

II. The European Parliamentary Union (EPU)

HERIBERT GISCH

Introduction

The origin, development and decline of the EPU¹ are to a large extent bound up with its initiator and moving spirit, Count Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi,² the creator of the Pan-European Movement. Founded between the wars, that movement enjoyed considerable attention in the 1920s, and during the Second World War was probably the sole institution of importance working for European union, although the Nazi regime had completely destroyed its organization in the occupied European countries. In 1943 the group surviving in exile in the USA under Coudenhove's leadership held its fifth Pan-European Congress, which drafted a federal constitution for Europe and strove to win over American public opinion for a democratic European federal state. Coudenhove himself, who had become a professor of history in New York, headed a 'Research Seminar for Post-War European Federation', which kept alive the European idea despite the basically unfavourable attitude of the American public. With the same object a 'Declaration of European Interdependence', signed by Coudenhove and fifteen other prominent European émigrés, was submitted to the US Congress in March 1945; its content, however, did not go beyond what was accepted between the wars.³

However, the position altered very soon after June 1946, when Coudenhove returned to Europe and realized what changes had taken place during his six years' exile. It became clear that the Pan-European movement could not be

so speedily reorganized, since Churchill and especially his son-in-law, Duncan Sandys,⁴ showed much reserve towards Coudenhove's plans and did their best to restrict his influence in the new European groupings that were taking shape.⁵ On the other hand Coudenhove became aware of the widespread popular interest in European union, as expressed e.g. by R.W.G. Mackay,⁶ one of the leading spirits of the future EPU, in an indirect criticism of the Declaration of March 1945.⁷ To take advantage of this trend Coudenhove developed the plan of mobilizing parliamentary majorities in favour of European union, so as to submit a co-ordinated appeal to governments. This was eventually to be the task of the EPU.

In the first place, Coudenhove sought backing for his idea in a questionnaire addressed to European members of parliament at the beginning of November 1946, after his temporary return to New York, to discover their basic attitude

4 Sandys, Duncan (Lord Duncan-Sandys), 1908–87, educated at Eton and Oxford; diplomatic service 1930–4 (1930–3 at the British Embassy, Berlin), from which he resigned in protest against the British Government's German policy. Conservative MP for Lambeth, 1935–45, Streatham, 1950–74. Married Diana Churchill, 1935. An important member of the anti-appeasement group formed around Churchill. 1939–40 on active service, Norway Expeditionary Force, disabled, 1941. Financial Secretary to War Office, 1941–3; Parliamentary Secretary to Ministry of Supply, 1943–4; Minister of Works, 1944–5. Founding leader of the United Europe Movement (UEM), 1947. Founding Executive Chairman of the European Movement, 1948–50. Member of the European Consultative Assembly, 1950–1. During our present period he held no government office.

5 Sandys to Churchill, 11 Oct. 1946:

... '2. As you know, Coudenhove's pre-war organization has become entirely dissipated and he is now attempting to recreate it virtually from scratch. There is a serious danger that the approaches which we are going to make to European personalities will become confused with Coudenhove's parallel activities.

'3. This could best be avoided by finding an honourable place for him and, if need be, his Organization, within the framework of our new movement.

'4. Leo Amery and I thought that Coudenhove should be invited to be a Vice-President of the International Council when it is formed and should be asked to undertake responsibility for the international propaganda section of the movement. I do not, however, think that he should be offered a position which would give him control of the new organization. . . ' (EM Archives)

6 Ronald W.G. Mackay, born in Australia in 1902, lecturer in philosophy, history, and economics at Sydney University; settled in England as a solicitor in 1934; Labour Party parliamentary candidate, 1935–1942. His book *Federal Europe* (1940) provided the most thoughtful analysis, with a detailed constitutional draft, of a 'United States of Europe' with a close definition of the federation's 'exclusive' and 'concurrent' legislative powers, built around the nucleus of a British-French-German federation. From 1942 to 1945 he worked in the Ministry of Aircraft Production; from 1945 to 1950 he was Labour MP for North-West Hull, in 1950–1 for Reading North.

From 1947 to 1949, after King became a member of the British government, Mackay was vice-president of the EPU. He died in 1960.

7 Cf. Mackay to Coudenhove, 25 Nov. 1946 (Mackay Archives).

1 A basic source for the history of the EPU is M. Posselt, *Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi und die Europäische Parlamentarier-Union. Die parlamentarische Bewegung für eine 'Europäische Konstituante' (1946–1952)* (thesis), Graz, 1987. For the period down to the beginning of 1948 see also W. Lipgens, *A History of European Integration*, vol. 1, Oxford, 1982, pp. 435 ff. and 607 ff., and, from the older literature, O. Philip, *Le problème de l'union européenne*, Neuchâtel, 1950, pp. 185 ff.

2 On Coudenhove see also R. Italiaander, *Richard N. Coudenhove-Kalergi. Begründer der Paneuropa-Bewegung*, Freudenstadt, 1969; E. Krieger, *Große Europäer heute*, Frankfurt, 1964; Th. Jansen and D. Mahncke (eds.), *Persönlichkeiten der europäischen Integration*, Bonn, 1981, pp. 25 ff.

On the development of the EPU as seen by Coudenhove: R. Coudenhove-Kalergi, *Europe Seeks Unity*, New York, 1948; id., *Kampf um Europa. Aus meinem Leben*, Zurich, 1949; id., *Ein Leben für Europa*, Cologne and Berlin, 1966.

3 Cf. Lipgens, *History*, pp. 435 f.

to European federation. The enquiry was confined to members of Western parliaments, and particularly those of the countries that later formed the Coal and Steel Community. After initial difficulties the replies came in during the spring of 1947 and were decidedly favourable, clearly under the influence of world events such as the cold war and the Marshall Plan. Among those who replied were past and present members of government and party leaders covering a wide political range.⁸ However, from the outset Coudenhove was to some extent isolated owing to his cool relations with Churchill and Sandys since his first feelers in 1946, and his authoritarian claim to leadership.⁹

The response to Coudenhove's appeal made it possible to convert the theoretical goodwill of parliamentarians into concrete political action. Thus Cou-

⁸ The results of the poll were as follows:

Country	Parliament	Total Members	Answers		% 'Yes'	% 'No'
			'Yes'	'No'		
Belgium	Ch. of Deps.	202	98	1	49	1/2
	Senate	167	42	0	26	0
Denmark	Folketing	150	15	4	10	3
	Landsting	77	13	1	16	1
France	Natl. Ass'y	598	301	6	50	1
	Council of the Rep.	310	105	0	35	0
Great Britain	House of Commons (Non-govt.)	587	133	3	23	1/2
Greece	Const. Ass'y	354	202	1	58	1/3
Ireland	Dáil Éireann	136	50	6	37	4
Italy	Const. Ass'y	554	342	0	62	0
Luxemburg	Ch. of Deps.	51	28	1	56	2
Netherlands	Lower House	99	53	5	53	5
	Upper House	49	25	1	50	2
Norway	Storting	150	12	2	8	1
Sweden	Lower House	230	19	5	8	2
	Upper House	150	20	4	13	3
Switzerland	Natl. Council	186	93	5	50	3
	C. of States	44	20	1	45	2
Provisional results:		4,094	1,571	46	38	1

From R. Coudenhove-Kalergi, *Rapport sur l'UPE*, Gstaad, 7 Sep. 1947 (Mackay Archives).

⁹ Cf. H. Brugmans, 'Trois questions à M. le comte Coudenhove-Kalergi', 20 June 1947 (BEF Archives, Brugmans Archives).

denhove pressed for the formation of national parliamentary committees (doc. 32), which were set up in Belgium, Italy and Greece in the early summer of 1947. In France there came into being a 'Groupe parlementaire fédéraliste français', which was close to the Union européenne des fédéralistes (UEF; EUF in English) and similar to the Federalist Group of the House of Commons headed by Gordon Lang, a champion of world federation and a leading member of the EUF and the UEM (Churchill's United Europe Movement).

Thus the impulse towards founding the EPU came basically from the Belgian, Italian and Greek groups,¹⁰ at whose instance a preliminary conference was held on 4–5 July 1947 at Gstaad in Switzerland, where Coudenhove was then residing. It was there decided to create an umbrella organization for the national groups as soon as at least seven nationalities could be represented.¹¹ This was the case at the beginning of August,¹² after a meeting in Paris on 20 July¹³ between the EPU and the other European associations: there firm agreement was reached on the recognition of the EPU, and the French and British groups were invited to take part in the 'preliminary parliament' to be convened at Gstaad at the beginning of September (cf. doc. 34).

The first EPU congress, from 8 to 10 September 1947 (doc. 35),¹⁴ was attended, on the basis of these preparations, by 114 MPs from ten West European countries.¹⁵ Besides questions of organization¹⁶ the congress developed

¹⁰ In a press conference on 20 June 1947 Coudenhove-Kalergi described the state of preparations and planning and the outlook as he saw it; without justification he included the formation of the French and British group (von Schenck papers, UEF file).

¹¹ Cf. 'Rapport sur les travaux de la Conférence Parlementaire Européenne à Gstaad, les 4 et 5 juillet 1947' (BEF Archives, Brugmans Archives).

¹² From August 1947 the governing body of the EPU was as follows: Leon Maccas, Socialist (Greece); Erik Arrhen, Conservative (Sweden); Ernst Boerlin, Radical Democrat (Switzerland); Georges Bohy, Socialist (Belgium); Enzo Giacchero, Christian Democrat (Italy); Gordon Lang, Labour (Britain); Edmond Michelet, Christian Democrat (France); Søren Olesen, Liberal (Denmark); E.G.M. Roolvink, Catholic (Netherlands). Mackay did not become a member until December. The first regular meeting of the Executive Council took place immediately before the first EPU congress at Gstaad on 6–7 September.

¹³ Cf. 'Minutes and Agreement of a meeting of the European Liaison Committee in Paris on Sunday 20th July, 1947' (EM Archives).

¹⁴ Statements that the congress continued until 11 September are incorrect: the opening session took place on the morning of the 8th, and the closing press conference on the afternoon of the 10th.

¹⁵ J. Schwarz (*Der Aufbau Europas. Pläne und Dokumente, 1945–1980*, Bonn, 1980 pp. 5 f.) speaks wrongly of 150 participants from 12 states. The official list enumerates 114 parliamentarians, in very different strength from country to country. France alone sent 43 members (including such important names as E. Bonnefous, R. Coty, F. de Menthon, F. Gay, M. Guérin, F. Leenhardt, André Mutter, André Noël, P. Pflimlin, and Paul Reynaud), and Italy 39 (including L. Benvenuti, F. Colitto, Ugo Damiani, Enzo Giacchero, Guglielmo Giannini, G. Russo Perez and T. Zerbi). The French and Italians comprised almost three-quarters of the total; of the remain-

Coudenhove's basic conception: the creation, as soon as possible, of a European assembly to bring about the United States of Europe; increased economic co-operation as a step towards co-operation in political matters, and organizational progress with the formation of further groups within the EPU.

The successful co-operation at Gstaad with the declared object of achieving a federal constitution and parliament gave a decisive impulse to further work. To formulate its aims more precisely the newly elected Council of the EPU met in December 1947 to prepare for its second congress, to be held in September 1948 at Interlaken. A Committee under F. de Menthon¹⁷ was to draft a

ing 32, 10 were from Brussels and 7 from The Hague, only 4 from London (Labour MPs E.M. King and R. Mackay, Conservatives Sir Peter Macdonald and Sir Walter Smiles), 2 each from Greece and Denmark, and 1 each from Sweden and Austria. In addition there were at least 80 'observers' and journalists; among these were Duncan Sandys and Somerset de Chair from Britain.

16 The newly elected 'Provisional Executive Council' was composed as follows:

President

Georges Bohy, chairman of Socialist party in the Belgian Chamber of Deputies
First Vice-President

Leon Maccas, ex-minister, Social Democratic member of the Greek National Assembly

Vice-Presidents

K. Bøgholm, Conservative member of the Lower House of the Danish parliament
Enzo Giacchero, Christian Democrat member of the Italian Constituent Assembly
E. M. King, British Labour MP (From 12-14 Dec. 1947: R. W. G. Mackay)

Parliamentary Secretaries

A. H. W. Hacke, Liberal member of the Dutch Lower House
Anne-Marie Trinquier, MRP member of the French Council of the Republic

Delegates

Erik Arrhen, Conservative member of the Lower House of the Swedish parliament
Ernst Boerlin, Radical-Democratic member of the Swiss National Council
René Coty, ex-minister, Independent Republican member of the French National Assembly
Eduard Ludwig, ex-minister, chairman of Foreign Affairs Commission of the Austrian National Council, member of People's Party
E. G. M. Roolvink, member of the Dutch Lower House (Catholic People's Party)

Alternates

Arthur Gilson, Christian-Social member of Belgian Chamber of Deputies
Francis Leenhardt, Socialist member of French National Assembly
Sir Peter Macdonald, Conservative MP (Britain)
Søren Olesen, Liberal member of Lower House of the Danish parliament
Guido Russo Perez, Qualunquist member of Italian Constituent Assembly

Committees were set up for economic matters, culture, propaganda and social security; also a juridical committee with the task of drafting statutes. The Council was instructed to prepare for a further conference in September 1948.

17 François, comte de Menthon, born 8 Jan. 1900; 1940-2 professor of political economy at Lyons; 1940, member of resistance organizations Liberté, Combat,

'Constitution of the United States of Europe'.¹⁸ At this time R.W.G. Mackay became vice-president of the EPU in place of Evelyn King (who became a member of the British government), and from then on had probably the chief voice in policy matters next to Coudenhove.¹⁹ In a series of lively initiatives following the Gstaad meeting Mackay began by founding a Labour 'Europe Group'; on 16 December 1947, in accordance with the EPU programme, this became an 'All-Party Europe Group',²⁰ whose non-party character was increasingly plain until February 1948. It had as its base the still extant 'Federalist Group' in the House of Commons, which had, however, largely ceased to be active as it could not obtain support for its ideas of world federation.

In a similar fashion federalist groups took shape in the parliaments of the Benelux countries, as well as Italy and France.²¹ Thus in the spring of 1948 a foundation existed for political initiatives to be taken by the EPU: moreover, world conditions had meanwhile developed further in its favour²² (cf. doc. 36). Consequently, in the parliaments of France, Britain and the Netherlands motions in the sense of the Gstaad resolution were presented more or less simultaneously in March 1948 (cf. doc. 37) and gained considerable support. They were clearly co-ordinated by the EPU and, together with the resolutions of the Congress of Europe at The Hague in May 1948, were to form the basis of the initiative of the French and Belgian governments in the summer of that year.

While the EPU was developing its organization and policy, the UEM under Duncan Sandys was endeavouring to unify the organization of the different European associations and groups. Its object was to strengthen Sandys' 'unionist' position, implying a lesser degree of integration. The foundation of the Liaison Committee on 20 July 1947, and Sandys' skilful integration of the federalist EUF from the point of view of organization and policy, were directed to the same end and therefore aroused mistrust and hostility on the part of the EPU leadership. Coudenhove refused to join a Committee in

Maquis; edited *Cahiers politiques* for the last-named. Minister of Justice from Sep. 1944 to May 1945; presided over 'purge' of collaborators, and in 1946 was a prosecutor at the Nuremberg trials. MRP Deputy from 1946 to 1958; minister of the economy, 1946; 1952-4, president of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe.

18 At that time there evidently existed a draft constitution prepared by Coudenhove, which may have been identical with the Coudenhove text of 1944 mentioned by Mackay (cf. his letter to Coudenhove of 27 Aug. 1947 (doc. 34)). The draft in question was discussed in Brugmans's circle at the beginning of Dec. 1947 (cf. H. R. Nord, 'Thoughts about a European Constitution', dated 8 Dec. 1947 (BEF Archives, Brugmans Archives)).

19 Cf. 'Rapport sur la réunion du conseil exécutif de l'UPE à Gstaad les 12, 13, 14. 12. 1947' (Giacchero papers).

20 Communication from Shawcross (Mackay Archives).

21 Cf. Lipgens, *History*, pp. 614-22.

22 Cf. letter of 22 March 1948 from Secretary of State Marshall to Coudenhove endorsing the latter's aims (Duncan Sandys papers).

which the federalist programme did not appear to be safeguarded; moreover, his exaggerated ambition and claim to leadership were jeopardized by the rivalry with Sandys. Subsequently, despite various attempts at co-operation this coolness continued to mark their relations, and Coudenhove became increasingly isolated and deprived of influence.²³

Coudenhove maintained his contacts in the USA and spent some time there until the beginning of May 1948, pleading for the European cause in conversations with members of the US government (cf. doc. 36).²⁴ Alarmed by Duncan Sandys' activities, he endeavoured to keep the initiative. He joined in the preparations, which were going on successfully, for the Congress of Europe to be held at The Hague in May 1948, as may be seen from a lively correspondence with Churchill, Sandys and Mackay.²⁵ Coudenhove and his friends were at pains to ensure that the EPU took part in shaping the Congress despite the points of policy and organization which separated them from the Committee. They also tried to play the role of mediator and to smooth over the party-political differences between British Labour and the Conservatives: thus Bohy of Belgium urged that Labour MPs should take part in the Congress although it was largely organized and dominated by Conservatives.²⁶ After much uncertainty the EPU did take part in the Congress, but the coolness and personal mistrust persisted and increased, owing in part to unionistic resolutions and to the question of the European flag, which was much played up by Coudenhove.²⁷

In consequence, the EPU leaders concentrated on preparations for their congress at Interlaken in September 1948, and continued to uphold their conception of Europe and plan of action.²⁸ The Hague Congress aroused lively interest on the part of the European and American public, reflecting the fact that the attitude of the West European and American governments had shifted

23 Cf. letter of 15 Aug. 1947 from Silva to Naudin (in French): '... M. Coudenhove-Kalergi seems to take no account of the agreement reached between us on 20 July last ...'

'As you know, many parliamentarians have strong reservations about M. Coudenhove-Kalergi's personal initiative, and agreed to go to Gstaad only on condition that the Congress would be guided by the letter and spirit of our agreement. The course chosen by M. Coudenhove-Kalergi not only undermines the agreement but threatens the future of the Parliamentary Union itself. ...' (UEF Archives).

24 Cf. note 22 above.

25 Coudenhove to Sandys, 15 March 1948; Coudenhove to Churchill, 16 Feb. 1948; Coudenhove to Sandys, 25 March 1948; Sandys to Coudenhove, 2 and 14 April 1948; Coudenhove to Sandys and Churchill, 14 April 1948 (all in Duncan Sandys papers); Coudenhove to Mackay, 28 Feb. 1948 (Mackay Archives).

26 Cf. Bohy's letter of 10 April 1948 to Labour MPs (Giacchero papers).

27 Cf. 'Report of the meeting of the Executive Council of the EPU, London, 9–10. 4. 1948' (Mackay Archives) and Coudenhove's letter of 14 April 1948 to Churchill (Duncan Sandys papers).

28 Cf. Council Meeting of the EPU at Château d'Ardenne, 12. 5. 48 (Mackay Archives) – i.e. immediately after the Hague Congress.

considerably in favour of European integration. The advance so far made was insufficient; more intensive activity and bolder proposals were called for. Such moves at government level were Bidault's plan of 18 July 1948 for a European Assembly, and the adoption of the Hague resolutions by the French and Belgian governments on 18 August.

In these circumstances the Interlaken congress – with Mackay playing an increasingly important part in its preparation (doc. 38) – was able to go far beyond the very general ideas expressed at Gstaad. On the basis of the drafts prepared by Mackay and the de Menthon Committee,²⁹ a detailed plan was put forward for a European federal state, to be created by a Constituent Assembly. The documents produced at Interlaken were very specific in character and led to lively debate concerning the area of the federation, the question of colonies, the franchise, representation and so on;³⁰ the resulting 'Interlaken Plan' (doc. 39) expressed a remarkably unambiguous and forward-looking concept, and may be regarded as the peak of the EPU's activity.

Together with the Hague Congress and the memorandum of the nascent European Movement dated 18 August 1948, the Interlaken Plan completes the spectrum of integrationist ideas represented by the different associations. The enthusiasm of the European public led to the setting-up of a special committee by the five signatories of the Brussels Pact, which met on 25–6 October 1948. This 'Comité d'étude pour l'Unité Européenne' was to examine the feasibility of existing plans for integration, especially the Franco-Belgian government proposals for a Consultative Assembly and the British plan for a European Committee of Ministers. To simplify the discussion the European Movement in concert with the EPU submitted a memorandum, which, however, was cautious in important respects in view of the British attitude, and remained unionistic in tendency.³¹

This co-operation between the EPU and the European Movement (the successor to Sandys' Joint Committee) was short-lived, however,³² as the Interlaken Plan continued to govern the EPU's attitude. It soon became clear that the British MPs with ideas based on Interlaken were decidedly isolated in their own country.³³ Given the very reserved position of the British government, the plans of the European Movement – dominated as it was by British

29 The Committee submitted the 'Draft of a federal Constitution for the United States of Europe' (Mackay Archives). Cf. W. Lipgens (ed.), *45 Jahre Ringen um die europäische Verfassung. Dokumente 1939–1984*, Bonn, 1986, pp. 243 ff.

30 Cf. E. Mann Borghese, 'The Interlaken Charter', *Common Cause*, Jan. 1949, p. 224, and Philip, *Problème*, p. 187.

31 Memorandum of 23 Nov. 1948: 'Assemblée Consultative Européenne et Conseil Européen des Ministres'.

32 On the attempts at union cf. the comprehensive review from Sandys' point of view in EM Archives, Duncan Sandys papers, file 'Formation of a parliamentary section May–July 1949', and correspondence between Sandys and Bohy (EM Archives).

33 Cf. discussion of the Interlaken proposals in the *London Times*, Sept.–Oct. 1948.

and unionist ideas – fitted far better than the EPU into the narrow framework that was consistent with government policy.³⁴

The breach between the British group and the EPU leaders, and the former's increasing *rapprochement* with the European Movement, must be seen primarily in this context.³⁵ Attempts at a merger between the EPU and the European Movement failed because of mutual disagreement and the unacceptable conditions laid down by the EPU leaders; and the latter refused to accept an organizational reform proposed by the British group.³⁶ The breach with the British was a grievous blow, from which the EPU never recovered, to its efforts to gain acceptance for the Interlaken Plan (cf. doc. 40); for the European Movement took advantage of the showdown provoked by Coudenhove and Bohy in March 1949³⁷ to set up a vigorous and effective parliamentary section of its own.³⁸

It is not surprising, therefore, that the EPU leaders largely fell into inactivity for a while, given the evolution towards a compromise in the form of the Council of Europe. They could not and did not wish to abandon the Interlaken Plan,³⁹ but had to admit that it had led to no tangible result. On the other hand Mackay, although on distant terms with the EPU leadership since the breach with the British group,⁴⁰ held to the Interlaken ideas which he had done much to formulate. On 5 May 1949 the representatives of ten European nations, after long negotiation, signed the treaty setting up the Council of Europe, which to some extent met the wishes of the European associations. From then on, the Interlaken Plan became for Mackay the basis – though increasingly

34 Cf. Duncan Sandys' comments in the *Times* of 21–22 Sept. 1948 ('Assembly of Europe. French and British proposals'), where he sought to soften the negative attitude of the British government by emphasizing the 'unofficial' nature of the Interlaken congress and drawing attention to the more feasible initiative of the French and Belgian governments.

35 The group could only be held together by keeping its programme open and loosening its ties with the EPU as far as possible (cf. meeting of the group on 9 Feb. 1949, Mackay Archives).

36 Cf. 'Procès verbal de la Réunion du Bureau tenue à Londres les 29 et 30 décembre 1948' (Giacchero papers).

37 Coudenhove's and Bohy's definite opposition to the attempts at co-operation was evidently not shared by all in the EPU. Thus Giacchero left it for the European Movement: cf. Sandys' letter to Giacchero, 15 Jan. 1949, (Giacchero papers).

38 After soundings in Oct. 1948, the Parliamentary Section of the European Movement was set up on 5–6 April 1949 or 16–18 June 1949 (cf. protocol EX/P/76, EM Archives). Later the European Movement attracted to itself several national groups and individual members from the EPU (cf. Sandys-Bohy correspondence in Feb. 1949 (EM Archives)).

39 The Executive Council of the EPU reiterated at its meeting at the beginning of Feb. 1949 'that the constitution of executive and deliberating organs with appropriate powers can alone create conditions for adequate, loyal co-operation among all European countries' (*Le Monde*, 9 Feb. 1949).

40 Thus Mackay was one of the chief initiators of the conference at Versailles which set up the parliamentary section of the European Movement in July 1949.

modified – of a policy of further development using the opportunities afforded by the Council of Europe (cf. doc. 41).⁴¹ For this purpose he helped to initiate, and co-ordinated with the European Movement, a conference at Copenhagen of the British and Scandinavian parliamentary groups on 7–8 May 1949, from which it was clear that the latter groups also were increasingly disaffected towards the EPU.⁴²

The EPU leaders finally followed Mackay's lead in conforming to practical realities. In July 1949, shortly before the opening of the first session of the Consultative Assembly at Strasbourg, they made a public statement, the first for some time, welcoming the Council of Europe as an important step forward (cf. doc. 42). This was also the spirit of the EPU's Third Congress held at Venice in September 1949, immediately after the first session of the Council of Europe. At that Congress the EPU – whose members composed about a quarter of the Consultative Assembly⁴³ – reviewed the latter's debates and called for a further implementation of the EPU programme within the framework of the Strasbourg institutions.⁴⁴ They also advocated the creation of a European currency, against the background of international economic and monetary problems (cf. doc. 43).

The limitations on progress towards European integration – imposed by the British in particular, as had become clear in the debates on currency – were confirmed as time went on by their growing resistance to moves by the Consultative Assembly to extend its own competence. Given the increasingly reluctant British attitude towards federalism as international tension escalated (creation of NATO; Korean war) it became clear that a progressive European

41 Mackay consistently subsequently adhered to this conception: cf. his plan of 23 Nov. 1950.

42 The Swedish group formally transferred to the European Movement on 24 May 1949 (Duncan Sandys papers); the Danish group on 28 June 1949 (EM Archives); and the British group on 29 June 1949 (EM Archives).

43 Cf. the Congress's working papers and esp. the list on p. 50 thereof, giving the delegates' names as follows: Bastianetto, Italy; Benvenuti, Italy; Bolifraud, France; Bonnefous, France; Boothby, Great Britain; Casati, Italy; Cassimatis, Greece; Cingolani, Italy; Dominedo, Italy; De Felice, France; Giacchero, Italy; Heyman, Belgium; Jacini, Italy; Jakobsen, Denmark; Kristensen, Denmark; Layton, Great Britain; Maccas, Greece; Mackay, Great Britain; de Menthon, France; Parri, Italy; Reynaud, France; Rozakis, Greece; Ruini, Italy; Schmal, Netherlands; Yetkin, Turkey. The differences between this EPU list and official ones are probably due to the uncertainty of relations between the EPU and its former national groups and members.

44 All in all, it appears beyond doubt that the EPU played an important part in the genesis and development of the Strasbourg Assembly (cf. Council of Europe, Directorate of Information: *Studies and Documents*, no. 2 of 25 May 1950 (IP/64/PL/YM): 'This is largely due to the important role played by inter-parliamentary organizations in the activities which led to the creation of the Council of Europe. In particular, mention may be made of the European Parliamentary Union, which was instituted in Gstaad in July 1947, and the Congresses it has held since that date in Gstaad, Interlaken and Venice.'

which have twice ruined our generation: those of unrestricted national sovereignty, national tariffs and currencies, nationalistic hatred and the arms race.

'We urge you to put a stop to these conditions by at once inaugurating the United States of Europe – with a Supreme Council and a Supreme Court, a joint police force, equal human rights for all, a European market and a European currency.

'Not all European states are at present free to unite. But Britain and France with some of their neighbours can and should take the lead, and in due course the whole of Europe will follow. The UN is obliged by its Charter to help us to set up a Continental regional authority, and the USA, our most powerful neighbour and a shining example of democratic federation, is prepared to assist our union.

'The parliaments of Europe are destined to take the lead in this decisive battle. Our poll of all West European parliamentarians has produced hopeful results. (...)

'You must repeat again and again the simple truth that the division of Europe must inevitably lead us into war and destruction, and only the union of Europe can save us.

'Let a storm of public opinion sweep out of their offices all the little Hitlers who spread hatred and vengefulness in order to gain power. You must vote only for men and women who are determined to create a free united Europe that is all of one mind, imbued with faith, hope and love.'

34. Ronald W. G. Mackay: Thoughts on the Gstaad Conference 27 August 1947

Mackay Archives, EPU file.

*

Following the inaugural meeting of the EPU at Gstaad at the beginning of July 1947, lively activity took place in preparation for the first conference of European parliamentarians, which was to be held in September also at Gstaad, then Coudenhove's place of residence. The present letter from Mackay to Coudenhove belongs to this period. It expresses his agreement to attend the conference: Coudenhove was anxious to achieve as wide a political spectrum as possible and had invited Mackay as a prominent Labour MP and member of the British parliamentary group of federalists, one whose influence had been increasing since his notable speech in the 'state of the nation' debate on 6 August 1947. Mackay was to become a vice-president of the EPU in December 1947 and thereafter had great influence on its policy. In the present letter he outlined his ideas as they had developed over the years in favour of European union, and described Britain's role as he saw it.

*

(...) I am sorry that the British Parliament is not coming along as it should, and I will do what I can between now and the time to get people to come.

You see, so long as it is associated with a Churchill movement in people's minds, and the Gordon Lang-Duncan Sandys association, it means that Labour people won't get interested. However, I will do what I can. I will cer-

tainly use this plane and I would be glad if you could let me know as soon as possible what arrangements have been made, if any, for the return trip. If I have to book a seat from this end I should know without any delay.

What worries me is that I fear we are going to conflict on fundamentals. I am sending you herewith a copy of a memorandum which I have recently circulated to Members of the Parliamentary Labour Party, and which seems to have had quite an effect on them; also a Constitution which Ivor Jennings drew up some time ago which I think is of importance at the present time. I don't want to get this thing out of its proper perspective but I do want you to realize that the creation of a European Federation in the next five years is more in the hands of Great Britain than anyone else. If Bevin would only take the lead at Paris now he could convert the present Paris Conference¹ into a Conference for European Federation.

I have been working hard for two years with the Labour Party people and I think I am now getting a majority of the British Labour Party to think along these lines, and I don't want to do anything which is going to prevent them coming to a conclusion on this matter in the next months or so. That is where the Churchill business is so awkward. The things I want to put to you particularly and to the Conference are:

(1) That it must not be a Federation within UNO. That, in effect, means nothing. The Federation, to be of any value, must itself be a member of UNO, the States in the Federation dropping out of UNO. We must have a real merger of sovereignty.

(2) That any document issued should tie up with what is happening in Paris as far as possible, and be simple and something which the Members of Parliament present can take back to their own Parliaments for approval.

(3) A Constitution, the length of one published by you in 1944, by me in 1941 or even by Ivor Jennings in 1940, a copy of which I am enclosing, is far too long. I will go through the Ivor Jennings one and see to what extent it can be cut. But what we really want at this stage is a few sheets of papers containing the principles on which we want the Governments of Western Europe to act. For examples we might get a proposal on the following lines:

(a) That in order to secure the economic and political well-being of the peoples of Western Europe, including Great Britain, the United States of Western Europe should be established, comprising such of the States in the schedule as are willing to join.

(b) That the United States of Western Europe should be a democratic Federation which (i) is based on and guarantees to the people of Western Europe the principles of civil and political freedom and social and economic security; (ii) has a Government directly elected by the people and responsible to them for their common affairs, and (iii) has power to make laws for the peace, order and good government of the territory covered by the Federation, and in particular power to legislate with respect to external affairs, defence, essential

¹ Conference of CEEC.