ook geen versterkt effect van het samen op gaan.’
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remaining member States of the EU. In the meantime further developments in Greece show that the first bail-off contract was not enough to ‘save’ Greece from bankruptcy. The pressure put on the EU’s solidarity has put pressure on the notion of the idea of Europe. As Barroso explains:

We have been through crises before. Usually those result into more Europe, not less Europe. Always when Europe has to address a problem, as is the case now during the financial crisis, there is resistance.

Even though crisis eventually will lead to ‘more Europe’, according to Barroso in the first place it leads to euro scepticism, or resistance. This can be seen in the lack of solidarity given to Greece, Ireland and Portugal. Results of Delors’ White Paper show that member States preferred to focus on their own economies, lacking solidarity towards the rest of the EU. Ruud Lubbers is of the opinion that countries are becoming more and more egocentric and that the common ideal is lost. One of the reasons he names for this is that increasing power has come in hands of large businesses which do not feel responsible for the common good and solidarity.

Barroso continues:

Some people speak about loans to Greece or Portugal as if it were charity. These loans have hard conditions and come with higher interests than the IMP requests. Many underestimate the danger of contamination. This crisis is not here because of the euro. Iceland fell. The US is in trouble. Do these countries border with the Mediterranean
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74 Gruyter, C. de. ‘Ik wed dat er over vijf jaar nog meer Europa is’ – de voorzitter van de Europese Commissie vindt dat Nederland eerlijker moet zijn over de baten van de Europese samenwerking. Retrieved from: NRC Handelsblad on May 16th 2011.
Original: ‘We hebben vaker crises meegemaakt. Meestal zorgden die voor méér, niet minder Europa. Altijd als Europa moet dóórpakken, zoals nu tijdens de schuldencrisis, komt er weerstand.’

75 Interview with Ruud Lubbers on May 21st 2011. He mentions the common ideal when speaking of the debates between Mark Rutte (Prime Minister of the Netherlands and member of the ‘People’s Party for Freedom and Democracy’ (VVD)) and Geert Wilders (member of the ‘Party for Freedom’ (PVV)) on solidarity towards Greece during the financial crisis. Neither Wilders nor Rutte seemed to have any ideals that they were debating in favor of: all they wanted was more votes.
Sea? And Ireland? Also, the crisis with loans concerns banks as much as anything. Sorry, but those banks are in the Northern part of Europe more than anything.

As the crisis endangers the financial situations of member States, these search for the ones responsible for the situation. Europe takes the blame for the situation. However, as during the Delors-cabinet, the EU is not responsible.

As becomes clear with Barroso’s statement quoted earlier:

We have been through crises before. Usually those result into more Europe, not less Europe. Always when Europe has to address a problem, as is the case now during the financial crisis, there is resistance.

Europe is now at a time of crisis, but that does not mean that Europe is in danger. This is exactly the moment in which more Europe should surge. Higher integration, more solidarity, a correct application of the subsidiarity principle could be methods with which the ideal of more Europe could be reached.

However, there are critics who claim that there has been an ‘unfair advantage’ for economically less strong member States. They imply that only part of the member States carry the weight during crises, insinuating that the EU as a scapegoat is a fair accusation:

Europe’s new financial integration has disproportionately benefited the peripheral and lower-income member countries.
Jacques Delors: The Lessons Not Learned

This new form of protectionism is necessary due to the 'challenge of increased global competition'. Public opinion is ambiguous since on the one hand there is much criticism on the integration of the EU but on the other hand there is the overall acceptation and realization that in the growing more globalized world the member States of the EU have no other option than unifying because of:

... the motives for creating the EU and its global competitive position. The formation of the EU can in part be seen as a conscious attempt to counter the threat of European markets being dominated by multi-national capital based in the US.

This is also something that Delors highlighted explaining the necessity of the EU, both for its member States and the US.

There is a 'lack of popular support for deeper political integration at the EU level'; this can be concluded from the rejection of the Constitutional Treaty by the Netherlands and France through their referendums. The comment made by Barroso which was quoted earlier follows this same line of thinking: in time of crisis the EU is blamed. During Delors’ presidency there was also resistance to deeper integration of the EU. Delors was one of the few who defended the admission of States of Eastern Europe after the fall of the Wall of Berlin. He referred to the ideal of the ‘European family’ when pleading against the idea that the States of Eastern Europe would 'benefit disproportionately from Europe’s financial integration'.

Delors spoke of three aspects of European revitalization during his speech at the European University Institute in 1986, right before the ratification of the SEA; one of these elements was technology. Delors states that technology is so important since technology and advancement go

---
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hand in hand. He claims that without technology Europe will lag behind the rest of the world. When speaking of the revitalization of Europe he stated the following about technology:

The second theme is technology, so that Europe, in the bitter struggle now being waged, may regain its rightful place and keep control over its destiny, which today, as you will agree, is by no means secure.84

The current president of the European Commission, José Manuel Barroso, also focuses on more than just the economic integration and argues that stronger integration is the result of globalization. A globalization that cannot be stopped:

Globalization continues whatever, politicians do. So they better formulate an answer, so that we in Europe have a strong stand against China and Russia and other world powers... It’s globalization that forces us to make decision, not politics. It’s the markets that do that. It’s technology.85

Ruud Lubbers explains86 that this globalization is partly a result of the end of the Cold War but also one of the reasons it ended. Only because of globalization could the EU further develop.

Barroso knows, just as Delors knew, that the changing market forces Europe to grow with it. Technology forms a part of our development and as a leading element of globalization we need to invest in it. Only if we keep developing technology, economy and integration can we survive in the more and more globalized and interdependent world.

It is clear that during the Delors period and the current period the same problems are still occurring. We are in a time of identity crisis, in which it is unclear what the cultural heritage is of Europe, or better said, it is not widely accepted that there is a common cultural heritage. Today public intellectuals discuss the case but the ‘people of Europe’ do not seem to accept a ‘European culture’, as can be deduced from the results of referendums on the Constitutional


86 Interview with Ruud Lubbers on May 21st 2011.
Treaty. There is a lot of euroscepticism and it is not accepted that the EU is a logical step in history. Euroscepticism of today can be compared to eurosclerosis of Delors’ period. Eurosclerosis refers to the notion that the EU does not move forward, that it is literally ‘calcified’ into its position and Euroscepticism refers to the idea that the EU does not ‘do anything’ for its citizens\(^7\). Even though euroscepticism is far more negative as it is connected to an all-over negative view of the EU, both are connected to the idea that the EU is to bureaucratic and it takes too long to imply changes. The EU is standing still, is not evolving further. There is an economic crisis in which all member States should show solidarity, as a family would show, but no such thing is occurring. To keep up with the globalizing world Europe must closely unite, and not just on an economic level. Solidarity should not be seen as a result of economic solidarity but the economic cooperation is the result of a solidarity that from time to time seems to be lacking within the EU.

The direction the EU is moving towards today, an increasingly practical process of integration in which solidarity has no large role, to me seems dangerous. It seems as though policy makers have forgotten why the EU was created and how unique it is that Europe has been in a situation of peace for so long. It is surprising to me that the member States of the EU do not realize this, or better said; act as though they do not realize this.

\(^7\) Interview with Ruud Lubbers May 23\(^{rd}\) 2011.
4. Lessons Not Learned

Some believe that the attempt to define the essence of Europe is pointless. To be quite honest, I beg to differ. Let me remind you of Jacques Delors' famous appeal that we have "to give a soul to Europe".

Angela Merkel

In the former chapters it has been explained what Delors’ view on a European identity is and how necessary a European identity is. Also the societal situation in which Delors spoke his famous words: ‘Europe needs a soul’ has been compared to the situation we live in today. It has become clear that we indeed live in a similar situation. Now what is left for this thesis is to explain what lessons we could have learned from Delors. Lessons that would help the European Union to evolve and lessons that would show us the actual value of the ‘European Family’.

Delors viewed the European identity in an entirely different light than we do today. Instead of finding a static definition to describe it, he created the space to converse about it. We know that we are a family. As a result of subsidiarity each region and member State of the EU has an equal role within the EU. This sense of equality will logically result into solidarity. If all are equal all deserve the same help. This way subsidiarity results into solidarity. Every nation and

---


89 Subsidiarity is a Catholic social principle and is ‘a principle in social organization: functions which subordinate or local organizations perform effectively belong more properly to them than to a dominant central organization’. Definition from Merriam-Webster Dictionary retrieved from: http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/subsidiarity
region can and should contribute, and the only condition to this contribution is the acknowledgement that all parties can and should contribute.

Considering this it is interesting that Delors stated that ‘Europe needs a soul’. Delors seems to not believe that Europe needs a soul, but that the European people should realize that Europe has a soul. This is actually quite the contradiction: he states that we must find a soul for Europe, that to just have a market which connects the different member States is not enough. But at the same time his rhetoric and ideology prove the exact opposite: Europe does have a soul, and this soul is a given, Europe is not just based on a common market. The people of Europe however did not see this and Delors tried to show us this. So when Delors states that Europe needs a soul he is trying to say: ‘Europe has a soul, why can’t you see it?’ In all his speeches and works the main focus of his attention is to explain what the results of this soul should be instead of what this soul in itself is. In all the articles, books, and speeches read to investigate the matter for this thesis only one description of European values was found:

... [The] rich heritage of our history, from Greek democracy to Roman law, from ancient philosophy to Judeo-Christian religions, from the Enlightenment to contemporary philosophies, and not to mention the footprint of Muslims and Islam have left in our history. Our spiritually and cultural values are still the best remedy against the imposed uniformity.90

Yet only one of these heritages seems to be the starting point of the notions Delors makes concerning improving the EU and its integration. Delors’ main inspiration seems to lie in Christianity. One of the most important aspects of Delors’ ideology is in essence subsidiarity, which is a Roman Catholic principle. At the same time subsidiarity has now turned into a Christian principle as Protestants have integrated the principle into their social systems as well. This of course is only advantageous when the principle is applied to Europe: not only the Catholic part of Europe, but also the more northern States will recognize the beauty and importance of the principle of subsidiarity.

Original: ‘…patrimoine si riche de notre histoire, de la démocratie grecque au droit romain, de la philosophie antique aux religions judéo-chrétiennes, du siècle des lumières aux philosophies contemporaines, sans oublier l’empreinte des musulmans et de l’islam sur notre histoire. Nos valeurs spirituelles et culturelles restent le meilleur remède contre l’uniformité impose.’
This is exactly why it is disappointing to see what is stated about subsidiarity within the EU:

The principle of subsidiarity is defined in Article 5 of the Treaty on European Union. It ensures that decisions are taken as closely as possible to the citizen and that constant checks are made to verify that action at Union level is justified in light of the possibilities available at national, regional or local level. Specifically, it is the principle whereby the Union does not take action (except in the areas that fall within its exclusive competence), unless it is more effective than action taken at national, regional or local level. It is closely bound up with the principle of proportionality, which requires that any action by the Union should not go beyond what is necessary to achieve the objectives of the Treaties.  

Even though this is a principle that almost all the States of Europe have applied to its social structures, the EU has applied it to its policy in an inadequate manner. The principle of subsidiarity has, with this application, turned into a top-down principle: the EU states what the people can decide for themselves, whereas is should be a bottom-up principle: the people explain to the EU what it can decide for them. The way that subsidiarity has been applied within the EU does not seem congruent with what subsidiarity literally means and what Delors believed it to be. However, whatever element of subsidiarity that is now upheld within the EU: that has been an influence of Delors. The element of regionality above supranationality is very important for the structure of the EU and even though it might not be the best application of subsidiarity, ‘it’s a start’.

It can be concluded that we should not define why we are an entity but acknowledge that all should be included to form this entity and all shall have as much influence in the form and shape of the entity. The common heritage all the member States share forms an important, if not crucial, part of the European identity. However, this heritage is proof of the existence of the European family and the flexible elements of the European identity must be in constant development through the individual member States. The idea that each member State is to take responsibility to the fullest for their well being as far as possible is a signal of a European family. All should be dealt with as local and regional as possible. One of the problems in the discussions today concerning exactly this is the reproach of nation States that they would lose their national identity. However, when one studies Delors´ views on this it becomes clear that

replacement is not what he refers to. The European identity and the national identity will not hinder each other; this because the principle of subsidiarity enables each national identity to be present within the European identity. The identity of each individual is consists of different building blocks. What Delors defends is that the ‘European building block’ forms part of this construction in each European citizen. In this identity it becomes clear what each European shares with the rest of Europe. The European identity is a dynamic concept which will evolve according to the contribution of different member States. Precisely this is the effect of subsidiarity, each region keeps as many responsibilities as possible, this way enabling the European identity to not hinder regional/national identity but forming the base, or the top of, a ‘identity pyramid’. Without the creation of a similar ‘identity pyramid’ it would be impossible for each region to be included in the European identity and with it a successful integration in the EU. European identity should therefore result into communication and not into an imposed identity that each nation and region is to adjust to. The notion that the European identity results into communication can only be upheld if problems are dealt with locally. Only then does each member State, and with it its regions, fulfill a valuable role within the EU.

Delors sees it as following: we are all part of the European family and that is just the way it is. Nowadays we cope with a problem of legitimacy. Why is there an EU? Why are certain States members? Member States are constantly trying to define why they form part of Europe and thus the European Union. Delors took exactly this as a given and proved that we should not concentrate on why we are part of this family, but what we can add to this family. The problem with a European identity as we deal with it today is that it becomes static. In wishing to measure one’s own identity to the ‘European one’ a final and defined identity should be known. Without this there is no point to legitimizing ones membership. However, this legitimation has turned the European identity in an unchangeable defined entity. Therefore the biggest issues with member States has become trying to check if their ‘own identity’ matches up to the European one, and if other member States are fulfilling their responsibilities and duties within this identity. With this notion come, figuratively speaking, contractual problems. Instead of solidarity, accusations now dominate the debate surrounding the EU. Delors however did the opposite; he believed that the best we could do for Europe was open the discussion on this European family. Focusing solely on the static European identity leads the discussion into a void, losing sight of the actual European family. We should not see the EU as a contract that we cannot break and that other member States should honor as well, but as an open process that we should work on together.
Europe’s vocation… can be clearly defined. It is to unite people in accordance with their true genius, which is that of its diversity, and in the conditions of the 20th century, which are those of the Community, in order to open us for the world the way it is seeking the way of organized freedoms…92

This can also be seen in the issues nowadays with the financial crisis. The bail-out agreements with Greece, Ireland and Portugal encounter opposition exactly because of this. They did not keep their part of the contract and now we have to fix their problem. There is no they and there is no we. The family that Delors speaks of counters this problem: member States already form a part of this family, the construction already exists and the member States are automatically part of this construction. Ideologically we are a family. Only if member States acknowledge they belong together, a combination of subsidiarity and solidarity, can this be translated into a political unity. One must not forget however that within a family there are boundaries and there are rules. Besides subsidiarity and solidarity the notion reliability also plays a crucial role when referring to the ideal of a family. Within a family all have the responsibility to ‘behave’. Each family member has to act in a manner that will not harm the rest of the family; or at least do his best to avoid situations in which the rest of the family could be harmed: this is where reliability comes in.

This unity of member States is what Delors strived for. His process of integration for the EU can be divided in three phase93. First of all the phase of one market in which Delors strived for a common market. The second phase is the one in which the main goal was creating a single currency; this was achieved with the Maastricht Treaty. Finally he embarked upon the third phase: the phase of a political entity, in which he emphasized the importance of a soul for Europe. As mentioned before, there is barely an actual definition made of this soul – Delors mainly focuses on the acceptance of this soul and how it is actually a logical result of the history of the European family. If Delors’ ideological views on a European family would have been maintained, the discussions about contractual obligations we are having now concerning the bail-out plans might not be taking place. Whether this is the result of unsuccessful policy on Delors’ part or a lack of ideological view on the part of the member States is a different


93 Interview with Ruud Lubbers on May 21st 2011.
conversation. However, it does become clear that the importance of Delors´ notion of the European family has not had its desired results.

In the ‘contractual discussions’ mentioned earlier another issue surfaces. Many nationals seem to fear losing their own national identity if they were to accept this European family. But:

…it is no longer controversial among scholars and policy-makers alike that individuals hold multiple identities. It is, therefore, wrong to conceptualize European and national identity in zero-sum terms, as if an increase in European identity decreases one’s loyalty to national or other communities.\(^\text{94}\)

This seems to be a popular notion nowadays: multiple identities. As if one person can have numerous identities. The human being is one integrated being and we only have one single identity. However, this identity is as a mosaic which is built up of many different stones and colors. One of the stones that form a part of this mosaic is that of Europe. Europe is part of the identity of Europeans; it forms part of their identity. Why is this notion not promoted on a European level? Having multiple nationalities is indeed not uncommon today, as many people have double nationalities and not all family members share the same nationalities. Here comes the responsibility of the national politics and media. Even though it is too ´easy´ to state that the lack of ´European sense of belonging´ is the fault of the media and national politics, it cannot be denied that much can be improved concerning communication towards the European citizens. There is a lack of knowledge concerning the history of the EU, its goal, and its importance for the EU citizens. One of the main reasons that can be found when explaining why European citizens do not seem receptive to the idea of upholding a European identity as part of their own national identity, is that they are not aware of up to what level the EU positively influences their daily lives. Besides this it cannot be forgotten that the EU is based upon an ideological construction. This construction ceases to exist as soon as conversation surrounding the ideology disappears. This construction and with it the EU will only continue having a meaning if the ideology behind is present in the public debate.

It has been mentioned before that the Euro has a great influence on the feeling of ´Europeaness´ and one must not forget that travelling within the EU has strongly been facilitated by the fading...

of the internal borders of the EU. It might be useful to, when looking for support of the European citizens, to focus on what benefits the EU offers them. Besides that, in the treaties of the EU numerous rights have been stipulated for the European citizens. The latter are however unaware of the advantages they may enjoy thanks to the EU.

Within Europe another discussion plays, there is an existential connection between all the member States. Delors explained this existential connection with the ideological notion of the European family. This is a family in which all members carry responsibilities and look out for each other. The criticism related to this issue has to do with a process that takes place earlier. The process that Delors deliberately avoided: Who can form part of this family? How is this decided? What Delors implies with the use of the metaphor the European family is that it is logical what States should be members of the EU as each State that shares history, values, culture and heritage is a child of the same parents – there will be no doubt on what States should be members. However, it is opportune to reflect upon the enlargements of the EU. Lubbers stated that the problem with the EU is that the decision was made to ‘enlarge instead of deepen’. An opportunity was missed here; to return to the ideological start of the EU. This ideological goal was to maintain peace within Europe. After the fall of the Berlin Wall this goal resurfaced and to fulfill it the member States in question had to be included in the EU. Delors might state that as a family we owed it to them to help them. When looking purely at economical gain this indeed did not make sense, but reflecting upon the ideological point of view the Founding Fathers of Europe had, this particular enlargement was no mistake:

World peace cannot be safeguarded without the making of creative efforts proportionate to the dangers which threaten it. The contribution which an organised and living Europe can bring to civilisation is indispensable to the maintenance of peaceful relations. In taking upon herself for more than 20 years the role of champion of a united Europe, France has always had as her essential aim the service of peace. A united Europe was not achieved and we had war. Europe will not be made all at once, or according to a single plan. It will be built through concrete achievements which first create a de facto solidarity.

95 For example the rights stipulated in the Charter of Fundamental Rights.


In the foundations of the EU, the Schuman Declaration, it is stated that at the base of a European State (as it was called) is world peace. There is not a single notion made of what is Europe, where its boundaries are and who are allowed to join. What should unite the members of the EU is that they want all that was stipulated in the Schuman Declaration. This does not imply that there are no boundaries. Schuman, when writing his Declaration together with Monnet, did not envision the enlargements that are taking place presently. Times have changed and the discussion on boundaries has become important; for example the candidate membership of Turkey. Keeping in mind all that has been mentioned about the European identity, the main cultural and moral values that all member States share Turkey should not come into consideration. It is in my opinion a grave mistake to claim that because Turkey is modern it should form part of the EU. There are many modern States in the world that culturally and morally have a lot to offer to the world. This however does not imply that they form part of Europe. It seems as though the discussion on Turkey’s possible membership is drenched in political correctness where no one wants to insult Turkey by stating that they are not European. That a State is not European is not a value judgment but a historical observation. With the acceptance of States that do not share the same historical heritage we risk sacrificing the European family for a global family of which all can form a part. As soon as the historical heritage of Europe is forgotten in these discussions the identity of Europe is being ignored. Needless to say these discussions are crucial, but in the process of these debates one must not forget what the goal of a European unity was and is.

At the same time the discussion is arising on the European identity. Delors actually does not try to give a static definition of this European identity. Has that been a good decision? Some may state that in avoiding this debate he might have contributed to the creation of the void that the discussion surrounding the EU finds itself in today. However, is there a static and definable European identity? Is the beauty of the EU not that it is indefinable? Indefinable in the sense that its strength, charm and attraction lie in its diversity. The discussion on demarcating the ‘exact EU identity’ is as explaining what the characteristics of a family with 27 children would be. This is exactly what Delors teaches us, we cannot define this identity and we should realize that it is not the identity that creates the unity but the unity that creates the identity. Through history, common culture and values it will become apparent that there are resemblances. These resemblances have been defined by Delors (Greek democracy, Roman law, ancient philosophy, Judeo-Christian religions, Enlightenment, contemporary philosophies, and the footprint of Muslims and the Islam). Besides these resemblances, or heritage, Delors emphasizes the
European identity will change according to the national identities. As the unity changes, for example through enlargement of the EU, the identity will adapt to the new unity. Demanding that all new member States should fit into this ‘static identity’ instead of adapting the identity to the composition of the EU which is in constant flux is a grave mistake. Instead of blaming Delors for not ‘opening’ this discussion we should thank him for keeping it away as long as possible. And then, after thanking him, we should return to his ideal of the European family and all its results mentioned in this thesis.
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**Interviews**

Two interviews were held with Ruud Lubbers. Recordings of the interviews are available upon request:

1. On May 21st 2011
2. On May 23rd 2011

**Definitions**

Throughout this thesis numerous definitions have been taken from online reference websites. Below all these websites are mentioned plus the names that they were used to define:

1. [www.catholicculture.org](http://www.catholicculture.org)
   a. Subsidiarity:
      [http://www.catholicculture.org/culture/what_you_need_to_know/index.cfm?id=84](http://www.catholicculture.org/culture/what_you_need_to_know/index.cfm?id=84)
2. [www.europa.eu](http://www.europa.eu)
   a. The Charter of Fundamental Rights:
   b. EEC:
   c. The European Council:
   d. EURATOM:
   e. SEA:
   f. Subsidiarity
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3. www.merriam-webster.com

4. www.wto.org
   a. The Uruguay Round:
      http://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/whatis_e/tif_e/fact5_e.htm