

The Lothian Foundation Origins and a brief history

Established in October 1986, the Lothian Foundation has remained loyal to its original aims which are to educate the public in the problems and ways of achieving better relations between the peoples of the European Union, and between them and other peoples, particularly those of the United States. In pursuing these aims the Foundation has followed a programme of activities focusing on the the history of the federal idea and the economic and political consequences of the creation of a European Federation.

In particular, the Foundation developed its activities demonstrating that federalism is not alien to British political thought and tradition, as generally believed. Indeed, it was Winston Churchill who in June 1940, during the Nazi occupation of Europe, offered to merge British sovereignty with that of France. This move was made possible because there was widespread support in Great Britain for the Federal Union, the first European federalist movement organized on a popular basis, with 270 branches all over the country and 15,000 members. The writings by such distinguished representatives of British culture, as Lord Lothian, Lionel Curtis, Lord Robbins, Sir William Beveridge, Barbara Wootton, Lord Lugard, Arnold Toynbee, Henry Wickham Steed, James Meade and Harold Wilson were seminal in the creation of federalist movements in Germany and Italy, where Helmuth von Moltke, Altiero Spinelli and Ernesto Rossi played a significant role in the Resistance.¹

The acceleration of the process of European unification also brought the European issue to the top of the political agenda in Great Britain. On more than one occasion -- and particularly on 16 May 1989, on the occasion of the Second Lothian Memorial Lecture, delivered at Chatham House by Lord Plumb, then President of the European Parliament – the Foundation found itself at the centre of public attention for being identified as the powerhouse for the rebirth of the federal idea in Great Britain. The media gave wide coverage to reports of the lecture, identifying the Foundation as the catalyst of a policy which produced a split within the Tory Party over Europe: with Mr Heath, Lord Plumb and Mr Heseltine on one side, and followers of the Bruges Group on the other. In offering a distinguished platform to Conservatives leaders strongly opposed to the European policy implemented by Margaret Thatcher – the Inaugural Lothian Memorial Lecture had been given always at Chatham House by the Rt. Hon. Edward Heath, MBE, MP, on 3 November 1987 – it became manifest to the large public of a deep fracture, within the party leadership, regarding the strategy to be followed towards the European unification process. It was no coincidence that the European elections that followed a month later recorded an historical defeat – the first since the raise of Mrs Thatcher to power – of the Conservative party, placing Mrs Thatcher on the incline that within 18 months led to her definitive exit from the scene, which opened the road to Maastricht and the creation of the euro. It was no coincidence that Mrs Thatcher fell on European, and not home affairs, confirming the primacy of foreign on internal affairs.

Although primarily involved in academic research, the mission of the Foundation is to carry on the work of the 11th Marquess of Lothian, Philip Kerr, who played a crucial and sometime controversial role, at critical turnings during the first half of the twentieth century, in the attempt to promote international peace through some applications of the federal idea.

¹ Andrea Bosco, “Lothian, Curtis, Kimber and the Federal Union Movement, (1938-1940)”, *Journal of Contemporary History*, 23 (1988): 489-94; id., “Lord Lothian e la nascita di Federal Union (1939-1940)”, *Il Politico*, 48, 2 (1983).

I. Origins

The idea of establishing a Lothian Foundation was first proposed on 1 July 1986 at the Italian Institute in London. The occasion was the launching of the book *Lord Lothian. Una vita per la pace*, edited by Professor Giulio Guderzo of the University of Pavia. The book contains the Italian version of the proceedings of the Lothian Colloquium, an international Conference held at Bedford College, London, in November 1982, to commemorate the work and figure of Lothian, on the occasion of the centenary of his birth.²

Lothian's thought and action were the expression of that historic process which transformed the European system of states into a global one, dominated since 1945 by the Atlantic System. Lothian was one of the few Britons who clearly understood the direction of that process as soon as it began to show its first premonitory signs during the course of the First World War, and who tried to promote a progressive solution, identifying in the federal government the political formula necessary for the growing interdependence of industrial production and the maintenance of peace.

Having taken an active part in the process of South African unification during the initial years of the century, and having tried in vain to transform the British Isles and the Empire into a true and real federation through the Round Table Movement, Lothian, as Private Secretary to Lloyd George during the Paris Peace Conference, was one of the architects of the Versailles settlement. He opposed the French plan to divide up Germany, introducing the clause for Allied disarmament, planning the solution of the mandates, defending tenaciously (against Churchill's strivings) non-intervention in Russia, and introducing the Anglo-American Treaty of Guarantee to French North-Eastern frontiers, precursor of the Brussels Treaty and NATO. The American withdrawal suddenly took away the central pillar from that structure and induced Lothian to abandon active politics for a decade in order to dedicate himself to the study of international politics, rethinking the writings of Alexander Hamilton, John Jay and James Madison, discovered in South Africa fifteen years previously. It was in this period that Lothian developed his federalist conception of international relations through a series of conferences and occasional articles in the *Times*, *Manchester Guardian*, *Christian Science Monitor*, *Observer*, and *Round Table*.

Lothian took up active politics again after 1930 when he entered the House of Lords, developing his action in four directions: steering the constitutional process in India towards Dominion status, the formulation and implementation of the strategy of appeasement towards Germany, the creation of the Federal Union Movement, and the strengthening of Anglo-American co-operation towards the creation of the Atlantic System. Although he was not involved in the exercise of governmental power, but only in the 'moulding' of public opinion, Lothian nevertheless made a fundamental contribution to the events which brought about the new Federal Constitution in India in 1935, the replacement of Eden and Vansittart with Halifax and Cadogan at the head of the Foreign Office in 1938, the birth of the Federal Union in 1939, the Destroyers for Bases Deal in 1940, and the Lend-Lease programme in 1941, which brought the United States into a *de facto* semi-belligerent condition.

Until now British historians have not paid much attention to the work carried out by Lothian in the period between the two wars and have completely neglected the study of his political thought. It was above all for ideological reasons and religious bias that Lothian was not forgiven for having theorized a political doctrine – federalism – that even to this day is not universally accepted in Great Britain; for having been a principal exponent of appeasement – still almost universally considered a capital sin – and a member of the so-called 'Cliveden Set'; for having allowed himself to be

² Giulio Guderzo ed., *Lord Lothian. Una vita per la pace. Atti del Lothian Colloquium. Londra 23 novembre 1982* (Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1985).

converted to Christian Science by Lady Astor, thus leading to a ‘wasted’ death, just at the time he was Ambassador in Washington in 1940; and finally for having speeded up the alienation of India, that most precious jewel in the crown.³

The establishment of a Foundation was therefore seen as the ideal way to honour the memory of a pioneer of federalism who has been sadly neglected in his own country and to carry on his work. The aims of the Foundation were to promote the study of certain aspects of the history and theory of international relations arising from Lothian’s work and influence, viz. a) the problem of international anarchy; b) the history and theory of the federal idea and supra-national organisations; and c) relations between Britain, continental Europe, the Commonwealth and the United States in the XXth century. Specific activities were proposed: i) an annual Memorial Lecture; ii) a programme of conferences and seminars; iii) the award of scholarships; and iv) various publications.

These proposals were given serious consideration by the scholars present at the meeting of 1 July, and during the summer efforts were made to find the necessary funds to finance the undertaking. A promise of financial help was made by some private individuals. It was also suggested that the Foundation might be attached to and administered by an existing institution working in the field of international relations and the ideal candidate seemed to be Chatham House, which administers a Lothian Memorial Fund given by friends of Lothian in 1943. A meeting was therefore called on the 29 October 1986 at the Italian Institute, with Professor Guderzo in the chair, to discuss the next steps towards establishing the Foundation. It was decided to set up a Working Committee with the task of establishing the Foundation within the next seven months. The Committee was composed of academics and private individuals interested in the creation of the Foundation; membership was then left open.⁴

The tasks of the Committee were: a) to draft a statement of aims; b) to decide on the affiliation of the Foundation; c) to raise a substantial capital fund; d) to organize the first Lothian Memorial Lecture; and e) to elect the Council of the Foundation. It was decided that the structure of the Foundation should be as simple as possible: a Council with a Chairman, Director, Secretary, and some active members. This Council should include a number of academics acting in advisory and editorial capacities, and representatives from sponsoring bodies. However, activities were limited by the funds available and therefore: a) an annual Lothian Memorial Lecture; and b) publications on a

³ Essential bibliography: J.R.M. Butler, *Lord Lothian (Philip Kerr) 1882-1940* (London: Macmillan 1960); Andrea Bosco, *Lord Lothian. Un pioniere del federalismo (1882-1940)* (Milan: Jaca, 1989); David Reynolds, *The Creation of the Anglo-American Alliance, 1937-41: A Study in Competitive Co-operation* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1981); id., “Lord Lothian and Anglo-American Relations, 1939-40”, *The American Philosophical Society*, 93, 2 (1983); id., “Lothian, Roosevelt, Churchill and the Origins of Lend-Lease”, *The Larger Idea. Lord Lothian and the Problem of National Sovereignty*, John Turner ed. (London: The Historians’ Press, 1988); John Pinder, “Prophet not without Honour: Lothian and the Federal Idea”, *The Round Table*, 286 (1983); Kenneth Ingham, “Philip Kerr and the Unification of South Africa”, *The Larger Idea* cit., 20-32; Gerard Douds, “Lothian and the Indian Federation”, *The Larger Idea* cit., 62-75; Rhodri Jeffreys-Jones, “Lord Lothian: Ambassador ‘To a People’”, *The Larger Idea* cit., 77-91; Ira Straus, “Lothian and the Anglo-American Problematic”, *The Larger Idea* cit., 124-135; Stefan Schieren, *Von Weltreich zum Weltstaat. Philip Kerr/Lord Lothian Weg vom Imperialisten zum Internationalisten, 1905-1925* (London: Lothian Foundation Press, 1995); David Billington Jr., *Lothian: Philip Kerr and the Quest for World Order* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2006); Priscilla Roberts, *Lord Lothian and Anglo-American Relations, 1900-1940* (Danvers, MA: Dordrecht, 2010).

⁴ Mr Richard Lamb was appointed Chairman of the Committee and Mr Terence Bishop convenor. Members appointed were: Dr Andrea Bosco (University of Pavia), Dr Valerie Cromwell (University of Sussex), Dr Rüdiger Görner (University of Surrey), Prof. Giulio Guderzo (University of Pavia), Prof. Luigi Vittorio Majocchi (General Secretary of the International European Movement), John Pinder (President of the Union of European Federalists), Dr Roy Pryce (Director of the Federal Trust for Education and Research), Dr David Steeds (University of Wales), Dr John Turner (University of London), Dr Helen Wallace (Chatham House), and Dr David Weigall (University of Cambridge).

self-financing basis were to be given priority.

The first meeting of the Working Committee was held on 5 February 1987 at the School of Oriental and African Studies, London. The Committee agreed that the first priority should be the organization of the Inaugural Lothian Memorial Lecture as part of the Chatham House programme. Given that it would be appropriate for the inaugural lecture to encompass Lothian's federalist thinking, it was agreed to approach the Rt. Hon. Edward Heath. It was also agreed that, if possible, organisational support for the Foundation should be provided by the Federal Trust for Education and Research.

The second meeting of the Working Committee was held on 28 May 1987 at the National Liberal Club, London. It was agreed that the Foundation should be attached to and administered by the Federal Trust, a charitable organization. The Foundation was to be managed by a Council, appointed for an initial period of three years by the Federal Trust on proposals put forward by the Working Committee. This Council should operate in collaboration with the Federal Trust but retain autonomy in decision-making. In the meantime the Hon. David Astor, Michael Ancram, Henry Hodson, Sir Charles Kimber, and Lord Gladwyn accepted the Committee's invitation to serve as patrons of the Foundation. At the beginning of July 1987 the Foundation was ready to start its activities.⁵

II. The Lothian Memorial Lectures

Chatham House, founded in 1921 by Lothian and Lionel Curtis, with the generous patronage of the Astors, proved the ideal place to baptize the Foundation. A great European, Heath gave a thought-provoking lecture at Chatham House on 3 November 1987, entitled "European Unity over the Next Ten Years: From Community to Union". A distinguished audience of over 360 (with forty participants obliged to stand in a nearby room) gave a warm welcome to Mr Heath's speech in support to the case for closer European unity. "The interest shown in the establishment of the Lothian Foundation in 1987", Mr Heath opened, "is an indication of the immense interest in the United Kingdom in the future of the European Community. Lord Lothian had a charismatic effect on my generation at Oxford in the late 1930s and on our thinking, whether we were Conservatives, like myself, or whether we belonged to another political party. We owe him a great debt for his contributions to the development of the European Community and to the development of thought in the Community". "We in the United Kingdom", Mr Heath concluded, "have got an enormous responsibility. Our place is in Europe. Our policy must be European. We are friends and allies of the United States as Europeans, and that is basic. But we must no longer try to ride both horses at the same time, for as we will increasingly see, we have no influence economically, militarily or politically on the United States. These are realities. We must face them and make a success of the power we can use, which is that of Europe".

Mr Lamb, in his introductory remarks, stressed the impetus given by the University of Pavia to the establishment of the Foundation and the fact that it is an Anglo-Italian venture. Lord Gladwyn, in his vote of thanks, said of the speaker: "A leading characteristic of Edward Heath is that he has a

⁵ Mr Richard Lamb was appointed Chairman, Mr Terence Bishop Hon. Treasurer, and Mrs Judy Keep Secretary of the Foundation. Members of the Council were those of the Working Committee and Prof. J. Mordaunt Crook (University of London), Dr Michael Dockrill (University of London), Dr Gerard Douds (Worcester College), Prof. Kenneth Ingham (University of Bristol), Dr Anthony Lentin (Open University), Dr Roger Morgan (European Institute, Florence), Prof. John Roberts (New England College), and Ira Straus (Association to Unite Democracies) were added.

world outlook – a conception of the world which is lacking in the great majority of his fellow politicians in this country and elsewhere. Moreover, he has the ability to express this in most cogent terms, which I deeply appreciate”.

Professor Luigi Vittorio Majocchi expressed the gratitude of the University of Pavia to Mr Heath for “his extremely clear and highly stimulating lecture”, and to the Lothian Foundation and to Chatham House for making so successful a gathering possible. Prof. Majocchi explained why Italian federalists feel very indebted to Lothian and the British federalist tradition. He recalled the role of Altiero Spinelli in his battle for a more solid European democracy, and supported the case for a European referendum to coincide with the next European elections. In this referendum national governments should ask their electors whether they favour giving a constituent mandate to the European Parliament empowering it to draft a Treaty establishing the European Union. “Politics”, Prof. Majocchi concluded, “is the art of making possible what is necessary. I believe that a European referendum is necessary. Its feasibility depends on the attitudes of the national governments. It is a democratic struggle. We continental Europeans, especially those liberated from Nazism and fascism by Britain in the name of democracy, hope sincerely that the British will again remind the Europeans of this just democratic cause. My wish is that, in the next two years, we continental Europeans will be offered a new opportunity to be grateful to your country”. The text of Mr Heath's lecture has been published in *International Affairs* and reprinted as a pamphlet.⁶

The Second Lothian Memorial Lecture was given by Lord Plumb of Coleshill, President of the European Parliament, at Chatham House on 16 May 1989 on “Building a Democratic Community: The Role of the European Parliament”. The lecture was given at a particularly interesting moment in the political life of the Community and of the United Kingdom. For the first time European issues were assuming an importance usually reserved for domestic affairs. This reflected the growing popular realisation that Great Britain was an integral part of Europe, and that what happened in Brussels and Strasbourg was of vital importance to British national well-being. The issue of sovereignty, so central to Lothian's concerns, was moving to the centre-stage of British political debate.

Introducing Lord Plumb, Richard Lamb paid tribute to the commitment of the speaker to “an ever closer union of the peoples of Europe”. The essential aim of the Treaty of Rome echoed the fundamental beliefs of Lothian, and Parliaments' efforts to further this goal were to be warmly welcomed. “There have always been two driving forces behind the European idea”, began Lord Plumb, “idealism and pragmatism”. Idealism “stemmed from the experiences of world war and from those who were determined to establish a system of binding co-operation among the states of Europe that would make conflicts between them inconceivable”. Pragmatism “stems from the growing interdependence of our countries and the need to find common problems”. This process itself has produced a vicious circle: “common solutions to problems create greater interdependence requiring more common solutions”. Speaking about Lothian, Lord Plumb said: “Among those who made an important contribution towards developing this ideal was Lord Lothian, to whom we pay tribute today. Paradoxically his work is perhaps better known on the continent than in his own country. He was an outstanding political thinker and writer and a great public servant, without whose contribution the movement towards European unity would not have been the same”.

The Community is, according to Lord Plumb, neither a classical international organization nor a fully-fledged federation: “In certain limited but important fields, sovereignty has been pooled and exercised jointly – but not surrendered. In those largely economic areas we act through a joint and

⁶ The lecture has been published by *International Affairs*, the quarterly journal of the Royal Institute of International Affairs, London, 64, 1, (Spring 1988).

therefore stronger sovereignty. As a result, Community law overrides national law in the fields to which it applies. This gives all of us the guarantee that what member states have agreed jointly will be applied equally throughout the Community. The Community has long since gone beyond the stage of sovereign states co-operating with each other. Its principal achievements would have been impossible without this pooling of sovereignty. Yet the Community is still some way from becoming a federation". Lord Plumb concluded: "We have come a long way. We have come further than many have realised in terms of working together on common problems through common institutions with limited but important powers. The level of responsibilities that now falls upon the Community is such that it is essential to ensure that its powers are used effectively and democratically. In this the European Parliament has a major role to play. There are still potential benefits to be reaped by going further down the road we set out upon in creating the European Community. These benefits would not be at the expense of national identity even though they would require the joint exercise of sovereignty in certain important though limited areas. Provided it is limited to the areas where it is justified and provided it is subject to efficient and democratic procedures, we should not hesitate to take further steps down this road".

Rising to propose a vote of thanks at the end of the lecture, Christopher Tugendhat, former European Commissioner, and at the time Chairman of Chatham House, underlined the importance of Lord Plumb's statement. A methodical enumeration of the practical powers of the European Parliament and examples of how these powers contributed positively to the better governing of the Community were sorely needed at a time of intense debate over the future of the Community. In contrast to the usually friendly language of co-operation in which Anglo-American relations were discussed in public debate in Britain, the language of conflict and antagonism too often marred political discussion of European affairs. The Second Lothian Memorial Lecture, Tugendhat said, redressed the balance by finding the right tone of honest enquiry and objective reporting when dealing with the democratic deficit and Parliament's role in compensating for it.⁷

The Third Lothian Memorial Lecture was given in July 1991 by Sir Anthony Meyer, MP, at the London School of Economics on "Great Britain and European Unification". Sir Anthony will be remembered for the prominent role which he played in Mrs Thatcher's fall as Prime Minister in 1990, a process that had begun with his own unsuccessful challenge in the 1989 leadership contest of the Conservative Party.

Remembering Lothian as "one of the truly far-seeing statesmen of our century", Sir Anthony recalled his first meeting with Lionel Curtis: "Curtis was an astonishing man; as the historian A.L. Rowse (no blushing violet himself) put it, Curtis believed himself intolerably to be a prophet; what made him tolerable was that he was warm hearted and lovable. Certainly I can vouch for the magnetic effect which he had on an impressionable adolescent". Curtis's ideas on federation were, in many respects, "rather different from the notions which most of us who call ourselves federalists today normally entertain". As one of the more liberal minded of the early federalists put it, "Curtis saw federation as God's will and as a vehicle for extending the *Pax Britannica* by way of an Imperial federation to which ... he was prepared to admit lesser breeds if they conformed to Anglo-Saxon good manners". What a gulf divides us from the men of the thirties".

"The European Community", Sir Anthony remarked, "is miles from being a true federation; it is even more miles removed from the kind of white brotherhood envisaged by Curtis. But it *is* European, it *is* a sort of a kind of a federation, and it *works*. And, what is more, it is the only sort of a federation of distinct national states which exists". Those "who believe that federalism of one sort

⁷ The lecture was published in *World Affairs*, monthly journal of the Royal Institute of International Affairs, 65, 7, (July 1989): 112-17.

or another offers the best chance of so limiting national rivalries that they can never burst out into armed conflict must regard the EC, not as the solution to all our problems, but as the most solid building we have in the construction of a better and safer world”.

Speaking about the role the United Kingdom should play within Europe, Sir Anthony said: “The area above all others where Britain should have a vital contribution to make is in the matter of democratic control of the Community institutions; making the European Parliament more effective, and getting national parliaments to work better together. But, in fact it is here that Britain failure has been the most spectacular”.⁸

III. The Lothian Conferences

Set at the foot of a hill at the top of which is Arundel Castle, New England College provided the location for a very successful Inaugural Lothian Conference on the 19-20 May 1988 on “Lord Lothian and the Federal Idea: A Critique of National Sovereignty”. The aim of the Conference was to trace the contributions made by Lothian and Lionel Curtis to the British federalist tradition, the Indian constitutional process, and the birth of the Federal Union.

It had emerged that in the history of British federalism Lothian and the Round Table were the link between imperial and international federalism, i.e. the Imperial Federation League and Federal Union. Lothian started his public life as a Milnerite imperialist. Until the Great War his political background consisted of the Round Table, which was the heir of the Imperial Federation League. After the war he was primarily involved with the Rhodes Trust and the Royal Institute of International Affairs. He ended his public life in London by taking a leading part in shaping Federal Union, and in Washington as the architect of closer Anglo-American co-operation during war and peace. Lothian worked out a political doctrine to show that only with a federal system could co-operation be stable and lasting. He then regarded federalism as a form to fill with a historic content: the Atlantic democracies. The Round Table enabled Lothian to grasp the meaning of the experience of the Imperial Federation League, to adapt it to the changing political conditions of the British Empire in the twentieth century and to bring it to its logical (if logically extreme) conclusions: the political unity of the English-speaking peoples as the nucleus of a world federation. Federal Union was then regarded by Lothian as the heir of the Round Table, in direct line of succession from the Imperial Federation League. The proceedings of the Conference have been published by the Historians Press.⁹

On the afternoon of the 19 May participants paid a visit to Arundel Castle, where the Duke of Norfolk – a relative of Lord Lothian – very kindly gave a reception. Michael Ancram — present Marquis of Lothian – was the guest of honour and gave a much appreciated speech after dinner. Mr Ancram said that at the moment the process towards European unification was marking time. Despite the arrival in 1992 of a Europe without frontiers for people, goods, and capitals, those responsible for the development of Europe lacked the vision of the great architects and the spirit of the pioneers. The problem lay in finding common answers to common problems in those spheres which are no longer subject to mere national control, but to do so without building up a centralized

⁸ The lecture was published in *The Annals of the Lothian Foundation*, 1 (1992).

⁹ Papers were presented by Andrea Bosco (University of Pavia) on “Lothian and the British federalist tradition”; Deborah Lavin (University of Durham) on “Lionel Curtis, Lothian and the pursuit of the federal idea”; Gerald Douds (Worcester College) on “Lothian and the Indian Federation”; Ira Straus (Association to Unite Democracies) on “Lothian and Federal Union Movement in the United States”; and John Roberts (New England College) on “Lothian and the development of Federal Union Movement in the United Kingdom”. Turner, *The Larger Idea* cit.

European government which would suppress the national traditions and represent the richness of European culture.

The Second Lothian Memorial Conference was held at the Royal Holloway and Bedford New College (University of London), on 3-5 April 1989. Its theme was “The Federal Idea: The History of Federalism from the Enlightenment to 1945”. The conference was held under the auspices of the Fondazione Luigi Einaudi, the Department of History of Royal Holloway and Bedford New College and the Dipartimento Storico-Geografico of the University of Pavia. An international group of speakers presented papers emphasizing the connection between the development of federalist theories since the 18th century and the political conditions under which these theories emerged.

The study of the development of federalism from the Enlightenment to 1945 analyses the formation of ideas and behaviour which emancipated federalism from being, to use a Kantian expression, a simple idea of reason, to becoming the content of an historical process: the overcoming of the nation-state, i.e. the modern political formula which institutionalizes the political division of mankind. To write the history of federalism is therefore to trace the thin line which runs from the cosmopolitan element of the French and American Revolutions to the process of European unification taking place now.¹⁰

Three stages have been identified in the development of the federal idea, all of which correspond with three cycles of European history. During the first, from the French Revolution to the First World War, federalism is used to give expression – even if only a Utopian one – to the values of European civilization denied by nationalism. During the second, from the First World War to the Second World War, federalism offers a criterion by which to understand the European crisis. The third, which is taking place now, is characterized by the fact that the application of federalism is necessary to resolve the European crisis.

If federalism found its conceptually articulate expression in Kant – who, as Luigi Vittorio Majocchi pointed out, expressed better than anybody else the value of federalism, i.e. peace – it was only with the American Constitution and its application to the unification of that sub-continent that federalism was able to show a new character and potential. As Lucio Levi has shown, it was Alexander Hamilton in particular, in his *Federalist Papers*, who turned the American Constitution – a political compromise between the parties at the Philadelphia Convention – into an institutional model, thus defining the structure of federalism. From then on, federalism entered into the field of juridical and political thought.¹¹

¹⁰ The proceedings of the Conference are published in the volume *The Federal Idea. The History of Federalism from the Enlightenment to 1945*, Andrea Bosco ed. (London: Lothian Foundation Press, 1991), with essays by Luigi Vittorio Majocchi (“Actualité de l’analyse Kantienne à propos de la paix” and “Nationalism and federalism”), Lucio Levi (“The *Federalist Papers* and the choices before the American people”), Ellis Katz (“The development of American federalism, 1763-1865”), Bruce Collins (“American federalism and the sectional crisis, 1844-1860”), Thomas Daffern (“The etymology of federalism and the dissemination of federal ideas in Europe”), Rüdiger Görner (“Constantin Frantz and the German federalist tradition”), Ferdinand Kinsky (“The impact of Proudhon and the personalist movement on federalism”), John Pinder (“The federal Idea and the British liberal tradition”), George Boyce (“Federalism and the Irish question”), Michael Burgess (“The federal plan of the Imperial Federation League, 1892: Milestone or tombstone”), Martin Ceadel (“Supranationalism in the British peace movement during the early twentieth century”), Deborah Lavin (“Lionel Curtis and Indian dyarchy”), Cornelia Navari (“The origins of the Briand plan”), Ralph White (“The British response to the Briand plan”), Richard Lamb (“The Briand plan and Austro-German customs union”), Daniela Preda (“Le débat fédéraliste dans le Royaume-Uni entre les deux guerres”), Andrea Bosco (“Federal Union, Chatham House, the Foreign Office and Anglo-French union in Spring 1940”), Ira Straus (“Clarence Streits revival of the federalist strand in American history”), Sergio Pistone (“Altiero Spinelli and a strategy for Europe”), and Luciano Bolis (“La constitution du Movimento Federalista Europeo”).

¹¹ Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and John Jay, *The Federalist: (A Collection of Essays, Written in Favour of the New Constitution as Agreed upon by the Federal Convention, Sept. 17, 1787)*, 2 Vols. (New York: 1788).

During the nineteenth century, however, federalism did not display its character and potential, because it had only been realized in dead corners of the main stream of history, where exceptional historical circumstances have kept men sheltered from the most serious consequences of conflicts among classes and nations. The federations of the nineteenth century have been socially premature since the social conditions within the states and the divisions among consolidated nation-states prevented the growth of a sense of community and cosmopolitanism, which constitute the fundamental elements of federalist behaviour.

During the last century, federalism did not have a unitary, comprehensive and positive theory, because the pre-condition for the formation of a theory of this kind was the existence of independent federalist behaviour, and it had not yet developed. Experience only revealed some uncertain and subordinate federalist datum and data of other kinds, and there were only two possibilities: either to interpret these data without thinking of fixing a criterion for relating federalism with the values, the institutions, the historical course and human condition, and attributing to it, in the cultural domain also, the subordinate role which it had in the society; or overcoming the experience and trying to grasp its global sense and to finish in utopianism, for the detachment of the thought from the reality.¹²

The first trend manifested itself within the British Empire and the United States, without contributing significantly to the development of the Hamiltonian theory of the federal government. The second federalist trend developed in continental Europe, where federalism took on a utopian character, but nevertheless made a fundamental contribution to the understanding of nationalism and the centralization of power. Having understood the character of the nation-state, Proudhon, Cattaneo and Frantz were able to foresee the development of nationalism in Italy and Germany and the tragic fate of Europe as a system of sovereign nations. Federalism was then regarded as the theoretical alternative to the centralization of authority, which found in nationalist ideology an indispensable means of persuasion for consolidating the nation-state. Its concrete achievements were modest, however, because the ideas of Proudhon, Cattaneo, and Frantz were, as Rüdiger Görner and Luigi Vittorio Majocchi have remarked, too divergent from the culture and interests on which nineteenth century national realities were based.

During the second stage of the development of the federal idea, which coincided with the interval between the two wars it was possible to discern more clearly the cause of international anarchy and the degeneration into totalitarianism of national political life by reference to the concept of federalism. Inter-war federalists were able to offer a non-contradictory interpretation of the structural aspects of the European crisis, namely the contradiction between the growth of the forces of production and their inter-exchange beyond the geographical borders of European states, and the ever closer identification between state and nation. The historical process which had led to the Balkanization of Europe, with the concession of independent government to the nationalist claims on the continent, clashed with the universalization of production, distribution and exchange realized by the industrial mode of production.

In the British federalist literature of this period Lothian pointed to the cause and the consequences of international anarchy; Curtis a comprehensive federalist conception of the origin, the development and the end of history; Lionel Robbins, to the limits of an international liberal economic order within a system of sovereign states; and Barbara Wootton, to the international

¹² The author who has developed a general theory of federalism as ideology is Mario Albertini (*Lo stato nazionale* (Milan: 1960); id., *L'integrazione europea e altri saggi* (Pavia: 1965); id., *Proudhon*, Florence, 1974); id., *Il Federalismo. Antologia e definizione* (Bologna: 1979), founder of the journal *The Federalist*.

failure of socialism.¹³

The main contribution of this literature to the development of the federal idea was, as discussed by Daniela Preda, the production of a critique of national sovereignty as the fundamental cause of international anarchy. During the inter-war period, however, only a handful of European writers or politicians understood that the supranational course of history was wide open, and that the formula of the nation-state was about to be called into question again. The voice of inter-war federalists was weak, however, and they were divided. Each of these writers did his best to make sense, through federalism, of current events, which traditional ideologies (such as liberalism, socialism, and democracy) failed to comprehend, but they were unable to put forward a practical plan to fill the gap between theory and political experience.

The only exception was Count Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi, who in 1923 founded in Vienna the Pan-Europa movement, which favoured political union of the old continent on a federal basis. Despite the support of Edouard Herriot – who, in a speech to the French National Assembly on 29 June 1925, launched the idea of a European union, Aristide Briand – author of the famous plan for European union, (discussed by Cornelia Navari, Richard Lamb and Ralph White), and Gustav Stresemann, the movement was short-lived and unable to raise significant popular support for the federal solution. Being elitist in the same way as contemporary federalist literature, it was intrinsically weak.

At the end of the 1930s, European militarism, as represented by Germany for the second time in a quarter of a century, might have achieved (even briefly) the objective which the democracies had failed to produce: the political and economic union of the old continent — not by agreement, however, but with Satan’s sword, to use a Luigi Einaudi’s famous expression. It was the public acclaim of *Union Now*, a book by the American journalist Clarence Streit, published in spring 1939, that encouraged federalists to organize themselves into a popular movement, to stand up to the challenge of militarism on the continent.

The democracies, Streit suggested, had to construct a barrier. However, as Ira Straus argued, this barrier should not be constructed with a mere defensive alliance, but in a new form: a political union on a federal basis. It was Streit’s purpose to give life to democracy on a supra-national level, thus overcoming the contradictions which had reduced it to an empty shell. Democracy could have achieved, by revolution, the objective that militarism attempted to attain through war. The result would have been very different: a federation founded on public approval could have opposed an empire held together by German militarism.

A few months before the publication of *Union Now*, however, three young and unknown men, Charles Kimber, Derek Rawnsley and Patrick Ransome, had formed, in London, the nucleus of a federalist movement, the Federal Union. In the space of a few months, this movement became — thanks to the success of *Union Now* and the preparatory work by Lothian, Curtis and Robbins — one with 225 branches all around the country and a membership of over 15,000. The contribution of Federal Union to the development of federalism in Britain and Europe was to express and

¹³ Henry Philip Kerr, *Pacifism is not Enough. Collected Lectures and Speeches of Lord Lothian/Philip Kerr*, John Pinder and Andrea Bosco eds. (London: Lothian Foundation Press, 1990); id. “The Ending of Armageddon”, *Studies in Federal Planning*, Patrick Ransome ed. (London: Lothian Foundation Press, 1990): 1-15; id., *The American Speeches of Lord Lothian* (London: Oxford University Press, 1941); Barbara Wootton, *Socialism and Federation* (London: 1940); Lionel Robbins, *The Economic Causes of War Conflicts* (London: 1939); id., *The Economic Basis of Class Conflict and Other Essays of Political Economy* (London: 1939); id., *Economic Planning and International Order* (London: 1937); id., *Economic Aspects of Federation* (London: 1941); Lionel Curtis, *Civitas Dei. The Commonwealth of God* (London: 1939); id., *The Way to Peace* (London: 1944); id., *World Revolution in the Cause of Peace* (London: 1947).

organize the beginning of a new political behaviour: the aim of the political struggle was no longer the conquest of national power but the building of a supranational institution, a federation (not a league) of nations. The third stage of the development of the federal idea had begun. With Federal Union, European federation was no longer an idea of reason, but the first step of a historical process: the overcoming of the nation-state.¹⁴

In the year leading up to and the early part of the Second World War, a substantial and powerful literature was produced by a number of distinguished representatives of liberal and socialist thought, such as Lord Lothian, Lionel Robbins, William Beveridge, Lionel Curtis, Lord Lugard, Henry Wickham Steed, Arnold Toynbee, James Meade, Kenneth Wheare, Norman Bentwich, J.B. Priestley, William Curry, Ivor Jennings, Henry Noel Brailsford, Cyril Joad, Konni Zilliacus, Barbara Wootton, Ronald Gordon Mackay, and Olaf Stapledon. This literature, which had a direct or indirect influence on British political thinking at the time, has been almost completely forgotten in Britain today. Nevertheless it is held in high regard by continental scholars, especially in Italy, where it is referred to as the Anglo-Saxon Federalist School and thought of as the most illuminating contribution to the evolution of European federalist thought.¹⁴

At the beginning of 1940, not only intellectuals, but also some of the most prominent politicians – such as Chamberlain, Halifax, Churchill, Eden, Attlee, Bevin, Sinclair, and Amery, and members of the Anglican Church – the Archbishops of York and Durham, openly supported the federalist project. The Foreign Office seriously studied, from March 1940, an “Act of Perpetual Association between the United Kingdom and France” setting up an *ad hoc* inter-ministerial committee chaired by Hankey. Finally, on the afternoon of 16 June, a few hours before the French Government accepted the capitulation, Churchill made the famous offer of “indissoluble union”: “We had before us”, commented Sir John Colville, private secretary to Churchill, “the bridge to a new world, the first elements of European or even world federation”.¹⁵

The fact that the British proposal came too late to succeed and that in France public opinion was not ready to accept it, shows that the material conditions needed to create the European federation on the basis of an Anglo-French nucleus were then lacking. The resistance to this goal in Great Britain, where all available forces were mobilised, together with a further rapprochement between Great Britain and the United States, marked the beginning of a rapid decline in organized federalism in Britain.

The renaissance of the federal idea on the continent from 1943 onwards, however, owed much to British federalism. The most influential and dynamic starting-point of federalist resistance was the island of Ventotene, off the coast of Naples, where Altiero Spinelli and Ernesto Rossi were confined as anti-fascist militants. At the beginning of 1939, Luigi Einaudi (later to become President of the Italian Republic), who was then Professor of Economics at the University of Turin and one of the very few liberal intellectuals to whom the fascists accorded a certain freedom of speech, sent Rossi some books by British federalists, which he had received from the Federal Union. Spinelli explained why these writings had influenced him: “Since I was seeking clarity and precision of thought, my attention was not attracted by the nebulous, contorted and hardly coherent ideological federalism of the Proudhonian or Mazzinian type, which thrived in France and Italy, but by the

¹⁴ William Beveridge, *Peace by Federation?* (London: 1940); William Curry, *The Case for Federal Union* (London: 1940); Ivor Jennings, *A Federation for Western Europe* (Cambridge: 1940); Ronald Gordon Mackay, *Peace Aims and the New Order* (London: 1940); id., *Federal Europe* (London: 1940); Kenneth Wheare, *What Federal Government Is* (London: 1941); id., *Federal Government* (London: 1946). For a study, see: John Pinder and Richard Maine, *Federal Union. The Pioneers* (London: Macmillan, 1990); Andrea Bosco, *June 1940. Great Britain and the First Attempt to Create a European Union* (Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2016).

¹⁵ John Colville, *The Fringes of Powers* (London: W.W. Norton, 1975), 65.

polished, precise and anti-doctrinaire thought of the English federalists ... who proposed to transplant to Europe the great American political experience”¹⁶

The literature produced by Federal Union was, therefore, seminal to the drafting of the *Manifesto di Ventotene*, a basic text for the formulation of a federalist strategy for the political struggle ahead. As Sergio Pistone and Luciano Bolis have remarked, the birth in 1943 in Milan, of the *Movimento Federalista Europeo*, continued the political struggle of Federal Union.

The Third Lothian Conference was held in March 1990 at New College, Oxford – the College where Lothian had studied – on “The Federal Idea: The History of Federalism since 1945”, under the auspices of the Fondazione Europea Luciano Bolis, the Fondation Archives Européennes, the Coudenhove-Kalergi Foundation, the Centre International de Formation Européenne, the Centre Européen de la Culture, and the Dipartimento Storico Geografico of the University of Pavia. The papers presented outlined the character of European and world federalism in the context of the historical character of the path to European integration so far followed.

At the end of the Second World War the European countries, faced with the problems of economic recovery and how to re-order their defence, had no alternative but to accept American protection. Thus, they organised their economy and defence in the only suitable context: the European one. In fact, the Americans realised the situation even before the Europeans, who reluctantly accepted American protection. Indeed it was only after the failure of the French attempt to re-establish the Franco-Russian alliance as an anti-German measure that Europeans understood the need for the most important decisions concerning defence, currency and economic control to be made in the European context.

This realisation – it has been remarked – had three important consequences. The first was that the final seat of power for member states of the European Community was shifted from the national to the European context. The second was that, because of this, it became necessary to have a European policy (conceived and managed in the European context, in co-operation with other countries), alongside national policy (conceived and managed in the national context). The third was that such a European policy created a power vacuum – only partly covered by American leadership – which had to be filled. The history of European unification is the history of attempts to fill this vacuum.

The views supported particularly by Italian federalists – who took on the leadership of the European Union of Federalists – were that there are only two possible ways to fill this power vacuum: either by starting with a European government of a federal nature, or by moving towards this federal goal with a step by step convergence of the national policies of the different countries. The first solution (for which Altiero Spinelli fought with some support from the Italian government) puts federation at the beginning, conceiving it as the goal of a constitutional struggle. The second solution (advocated by Jean Monnet and in fact adopted by European governments) places federal power at the end of a gradual process, and could be conducted by an intergovernmental mechanism mobilising the national forces interested in European solutions.

The advantage of Monnet’s strategy is that it can involve the active forces of the nations without needing constitutional reform. The disadvantage of the strategy is that it cannot be carried out in a democratic manner because it requires European decisions to be made by bodies which are no longer controlled by national parliaments and not yet controlled by the European Parliament. Hence the democratic deficit of the Community.

The advantages of Spinelli’s strategy derive from the fact that with federal power as the starting

¹⁶ Altiero Spinelli, *Il Lungo monologo* (Rome: 1968), 163.

point it would be the responsibility of European democracy to determine ways and means, structures and deadlines for European unification. The disadvantage lies in the extreme difficulty of setting up a constituent assembly as the beginning of the process, with the parties still closely tied to the national powers.

Spinelli's criticism of Monnet's strategy (even though the two actually worked closely together both during and after the establishment of the first European Community, the ECSC) was that federation cannot be the result of a gradual process because the power indispensable for the existence of a federal government cannot be transferred from the nations to Europe in stages: either it is transferred or it is not. Spinelli acknowledged that Monnet's strategy was effective in keeping European unity on the agenda and in bringing the process of integration to the threshold of the single market, but he also remarked upon its ineffectiveness in transferring sovereign powers from national to supranational institutions.¹⁷

The Fourth Lothian Conference, "A Currency for Europe. The Currency as an Element of Division and of Union of Europe", was held at Kings College, University of London, on 15th September 1990, and dealt with the ways in which the European Monetary System might develop. It brought together the views of a number of economists, bankers, lawyers and historians, on questions surrounding the establishment of a Single European Currency. Beginning with a historical perspective on the question "What can be learned from the experiences of (i) the gold standard and (ii) the foundation of a central bank in Italy in nineteenth century", James Foreman Peck (Oxford University) found little historical evidence of a role to be played by government commitment to price stability, for example, in the absence of other widely shared goals for economic policy. Valeria Sanucci (from *Banca d'Italia*) reluctantly pointed to the difficulties posed for monetary union by the heterogeneity of banking systems around Europe. Peter Oppenheimer (Oxford University) elegantly pointed to the ambivalence of the United Kingdom long and hesitant flirtation with EMU. Turning to other more immediate questions ("How would policy and events have developed in Europe without the EMS, rather than with it? What difference has the EMS made?"), Andrew Hughes-Hallett, Patrick Minford and Anupam Rastogi (University of Liverpool), analysed the question using the Liverpool economic model. The costs of the EMS are caused by removing the ability of countries to make changes to their exchange rates. Hughes-Hallett (Strathclyde University) and David Vines (Glasgow University) addressed the problems of the transition to monetary union using an economic model which tries to reproduce the features of the real world. David Mayes (National Institute of Economic and Social Research) pursued the problems of the transition to EMU; and Charles Goodhart (London School of Economics) investigated the implications of

¹⁷ The proceedings of the Conference are published in the volume *The Federal Idea. The History of Federalism since 1945*, Andrea Bosco ed. (London: Lothian Foundation Press, 1991), 395, with essays by Andrea Bosco ("The federalist project and Resistance in continental Europe"), Lubor Jilek ("L'idee d'Europe devant la guerre: Les exilés et le fédéralisme Européen en Suisse, 1938-1945"), Archibald A. Evans ("The 'New Europe' circle in London"), Joseph Baratta ("Henry Osborne and the creation of the World Movement for World Federal Government", and "Mundialism and the reform of the United Nations"), Henry Osborne ("A history of the British Parliamentary Group for World Government"), Daniela Preda ("From a defence Community to a political Community: The role of De Gasperi and Spinelli"), Philippe Chenux ("Les Élités catholiques et l'union européenne"), Martin Posselt ("The European Parliamentary Union"), Norbert Kohlhasse ("Henry Brugmans: His contribution to federalist thought and action"), François Saint-Ouen ("L'action de Denis de Rougemont et du Centre Européen de la Culture dans les années soixante et soixante-dix"), Lucio Levi ("Altiero Spinelli, Mario Albertini and the Italian Federalist School: Federalism as ideology" and "European elections and international democracy"), Luciano Bolis ("Le Congrès du Peuple Européen"), Cinzia Rognoni ("Spinelli's action in the European Parliament: The Crocodile Club, the Institutional Commission, the Draft Treaty"), Michael Watson and Caroline Jones ("Minority nationalism and European integration"), Dario Velo ("The formation of the European banking system") and Bruce Collins ("American views of European economic and monetary union").

monetary union for natural fiscal policies. Goodhart supported the case for a strengthened system of automatic inter-regional transfers within Europe as a concomitant of EMU.

John Spencer (The Queens University, Belfast) and Massimo Beber (University of Cambridge) examined regional questions in more detail. Although the British Government's proposal for a common rather than a single currency has been viewed largely as a red herring, Peter Sinclair and C.J.K. Stewart-Roper (University of Oxford) carefully analysed their relative costs and benefits. They provided one of a small number of well-founded arguments in favour of a common currency. The analysis then turned to questions of Central Banking arrangements under EMU. The question of the political independence and the accountability of the European Central Bank looms large not only in the United Kingdom but in Europe generally. Finally, John Grieve Smith (University of Cambridge) and Ian Harden (University of Sheffield) considered constitutional aspects of monetary union and European fiscal policy. Harden was optimistic that subsidiarity will enable Europe to resist an unplanned and undesired drift toward centralisation of governmental authority, although it is a principle which needed to be more clearly defined in the light of experience.¹⁸

The Fifth Lothian Conference was held under the auspices of the British Academy, at the Royal Holloway and Bedford New College, University of London, on 16-17 December 1990 on "A Constitution for Europe. A Comparative Study of Federal Constitutions and Plans for the United States of Europe". An international group of economists, constitutionalists, political scientists and historians, discussed the features of existing federal constitutions and examined the major plans for a European federation which have been set forth during this century. It was also examined federalism in contemporary Europe with essays by James O'Connell, Geoffrey K. Roberts, Cornelius O'Leary, Richard Sakwa, and Andrew Adonis; the federalist traditions in continental Europe and the British Commonwealth with essays by David B. Swinfen, Michael Rush, Vincent della Sala, Angus Macintyre, Michael Burgess, Thomas Fraser, D.H. Aldcroft, Howard Williams, Rüdiger Görner, Peter Stirk, Andrew Crozier, Anthony Short, and Clive Church; and the American experience of federalism by Howard Temperley, Peter Marshall, Colin Bonwick, and Peter Parish. It has been pointed out that in the light of the acceleration of the process of European unification, the problem of creating a democratic power to regulate the European economy becomes crucial.

¹⁸ The proceedings of the Conference are published in the volume *A Currency for Europe. The Currency as an Element of Division or of Union of Europe*, John Driffill and Massimo Beber eds., (London: Lothian Foundation Press, 1991). Part one considers the historical background with essays by James Foreman-Peck ("The Gold Standard as a European lesson"), Valeria Sannucci ("The establishment of a central bank: Italy in the nineteenth century") and Peter Oppenheimer ("The historical development of the European Monetary System and the question of British participation"). Part two deals with the transition to European Monetary Union, with essays by Andrew Hughes-Hallett, Patrick Minford and Anupam Rastogi ("The European Monetary System — Problems and evolution"), A. Hughes-Hallett and David Vines ("Adjustment difficulties within a European Monetary Union: Can they be reduced?"), David G. Mayes ("European Currency and problems of transition to European Monetary Union") and Charles A.E. Goodhart ("Fiscal policy and European Monetary Union"). In part three are discussed regional problems by John E. Spencer ("European Monetary Union and the regions") and Massimo Beber ("Regional differentials, economic integration and monetary union"). Part four analyzes the establishment of the common currency, with essays by Werner Becker ("Cost and benefits of a European currency") and P.J.N. Sinclair and C.J.K. Stewart-Roper ("European monetary integration: The rival merits of single and common currencies — singular problems and common benefits"). Part five discusses central banking arrangements under European Monetary Union, with papers by Ray P. Kinsella ("European Monetary Union and the development of a European central banking system"), Emanuele Itta ("A European currency and a European central bank") and Lorenzo Bini Smaghi ("Monetary institutions and monetary sovereignty in European Monetary Union"). Part six deals with institutional and constitutional aspects of economic and monetary union, with essays by John Grieve Smith ("European Monetary Union: Some fundamental issues") and Ian Harden ("The Community budget, national budgets and European Monetary Union: A constitutional perspective"). The volume was launched at Midland Bank on 2 December 1991, at a buffet lunch, where Sir Michael Palliser, Chairman of Midland Bank, outlined to the guests the relevance of the book in relation to the debate on European Monetary Union, while Professor John Driffill stressed the book's importance in the field of academic research.

One option is greater centralisation. Yet greater centralisation in some matters can only usefully be acquired at the cost of firmer guarantees for localities in others. The question of 'how we centralise' goes straight to the heart of constitutionalism, of which federalism is the most powerful political expression to date.

The largest systems, up to the last Great War, were imperial. The old European empires, extending into the 'soft underbelly of the world', were largely an expression of intra-European competition. They dispensed rough justice to peoples outside Europe, while repeatedly unleashing the dogs of war within Europe. Imperial systems were largely based to a great extent upon inequality at home and abroad, producing injustice and frequently also chaos when displaced. The principle of unity, upon which empire is erected, is always seriously flawed, pointing ultimately to dissolution.

Post-imperial systems of a more viable type have evolved, however. They have brought together large populations over vast areas. These involve New World federal entities, such as Canada, the USA, Mexico, and Australia. States of this sort have made possible vast economies of scale, high degrees of political centralization, with varying degrees of respect for human rights, citizen participation, and local identity. Even where this combination of factors is not to be found, or is found in only minimal degree, it remains a fact that economies of scale, as expressed especially in free trade zones, constitute the order of the day. Examples of this sort of arrangement are to be found in West Africa, Southern Africa, South East Asia, and South America, as well as between Canada, the USA, and Mexico. It is in Europe, however, that common-market arrangements are fastest paced and come closest to the position of political take-off along fully constitutionalist lines.

The problem is not whether the world will be integrated. Evidence for this is available on all sides. The question, rather, is how and on what basis integration will come about. The problem is to provide the political framework with which to organize the integration of different peoples. Federal arrangements can supply no panacea. But they do in general supply a sounder constitutional framework than any other arrangements thus far initiated. There is a strong case for a federal Europe which combines (i) sharply focused parliamentary debate with (ii) the constitutional protection of localities. A country like the United Kingdom, for example, while it enjoys the first, is entirely devoid of the second. And it seems likely that a problem such as that of Northern Ireland, which has dragged on for more than twenty years, will only be resolved within the broader and constitutionally sounder context of a federal Europe.

A choice of extraordinary significance now looms. For Britain, on the one side there is America, and on the other, Europe. A 'special relationship' with America is only really sustainable outside Europe. Such an Anglo-American relationship, however, is and must remain an unequal one. The US is governed by a President, and Britons cannot vote for this President. Thus any British government, allied to the USA, must largely submit to US wishes. Even should the influence of British leaders wane, as must happen, the British electorate can have no direct say. In this there lies a significant erosion of democracy, representation and participation.

With Britain outside, a difficult situation would likely arise inside Europe. Whether or not Germany pressed for an integrated Europe would scarcely matter. With the withdrawal of the Soviet Union from Eastern Europe, and particularly from East Germany (together with the addition of 17 million East Germans to the *Bundesrepublik*), we now have in the new Germany a state that is geographically central, politically united, and both numerically and economically dominant *vis-à-vis* any one of its political partners, taken alone. In short, the position of the new Germany in Europe is akin to that of Prussia *vis-à-vis* its confederal partners in the second part of the nineteenth century.

It is precisely in circumstances such as these that the retention of constitutional liberties is likely to require a balance of forces. States such as France and Italy are much better placed to preserve a

proper balance within the European Community if Britain is vigorously engaged elsewhere. While Britain alone cannot expect to exert any great influence over America through obscure exchanges between heads of state, she can expect both to have an impact on Europe, and indeed to underpin the constitutional character of an evolving European entity. With an effective federal Europe, the capacity to deal as an equal with America – and the USSR and Japan – is certain to re-emerge.

In 1984, with the Draft Treaty, the European Parliament made its first attempt to become the federator of the Community. Direct elections to the Parliament, initiated in 1979, opened an entirely new historical phase. The European Parliament has become unmistakably central to the evolving constitutional process in the Community. The strategic objective now rightly sought by federalists is the conferring of a constituent mandate upon the European Parliament as the core of a new and properly constitutional entity, grounded in the principle of equality of all peoples and a perfect respect for civil liberties.

Two final considerations were widely shared by the participants at the Conference. Firstly, it is not really possible to create a single European common market unless there is also a democratic and constitutionally grounded government, through which citizens may exercise genuine decisions relating to the political, social, and monetary choices created by the single market. Secondly, with such a government, Europe will be far better placed than ever before to make an historic contribution to world peace, a development compatible with the safeguarding of the environment.¹⁹

The Sixth Lothian Conference was held at London House, on 27-28 March 1992 on “Curtis, Lothian, the Astors, and Chatham House, 1919-1945: The Royal Institute of International Affairs during the inter-war years”. The creation of the Royal Institute of International Affairs (better known as Chatham House) owes much to Lionel Curtis, Lord Lothian, Waldorf Astor and other members of the Milner Kindergarten, who after the political failure of the Round Table movement in bringing about Imperial Federation, sought to promote the integration of the English-speaking peoples on the basis of closer Anglo-American co-operation. In fact the idea behind Chatham House was originally to create throughout the Commonwealth (with branches in every capital, and in the United States, with the establishment in 1925 of the Council on Foreign Relations), a type of intelligentsia capable of exercising, at the favourable moment, a decisive influence on Commonwealth and foreign policies.

The Conference discussed the origins of the project for an Institute of International Affairs at the Paris Peace Conference of 1919; the establishment of Chatham House in 1920 and the role played

¹⁹ The proceedings of the Conference are published in the volume *A Constitution for Europe. A Study of Federal Constitutions and Plans for the United States of Europe*, Preston King and Andrea Bosco eds. (London: Lothian Foundation Press, 1991), with essays by James O’Connell (“The Making of Europe: Strengths, constraints and resolutions”), Andrew Adonis (“Subsidiarity: Theory of a new federalism?”), Dieter Biehl (“The financial constitution of the European Community: Its deficiencies and a proposal for reform”), Geoffrey K. Roberts (“Constitutional and political problems of German reunification: Their relevance and impact on European unification”), Richard Sakwa (“The new federalism in the USSR”), Clive Church (“Exploration in ambiguity: The paradoxical relationships between Swiss federalism and European integration”), Cornelius O’Leary (“Anglo-Irish relations, the Northern Ireland problem and the possible mediatory role of the European Community”), Howard Williams (“The Kantian model of federalism”), Rüdiger Görner (“Notes on the political aesthetics of German federalism”), D.H. Aldcroft (“The federal idea in Europe before 1914”), Peter Stirk (“Authoritarian federalists in central Europe”), Andrew Crozier (“Britain, Germany and the dishing of the Briand Plan”), Anthony Short (“European federalism and the Attlee Government”), Angus Macintyre (“Home Rule for Ireland: A failure of federalism?”), Michael Burgess (“Federalism and the Empire: British federal ideas for the British”), Thomas Fraser (“Federal solutions to the problem of Indian unity, 1931-1947”), D.B. Swinfen (“The Canadian experience”), Michael Rush (“Federalism in Canada”), Vincent della Sala (“Breaking up is hard to do: Canadian Lessons for European federalism”), Howard Temperley (“The making of the American Constitution”), Peter Marshall (“The ratification of the American Constitution”), Colin Bonwick (“Giving life to the American Constitution”), and Peter Parish (“The changing character of American federalism”).

by Lionel Curtis, the great wire-puller, the persistent operator behind the scenes; the contribution of Mr and Mrs Leonard, the Canadian couple who donated the nascent Institute No. 10 St James Square; the involvement of the Astors in the creation of the Institute; Chatham House and the creation of the Council on Foreign Relations; the role played by Robert Brand and the City; the relations between Chatham House and the press, particularly the *Times* and the *Observer*; Lord Lothian and Chatham House's Anglo-American policy; Chatham House and the Foreign Office; Chatham House and appeasement; Chatham House and federalism; Chatham House and British Commonwealth relations; Chatham Houses study-groups method and its relevance to policy-making; Chatham House, the Foreign Office and the Foreign Press Research Service during the Second World War.²⁰

The Seventh Lothian Conference was held at London House, on March 1995 on "The Round Table, the Empire/Commonwealth and British Foreign Policy". The place of the Round Table Movement in the history of the British Empire could be compared to that of the sun at noon, the moment of its greatest radiance but also the beginning of a rapid and inexorable decline. What the Round Tablers attempted to do was to reverse that inexorableness. Could the history of the British Empire diverge from the fate which marked all the empires in the course of history? This was the challenge which the Round Tablers took up. The Round Tablers were, at the beginning of the venture, young men. However, they remained loyal to the cause—to different degrees, but nevertheless loyal—for all the rest of their lives. They were not, therefore, victims of a youthful delirium of omnipotence, but actors in a coherent and persistent programme of action. What they were looking for was not just an answer to the problems of a multi-racial Empire kept together by a provisional convergence of interests, but a radical solution to the problems of interdependence of the modern age, which could be better discerned within the British Empire than anywhere else in the world stage at the time. Their spirit was longing for a deep meaning to give to their lives, and they found it in the Empire. Only later they discovered in federalism the political ideology able to give this existential yearning a political dimension. There was a 'spiritual' element at the base of this conversion, and long fidelity, which had its dynamic source in Anglicanism.

The specific contribution of the Round Table to the development of the federal idea into a political movement was to produce a theory of supranational political action centred on reflection on the question of power. The Round Table theorized on and realized—through Milner's influence on British Unionist and Liberal political élites—the exercise of power not through the traditional instruments of political struggle—the parties, and the control of parliamentary institutions—but through the formation and consolidation of an extra-parliamentary consensus on a specific political agenda. Set a strategic goal, the movement would employ all available means to achieve it, including

²⁰ The proceedings of the Conference are published in the volume *Chatham House, and British Foreign Policy, 1919-1945: The Royal Institute of International Affairs during the Inter-war Years* (London: Lothian Foundation Press, 1994) with essays by Gordon Martel ("From Round Table to New Europe: Some Intellectual Origins of the Institute of International Affairs"), Stefan Schieren ("Between Two Extremes: Philip Kerr Between Democracy and Empire"), Deborah Lavin ("Lionel Curtis and the Founding of Chatham House"), Mike Dockrill ("The Foreign Office and the Creation of Chatham House"), George Egerton ("Hankey, the League of Nations, and Diplomacy by Conference: Educating the [Royal] Institute of International Affairs"), Alan Sharp ("Making International History: The Writing of History of the Peace Conference of Paris"), Roger Morgan ("To Advance the Science of International Politics ...' Chatham House's Early Research"), Christopher Brewin ("Arnold Toynbee and Chatham House"), Charles Jones ("E.H. Carr Through Cold War Lenses: Nationalism, Large States and the Shaping of the Opinion"), Thomas G. Fraser ("Chatham House and the Palestinian Question 1920-1939"), Andrew J. Crozier ("Chatham House and Appeasement"), Christopher Thorne ("Chatham House, Whitehall, and Far Eastern Issues: 1941-1945"), Inderjeet Parmar ("Chatham House, the Foreign Policy Process, and the Making of the Anglo-American Alliance"), Andrea Bosco ("Chatham House and Federalism"), Cornelia Navari ("Chatham House and the Broad Church View of International Relations").

the manipulation—they called it ‘moulding’—of public opinion, and the exercise of coordinated action by a network of associated individuals and organizations. The Royal Institute of International Affairs and the Council on Foreign Relations were the major among them.²¹

IV. Publications

The establishment in January 1990 of the Lothian Foundation Press as a commercial unit, gave the Foundation a marvellous opportunity to re-think its function. Matters such as surrender of national sovereignty, European democracy, federal structure, single currency, and so forth, entered into the daily public debate in Britain. The specific role of the Foundation was seen as educating the public about the exact meaning of these terms and the implications of closer European economic and political union.

In order to accomplish its institutional role, the Foundation launched the publication of three series: a) a classic series (reprints of classics of the federalist doctrine); b) a historical series (monographs and proceedings of conferences); and c) a political series (studies on the current debate of European and world unification). The Foundation also decided to publish a series of pamphlets (Federal Tracts - New Series) and the *Annals*, devoted primarily to the study of the history of federalism. The *Annals* are to be published annually by the Foundation, which will itself hold editorial responsibility.

V. The Lothian Society of North America

²¹ The proceedings of the Conference are published in the volume *The Round Table, the Empire/Commonwealth and British Foreign Policy* (London: Lothian Foundation Press, 1997) with essays by Andrew Thompson, University of Leeds (“Imperial Ideology in Edwardian Britain”), Peter J. Durrans, University of Sunderland (“Parliament and Empire, 1906-1914”), Iain R. Smith, University of Warwick Milner, (“The ‘Kindergarten’ and South Africa”), Andrew Lownie (“John Buchan, the Round Table and Empire”), Bill Schwarz, Goldsmiths College, London (“The Romance of the Weld”), Peter Merrington, University of the Western Cape, (“*The State* and the ‘Invention of Tradition’ in Edwardian South Africa”), Kent Fedorowich, University of the West of England, Bristol, (“The Weak Link in the Imperial Chain: South Africa, the Round Table and World War One”), Luke Trainor, University of Canterbury, New Zealand (“The Imperial Federation League in Britain and Australia, c 1884-1900”), Leonie Foster, Royal Historical Society, Victoria (“The Victorian Imperial Federation League and the Genesis of the Australian Round Table”), Christopher R.J. Rickerd, St. Antony’s College, Oxford (“Canada, the Round Table and the Idea of Imperial Federation”), Alex May, South Bank University (“The London ‘Moot’, Dominion Nationalism and Imperial Federation”), Ridgway F. Shinn, Jr., Rhode Island College (“Arthur Berriedale Keith: The Logic of Responsible Government and Closer Union”), Gerald Studdert Kennedy, University of Birmingham (“Curtis, Lionel George: Intense Beliefs of”), Alan E. O’Day, University of North London (“Federalism, Home Rule and Self-Government Ideas of Irish Nationalism in the Age of Isaac Butt and Parnell”), Gary Peatling, Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford (“The Last Defence of the Union? The Round Table and Ireland, 1910-1925”), Donald Lowry, Oxford Brookes University (“Shame Upon ‘Little England’ While ‘Greater England’ Stands”: Southern Rhodesia and the Imperial Idea), Chandrika Kaul, Nuffield College, Oxford (“The Round Table, the British Press and India, 1910-1922”), Philip Woods, Thames Valley University (“Lionel Curtis, the Round Table Movement and the Montagu Chelmsford Reforms, 1919”), David Meredith, University of New South Wales (“Colonial Development, the Impact of the Great Depression and the Origins of Decolonization, 1930-1939”), Thomas G. Fraser, University of Ulster (“Sir Reginald Coupland, the Round Table, and the Problem of Divided Societies”), Peter Lowe, University of Manchester (“The Round Table, the Dominions, and the Anglo Japanese Alliance, 1911-1922”), Erik Goldstein, University of Birmingham (“The Round Table and the New Europe”), Stefan Schieren, University of Magdeburg (“Philip Kerr and Anglo-American Relations after the Great War”), Andrea Bosco, South Bank University, London (“Lord Lothian and Appeasement”), Suke Wolton, St Antony’s College, Oxford (“Lord Hailey’s War-Work: Defending the Empire in America”), Alex May, South Bank University (“The Round Table and the Post War Commonwealth, 1945-1966”), John B. O’Brien, University College, Cork (“Canadian and Australian Responses to Britain’s First Application to Join the EEC, 1960-1963”), Peter Lyon, Institute of Commonwealth Studies, London (“The Round Table and the Commonwealth since 1965”), John Darwin, Nuffield College, Oxford (“Afterword: The Round Table Assessed”).

The Foundation, however, did not confine itself to a mere European outlook. Lothian's vision was global. An American Committee of the Foundation had been therefore established in Washington DC in November 1989, under the auspices of the Association of World Federalists and in collaboration with the Centre for the Study of Federalism of Temple University, PA. A fund-raising campaign among American Rhodes Scholars has made various funds available for activities organized in co-operation with the London Council, and in particular for the Lothian Fellowship Scheme and the conferences programme.

VI. Internal Organisation and Staff

Between 1986 and 1989 the Foundation was affiliated to the Federal Trust. During this first period the officers of the Foundation were Richard Lamb (Chairman), Prof Kenneth Ingham (Vice-Chairman), Dr Andrea Bosco (Director), Terence Bishop (Treasurer) and Judy Keep (Secretary). The Council had been enlarged to include: Dr Michael Burgess (Plymouth Polytechnic), Thomas Daffern (University of London), Prof Murray Forsyth (University of Leicester), David Griffiths, Dieter Heinrich (World Association for World Federation, NY, USA), Deborah Lavin (University of Durham), Prof John Logue (Villanova University, PA, USA), Prof Alan Milward (London School of Economics), Dr Hanna Newcombe (Peace Research Institute, Dundas, Canada), Henry Usborne (Minifed), and John Vernon. The Rt Hon. Lord Callaghan of Cardiff, the Rt Hon. Lord Jenkins of Hillhead, the Rt Hon. Sir David Steel, MP, and Sir Michael Butler have also agreed to serve as patrons of the Foundation.

In order to speed up the work of the Council it was decided to create three sub-committees: a Publications Committee, a Conference Committee and a Lecture Committee. The Foundation was run by the Council which, in co-operation with the Federal Trust, was ultimately responsible for the Foundations affairs.

As a consequence of the popularity of the Second Lothian Memorial Lecture (for details see above) the Foundation was soon identified as a federalist propagandist organization and this caused increasing difficulties within the Council and officers alike. In September 1989 it was therefore decided to transform the Council from a governing to advisory body and to seek independent charitable and legal status. From January 1990 the Foundation severed its links with the Federal Trust and followed an autonomous programme of activities run by three officers: John Pinder (Chairman), Dr Andrea Bosco (Director) and Richard Burn (Treasurer). The headquarters of the Foundation moved to 23 Doughty Mews, London, WC1. The Council continued to work in its advisory capacity

VII. Finance

From the outset, the Foundation has organised its activities on a self-financing and voluntary basis. Occasionally salaries have been paid to part-time staff, employed in connection with specific projects.

In addition to private donations, financial help has come from the Rhodes Trust, the Commission of the European Communities, the Nuffield Foundation, the Luigi Einaudi Foundation, the British Academy, the Adler Foundation, the Harris Trust, and the University of Pavia. Substantial help has come from the membership campaign, which has widened the base of support for the Foundations activities and has provided a close link with those sympathetic to the Foundations aims. The annual subscription for Associate Members is £15 (£10 for students and pensioners) and membership runs

from 1 January to 31 December. Associate members receive: 1) a copy of the *Annals*; 2) invitations to activities organized by the Foundation; and 3) information on publications sponsored by the Foundation.