

Possibility of European Union Restructuring (Future of Europe)

by Dragan M. Popovic

INTRODUCTION

"Future of Europe" debate raised many questions: What is the European perspective? Should it go forward with the same institutional arrangements? How will its destiny look with increasing wish for European federation? How government officials will reconcile inter-governmental and federative approach? What will be the future of Nice Treaty?

Those questions become essential for reestablishing of European institutions and European future in general. However, there are many opposite visions between main actors of European structure. It is the most visible when we consider two conflicting visions toward Future of Europe: inter-governmental and community approaches. Supporters of the first one are emphasizing the nation states independence. Those countries often recall exclusivity of nation culture and tradition. If we include their ideas in European setting, every transfer of nation states special rights to the European level would be thought as defeat of state sovereignty. Because of those adherent states of first approach did not establish EURO as single currency system nor they want to apply in arranging of common foreign policy, or to create universal tax system. They will continue to support EU only as most powerful world economic giant. From the other hand, followers of federative position think that only stronger co-operation between states are going to defend their nation culture and tradition, which is completely opposite to the stance of inter-governmental approach supporters. Federative forces accepted single currency system. They wish to organize center of gravity, which will represent closer state organization based on the principle of EURO, and Schengen. For them, true "fighters" for independence and states sovereignty are countries, which are followers of federation. We will see below how serious gap between those two blocks of states is.

Future enlargement will be really historical event for Europe, which has been divided for a long time, especially during Cold War. Those two approaches are very influential and essential for the mentioned enlargement as well. Barriers between the old and the new possible member states broke down, but mutual fears in different form are still viable. Why?

Enlargement in the light of supporters of inter-governmental approach is great opportunity, which will create wider European market and will increase productivity of European society. Those states are afraid of parallel processes that may follow mentioned opportunity: unemployment, immigrations from former communist states, soft borders, increasing differences of national cultures and their mixture, which is, according to them threat for their exclusivity …

Campus of federative forces in enlargement sees historical chance for increasing security and peace as possibility of "finality" of Europe, which means European Federation. Beside that, new countries will bring economic benefits for everybody, and for national cultures, too. Those opinions are very opposite to the inter-governmental campus.

New comers are very sensitive bearing in mind stances of both blocks of states. They are too weak to create different path inside EU; therefore, they must recognize ideas from the first or the second one block of, which will be accepted without enthusiasm. Applicants are aware of fears of inter-governmental approach followers, chiefly because of possible division on "us" and "them" that could be generate from their ideas. From the other side, new comers were participants of former, and not successful federations. Sounding of "F" word in their ears maybe cannot be good music. Theirs federation experience often carries hard remembrance of ethnic or civil conflicts, like that one in Slovenia. Czech and Slovakia did not have a war but they were not friendly neighbors. Same things happened with Baltic States and Soviet Union. In institutional arrangements they cannot be satisfied because of potential lack of their sharing in decision-making processes, considering Nice Treaty. With some solutions of mentioned treaty they will lose some rights, which old states had before inauguration of last treaty: right of veto, participation in European Commission, which will lose its form as body that represents all EU states, and gets considerably lesser number of seats then it will be number of EU countries. It is hard to believe that old member states will lose their place in Commission in favor of new comers, especially when it was announced by Nice Treaty that Commission role should be strengthen. Applicant countries can be happy only with majority voting system that guarantees them independence from the large states. Qualified majority voting will enforce them to join in certain state blocks, where "hegemonic power" will be one of the large countries. Citizens of new comers would be almost only voting machine for reaching 62% of EU population, needed for recognition of new rule, according to qualified majority system. Large states cannot accept clear system of majority, where every voice is equal no matter of how states are big. That kind of voting system would be present of the large countries side as dictatorship of small ones.

Those extreme interesting situations in European Union will be quintessence of the essay. I would like to divide it in three parts:

- 1) In first one I will present opinions of three the most influential countries, Great Britain, France and Germany, evaluation of their competing principles with proposals of mine.
- 2) New comers will be shown in the third part of the essay with their expectations of participation in EU, likewise their hopes and fears with those ones from the EU old members' side.
- 3) Third part of the essay will be conclusion, which will include future European perspective.

INCOPATIBLE APPROACHES OF THE MAIN ACTORS OF EUROPEAN UNION

From its start, Europe has passed through many temptations. The First and The Second World War were something, which Europeans probably could not avoid because of many reasons. New and old enmities blocked the road of European peace. Resentments of the, not only Germany, but the others players of multiethnic and multi-confessional Europe, as well, started from the fresh points. France in the interwar period could not look in strong Germany and it was feared a lot by German possible reestablishing as influential state. On the other side, Germany saw France as the main player of its destabilization in recovering of economy, social life and security. Great Britain stepped aside from that games, but with open eyes on the Continental political movements or wider, on the Globe, as the strongest colonial power. Beside that, France wished to keep Germany down, but formed League of Nation had to give opportunity to the Germany to get up. Unfortunately, good will did not finish with inter-states trust, but The Second World War.

After The Second World War, nobody believed that old enemies could play political games together. Mutual distrust of "both sides in the conflict" (France and Germany) and, which are the most important, fears of communism and Soviet Union, pushed them in closer co-operation for constructing something that will later be known as "European Coal and Steel Community" ? cornerstone of European Union. "Founding fathers" of it, Frenchmen Robert Schuman and Jean Monnet, started new era in Continental political affairs. They had a vision of great and united Europe. Maybe the "fathers" were just hard dreamers in that streamline , but dream proved its reasons of being through the Treaty of Rome, enlargements of 73rd and 80s , Single European Act, Maastricht Treaty, and final enlargement of 95th . Why did not I mention the Amsterdam Treaty and final Treaty of Nice?

After Maastricht Treaty, everything seemed almost ideal, but what is almost sure, Europe came until some kind of stalemate, even to its gap without knowledge how to pass on the other side of the European mountain. Simply, maybe Europe itself is not prepare yet for great leap forward in something, which will be called by somebody United States of Europe, Federation of Europe, or Federation of Nation states. For instance, Britain is supporter of slower approach to the European future. Considering history of the nations, Britons were never for radical changes especially in time when their state was colonial super-power. They have needed to keep its influential position because of economy and prestige in the world. Taking into account previous century neither France did not play radical games in the global policy because of similar point of view as Britain's. Those things changed almost immediately after The Second World War when Great Britain, step-by-step, has gone in defensive political deeds. On the other side, France has taken the most prestigious role in creation of European policy. French government's role has continued to be very distinguishable during the Cold War.

In some moment, after the role of lesser important partner, Germany shown that it was not anymore only the economic power, but political, too. It always played active role, even radical, in the organizing of world events. After The Second World War, it needed to become part of NATO or ECSC because of Soviet Union's threat, from the one side, and to suit again economic strong and respectful European power. Destruction of Berlin's Wall gave to the Germany opportunity again to play real leading role in European affairs. Its counterparts, Great Britain, which does not want to have lesser important place in European politics anymore, and French, conscious of losing its previous position, cannot follow Germany in fast creation of European strong integration.

Misunderstanding of the most important European partners about "F" word exist, where Germany's stance is similar, but opposite of French's, and "against" Britain's one. Differences between France and Britain exist as well because of French government interim path, and again toward some kind of European federation. Mentioned "quarrellings" created deadlock in European political affairs, which was started to be visible after Nice IGC. Basic positions of those European states are noticeable different, but fear between them, I think, is viable and more than visible.

1. GREAT BRITAIN'S ATTITUDE TOWARD EU INTEGRATION

Britons are aware of their leading role in European Union politics. "From Europe's perspective, Britain as a key partner in Europe is now a definite plus not a minus. Britain has a powerful economy, an obvious role in defense and foreign policy and there is genuine respect for Britain's political institutions and stability. Also, in a world moving closer together, with new powers emerging, our strength with the United States is not just a British asset, it is potentially a European one. Britain can be the bridge between the EU and the US."

Tony Blair's preposition for organizing Europe is hard inter-governmental approach to the European affairs. In his opinions or in opinions of his officials Europe, as more than international organization, but not a state, should continue to pool its existence from national democracies, and democratic elected national parliaments and governments, which representatives have chair in European Institutions, like in Council of Ministers, and European Commission. Furthermore, European Parliament should have upper house to avoid democratic deficit that exists in European policy. With new chamber, Europe will be much closer to their citizens, and European Parliament will seem in the eyes of public very familiar to the nation states institutions. From the other side, role of European Commission should be strengthened, but not in way as a true executive body, but just as a guardian of European affairs. Likewise, European Parliament should keep its legislative power but not in a sense of nation states parliaments since Europe is not a federation and EP does not have strength to do so. Thus, upper house will solve misunderstanding between European and National states level. Considering Blair's opinions everything said in previous sentences were underlying of processes, but not objectives of

European citizens.

As pragmatist Britons are interested in better functioning of European Union, border security, fighting against human trafficking, clean environment, better food, closer co-operation between citizens and European institutions… According to Britain's attitude toward citizens of Europe, European people are not interested in manner of decision-making process. In short, we can observe in Britain's proposition continuation of elitist way of decision-making process especially if we notice that Britain government has stance that role of European Council should be stronger. With stronger European Council, implementation of decisions from above will be strengthened as well, which would be opposite to the French grassroots suggestion of decisions implementation. Europeans are very interested in how much things will their countries lose if, for instance, some laws pass and possibly endanger their tradition and culture. Those concerns of European people should be the most important thing for British officials because of sharing of fears with them toward the future of their nation states.

Blair clearly said that the important and common duties of nation state governments will remain in hands of national government, at least in the case of Britain: defense policy, taxes, foreign affairs, control of immigration, education, social insurance, but of course in co-operation with its counterparts until borders of national interests . Problems of environment, pollution, food safety, economy (common market), unemployment, national states, as they have already done, will continue to transfer to the European level, or the other things, which will be decided to relocate to the European level, because Europe can better manage with those things .

The next important thing is that that Britons government will not enforce its citizens to vote for single currency system. They are not in hurry, as Britons officials would say. They would like to see how it goes in other EU states, which have already accepted EURO and after that decision will be brought about single currency system implementation. Now, Britain officials are afraid of possible negative economic impact, which EURO, according to them, can get to the British economy.

2. FRENCH GOVERNMENT TOWARD EU INTEGRATION

France in European affairs took line that passes between Britain's inter-governmental approach, and German's pure federalist position. It government officials are for "Federation of nation states" , expression, which was founded by former President of European Commission, Jacques Delors. He proposed it just because of fear of losing unique French cultural products, language, tradition and heritage. There should be included things, which have been up-to-now exclusively right of nation states like system of education, social security, health … The same opinion has the President of French Republic Jacques Chirac: "Our states are the source of our identities and our sense of belonging. The diversity of their political, cultural and linguist traditions is one of the strength of our Union. In the future, too, the nation state will remain people's first point of reference." French officials as their British counterparts are gather around of Delors and Chirac's ideas of nation states exclusivity.

France would like to strength existing European institutions through visible community ? federal approach, but it stance is not pure federative as German's. As assistant organ of Council of Ministers, which should keep its executive and legislative power, they are suggesting creation of new one "European Federation Affairs" that should better organize meetings of European Council. According to them European Council should keep its importance in European decision-making process. Organizing of new chamber of European Parliament will be counterproductive because of, from one side, overlapping responsibility between European Council and European Parliament, and from the other, because of possible redundancy and bureaucratization of European institutions. In that sense, they are opposite to the British, especially for the reason that delegates of upper house should be representatives of national parliaments. About previous sentence, I will say something more in conclusion of this first part.

They are against strengthening of European Commission as executive body. It should continue its role as guardian of Treaties and to become real body of initiatives. Most important thing in Delors' perspective is organizing of "pioneer group" , which should work in the field of closer co-operation among states and that will be ready in some moment to make stronger unity based on the federative principle. Those states probably will be ones, or some of them, which have accepted EURO as single currency, or Schengen agreement. His expression I find very similar with Fischer's one about formation of "Core group" of countries.

France in European affairs is not supporter as well as Britain of delimitation of powers in Montesquieu's terms. Legislative, or executive powers in Europe are not clear divide between European Institutions. Council of Ministers has legislative and executive roles. As executive body, it overlaps quasi-governmental role of European Commission, and as legislative body role of European Parliament. Mentioned similarities, which I found between Britons and French stances were toward institutions arrangements. With previous sentence closeness between their attitudes finished. France agrees with Germany in some, real, and federative principles; joint action in organizing European police forces (Europol) that will intervene beyond national boundaries, with the co-operation with national police forces and European Union prosecutor; Eurojust; draft Constitutional text for European Union, and, what is most important, common currency system - EURO, which should be defense from inflationary, or any kind of economic insecurity from outside. Propose that separates position of France government toward Britain or German's approach is opposition of forming the second

chamber of European Parliament. Lesser role of European Council, and especially Council of ministers is very unacceptable according to French government's position.

Addition in French proposal would be perspective of Valery Giscard d'Estaing. "Europe was at the end of one process and the beginning of a new one." Reestablished Europe he does not see neither as federative state, nor as his government leaders think, as "Federation of nation states". He thinks that emphasis of nation states importance in this current sensitive situation where is Europe today is counterproductive and inefficient for future development. For him French preposition is too rigid to be accepted. He wants to reconcile those two ballasts with "Union of states managing federal power" . It should be based on the same foundation as Delors' proposed, monetary Union and the Schengen area.

3. GERMAN ATTITUDE TOWARD EU INTEGRATION

In comparison with British and French ones, German officials have prospects for almost final (Johannes Rau, Gerhard Schroder), or final (Joschka Fischer) federative arrangements for EU restructuring. I would like to start with those, which share similarities with French position. Gerhard Schroder, chancellor of Germany, is full of respect of nation states exclusivity and has almost the same vision as his counterparts from the France. According to him nation governments ought to be much more concern for defense of national prerogatives. He suggests that the role of European Parliament should be strengthened and to have sovereignty over European budget section as it exclusive right. EP's second chamber would become Council of Ministers as strong legislative body. More power, particularly executive will be got to the European Commission. Comparable vision has the President of Germany Johannes Rau. He explained that European federation must be established quite because of struggling against globalization and effective protection of nation state sovereignty and culture. He also agreed with the chancellor that Council of Ministers should have become second chamber of European Parliament. In his vision, he went beyond the Schroder's proposal and suggested powerful Commission president, which will be elected by both chambers of European Parliament.

Mentioned clear visions of German officials about federative order of EU are obscured by proposal of German Minister of Foreign Affairs, Joschka Fischer, which consists of a pure federative solutions. Fisher has clear vision of Europe with strong legislative and executive bodies, and with the federation president, who will have considerably small function in comparison with the role of nation governments in future European federation. The second chamber of European Parliament will be built on the principle of German upper house, where seat representatives of Landers; or it should be look as American Senate. Delegates from nation states parliaments will fulfill first chamber. Delegates from second one will be elected representatives of states. Lower chamber represents citizens of Europe, and the second one European states. Nation states will become very similar to German Landers, but with much greater role. Fischer thinks that only federation can preserve European peace and stability. He would like to keep axis Paris-Berlin in effort to make greater European integration. Fischer shares visions of Rau and Schroder that role of nation states should be secured and would like to imply in federation building term "Core group" , a center of gravity, which is quite comparable with Delors' "pioneer group". "Core group" would gather around states with similar vision of European federation and will become cohesion force for the others who will join some day in it. This group of states should be organized on Schengen agreement and single currency system, like d'Estaing has already proposed. Mutual responsibilities will define new treaty, which should be brought by "core group" participants.

4. EVALUATION OF THE MENTIONED PRINCIPLES

After mentioning of basic principles of European Union leader states one can conclude that in the Continent we have two very different approaches toward "finality" of Europe. Unofficial leader of those, which are supporters of intergovernmental approach for the EU integration, is Great Britain. It allies are Scandinavian countries, especially Denmark. Second, group of countries that are supporters of community approach in EU represent "Paris-Berlin axis". Their main allies are Greece and Belgium. First alignment is much more integrated then second one especially when we consider German and France proposals. Kostas Simitis, Prime minister of Greece, has a suggestion that can reconcile Germany and France stances. Namely, Simitis proposed that Council of Ministers must become upper house of EP, which is the German propose, too. From the other side, Greek Prime Minister has a similar view with French officials when he said that European Commission ought to have permanent Commissioners for EURO and CFSP, which is the German stance as well.

If we consider British position toward restructuring European institution or EU in general, we can notice very viable clashes between Britain, from one side, and "French-German's" axis, from the other. Stereotypes that Britons are pragmatist and conservative are correct if we include British's hesitation for entering in European Community (before De-Gaul's freezing of their application), their refusal to go into Schengen agreement, and their rejection of participation in single currency system. Furthermore, Britain's posture toward EURO is full of gratefulness, but this is its manifest opinion, though they do not want to participate in it. Latently, Britons are full of mistrust toward EURO. They are afraid very much of it negative impact on Britain's economic interests. Shortly, they are afraid of economic collapse. Considering EURO, we find deep and strong conflict between Britain's alignments and "Paris-Berlin axis" for which single currency system represent true shield from negative outside impact. Furthermore, for French and German governments, accurate fighters for sovereignty of states are those governments, which have accepted single currency system up-to-

now. This would be the first insoluble problem between those two centers of powers.

British government, as we might see, have counted certain number of things, which it is supporter of. In this counting, I would like to stress the importance of European citizens. British attitude is to bring them closer to the Europe. I notice ambiguities in British government stance. Tony Blair thinks that people of Europe are not interested in details about decision-making processes or how European institutions function, or on what way the president of European Commission will be elected. How European citizen will be closer to the EU when they do not know anything about, for instance, such important thing as decision-making process? My point is opposite. European public should know how their representatives in European institutions make decisions, especially when we consider that every important decision are made behind close doors without public debate and on a way, which is familiar with decision-making process of Communist countries in Presidium or in similar Committees without eyes of citizens even and other Communist party players. They are proposing strengthening role of European Council, which will mean continuation of making and implementing decisions from above. The exact opinion shares French government or even Greece government as well, though their officials are proposing grassroots implementation of decisions. That thing will be very questionable and create insecure and unstable position of "French-Berlin" axis because of German proposal for exclusive federative European order where European Commission and Parliament will be much more independent from European Council.

Next thing that I would like to stress is maybe more important than previous one. Every single Treaty was made by compromises between European counterparts. Nobody knows how that debate looked behind close doors, but everybody could see and hear that those debates were not easy. Obviously, nation interests of some country (countries) are ruined in some extent by proposing consensus. If we look in that way, we can be sure that the citizens of "ruined" state will be very opponents of that new idea or rule, and they will vote against it on the referendum or in parliaments. After all, we can expect further hesitation, and hard emphasis of nation state interests, but not an accent on common interests, which can wake up secret national feelings and bring Europe to the harsher consequences and real stalemate of European affairs. Pause of nation governments to make a step further in European integration (or hesitation to accept some new rule) fear enough public of states and they logically accepted the government direction because they feel much more safety if follow it.

A. EUROPEAN INSTITUTIONS

Europe should be settled on a way, how nation state institutions were formed. European citizens would like to see on European level structure of institutions, which are familiar to them. Why cannot we then transfer the base of national states (democracy) and their institutions to the European level? Real problem is that that Europe is not like nation states and Montesquieu's delimitation of responsibility on executive, judicial, and legislative bodies cannot be applied until taking place of general reestablishing of European Institutions.

a. EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND COUNCIL OF MINISTERS

Considering current place of European Parliament in Europe setting, I have to be close with French officials opinions about it. However, they are very right when they are speaking that EP are not "armed" with enough power to create common European laws, and especially to get European budget, as German attitude would expect of it. Then we cannot speak in favor of real legislative role of EP. Beside, decisions that MEP would like to accept first should be approved by European Councils, which represents real power in European setting. French government is against Britain and German's proposals for forming of second chamber. Britain stance is that that members of upper house should be representatives of domestic national parliaments because of necessary relation between national and European level as a barrier toward more inflow of democratic deficit. Role of parliaments, according to Britain, will not be overlapped but complementary. French cannot be for that suggestion because, first, of possibility of overburdening bureaucracy in EU. Second, European Council, and Council of Ministers would lose their previous roles, or part of those. Lesser task of European Council, as a supreme body in European affairs and position of Council of Ministers is very unacceptable to the French government. I agree with French plan especially because of the thing that delegates of national parliaments, first, are not much familiar with managing of European affairs (Primary, it was a responsibility of European Council and obligations of the others European institutions) and they already have their duties in domestic politics. With adding of more arrangements in the hands of representatives of national parliaments, it will lose much in managing of national affairs.

Johannes Rau and Gerhard Schroder proposed that Council of Ministers should become upper house of EP because it already has legislative function. Beside, representatives of Council of Ministers are representatives of their member states. With that, federative principle would be satisfied. In every federal state upper house is fulfilled by representatives of member republics. That plan French officials cannot accept as well as the previous one. Alongside strong European Council, they need strong Council of Ministers. Considering their attitude, if Council of Ministers would be bound only with legislative obligations it will lose its executive power. And it will be true. I think that in any case Council of Ministers should not be neither executive nor legislative body. Or it can be legislative, but it must not be anymore executive power. Overlapping of those mentioned powers can again recall undemocratic way of governance when were not clear distinctions between executive, legislative, and judicial powers. Using Council of Minister as legislative body, we do not have interests for EP. Same thing can be said for the European Commission's

quasi-executive power and overlapping responsibilities with, again Council of Ministers.

Second German's proposal for arranging of EP is Joschka Fischer's one, which is to rigid for nowadays relations between states. He proposes that upper house should be arranged and has a function like second chamber of German Parliament, where representatives of Landers have their place. From the other hand, it can be organized as American Senate. In current European situation, I cannot see any states, within or outside of block of federation supporters, which would accept "germanization" of European institution. Emphasize of German's state order in Europe would be more than counterproductive and can call again fears from the past.

From federative campus, Greece suggest Rau and Schroder's proposal, but Belgium supports principal of American Senate.

I would like to present my proposal for restructuring of European Parliament. Lower chamber of EP should be fulfilled by representatives, which will be elected on the democratic election as delegates in national parliaments. Upper house is necessary for great steps in stronger European integration. It is also important because of reconciliation between community and intergovernmental approach. Ministers responsible for European affairs from national governments will be part of second chamber of EP. On that way, state officials will have full control on legislative making process in EP. Council of Ministers will oversee law-making process until restructured EP take full control of legislative power.

b. EUROPEAN COMMISSION AND COUNCIL OF MINISTERS

Considering problems connected with European Commission, we can find many similarities in stances of main actors of European integration (with exception again of Joschka Fischer's proposal). Three governments agree that European Commission cannot be established as true European government. I have the same opinion since it is impossible to arrange twenty people to control European area. However, according to Nice Treaty momentary number of Commissioners (twenty) will not be enlarged, even, this number will be lesser after future enlargement, and possible twenty-seven members of EU.

Europe really needs executive power, which will be more independent of Council of Ministers, though Europe needs Council of Minister existence as well because of still strong intergovernmental approach.

For many think-tanks, Nice Treaty preposition of lesser number of Commission is alarming view as well as for the applicant countries. It is hard to believe that one of the old member states will lose its place in any European Institution. Their wish is to keep existing situation - every country should have its delegate in any European Institution, so, in European Commission, too. I have to agree with it because the main principle of EU was equality of the member states. Nowadays, six-states structure of EU (which is through years enlarged in 15) cannot go further with same arrangements. "Evaluative mechanism around the Commission, (the "engine"), the Council (representing the intergovernmental side), and the Parliament (which was responsible for monitoring the institutions). This system … now 'ground to a halt". French government proposes that in Commission must be place for permanent Commissioners for EURO and CFSP. This is very good idea, especially when we do not know who can represent European policy in world. Collective bodies certainly cannot do this.

I will add here propose of mine about European Commission. Commission should be strengthened and with certain numbers of Commissioners, who will not be representatives of the states but of the Europe. European Council should make list of possible presidents and the candidates of European Commission using qualified majority voting. Their designation will be made by joint session of two chambers of European Parliament after public debate. Number of Commissioners would not be equal with number of states. Here I agree with Nice Treaty decision. Commission ought to be European executive institution (or government). Until it full independence and strength, Council of Ministers, which should still have representatives as much as EU has member states, will supervise Commission in its work. After that, Council of Ministers will become an organ inside European Commission. On that way rising federalism that is represented by clear executive role of European Commission, would be reconciled with "selfish" demands of European states, which Council of Ministers represents.

ENLARGEMENT

After almost sixty years of "isolationist" policy toward countries that were part of former Soviet block, Western Europe (EU), first, after Cold War, and especially from the middle of 90s started to change its view toward eastern "outsiders". Laeken European Council brought identification of ten possible new comers in the EU: Cyprus, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, The Czech Republic, The Slovak Republic and Slovenia. Romania and Bulgaria will be encouraged and helped for more reforms. In that very brave leap forward, everybody sees chance for stability, democracy, and prosperity in whole Europe. European governments think that there will be no conflict and problems with immigration. Economic potential of EU will arise. According to Jacques Delors before enlargement are "three basic objectives: creating an area of peace; establishing a framework for sustainable development; maintaining the European model in a world threatened by increasing uniformity, by giving diversity proper place." Especially Germany works very hard in the favor of enlargement with motto "as soon as possible". Nevertheless, whole situation connected with this

historic event is not so ideal as one can think. There are many fears toward "barbarians."

Leaders of the old states governments are satisfied with enlargement because of widening of the market, cheap labor force, and possible increase of capital. However, they are very frightened as well: Can new comers really achieve high criteria for membership in EU? Do they have resources for economic stability, and social security? I have already explained increasing discontent of European people toward EU decision-making process. Same thing happened with enlargement process. National governments did not consult citizens about their wishes toward widening of Europe. As a result, we have Irish rejection of Treaty of Nice. Europeans are very worried about possible migration movements from the eastern countries to the Western Europe because, according to their opinion, new comers are cheap labor force. They are also worried about competition and employment/unemployment. Problem of European governments is how to manage with, from the one side, absolutely economic prosperity with widening of the market, and from the other, fears of citizens that their incomes now will be transfer to the less develop area of new member states.

After first announcement of enthusiasm, we can hear calm claims for enlargement. EU members agreed that none applicant country does not have secure "entrance ticket". Only "ticket" are implementing of reforms. New comers will be assessed separately and none political consideration will not be acceptable as entering ticket if technical requirements would not be fulfilled. Here we can find another problems, which EU members should deal with. Road in enlargement is irreversible, but EU must not let the applicants countries to wait. Promised things should be continued to their implementation. Only on that way, new participants will not fill like "occupation force", or even, as I have already said, "barbarians", who are threat for European security and stability.

Other problem, which European member states have already met, is disagreement of regions of states with future restructuring of the European funds that will, for sure go in direction of new comers. If we continue on the same manner, up-to-now important role of regions will not be strengthen. It will be quite opposite. Every attention will be put on the encouraging of transformation of new states, and parallel with this, their getting of more and more responsibilities in EU.

Applicant countries are very strong supporters of Europe because of their almost certain step further to the direction of greater economic prosperity, which is reasonable considering success of EU. New countries would like to take an important role and to become very respectful from the side of old members. They are proud as well of their culture setting, history, and tradition. In wider Europe they would not want to be countries of lesser importance, and are much more sensitive especially because of very recent establishment of their national identity, which were suppressed so long by the influence of Soviet Union. In enlarged Europe, applicants will not accept same treatment as they had under Soviet's during Cold War.

They struggle for acceptance as full-fledged member states transformed in visible resignation, which can be explained with contemporary picture of Europe made by Estonian minister of foreign affairs Toomas Hendrik Ilves: "small member states vs. big, new states vs. old, democracy vs. efficiency!" Small states fear that they will lose independence because of powerful and influential large states. From the other side, large countries cannot accept simple majority voting in European affairs because of too many small members, which will enter in decision-making boards and possible establish "tyranny of the majority".

New states need respect and equality with old ones, and old states see themselves as "chosen ones". Only "chosen states" can be masters of decision-making process, because of "greater efficiency", and overburdening bureaucracy. Small (new) states need democratic principle in that process. Those things are very viable now. If EU brings applicant countries closer to the European market and get them equal place in European policy, new comers will change mentioned ambiguity from above.

They are also disappointed because of Europeans eyesight on them that they are cheap labor force and possible immigrants to the western states. Applicants are saying that mentioned situation would not take place, as well as similar situation did not happen when Greece, Portugal, and Spain entered in EU. However, legacy of previous regime (Communist regime) is still visible especially if we take in account problematic socio-economic and political situation of applicant countries. Things started to change but facts are still strong.

It is out of question to make comparison between Greece, Spain, and Portugal with any other new applicants. First, when they enter in EC their industry potential was not ruined. They had clear market economy, very strong civil society and strong democratic tradition, though Greece, Portugal, and Spain had dictatorship regime. Second, EC in that time was not so strong as EU is today. Criteria for EC participation in that time were not as hard as they are nowadays. Beside that, EC sought strategic areas for widening of its influence. EC succeeded and become the greatest world "corporation". Third, in addition of East Germany, It was not pass through the painful process of transition because of great inflow of money from West Germany. Those things cannot be included in the destiny of new comers.

Applicant countries would like to prove themselves. They were trying to implement almost every sought demand, which came from EU side, especially those ones about economy, and socio-political security. It is questionable will those governments have enough supply to go further in reforms? Some of them would answer negative, like Lithuania, for instance. Lithuania knows that it will become member after next Intergovernmental conference, which will be held 2006.

However, what is the prize of enlargement for candidate countries?

Applicants established large scale of reforms. Up-to-now main product of their transition process is growing unemployment. Because of that, they desperately need to enter in the European market and to continue their connections with the western countries. For the reason that European Union has hesitated to encourage new comers with greater inflow of capital, statistical scale of European Union supporters in applicant countries decreasing. They look in EU as a selfish manager, as Lithuanian deputy of minister of foreign affairs Rytis Martikonis said, especially because of long-term accession. Long-term accession has created more problems for EU. EU did not support policy of reform enough in new countries. They were on their own. Now, when applicants spent almost all resources for implementation of European accession criteria, they seek for rebalance of funds. On that way, new countries will get more supplies than European regions. Because of that reason, regions, used to carriers of important role in EU affairs, raise their voice against new comers.

Everybody of applicants seek increasing role of EP. With its greater role, their place in European decision-making process would not be small. They need place for Commissioner in European Commission. Without Commissioners they will feel as colonies of Europe or satellites of Europe. Those opinions can very easy build a national sensitivity and create new blocks in European policy, which nobody needs. With suggestion of Commission restructuring, which was given by me, I think that problem of applicant countries will be solved.

New comers were not spending their energy in clearly explanation of community or intergovernmental approach. They did not want to support any of sides, but I think that they will feel much secure if they come closer to the idea of greater European integration. Small European countries in general do not need to be afraid of enlargement or greater integration of Europe. They cannot give as much as big countries should give to the table of Europe. With wider Europe, they will only get much security, in economic, cultural, but because of reason, which previous sentence gave us, with considerably smaller influence in EU decision-making process.

CONCLUSION

As we could see process of European integration comes before serious crossroad: will EU continue with old direction of intergovernmental approach, or with the new federative principle? However, supporters of both guidelines are staying on very tough position. We cannot find almost any important topic, which can maybe bring them closer. Their stances are too incompatible.

Treaty of Nice made some advancement. The most important thing is qualified majority voting, but it will not be implemented in the essential areas like CFSP, tax regulations, social security, policy on asylum … Four topics have leaved to be settled by next IGC: role of national parliaments; implementation of Charter of Fundamental Rights; simplification of treaties; delimitation of powers between EU and member states. I think mentioned themes are creators of new inter-states relations and European structure building in the future. I made that conclusion for the reason that European government officials are in opposition to one another just because of those topics, which are base of mentioned two approaches in fight: inter-governmental and community approaches.

Problems connected with role of national parliaments, and delimitation of powers between EU and member states were covered in upper text. We saw that European member states can agree in some extent, about national assembly problematic and delimitation of powers between EU and member states. Question of Charter, and simplification of treaties maybe look very unsolvable. Supporters of federation would like to implement Charter of Fundamental Rights as a preamble of future Constitutional text of European Union. That text would be exclusively legal but not a political. It will bring Europe together in federation whatever it name would be, and which is the most important, it will be obligatory for every single state. Countries supporters of intergovernmental approach that have Constitution in Continental meaning of that word cannot accept European one just because of thing, which previous sentence represents. They need only simplification of treaties, or text, which will be acceptable and understandable for common people, and will not have meaning of greater integration. It will be exclusively political, but not legal framework of EU policy. Treaties should strengthen same relations between states that already exist in current situation.

Great Britain agrees with explanation of European Constitution opponents. It officials can say something more in favor of opposition of constitutional approach. This would be connected with British legal tradition. United Kingdom does not have Supreme legal document like states of Franco-German cultural area have. Domestic "constitutional" order Britain's courts are arranging with great numbers of precedents. On the territories of British's cultural area was not done reception of Roman law like it finished in Europe after Renaissance or in the 19 century, especially after famous Napoleon "Code Civile" from 1804. Thus, Britain has completely different legal system, and its tradition cannot give permission to the Britain's government to change its legal framework. If we implement constitutional problematic together with question of Institutional rearrangements picture of EU will be much more obscured by dark clouds.

Because of unsolvable principles of European policy, governments inaugurate Convention, which should deal with Problems of national parliaments, delimitation of power, status of Charter of Fundamental Rights, and simplification of Treaties. Europe desperately needs that answers as it requests to be strengthen and secure. With the help of

Convention we will see, which road do we have to take; intergovernmental or community approach. In formed Convention good thing is that that alongside representatives of old member states, think-tanks, European Institutions, Union of workers, and so on, new comers have their representative in Convention meetings. Therefore, European public can hear their stances, and there are more then possible chances for them to implement their own wishes.

Here I would like to say something more about proposed center of gravity in European policy. "Federative states" are free to make between them closer co-operation, but as members of EU, possible participants in center of gravity can have lobby power in European institutions. Implementation of their solutions in that relation of powers will be very easy especially when we consider principle of qualified majority voting. Do supporters of inter-governmental approach ought to permit them, as new subject in EU affairs, to have same number of chairs in European Institutions under principle "one state, one chair", with possibilities that previous sentence gave us? Does "federative coalition" ought on gentlemen manner to choose between its allies certain number of representatives for EU, which would be lesser number then number of countries in that federative subject? However, federative forces can secure their unique places in European institutions with full right, but with full right Inter-governmental states can demand lesser number of them as well because of federative forces strength and possible hegemonic attitudes in decision-making process.

Fischer's "core group" and Delors' "pioneer group" can go further in stronger integration, which will be arranged, as they said, by mutual treaties. Their possible success in closer co-operation (federation) will encourage others to come in that quasi state. That group should encourage the hesitant countries to come in their building by good will. Supporters of inter-governmental approach after comprehensive evaluation of possible success of federative forces can start to make concessions even in the expense of their traditional domestic arrangements. However, Europe must continue in direction of stronger inter-states co-operation until its "finality" whatever the name of the "finality" would be.

RESOURCES

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/index_en.htm, last update, 24/3/02

1. National governments and parliaments

Official site

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/index_en.htm, last update, 24/3/02

EU member states:

Austria:

1. Speech by Benita Ferrero-Waldner, Austrian Minister for Foreign Affairs - The forthcoming discussion and decision-making process on the future of the European Union - an enquiry into the Future of the European Union - National Assembly, 20/06/2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/speech/sp200601_en.htm, last update, 24/3/02

2. Speech by Benita Ferrero-Waldner, Austrian Minister for Foreign Affairs of Austria - The Ministry of Foreign Affairs website - Vienna, 30/05/2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/other/oth300501_en.htm, last update, 24/3/02

Belgium:

1. Speech by Guy Verhofstadt, President of the European Council, at the European Parliament - Programme of Work of the Belgian Presidency of the European Union - Strasbourg, 04/07/2001

2. A vision of Europe - Speech given by the Belgium Prime Minister, Guy Verhofstadt, to the European Policy Center - Brussels, 21/09/2000

Ireland:

1. Speech by the Taoiseach, Bertie Ahern, on Ireland's EU relations and the Future of Europe debate - Monaghan, 29/11/2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/other/oth291101_en.pdf, last update, 24/3/02

2. Inaugural Statement by the Taoiseach, Bertie Ahern T.D at the National Forum on Europe - Dublin Castle, 18/10/2001

<http://www.irlgov.ie/taoiseach/press/current/18-10-01b.htm>, last update, 24/3/02

Germany:

1. "From Confederacy to Federation - Thoughts on the finality of European integration". Speech by Joschka Fischer at the Humboldt University - Berlin, 12/05/2000

2. Tuesdays for Europe" debate on the future of the European Union: record of the hearing of Joschka Fischer, German Minister for Foreign Affairs, at the French National Assembly's Delegation for the European Union, (open to all MPs and the press - Paris, 30/10/2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/offtext/doc301001_en.pdf, last update, 24/3/02

3. "Closely involving citizens and parliaments", declaration by the Federal German Chancellor Gerhard Schröder - 14/06/2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/contrib/contjuin2001_en.htm, last update, 24/3/02

4. Speech by Johannes Rau, German Federal President: "Unity in diversity - what political structure does Europe need?" - seventh European Forum, Berlin, 16/11/2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/speech/sp161101_en.pdf, last update, 24/3/02

France:

1. Franco-German declaration - Nantes (Bundesregierung / Présidence de la République), 23/11/2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/offtext/doc231101_en.htm, last update, 24/3/02

2. Extracts from a speech given by Jacques Chirac, President of the French Republic in the German Bundestag - Berlin, 27/06/2000

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/speech/spjune2000_en.htm, last update, 24/3/02

3. Exchange of views with French MEPs on the future of the European Union, French National Assembly Delegation for the European Union - Paris, 21/06/2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/contrib/cont210601_en.htm, last update, 24/3/02

4. Extract (the portion concerning Europe) from an address by Jacques Chirac, President of the French Republic, at a reception for Ambassadors - Paris, 27/08/2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/speech/sp270801_en.htm

5. Summary of the discussions of the conference on the future of Europe at the National Assembly - Paris, 07-08/11/2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/offtext/doc081101_en.pdf, last update, 24/3/02

6. "Tuesdays for Europe" debate on the future of the European Union: record of the hearing of Jacques Delors at the French National Assembly's Delegation for the European Union, (open to all MPs and the press), - Paris, 19/06/2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/contrib/cont190601_en.htm, last update, 24/3/02

7. Speech on the Future of an Enlarged Europe, Lionel Jospin - Paris, 28/05/2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/press/pr091001_en.pdf, last update, 24/3/02

8. "Tuesdays for Europe" debate on the future of the European Union: record of the hearing of the French National Assembly Delegation for the European Union, open to all MPs and to the press, of Hubert Védrine, Minister for Foreign Affairs - Paris, 09/10/2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/speech/sp280501_en.htm, last update, 24/3/02

9. "Tuesdays for Europe" debate on the future of the European Union: record of the hearing of Valéry Giscard d'Estaing at the French National Assembly's Delegation for the European Union (open to all MPs and the press). Guest: President - Paris, 23/10/2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/press/cr231001_en.pdf, last update, 24/3/02

Denmark:

1. The Danish Government's contribution to the debate on the future of Europe, 08/2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/contrib/cont0801_en.pdf, last update, 24/3/02

Greece:

1. Speech by Kostas Simitis, Greek Prime Minister, at the event "The future of the European Union and Greece" organized by the EKEM (Hellenic Center for European Studies) - Zappeio Megaro, 11/07/2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/other/oth110701_en.pdf, last update, 24/3/02

2. "Globalization and Democracy: The European Paradigm" by Yannis Papantoniou, Minister of National Economy and Finance of Greece, 18/05/2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/other/oth180501_en.htm, last update, 24/3/02

3. Speech given by the Greek Prime Minister, Kostas Simitis, on "Twenty years of Greek membership of the European Union - fifty years of European integration" - Thessaloniki, 31/04/2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/speech/sp310301_en.htm, last update, 24/3/02

4. "The Future of Europe: Economic and Social Cohesion in the enlarged Union", speech by Kostas Simitis, Greek Prime Minister, at the College of Europe - Bruges, 31/01/2002

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/contrib/cont310102_en.htm, last update, 24/3/02

Italy:

1. Speech by Carlo Azeglio Ciampi, President of the Italian Republic, Istituto di Studi di politica internazionale (institute of international policy studies) - Milan, 03/07/2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/speech/sp030701_en.htm, last update, 24/3/02

Portugal:

1. Speech by Jorge Sampaio, President of the Portuguese Republic, at the Scottish Parliament - Edinburgh, 14/02/2002

<http://www.presidencia-republica.pt/pt/cgi/noticias.pl?ver=discursos&id=748>, last update, 24/3/02

Finland:

1. Future of Europe - the Finnish Model", speech by Paavo Lipponen, Prime Minister of Finland, at the London School of Economics - London, 14/02/2002

<http://government.fi/liston/base.lsp?r=7429&k=en&old=717&rapo=2016>, last update, 24/3/02

Netherlands:

1. Memo by the Dutch Government on the future of Europe - Press release - 08/06/2001
http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/contrib/notenl_en.pdf, last update, 24/3/02

Sweden:

1. Speech by Prime Minister Göran Persson at the Humboldt University - Berlin, 18/10/2001
http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/speech/sp181001_en.htm, last update, 24/3/02

Spain:

1. Speech by Spanish Prime Minister, José María Aznar - Brussels, 09/10/2001
http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/press/sp091001_en.pdf, last update, 24/3/02

Luxemburg:

1. Benelux memorandum on the Future of Europe, 20/06/2001
http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/other/oth200601_en.htm, last update, 24/3/02

United Kingdom

1. Message from Tony Blair, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, 03/04/2001
http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/speech/sp030401_en.htm, last update, 24/3/02

2. Speech by Tony Blair, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom to Polish Stock Exchange - Warsaw, 06/10/2000
<http://www.number-10.gov.uk/news.asp?NewsId=1341&SectionId=32>, last update, 24/3/02

3. Speech by the Minister for Europe, Peter Hain, at a dinner hosted by the British Chamber of Commerce - Strasbourg, 04/09/2001
http://www.fco.gov.uk/text_only/news/spechtext.asp?5258, last update, 24/3/02

4. Speech by Peter Hain, British Minister for Europe, at the London School of Economics - London, 04/12/2001
<http://www.fco.gov.uk/news/spechtext.asp?5639>, last update, 24/3/02

5. "The Future of Europe: Time for a new vision", speech by Peter Hain, UK Minister for Europe, at the European Policy Center - Brussels, 29/01/2002
http://www.fco.gov.uk/text_only/news/spechtext.asp?5831, last update, 24/3/02

6. Lecture by the British Foreign Secretary, Jack Straw, Royal Institute of International Affairs - London, 27/07/2001
http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/other/oth270701_en.htm, last update, 24/3/02

7. "Britain's role in Europe", speech by Prime Minister Tony Blair to the European Research Institute - Birmingham, 23/11/2001
http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/speech/sp231101_en.htm, last update, 24/3/02

8. Speech given by Jack Straw, Britain's Foreign Secretary, at the launch of the Center for European Reform Pamphlet, the Royal United Services Institute - London, 11/12/2001
<http://www.fco.gov.uk/news/spechtext.asp?5670>, last update, 24/3/02

Applicant countries:

Bulgaria:

1. Initial position of the Republic of Bulgaria on the debate on the future of the European Union - February 2002
http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/bulgarie0202_en.pdf, last update, 24/3/02

Cyprus:

Opening address delivered by Ioannis Kasoulides, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Cyprus "Our Vision For The Future Of Europe ", launching the public debate on the future of Europe in Cyprus - Nicosia, 29/06/2001
http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/other/oth290601_en.htm, last update, 24/3/02

Estonia:

1. Constructing a New Europe - Lecture by Toomas Hendrik Ilves Minister of Foreign Affairs, Estonia at Humboldt University - Berlin 05/02/2001
http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/speech/sp050201_en.htm, last update, 24/3/02

Czech:

1. Contribution by Prime Minister Miloš Zeman of the Czech Republic to "The Debate on the Future of Europe" - 14/06/2001
http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/contrib/cont140601_en.htm, last update, 24/3/02

Hungary:

1. In the context of the "Tuesdays for Europe" debate on the future of the European Union: minutes of the hearing of Janos Martonyi, Hungarian Minister for Foreign Affairs, at the Delegation for the European Union of the French National

Assembly, open to all members of parliament and the press - Paris, 06/11/2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/offtext/doc061101_2_en.pdf, last update, 24/3/02

Latvia:

1. The European Union - the way it is and the way we want it to be by Indulis Berzins, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Latvia, 31/05/2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/press/pr310501_en.htm, last update, 24/3/02

Lithuania:

1. Speech by Rytis Martikonis, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Lithuania, at the colloquium "The Aims of European Union: Ideas and Concepts of the Candidate Countries" - Bonn, 16-17/11/2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/speech/sp171101_en.pdf, last update, 24/3/02

Malta:

1. "The Future of Europe: The Maltese perspective", speech by Hon. Dr. Edward Fenech Adami, Prime Minister of Malta - Floriana, 18/10/2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/speech/cont181001_en.htm, last update, 24/3/02

Poland:

1. Address of the Prime Minister of Poland, Jerzy Buzek, delivered to the Royal Institute of International Affairs - Brussels, 26/06/2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/other/oth260601_en.htm, last update, 24/3/02

Romania:

1. The talking points of the Romanian Foreign Affairs Minister Mircea Dan Geoana at the informal meeting - Genva, 09/09/2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/speech/sp090901_en.htm, last update, 24/3/02

2. Speech by the Prime Minister Adrian Nastase at a conference convened by the Belgian Prime Minister - Brussels, 26/06/2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/speech/sp260601_en.htm, last update, 24/3/02

Slovakia:

1. Presentation by Mikuláš Dzurinda, Prime Minister of the Slovak Republic: "The debate on the European Constitution, a Slovak view", at the Humboldt University - Berlin, 19/02/2002

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/contrib/cont190202_en.pdf, last update, 24/3/02

Slovenia:

1. Contribution by Dimitrij Rupel, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Slovenia, at the informal meeting of EU Foreign Ministers - Genva, 09/09/2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/other/oth090901_en.pdf, last update, 24/3/02

2. Contribution by Dimitrij Rupel, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Slovenia, 11/07/2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/other/oth030701_en.pdf, last update, 24/3/02

Turkey:

1. The Turkish Delegation's contribution, headed by Foreign Minister Ismail Cem, to the Debate on the Future of Europe, Royal Institute of International Affairs - Brussels, 26/06/2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/contrib/conturkey_en.htm, last update, 24/3/02

2. European Council :

1. Official site :

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/doc_inst_en.htm#ce, last update, 24/3/02

2. To mark the opening of the debate on the future of Europe, message from Göran Persson, President of the European Council and Prime Minister of Sweden, 07/03/2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/speech/sp070301_en.htm, last update, 24/3/02

3. Laeken European Council: Presidency conclusions - extracts, 15/12/2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/offtext/doc151201_en.htm, last update, 24/3/02

4. The Future of the European Union - Laeken Declaration, 15/12/2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/press/oth151201_en.htm, last update, 24/3/02

3. European Parliament

1. Official site:

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/doc_inst_en.htm#pe, last update, 24/3/02

2. "The Treaty of Nice. A failure which can only be remedied by means of an effective and properly implemented post-

Nice process" by Dimitris Tsatsos, European Parliament representative to the 2000 Intergovernmental Conference, 08/01/2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/contrib/doc080101_en.pdf, last update, 24/3/02

3. The summary of the meeting organized by the Committee on Constitutional Affairs at the European Parliament with National Parliaments of the Member States and Applicant Countries concerning the process of preparation for the future of the European Union within the framework of the evaluation of the Treaty of Nice - Brussels, 20/05/2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/offtext/doc200601_en.pdf, last update, 24/3/02

4. Article by Alain Lamassoure, MEP, in issue No 94 of the review "Commentaire" (summer 2001): What are the prospects after Nice?

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/other/oth000701_en.pdf, last update, 24/3/02

5. Speech by Nicole Fontaine, President of the European Parliament at the opening of the European Council of Ghent, 19/10/2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/speech/sp191001_en.htm, last update, 24/3/02

6. Contribution from the XXIVth COSAC to the European Council - Stockholm, 22/05/2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/other/oth220501_en.htm, last update, 24/3/02

7. Europe - more than just British humour, Greek goddess and Italian design" by Michael Ebner, Member of the European Parliament, 06/07/2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/other/oth060701_en.htm, last update, 24/3/02

4. Council of ministers:

1. Official site:

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/doc_inst_en.htm#cm, last update, 24/3/02

2. Declaration by the Council of the European Union - General Affairs - Luxembourg, 11/06/2001

<http://ue.eu.int/Newsroom/loadDoc.asp?max=1&bid=71&did=66759&grp=3552&lang=1>, last update, 24/3/02

3. Speech by Guy Verhofstadt, President of the European Council, at the Institute of European Affairs - Dublin, 06/12/2001

4. Javier Solana: Address to the WEU Assembly - Paris, 18/06/2001

<http://ue.eu.int/solana/details.asp?BID=107&docId=66955>, last update, 24/3/02

5. Other players in the debate:

Academic and think-tanks:

1. Official site:

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/conothbis_en.htm#att, last update, 24/3/02

2. Working Paper "One clear voting system for timely and effective decisions", European Policy Center - Brussels, 06/11/2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/other/oth061101_3_en.pdf, last update, 24/3/02

3. European Constitution drafted by 71 young European citizens from the fifteen Member States and the thirteen applicant countries, at the Convention of Young Citizens of Europe, ENSAM - Introductory memorandum - Cluny, 9-15/07/2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/other/oth150701_en.htm, last update, 24/3/02

4. Contribution to the Debate on the Future of Europe by Papadimitriou, Legal Advisor to the Greek Prime Minister and Member of the Charter Convention, 13/11/2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/speech/sp131101_en.htm, last update, 24/3/02

5. Europe and its Teleology: Is there a Central-Eastern Vision? - Iulia Motoc

<http://www.jeanmonnetprogram.org/papers/00/00f1001.rtf>, last update, 24/3/02

6. How, then, does one get there? An Institutional Response to Herr Fischer's Vision of a European Federation - Johan P. Olsen

<http://www.jeanmonnetprogram.org/papers/00/00f0901.rtf>, last update, 24/3/02

7. A Federation of Nation States or a Federal State? - Charles Leben

<http://www.jeanmonnetprogram.org/papers/00/00f0301EN.rtf>, last update, 24/3/02

8. Fischer's Move Towards a European Constitution - Klaus von Beyme

<http://www.jeanmonnetprogram.org/papers/00/00f0201EN.rtf>, last update, 24/3/02

9. Possible Futures for the European Union: A British Reaction - Helen Wallace

<http://www.jeanmonnetprogram.org/papers/00/00f0701.rtf>, last update, 24/3/02

11. The European Union as a Sovereignty Association of a Special Nature - M. Rainer Lepsius

<http://www.jeanmonnetprogram.org/papers/00/00f1201EN.rtf>, last update, 24/3/02

12. Who is Afraid of a European Federation? How to Constitutionalise a Multi-Level Governance System - Tanja A.Börzel and Thomas Risse

<http://www.jeanmonnetprogram.org/papers/00/00f0101.rtf>, last update, 24/3/02

13. Working Paper "A strong President for a strong Commission", European Policy Center - Brussels, 30/09/2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/other/oth300901_en.pdf, last update, 24/3/02

14. "The Dilemmas for the Future of Europe" by P.C. Ioakimidis, Hellenic Center for European Studies - December 2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/press/oth001201_en.pdf, last update, 24/3/02

15. Commentary by Peter Ludlow, Founder-Director of the CEPS (Center for European Policy Studies) on "2006 and Beyond", published in the series A View from Brussels - Brussels, 22/08/2001

<http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/contrib/cont220801.pdf>, last update, 24/3/02

16. The Laeken Summit - a Milestone for Europe", paper by John Palmer, Director of the European Policy Centre - Brussels, 16/12/2001

6. Committee of the regions:

1. Official site:

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/doc_instbis_en.htm#cr, last update, 24/3/02

2. Resolution of the Committee of the Regions on the results of the Inter-Governmental Conference 2000 and the debate on the future of the European Union - Brussels, 04/04/2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/offtext/doc040401_en.pdf, last update, 24/3/02

7. Other, civil society, NGOs and schools of thought:

1. Official site:

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/conothbis_en.htm#osc, last update, 24/3/02

2. ETUC's proposals on the future of Europe (Laeken) - Resolution adopted - Brussels, 10-11/10/2001

3. The Re-organisation of Europe: Law Making and Policy Making in an Enlarged EU by David Harrison, 05/10/2001

8. Political or public grouping:

1. Official site:

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/conoth_en.htm#po, last update, 24/3/02

2. Speech given by Wolfgang Clement, Minister President of the German Land of North Rhine-Westphalia: "Shaping - not administering - a new Europe - Allocation of competences within the European Union after Nice " - Humboldt University, Berlin, 12/02/2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/speech/sp120201_en.htm, last update, 24/3/02

3. Draft Text - Subject to final adoption by the PES Congress Security in Change - Berlin Declaration, 07-08/05/2001

<http://www.pes-congress.de/en/berlindeclaration.html>, last update, 24/3/02

9. Socio-Economic:

1. Official site

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/conoth_en.htm#se, last update, 24/3/02

2. "A stronger Europe: the View from ERT", a message from the European Round Table of Industrialists (ERT) to the Laeken Summit - Brussels, 04/12/2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/contrib/cont041201_en.pdf, last update, 24/3/02

3. Joint contribution from the social partners for the Laeken European Council - European Trade Union Confederation, Union of Industrial and Employers' Confederations of Europe, European Centre for Enterprises with Public Participation and Enterprises of General Economic Interest - Brussels, 07/12/2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/contrib/cont071201_en.pdf, last update, 24/3/02

4. Statement by the German Trade Union Confederation (DGB) on the organization of the debate on the future of Europe, proposals for the European Council of Laeken, 02/10/2001

http://www.europa.eu.int/futurum/documents/other/oth021001_en.htm, last update, 24/3/02

5. ETUC's proposals on the future of Europe (Laeken) - Resolution adopted - Brussels, 10-11/10/2001

10. Convention 1. Official site:

<http://european-convention.eu.int/default.asp?lang=EN>, last update, 24/3/02

11. Nice Treaty

1. Official site:

http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/nice_treaty/index_en.htm, last update, 24/3/02

2. Treaty of Nice

http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/en/treaties/dat/nice_treaty_en.pdf, last update, 24/3/02