

Europe

AN EMERGENT NATION?

Carl J. Friedrich

Things won are done; joy's soul
lies in the doing.

—SHAKESPEARE, *Troilus and Cressida*, I, 2.

The mode whereby the inevitable comes to pass is effort.

—OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES

Nous ne coalisons pas les Etats, nous unissons les hommes.

—JEAN MONNET



1817

HARPER & ROW, PUBLISHERS

NEW YORK AND EVANSTON

To the memory of
ADRIANO OLIVETTI,
seeker after community and beauty

Contents

Preface	xi
<i>Map—The European Community</i>	(facing page 1)
1. The Background of European Community	1
2. European Consensus and Community Structure: A Federal Potential?	24
3. The Business Community: Enterprises	47
4. The Business Community: Associations	69
5. The Agricultural Community	90
6. The Labor Community in the Factory and the Guest Worker	114
7. The Trade Union Labor Community	133
8. A Community of Communities: Grass-roots Integration	151
9. The Academic Community	175
10. Trends and Prospects	196
<i>Notes</i>	217
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	245
<i>Index</i>	251

Preface

It is now over forty years since Coudenhove-Kalergi published his *Panuropa* (1924), following upon his article in the *Neue Freie Presse* (Vienna) in 1922. Ever since then, I have been a partisan of European unification. This needs to be said so that the reader may know where my heart is. But as a student of European politics, my mind has watched the ups and downs, and the accumulation of knowledge has increasingly impressed me with the enormous obstacles in the way of the goal, no matter how desirable in itself. Even if politics is not merely the art of the possible, but at least at times the art of making the seemingly impossible possible, the skill and dedication of quite a few master-politicians from Briand and Stresemann to Schumann and Adenauer, not to mention those now at work in this stony vineyard, have been expended in achieving very limited results. Europe is moving—it is *en marche*—but the march seems at times more nearly at a snail's pace than at the required speed demanded by the problems Europe is facing.

Over the years, I have been impressed, and especially since the first Congress of Europe in 1948 which it was my privilege to attend, by how many nameless people of deep devotion have contributed to these results. All their doings will never be told. But it has seemed to me for some time now that the political implications of many of these small undertakings were increas-

ingly vital to the progress of the European Community toward a viable political framework. Many are the studies devoted to this framework and to the overall policies which have issued from these emergent institutions. But we have had relatively much less knowledge of the informal community growth which has set in since this framework was created. The increasing contacts between businessmen and workers, between farmers and journalists, and between universities and communes have accumulated a certain weight over the years; they have developed a momentum of their own which it seemed worth exploring in fuller detail than was readily available.

Hence I am very grateful that the Center for International Affairs and its director, my good friend Robert R. Bowie, were interested and willing to enable me to set up a rather extensive research project. This project is still continuing, and further studies are in the making. But five of them have been completed and were published in 1967 under the title *Politische Dimensionen der Europäischen Gemeinschaftsbildung*. They were authored jointly under my editorship by Richard Grauhan, at present a *Privatdozent* at the University of Konstanz; Karl-Heinz Neunreither, permanent secretary of two committees of the European parliament; Hans-Viktor Schierwater, deputy director of Haus Rissen (Hamburg); Henri Schwamm, Lecturer at the Institut des Hautes Etudes Internationales (Geneva) and a staff member of the Centre Européen de la Culture (Geneva); Dusan Sidjanski, Professor of Political Science at the University of Geneva. I have benefited greatly from their studies, as will be shown more clearly in the chapters to follow. Their studies were developed in accordance with a "research strategy" that involved all available techniques, but concentrated upon the kind of evidence which in modern literate societies usually provides more reliable clues to the actual behavior of social groups than attitudinal inquiries, even when reinforced by computer analysis of the results. All these studies concentrate as a primary focus upon the Franco-German relationship. But there are others now nearing completion, notably

a study of the migratory Italian workers by Stefano Passigli, a lecturer in political science at the University of Padua; a study by Rudolf Steiert of the German trade unions' reaction to the crisis of the Common Market; and a study of the French agriculturists' behavior toward European integration by Héléne Delorme Louët and Yves Tavernier, both of the Fondation Nationale des Sciences Politiques (Paris). The last will soon appear in French and an English translation is being prepared for the Center; similarly, the publication of Passigli's study is insured in Italian and an English translation is planned; Steiert's work will probably be published in German. Other studies are in the making, especially in the field of mass communications and on Franco-German intermarriage. We are also planning to extend this work into Benelux, Italy, and Great Britain. At the same time, related studies are being published by others, such as the one by Meynaud and Sidjanski on business interest groups.

A very large number of friends, colleagues, students, and officials have, over the years, helped me in developing and refining my thoughts and research on European integration. It would be both presumptuous and impossible to undertake their listing here. Many of them know better than I can say what they have contributed. My thanks to all of them is heartfelt. I should, however, acknowledge specifically the help of M. J.-R. Rabier, deputy director of the Press and Information Services of the CE and chairman of the International Political Science Association's Research Committee on European Integration, which is actively engaged in sponsoring work in this field. Special thanks are also due to my research assistant, Miss Edith Kaiser, and to my secretary, Miss Rosalind Cummings.

CARL J. FRIEDRICH

9. The Academic Community

The political role and significance of the academic community have not been recognized until recent years. One of the path-finding explorations in the field of the connection between education and politics was Charles E. Merriam's *The Making of Citizens*.¹ Yet it contained very little in the way of a searching discussion of the universities. His basic theme is that "the political society constantly seeks to develop and maintain its solidarity through the impression of its traditions upon young and old alike," and that "the fund of common memories is an important possession of the tribe or nation; its cohesive value is very large, and is never neglected in any system."² These and related positions involve, of course, the universities, nowhere more so than in Continental Europe. It is apparent, then, or ought to be that any community formation will presuppose a Europeanization of the academic community. The linkages which have in recent years been forged, especially between French and German universities, constitute therefore an important part of our general inquiry. They have been analyzed and the results of these researches will be presented in this chapter. But some introductory remarks about the setting of these partnerships deserve to be made before we do so.³

Universities were developed in the early Middle Ages; they constitute in many ways a distinctive feature of Western culture and have spread with its expansion. They can trace their ancestry to the Greek and Hellenistic academies, but received their distinctive form since the twelfth century. Fostered by the ecclesiastic authorities, they were at the outset not subject to the political authorities, but operated under papal charter. As such they were European in outlook; both professors and students came from different countries and conceived of themselves as citizens of the *civitas Christiana*, though the students organized themselves into broad groupings which were called *nationes* and are considered one of the roots of the later national sentiment and consciousness which was to divide Europe into warring camps.

The political authorities, however, soon seized the chance of establishing universities. The first such efforts were made by the emperor Frederick II, when he founded the University of Naples in 1224 to train men for his government service, and by Count Raymond VII of Toulouse, in connection with the Albigensian troubles. Although not at first successful, these attempts were followed by other princes after the decline of the secular position of the papacy: in the fourteenth century Prague, Cracow, Vienna, and Heidelberg were organized, as well as Copenhagen, Uppsala, St. Andrews, Glasgow, and Aberdeen. But these universities became truly instruments of the state only with the coming of the Reformation and the subsequent emergence of the national state. When that happened, their autonomy and academic freedom became controversial; eventually the professors were made public servants, and the university became primarily a "school of public administration" for state and church. The notion of the university as a self-reliant corporate entity was replaced by that of its being a public institution and part and parcel of the governmental apparatus. This they have remained in Europe down to the twentieth century; and the totalitarian regimes in exaggerating this function have converted the university into a training center, removing the research function largely to separate academies.

These familiar facts are recalled here only in order to remind ourselves that the universities were European first and national afterwards and that therefore the present trend points to a return to a former state of affairs.⁴ Such a return is now in full swing between the universities of France and Germany, and to a lesser extent between those of the other Common Market countries. But the European university community goes beyond that in some areas. Close ties have always existed between French universities and those of French-speaking Switzerland; and likewise between Germany and those of German-speaking Switzerland; German and Austrian universities have always been linked; and the connections between English and Scandinavian centers of higher learning, while not as intimate as the ones just mentioned, still have been significant.

Indeed, even at the height of cultural nationalism in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, there have of course always been extensive contacts. Mostly these were, however, of a highly esoteric, scholarly, and scientific kind; their political implications were strictly limited by the national framework and the official functions it imposed upon the university community. Only the rise of a new international, and more particularly a European, order has enabled the universities, professors, and students to rebuild a genuine European university community. This rebuilding has taken three forms: (1) overall European-wide organizations; (2) direct personal contacts and relationships; and (3) the establishment of partnerships by which two universities are paired, much as communes are paired, for mutual cooperation and exchange. We shall, in the following pages, first deal in a somewhat summary fashion with the first and second of these aspects, and then concentrate in greater detail upon the third because it provides a relatively stable and yet strictly academic setting for the development of a European outlook and behavior, political and educational.

First, however, a word concerning the Europe-wide student unrest. In a sense, it is a manifestation of a growing European academic community. But its political momentum would seem to be a result of the fact that progress toward a united Europe

has been too slow to satisfy the ardent idealism of youth in France, Germany, and Italy rather than a response to the European idea. Because the connection is, at present, rather difficult to disentangle, we shall leave this movement, as well as the issues of university reform, aside in this chapter. Leaders like Dutschke and Cohn-Bendit are, in their call for revolutionary transformation of constitutional democracy and its underlying economic structure, adversaries rather than protagonists of a united Europe. Even if their activities are not Communist-inspired, as some would have them, their utterances are so clearly built upon Communist slogans that they sound anti-European; they certainly are anti-American. The choirs which shout "Ho, Ho, Ho" by the hour could instead fill the air with "Europe, Europe, Europe." For it is certainly a revolutionary undertaking. But they do not, as French and German students were inclined to do in the early fifties, make bonfires of the boundary posts. Let us turn then to the more humdrum organizational activity. The organizational collaboration is carried forward partly on an official and governmental and partly on a university level. In connection with the first level, OECE and OCDE, as well as the Council of Europe and the three Communities (ECSC, EEC, and Euratom), have played a significant role; while on the second level, certain overall organizations, such as that of the Rectors of European Universities, have been pathfinders of new approaches. In all this something that might be called the "Europeanization" of university instruction is playing an increasing role. It leads into a discussion of the somewhat diffuse development of personal relationships.⁵

National governments themselves have, of course, in recent years promoted bilateral exchanges of students and professors; this is particularly true between France and Germany, especially since the conclusion of the mutual Friendship Treaty (1963) and the establishment of the Franco-German Youth Office (*Office Franco-Allemand de la Jeunesse*). The latter has promoted youth exchanges on a very considerable scale, not limiting itself to students, but including workers, artisans, and

many other categories.⁶ These activities are, to be sure, part of a worldwide movement of student and youth exchanges, promoted especially by the United States, but they have achieved a considerably higher degree of intensity between France and Germany than between other countries. The negotiations for a mutual recognition of study periods and degrees within the Common Market—and especially between France and Germany, which have been going forward and are near completion between these two countries—will remove one of the main barriers to such exchanges as far as students are concerned.⁷

OECE and its successor have taken the initiative in promoting student exchanges, including management courses for business administrators. Their primary interest has been the preparation of engineers and administrators for underdeveloped areas, such as Greece and Turkey. They have not been a significant factor in the field of main interest for us here, but there can be little doubt that the graduates of these courses develop a European outlook in the course of their studies.

The Council of Europe, after engaging in a number of activities such as setting up the *Fonds culturel*, in 1962 organized the Council for Cultural Cooperation (CCC) as an overall organization coordinating a variety of activities. Its approach is very broad and covers the humanities and social sciences as well as the natural sciences; it also concerns itself with developing a European civic education, that is to say, the problems involved in creating a European loyalty. Under a Cultural Convention, an overall organization has been established. It consists of delegations appointed by national member governments, three members of the Consultative Assembly, and the chairmen and vice-chairmen of three Standing Committees: Higher Education and Research, General and Technical Education, and Extracurricular Education (Sport, Adult Education, etc.). These Committees provide the recommendations for action. The section (*Direction*) of the Council of Europe dealing with instruction and cultural and scientific affairs serves as a secretariat to the CCC; it serves as the initiator of the various activities

undertaken. Considerable means are at the disposal of the CCC (1,500,000 Fr. in 1964) for the financing of its various programs. It has tackled fairly complex issues, such as the cooperation of universities throughout Europe. But although the CCC contributes its share to the development of a European university community, its action remains marginal due to the dispersion of its interests among too many nations and too many projects.⁸

The three European Communities, now merged in one organization, have engaged in considerable activities directed toward furthering the European academic community. Their activity is framed within the setting provided by bilateral agreements between the states composing the Community,⁹ many of which antedate the formation of these communities; they contain the usual provisions about exchanges of students, language instruction, recognition of degrees, and so forth; they have recently been enlarged to promote explicitly "European culture and the unification of Europe."

The most important of such bilateral agreements is, to be sure, the Treaty on Franco-German Cooperation (January 22, 1963), which has been most fruitful in the field of cultural, and more especially, university collaboration.¹⁰ It has provided a reasonably firm institutional framework for the whole range of academic relationships through organizing an office called Franco-German Youth Work (*Deutsche-Franzosisches Jugendwerk*). Presided over and directed by heads of government and foreign ministers, it has brought about monthly meetings of the key administrators of both sides for effectuating an ever-widening set of activities, especially of course exchanges, but also language instruction, adaptation of study programs and degrees, and so on. In this latter field, the *Conference of French and German Rectors* (see below) has been particularly effective in implementing the governmental policies, not only in carrying out governmental directives, but also in suggesting new approaches.

The Press and Information Service of the three Communities, now consolidated, has naturally been active in the field of cul-

tural cooperation. It is the same world of youth and student exchanges, of adult education, press and radio that has been stimulated by this Service, often in cooperation with one or another of the many organizations that have become active in the field, notably the European Association of Teachers (*Association Européenne des Enseignants* [AEDE]); round tables, discussion groups, and more or less extended visits to Brussels and the other centers of European activity constitute a large part of this work. Direct cooperation with particular universities and their institutes of European studies have of course also figured among its activities.¹¹ Of the 15,000 visitors to the Community's institutions, it is reported that nearly 4,000 were teachers and students. In 1964, of 12,676 such visitors, a considerably larger percentage, namely 5,233, were of the academic world.

Among these visitors, many are of an advanced academic standing; seminars and similar groups remain in Brussels or Luxembourg for several days, receive detailed instruction from specialists in the various offices, and return with a greatly strengthened understanding of the European community.¹² The presentations are permeated by the sense of an emerging community; they are frank and calculated to appeal to the professional standards of academic and critical inquiry. As Dr. Sidjanski has concluded: "The students, chosen among the best and the most knowledgeable, establish a real contact with European realities and gain from such visits a fuller documentation, and verify their impressions in some special field or start new researches."¹³ Naturally, Euratom, acting as an intermediary in many fields relating to its work, also contributes a good deal to the mounting sense of effective academic cooperation throughout Europe, but more especially within the Community of the Six.

A perplexing special issue is presented by the proposal that a European university be organized. This project was believed to have been authorized by Article 9.2 of the Euratom Treaty, which provides that "there shall be created an institution of university level. . . ." Indeed it seems to be definitely required.

Nonetheless, much controversy developed; experts were consulted and heard, committees of the CEE and of the CE were formed, and the eventual upshot of all the to-do was the virtual abandonment of these plans; at any rate, no positive decision has been taken. The many criticisms have led to the conclusion that "if the European university should be created, it should be an Institute, primarily for teaching and research in the social sciences and the humanities (*sciences humaines*) and not a vast multilingual establishment leading to the bachelor's and doctor's degree."¹⁴ Open to all Europeans and not restricted to the Six, it is hoped that such an institute would not duplicate the instruction in existing universities and established centers of European studies, but would limit itself to special types of European studies and research, preferably of an interdisciplinary nature. The declared willingness of the Italian government to take the lead in establishing a European university (at Florence) has, however, not been implemented by any effective action, even though the Council of Ministers of Euratom welcomed such an initiative (July 18, 1961). Six departments were then envisaged: (1) Law, (2) Economics, (3) Political Science and Sociology, (4) History, (5) Mathematics, (6) Physics, to be implemented by a department of Comparative Languages and Literatures, and one for Art History. But nothing has happened since, and it does not seem likely that anything will very soon, unless outside (American) initiative enters the field. Nor does it seem necessary. The very pattern of interuniversity cooperation which has been developing suggests that in due course all universities and other academic institutions of higher learning will become European in outlook and methods of operation. To these methods of cooperation, other than actual partnerships, we now turn.¹⁵

There is a great deal of spontaneous private activity in the field of academic cooperation between European universities and their personnel. We can of course offer only some selected aspects of all these activities, but they are symptomatic for the development of a European university community. They may

be divided into three major sectors or levels: (1) general cultural relations, (2) European academic associations, and (3) the Europeanization of higher education in the institutions of the Common Market. These three implement each other, and an intensification in one sector is apt to be paralleled by comparable intensification in the others.

General cultural relations are being cultivated by a number of organizations and institutions, notably the Center for European Culture (CEC), the Committee for Civic Education, the European schools,¹⁶ the European Bureau for Popular (Adult) Education, the European Association of Teachers (AEDE), the International Center for European Education (CIFE), the International Federation of Europe Houses, and others.¹⁷ They address themselves to distinct and different phases of education and culture and thus supplement each other, the Center for European Culture having a sort of coordinating function. Some go well beyond the Common Market area, or even Europe. Their work is much influenced by an ideological commitment to the unification of Europe, and in most cases is handicapped by the lack of adequate funds.

There is no particular reason for reviewing the activities of these several cultural organizations here.¹⁸ They are part of the broad movement for European cooperation and eventual unification. Many of them are directed by deeply committed men and women who find in these organizational activities an outlet for their determination to see a united Europe come into being. There are, of course, among them many shades of opinion as to how such unification is to be achieved and about all the questions that go with the perplexing issue of the best way to federalize the European order. They have their ramifications in the academic world in many different ways: university teachers participate in their boards and administrative setups; students frequently do the same or utilize the programs in connection with their studies. All told, many thousands of the European intelligentsia are sharing in these enterprises and substantial sums are being expended in their multifarious activities. It is a

highly pluralistic world, not free of some bitter personal rivalries and petty jealousies, but in their entirety constituting the avant garde of the wide sweep of advance toward a free and federal Europe.

It is within this context that the efforts of a more strictly academic type must be seen and evaluated. Unless that is done, a misleading impression of academic primacy would be created. As a matter of fact, the universities and university-like institutions of higher learning have been rather slow in responding. They have been, certain specialists excepted, conservatively reserved in their interest. Only since the coming into being of the Common Market have they become more active.

The discussion of the academic dimension of European community formation falls into three parts: (1) overall organizations, (2) special institutes, and (3) *jumelages* or partnerships. Our discussion will be primarily concerned with these last undertakings, but the other two deserve at least brief sketching of their range of activity.

Among the overall organizations, a prominent place must be accorded the quinquennial *Conference of European Rectors and Vicechancellors*. It grew out of an effort to implement the Brussels Pact (1948) which called for cultural exchanges; and its growth parallels the progressive enlargement of European unity: the creation of the Western European Union (WEU) in 1954 precipitated the establishment of the Conference after repeated conferences and colloquia held in England, France, the Benelux countries, and Italy in the early fifties. The search was for a common policy for European universities, stressing the autonomy, if not the independence, of the universities, as it had been traditional in England. From the first Assembly (Cambridge, 1955) to the most recent one (Göttingen, 1964), these assemblies, reinforced by meetings of a continuing committee of the WEU, the Committee of West European Universities and its secretariat, have dealt with very general problems in a consultative way. Since 1962, a Standing Committee of the Council of Europe, the CESR (*Comité de l'Enseignement*

Superieur et de la Recherche) has collaborated closely with the Conference. At Göttingen they set up a permanent organization with its own statutes; these stressed in their preamble the ancient tradition of the free university throughout Europe and its importance for the moral, social, and economic future of Europe. Its permanent seat is Geneva; the rector of the University of Geneva was elected president. The organization of the Conference is typically federal and based on the equality of the universities, not of the nations to which they belong, with the majority being constituted by the 102 rectors of the universities of the Common Market countries: 6 Belgian, 25 French, 35 German, 27 Italian, and 9 Dutch; to these should be added the 2 Greek and 7 Turkish universities, since the two countries are associated with the Common Market, making a grand total of 111. EFTA countries (and their associate, Finland) provide 60 rectors: Austria 7; Denmark 4; Finland 3; Great Britain 30; Norway 4; Portugal 3; Sweden 2; and Switzerland 7. There are also included 2 Icelandic, 4 Irish, and 11 Spanish universities. It is evident that an Assembly, meeting only every five years and producing very general directives, which are then "applied" or "implemented" by a permanent committee in which each country is represented and which also contains seven members elected at large as well as the president and the prospective host rector—that is, in all, more than 25 members—cannot hope to come to grips with concrete problems of university cooperation.¹⁹

For this reason and because of the need of closer Franco-German cooperation within the Common Market, a special *Conference of French and German Rectors* has come into being which since 1958 has taken the lead in intensifying interuniversity cooperation. It is, like the larger body, somewhat handicapped by the brief tenure of a good many of the rectors, notably the German ones who traditionally serve for only one year, though this is in process of being changed under new university laws.²⁰ Nonetheless, good work has been accomplished, especially in the fields of exchanges of professors, stu-

dents, and the assimilation of programs of study and degrees as mentioned above. They, more particularly, recommended the establishment of *jumelages* between the French and German universities, in light of the initial successes, and adopted a charter for such partnerships in 1962. There can be little question that in spite of the great difficulties in assimilating higher education in the countries of the Common Market, real progress has been achieved.

The other overall organization on a university level, the *Association of Institutes of European Studies* (AIEE), had perhaps best be treated in terms of some of these institutes themselves.²¹ They have undertaken a good deal of research as well as instruction, and have addressed themselves to the training of personnel for the various European offices and organizations as well as of diplomatic and business cadres.²² They offer graduate and postgraduate instruction, mostly in economics, political science, and law. A large part of them are integral parts of a university or other institution of higher learning. Wherever they exist, they naturally become centers from which European community sentiment spreads into other parts of the university. Some of them, like that at Nancy, stress the broad historical and cultural givens and refuse to concern themselves with the immediate tasks of European unification; others—the majority—are frankly committed to these tasks, though usually stressing their neutrality vis-à-vis the rival programs of “federalists,” “functionalists,” and others. Challenges like those presented by the policies of General de Gaulle have caused sharp controversies at times, but have on the whole been stimulants rather than deterrents of research and writing on the problems of Europe.

In 1951 and at the instigation of the Center for European Culture, these institutes organized and have in the years since developed, as just mentioned, the Association of Institutes (AIEE), which now counts about thirty members, about half of which are French and German. The Association serves as a clearing house, seeks to coordinate activities—with rather

limited success—and more recently has sought to foster some joint research. The presidency has rotated among directors of these institutes and has been serviced by a general secretariat located at Geneva (at the Center for European Culture). It publishes an annual volume which gives a fairly good idea of the overall activities of the institutes and the problems which concern them.²³ To the extent that the AIEE and the institutes which it comprises succeed in developing joint research themes (at present the reaction of pressure groups to the crisis of 1958 is being studied), it may contribute considerably to the development of the European academic community.

Besides these organizations on the professorial level (and there are others, such as the *Association for the Development of European Political Science*,²⁴ founded in 1964), we find a proliferation of student organizations. In 1965 the six student unions of the Community organized themselves into the *Unions d'Etudiants de l'Europe des Six*. Like the Conference of the Rectors, this body is actively concerned with the harmonization of degree and admission requirements as well as the problems of university reform. Besides this semiofficial body, numerous discussion groups have come into being, often university-wide, and are engaged in all the usual and typical student activities, from working groups to social evenings. Where dormitories have been built—and such housing facilities are becoming more numerous all the time—study groups are likely to spring up, especially where the students themselves are in control, and such study groups are intermittently focused upon the problems of European integration. This in turn leads to trips and excursions to the main centers of European activity; the EC alone received over 5,000 students. The writer himself conducted such an excursion in 1965 within the scope of his seminar and was greatly impressed with the readiness of the authorities at Brussels to meet with and explain to the students the work of the EC and related activities; the same happened in 1964 and 1966 at Strasbourg when such an excursion led us to the Council of Europe. Student and faculty initiative implement each other

in these encounters. Another broadly based student association is the *Union des Associations Européennes d'Etudiants*, brought into being on German student initiative in 1961, and having strong roots in Belgium and Italy as well.

As a final point to this survey, mention may be made of the steady increase in both courses and seminars, as well as in dissertations dealing with problems of Europe.²⁵

Turning now to the more particular problems of and observations on the partnerships (*jumelages*) of pairs of European and more especially French and German universities, it needs to be said at the outset that it has proved very difficult to assess them in terms of their political implications. Even the elementary data are difficult to ascertain.²⁶ These data show that of 25 such partnerships existing in 1965, 14 were Franco-German ones, while only 4 were with British universities, 4 with non-European ones, and 1 with a Yugoslav university. In addition to formal partnerships, 14 officially sanctioned relationships (*rapports*) existed of which some were with American (1) and Spanish (3) and British (1) universities: these relationships may, of course, come to resemble partnerships rather closely. Partnerships (*jumelages*) are formally organized and institutionalized systems of cooperation through professorial and student exchanges, within the framework of official receptions and other kinds of ceremonial acts; they resemble the partnerships (*jumelages*) of cities and towns (*communes*) described in the previous chapter; as there noted, they often parallel them, as in the case of Montpellier and Heidelberg. The list of such *jumelages* or Franco-German university partnerships includes the following: Aix-Tübingen; Bordeaux-Hamburg; Clermont-Ferrand-Cologne; Caen-Würzburg; Dijon-Mainz; Grenoble-Freiburg; Lille Münster; Lyon-Frankfurt; Lyon-Karlsruhe; Montpellier-Heidelberg; Poitiers-Marburg; Rennes-Keil; Rennes-Erlangen; Toulouse-Bonn; there exist also five doubtful ones, which can be left aside here.

It is curious that the Italian universities have been so uncooperative, as have been the Belgian ones; for this indifference

contrasts sharply with the attitude of the general public in these countries, as well as their associational and political activity. In both respects Belgium and Italy have been in the forefront of European integration. The situation calls for more detailed investigation. There are some indications that it may in part be related to the same causes which explain the weakness of political science until very recently; but it may also be caused by cumbersome and antiquated university organization, as highlighted by recent strike and protest movements among the students who are very active in France and Germany where university cooperation and community formation have been flourishing. It is more likely that the lack of funds, repeatedly mentioned by Sidjanski in reporting his interviews, has a great deal to do with it. Certainly the Franco-German Youth Office has helped a good deal by assisting professors and students interested in forwarding university cooperation between the two countries.²⁷

Turning now to some of the effective Franco-German *jumelages*—the doubtful ones are discussed by Sidjanski with great candor²⁸—we find that they present a fairly uniform pattern. In a number of cases, such as Dijon-Mainz, Lyon-Frankfurt, Montpellier-Heidelberg, the *jumelage* between the universities parallels one between the two cities, and in all these cases they clearly reinforce each other. The author can confirm the interview and questionnaire data reported by Sidjanski from personal experience as a “participant observer” at Heidelberg. Obviously, the resources of a municipal administration available for representative functions significantly reinforce what the universities can do. At the same time, the prestigious position of the academic world lends a certain glamour to the partnership of two communes (see preceding chapter).

It is very difficult to assess the political implications of these undertakings. The multiplication of professorial and student exchanges, of longer or shorter duration, and the holding of joint conferences and extended discussions undoubtedly contribute toward reducing the national egocentricity in the aca-

demic establishment of both countries. This is not without value, since both French and German universities have been veritable fortresses of national sentiment, and if there ever is to emerge a European nation, its spirit will have to conquer these strongholds of past preoccupations with national culture, values, and beliefs.

Any realistic appraisal of the present situation suggests, however, that progress has been very slow. Is this "cultural lag" really to be wondered at? Long after the more venturesome spirits had abandoned scholasticism, it still held sway in the universities; during the English Revolution, both Oxford and Cambridge strongly inclined toward the royal cause; the unification of Germany found its most vocal advocates outside the universities, the majority of which remained faithful to the established order of the princely states. These cases are symptomatic; it would be easy to multiply them. In the process of forming new communities, the academic establishment tends to be rather conservative. It certainly is proving itself to be so in contemporary Europe. Even so, Sidjanski is probably right when he concludes his study with the assertion that the characteristic features of the academic and cultural relations which the *jumelages* have fostered "justify, in our view, at least to a considerable extent, the employment of the term 'European university community' (*Communauté universitaire européenne*)."²⁸ He adds the caution that this is an emergent community (*communauté naissante*).

The *jumelages* are based upon a formal act, as mentioned before. The text of agreement between Cologne and Clermont-Ferrand may serve as an illustration. It was adopted by the Council of the University of Clermont-Ferrand on July 3, 1962.

- A. The two universities will sponsor such *conventions de jumelage*, already concluded or to be concluded between its institutes and faculties.
- B. They agree on the following procedures for their *jumelage*:
1. For the duration of the *jumelage* (partnership) each university will:

- a. designate a delegate of its council (senate) who is to watch over the relations of the two universities;
 - b. make efforts to provide in their budgets the sums necessary for putting the agreements into effect.
2. Each university will communicate to the other all useful information concerning changes in their teaching personnel.
 3. They will make an effort to assure the professors of the sister university decent lodging, while they are on visit.
 4. They will reserve, in student dormitories, suitable lodgings for assistants sent by the institutes, faculties, or universities so twinned.
 5. They will reserve, at appropriate times, in such dormitories a suitably calculated number of rooms for the lodging of students of the twinned university.
 6. They look forward to establishing fellowships for this *jumelage*.
 7. They will encourage encounters of athletic groups.
 8. They will exchange annually reports of the rectors . . . especially such as evaluate the concrete results of this collaboration.
 9. During the *jumelage*, delegations of the Council and Senate of the two universities shall meet, at mutually agreed upon dates, in common assembly in order to exchange opinions on the progress and possible extension of the *jumelage*.
 10. Each university shall address once a year to the deans of the faculties of the twinned universities, and in both languages, a summary report about the outstanding facts of its development during the preceding year.
 11. The two universities will organize together university weeks prepared by a harmonization of both teaching and research involved.
 12. The adoption of this agreement of partnership shall be made the subject of a notification to the governments concerned.
 13. A solemn meeting is to be organized at the start of the *jumelage* which will permit informing the public.²⁹

Signed by the two rectors, this and other like agreements show how the *jumelages* are conceived. Let us now see how they have in general worked out.

The overall record is not as impressive as it might be. Sidjanski found that only four of the *jumelages* listed above are really developed to any large extent, and among these only Frankfurt-Lyon actually is being carried forward without any formal agreement of the kind just reported. The reason given by the administration at Lyon, when interviewed, was that it seemed unnecessary to formalize such a relationship, that this did not appeal to the informality of the French—surely an astonishing argument to an American or even a Britisher. Certainly the French propensity to carry all manner of contracts, including international treaties, into the most minute detail would suggest that the kind of general language in which the typical *jumelage* agreement is cast would seem rather to run counter to this French propensity than to any dislike for formalism!

The three most active *jumelages* are, besides the one just mentioned, Heidelberg-Montpellier, Freiburg-Grenoble, and Aix-Tübingen. In all four of these we find regular exchanges of professors and students, more informal visits of groups of students, exchanges of information, and so on. We also find that all of them are somewhat handicapped by the French professors' lack of knowledge of German and a recurrent reference to the obstacles created by the differences in educational program and preparation of the students. But in spite of these obstacles there is also a general sense of satisfaction and a belief in the value of these enterprises, at least for the time being. One cannot help but wonder, however, if in course of time, and in case of the stabilization of good Franco-German relations, these *jumelages* will not be superseded by a more broadly dispersed mode of exchanges. Academic life and scientific specialization being what it is, there seems to be no particular reason why teachers and students in different fields should necessarily complement each other in two universities, nor would it seem that the political implications of such interuniversity relations would be reinforced by that kind of dual localization. At the same time, a certain measure of institutionalization is undoubtedly proving helpful in the beginning phase; that would appear to be the

reason for the Conference of Rectors taking such a vigorous stand in support of the establishment of *jumelages*.

There are a few specific experiences and observations, which I believe germane to our overall concern in this analysis, to be drawn from the more detailed report of Sidjanski.³⁰ Taking first the problem of who took the initiative for it, one notes especially that the *jumelage* between Heidelberg and Montpellier had its origin and is receiving its continuing drive from student interest, curiously enough centered in the faculty of medicine. Montpellier claims to be the earliest medical school; more important, it remains one of the best in France. Whether that had anything to do with the fact that the oldest German university sought a close lien with it is hard to make certain of. It has become the "founders' myth" of this relationship. By contrast, the *jumelage* between Frankfurt and Lyon owes its existence to the devotion and enthusiasm of particularly interested professors in the respective linguistic fields. In the case of Aix-Tübingen, the *jumelage* between the universities appears, to all intents and purposes, to be a consequence of the *jumelage* between the two cities and has grown up as an implementation of it—precisely the opposite of Heidelberg-Montpellier, where the partnership of the universities has brought one between the cities in its train. It is clear from these four cases that the origin of such partnerships is neither uniform nor particularly revealing: they seem to occur in the sequel and as part of the generally favorable atmosphere created by the Common Market. These *jumelages* are clearly not the pathfinders of integration, but the result of it.

Even so, and more particularly in view of the unique position of the university in German intellectual life, the development of these *jumelages* ought not to be underestimated. That only a few are at present very active is natural enough; in this respect the university community does not differ from the other realms of community life we have been examining. Innovations are the work of the few in the very nature of things.³¹ Nowhere is the freedom of man at once so irrepressible and so elitist. Our de-

tailed inquiries have shown and support with adequate evidence that in the words of some interviewees, "colleagues have become friends." Whereas in the past, invitations to lecture and participate in conferences were rare between French and German universities, they are now the order of the day. Similarly, encounters between students of the two neighboring nations have become part of the routine of a considerable number of universities, and the establishment of lasting friendships, and indeed marriages, are becoming habitual. The latter is, according to accepted sociological findings, one of the most important indicators of community formation, assimilation, and the lessening of social distance associated therewith.³²

It is in turn rather significant that *jumelages* are most frequent in the European Community, and within this Community between French and German universities. Indeed, as Sidjanski discovered, they constitute two-fifths of the total. And as he observes, this quantitative result is reinforced by a more detailed inspection of the intensity and the quality of the contacts. Observers have, often in a spirit of mockery, spoken of a love affair between France and Germany. This expression is very misleading and unconfirmed by detailed inquiries into the mutual attitudes.³³ It is particularly inept in the university field; for the detailed interview data presented by Sidjanski show that these contacts were approached by both sides with a great deal of reserve, sophistication, and indeed scepticism. In the course of them, however, many surprising discoveries were made, often of a strictly scholarly and scientific kind, and these discoveries extended to the personal and family life of both faculty and students. Hence instead of a love affair, the relationship institutionalized in these *jumelages* or partnerships has many of the characteristics, psychologically speaking, of a conversion rather than a love affair. It more particularly was and is no romantic *coup de foudre*, but the men involved in it exhibit some of the convictional rigidities of the convert.

If Sidjanski rightly insists, at the conclusion of his study, that the institutionalized and stabilized relationship, which the

jumelages represent, enables us to speak of the beginnings of a European university community, one should add that his investigations do not permit any conclusion as to their political implications. Some French and German professors, too numerous to list here, have played leading roles in the movement for integration, as have professors of other European universities; others have, on the contrary, been among the most vociferous critics and sceptics, such as the late Pieter Geyl. Similarly, student groups have been in the forefront of the forces pushing toward European integration, but they have always remained a minority; and a large majority have remained indifferent, if not hostile. In France, the vociferous presence of a strong Communist contingent has combined with a substantial following of de Gaulle to strengthen these voices of doubt and even opposition; in Germany, the widespread desire for the reunification of the country has not only taken precedence, but has worried many, lest European integration prove an insurmountable obstacle to German reintegration. Partnership among the universities more than, but along with, the creation of a European University Center may prove a decisive factor in coping with these deep-seated reluctances of the academic community to abandon the familiar haven of national culture and community in which they have for so long played the central role.