

**European Economic Community:
Underlying Motives and Their Implications**

By

V.R.Gaikwad

**W P No. 841
January 1990**

WP841



WP
1990
(841)

The main objective of the working paper series of the IIMA is to help faculty members to test out their findings at the pre-publication stage.

**Indian Institute of Management
Ahmedabad**

PURCHASED

APPROVAL

GRATIS/EXCHANGE

PRICE

ACC NO.

VIKRAM SARABHAI LIBRARY

I. I. M. AHMEDABAD.

European Economic Community: Underlying Motives and Their Implications

I

When Christopher Columbus crossed the Atlantic and landed on Walting Islands in Bahamas in 1492, and John Cabot reached the North American mainland in 1497-98, and Vasco da Gama after touching Africa reached India in 1497, little did the natives of these lands then realise the significance and consequences of these events. So also the natives of South America when Pedro Gabriel reached the coast of Brazil in 1500, and the people of Philippines and other Pacific islands when Magellan's expeditions touched these lands while circumnavigating the Globe between 1519-22. So also the people of the northern and eastern Asia then little realise the significance of the thrust of Slavic and German races, commonly known as the White Russians, on the eastern front when they captured the Tartar States of Kazan in 1552 and Astrakhan in 1556 and reached the Pacific Ocean in 1644, only seventy years after crossing the eastern boundary of Europe, namely, the Urals, for the first time. Since then, the Europeans and the people of European origin have controlled the destiny of non-European communities with great pride and confidence.

And now, in Paris on May 9, 1950 the new, remarkable expedition of European Economic Community (EEC) was launched with the declaration of Schuman Plan, and in 1955 Jean Omer Marie Gabriel Monnet, the father of the Common Market, a symbol of post-war European thinking¹, announced that "the United States of Europe have already begun"². Only history will tell whether the Non-European Communities realised in time the significance of this event—an event perhaps of far more significance and consequence to the future of mankind, especially to that of non-European communities, than the early expeditions of Europeans for the control and exploitation of the world resources. If small, individual nation-states of Europe with their mercantile, imperial and racial orientation could subjugate and ruthlessly exploit the people and resources of non-European communities all over the world for nearly five centuries, then what would be their fate under the combined power of a United States of Europe? This is the question before the non-European communities. Have they taken the rapidly evolving scene in Europe for the last forty years at its face value or have they realised in time the long-term implications of these events and taken timely steps to safeguard their future, is a question mark.

The early expeditions of Europeans were not the adventures of mere individual pirates. These were launched by the nation-states of England, France, Holland, Portugal and Spain from Western Europe and supported by other European nations of the region, and by the Russians on the eastern front. These expeditions and colonisation that followed were initiated and supported by the wealth of merchants and their trading companies, organizing power of nation-states, religious zeal, skilful warfare, courageous leadership, and continuous supply of manpower by the fast breeding European communities.

Author: Professor V.R. Gaikwad, Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad, September 1989.

Acknowledgement: Author is grateful to Professor Dwijendra Tripathi for providing references on historical aspects covered in this and other Working Papers on the subject.

(C) Professor V.R. Gaikwad, 1989

These early expeditions and subjugation of natives was initially a very slow, gradual, and imperceptible process. By the time the natives realised the reality it was too late. By that time Europe which was the most densely populated region in the world then (and still is) pumped in more than 60 million people in the colonies of the New World³. Furthermore, these colonists themselves multiplied at an extraordinarily fast rate. Along with the numerical superiority was Europe's technological and industrial power, especially in the area of weapons, which was far superior to that of non-European communities.

Now, Jean Monnet's recent expedition for a United States of Europe in many ways is similar to the early expeditions. It is being accomplished by the wealth of merchants (the giant supra-national European business organizations), skilful manipulation of economics of European and non-European communities, and courageous leadership of the French and Germans. Furthermore, it is achieved through the supra-national institutions far more powerful than the individual nation-states of Europe. Under this expedition Europe is moving towards supra-mercantilism and supra-nationalism. As regards religious zeal of early expeditions it is now transformed into the zeal for 'European Origin', which becomes synonymous to 'racial zeal' since with the dilution of nation-state concept in Europe, race is the only characteristic by which Europe can express its identity, develop a sense of cohesion, common destiny and pride. As in the past, the process of transformation is gradual and imperceptible. As John Brooks observed:

Shrewdly, the Treaty of Rome set-up the process by which the Common Market might become a supra-national state—surely, in the light of history, the most unlikely feature of the whole enterprise—in such a way that progress would be not only gradual but more or less imperceptible.⁴

What are the motives behind the formation of the Common Market? Mostly following Monnet, Lawrence B. Krause provides the following four motives:

First and foremost, the six original member countries of Continental Europe had all been defeated and occupied in World War II and were intent on preventing a reoccurrence of this calamity. The remarkable economic revival of West Germany gave a degree of urgency to this concern. The statesmen of Europe wanted to find a way to remove Germany as a political and military threat to her neighbours.

The second motive also emerged from the fear of German power. After the war Germany was divided and under the cold-war conditions chances for the reunification of Germany through peaceful methods within the foreseeable future seemed remote.

"With the chances of success so far-off, understandable desire by Germans for reunification could only serve to increase East-West tensions and possibly lead to thermonuclear war. It was, therefore, desirable to find a channel for German nationalism that did not increase the war danger. Such an outlet is provided by European integration. It substitutes European nationalism for German nationalism, a goal quickly endorsed, especially by the younger generation".

The third motive was:

a desire to restore Europe to a place of dignity in the council of nations.... It was felt that if Europe was to become something more than a footnote to history, the individual nations would have to combine their power and speak with a unified voice.

The fourth, the only and purely economic, motive was:

it gave a promise of an enhanced standard of living for the member countries. The European idea was sold to many groups mainly on the expectations of a higher rate of economic growth.⁵

Professor Krause also tells us as to why inspite of major political motives, there is so little political content in the Treaty of Rome. From the failure of earlier attempts for European unity, the proponents of European unity learned that: "a frontal attack on national sovereignty was likely to fail.... It was therefore decided that the way to encourage political unity was to progress towards economic integration. True economic integration would force upon the member countries such a high degree of coordination and harmonization of their national policies that political unification would necessarily develop as a natural consequence."⁶

Thus, United States of Europe is the ultimate political objective to reestablish the supremacy of Europe. Towards this various strategies were evolved and institutions developed. Establishment of European Economic Community and the Treaty of Rome (1958) was one such strategy. Under this strategy Schuman Plan was implemented to bring the entire coal and steel industry in Western Europe under one single High Authority. Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) was evolved for land use planning, agriculture and livestock production as well as import and export of agricultural commodities for the EEC as a whole. Supra-national institutions such as European Parliament, European Court, European Secretariate, Euroton, etc. have already been established. Supra-large European industrial and business organisations are emerging at a fast rate. Standardization of technical specifications for plants, machineries and industrial products as well as for imported raw materials for Europe as a whole is moving at a fast pace. So also efforts for common European currency. Similar efforts for integration are being made on educational front for imbibing "European Spirit" in the new generation. Historical contributions of Europeans as a whole to science, art, literature etc., are being emphasised. A class of administrators/managers known as "Eurocrats" have emerged to evolve policies and implement programmes for Europe as a whole. By removal of tariffs, customs, protectionist measures among EEC countries and free movement of people, goods, products, capital and labour, etc., EEC is emerging as a vast economic organization. Emphasis on common economic threat from other developed countries like USA, Japan, Korea is part of the strategy to develop a sense of common destiny among European nations.

All these and many such processes have been in operation since Jean Monnet, the "arch-European", the brain behind the Schuman Plan, in June 1955 formed a private organization known as the Action Committee for the United States of Europe. Till then, Monnet was serving as President of High Authority of European Coal and Steel Community. His private Action Committee had forty-odd members, mostly prominent representatives of the political parties and trade-union organizations of France, West Germany, Italy, and the Benelux countries. This was, and is, a forthright pressure group. As Brooks reported, "From the start, the Action

Committee promoted the formation of a common market by periodically issuing declarations and manifestos, and its chief resource--apart from its members at any given moment--was the prestige of Monnet himself⁷." Under his guidance the Treaty of Rome was signed in 1958, and which, as Brooks mentioned, "Shrewdly set up the process by which Common Market might become a supra-national state in such a way that progress would be not only gradual but more or less imperceptible."

Are the non-European communities aware of this gradual and imperceptible process, and where it leads to? Or, are each of them so busy with their own day-to-day problems, frequent wars with their immediate neighbours, and defending their short-term economic interests against the constant pressures from the EEC and other industrially advanced countries, that they have yet to realise the strategic importance of the events in Europe.

II

Initially EEC started with only six members, namely, France, West Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg, and Italy. Now it has twelve members with the addition of the United Kingdom, Spain, Portugal, Ireland, Denmark and Greece. From the beginning EEC projected the advantages of a vast, unified market of 320 million European consumers. This is the most publicized aspect of EEC. Promise of quick economic gains has the greatest appeal to common man as well as to commercial and industrial enterprises. To start with, it is this appeal that got support for EEC, and through this strategy for the political objective, namely, United States of Europe. However, as Krause pointed out, "It was only when the political desire for Union became paramount that economic integration became possible"⁸. With forty-years of lead time and relentless drive EEC has made so much progress that by 31 December 1992 the process of establishment of the Common Market will be completed. Shawn Tully quotes Cor Van der Klugt, President of Philips' Gloeilampenfabrieken of the Netherlands, Europe's largest consumer electronic company, as saying, "What Europe is doing is gigantic. The drive for economic unity is the most important thing that will happen here in the next 50 years"⁹." Tully further reports:

"So tantalizing is the prospect of single market that European countries outside EEC are courting the Commission to avoid being left out. Sweden is negotiating a special agreement that would allow it to trade freely with the EEC countries in exchange for conforming to EEC regulations. Austria's foreign minister, Alois Mock, would like to see his country attain full EEC membership. Even the stubborn Swiss are beginning to question whether they can afford to stay away, says former Swiss President Pierre Aubert, a leader of the Social Democrats: "The EEC one of Switzerland's biggest suppliers and customers, will achieve a significant degree of integration by 1992. Will we end up on the margin of Europe?" The message is clear. Neither nations nor companies can afford to miss the dramatic rendezvous with 1992."¹⁰

Such is the appeal of EEC to European countries. After great deliberation, show of resistance and unwillingness United Kingdom joined EEC in 1973, inspite of all the concern for the Commonwealth. Turkey lodged its application in April 1987 which is still pending before the Commission. Austria's formal application was submitted to EEC in August 1989. It will not be too long before others like Iceland, Norway, Sweden will move in the same direction. Even Pope John Paul II has extended his tactical support for United Europe, when during his

recent visit to Spain he appealed for a unified Europe that "does not deny its Christian roots or the true humanism of the Christian gospel".¹¹

Recent developments in the Baltic Republics, Eastern Europe and USSR are indicators of the direction towards which these countries are moving. After all the Balts and Eastern Europeans were and are Europeans. And the White Russians originating from Slavic-German tribes were the European power and part and parcel of European history. Europe's geographical boundaries extend up to the Ural mountains and the Russian Republic in the Soviet Union covers this part, besides Siberia. Under Mikhail Gorbachev Russians are already moving closer to EEC on many fronts and it would not be long before the Balts, the East-Europeans and the White Russians would come to some sort of agreement with EEC before formally applying for membership of United Europe.

As Rajiv Desai reported:

Led by the admirable Mikhail Gorbachov, the Soviet leadership is talking about "a common European home". The phrase, like *perestroika* and *glasnost*, is aimed at winning friends and influencing people in the West. It is the clearest indicator of the change in Moscow's foreign policy perspective. The implications of Gorbachov's 'Common European home' are truly sweeping. To put bluntly, the Kremlin seems to have decided to focus its efforts on the European part of the USSR while leaving its Asian constituents to fend for themselves.¹²

Thus, as the Common Market was a strategy of Monnet towards an United Europe, so also Gorbachov's *perestroika* and *glasnost* are associate strategies to provide freedom to East European countries and European Russia to ultimately become members of the United States of Europe.

The draft declaration prepared by Yugoslavia for the ninth Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) summit meeting at Belgrade on September 4, 1989, indicated the changing orientation of that country. L.K. Sharma reported that it was devoid of punch and vigour in its condemnation of imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism and the present unequal world economic order. Several nations including Ghana, Cuba, Zimbabwe, Tanzania, saw in the Yugoslav draft an attempt to change the very direction of the movement and erode its fighting spirit. It presented an assessment of the world political and economic trends which was quite different from the one contained in the paper circulated by the Tanzanian leader, Dr. Julius K. Nyerere, in his capacity as Chairman of the South Commission.¹³ Hungary's recent opening of its borders with Austria so as to allow migration of thousands of East Germans to West Germany via Austria also fits in the pattern of things happening in Eastern Europe.

Jean Monnet, the visionary and the practical, anticipated all this and much more some thirty years back. With his deep sense of history and empathy with the deeply hurt psyche of the Europeans who lost their empires after the Second World War and hence felt "loss of past greatness and prestige", he knew that the desire to regain the past greatness and prestige will bring European nations together. Even before 1964 he wrote:

The countries of continental Europe, which have fought each other so often in the past and which, even in peacetime, organized their economies as potential instruments of war, are now uniting in a Common Market which is laying the foundations for political union.

Britain is negotiating to enter this European Community and by this very fact changing the tradition of centuries. And now the President of the United States is already asking Congress for powers to negotiate with the enlarged European Common Market.¹⁴

He did not agree with those who thought that Britain's entry into the Common Market would put a break on EEC's efforts of economic integration and would compromise the political unity of European countries. He wrote:

I am convinced that the British today are anxious to enter the European Community, not simply in order to take part in its economic growth, but also because they are necessarily conscious that none of our countries can any longer separately exercise any real influence in world affairs, and that only the union of Europe whose fate they wish to share will allow them to exercise this necessary political influence.¹⁵

Monnet's vision was not limited to unity among West European countries, but went much beyond. He wrote about "Atlantic Community" and unity of "West" bringing America and Europe together.

Just as the United States in their own day found it necessary to unite, just as Europe is now in the process of uniting, so the West must move toward some kind of union. This is not an end in itself. It is the beginning on the road to the more orderly world we must have if we are to escape destruction.¹⁶

He even expected Soviet Union to join in the efforts for European unification.

The President of the United States is seeking powers to negotiate with the European Community on steps to an Atlantic Partnership even before Britain has joined. Can we not expect a similar phenomenon in future relations with the Soviet Union?¹⁷

This was the strength of Monnet. He was a visionary, he was practical and he was frank. His "We" referred to European Community. He openly voiced the hidden feelings and sentiments of the post-war Europeans, and provided methods to satisfy the hidden urge of the Europeans. If the Europeans want to regain their lost prestige, pride and influence then they must politically unite. But all early direct attempts for political unity failed. The problem was how to market the idea of United Europe, how to make it acceptable to various European communities, as well as to Europe's adversaries. And Monnet planned a most innovative practical marketing strategy through the institution of Common Market. As John Brooks tells us, Max Kohnstamm, Vice-President of Jean Monnet's Action Committee for the United States of Europe, sums up Monnet's views this way. "You must have an idealistic objective and then be very practical. You must proceed step by step, never anticipating the next step. Political unity can be built only on self-evident material interest. Also, you have to create institutions that will perpetuate themselves."¹⁸

III

Behind Monnet's institutional approach to achieve European Unity, there is also, what looks like, a political philosophy. We give below the essence of his thoughts, though to do justice to him one must carefully study his article "A Ferment of Change". In this article, Monnet describes the setting for the Common Market in terms of substantial economic, scientific, and political changes that had taken place in the twentieth century--changes that have changed the manner of life more "than all the thousands of years of man's progress put together". He wrote;

For the first time we in the West are witnessing the emergence of a truly mass society marked by mass consumption, mass education and even mass culture....And now, on the very eve of creating unprecedented conditions of abundance, we are suddenly faced with the consequence of our extraordinary mastery over the physical forces of nature.¹⁹

Here he refers to modern medicine due to which population of the world is increasing fantastically fast, and new powers of destruction repeatedly created by science.

We are then in a world of rapid change, in which men and nations must learn to control themselves in their relations with others. This to my mind, can only be done through institutions: and it is this need for common institutions that we have learnt in Europe since the war.²⁰

The Europeans had to overcome the mistrust born of centuries of feuds and wars. The governments and peoples of Europe still thought in the old terms of victors and vanquished. Yet, if the basis for peace in the world was to be established, these notions had to be eliminated. Here again, one had to go beyond the nation and the conception of national interest as an end itself.²¹

We have seen that Europe has overcome the attitude of domination which ruled state policies for so many centuries. But quite apart from what this means for us in the old continent, this is a fact of world importance. It is obvious that countries and people who are overcoming this state of mind between themselves will bring the same mentality to their relations with others, outside Europe. The new method of action developed in Europe replaces the efforts at domination of nation states by a constant process of collective adaptation to new conditions, a chain reaction, a ferment where one change induces another.²²

He concludes:

One impression predominates in my mind over all others. It is this: unity in Europe does not create a new kind of great power; it is a method for introducing change in Europe and consequently in the world. People, more often outside the European Community than within, are tempted to see the European Community as a potential nineteenth-century state with all the overtones of power this implies. But we are not in the nineteenth century, and the Europeans have built up the European Community precisely in order to find a way out of conflicts to which the nineteenth-century power philosophy gave rise. The natural

attitude of a European Community based on the exercise by nations of common responsibilities will be to make these nations also aware of their responsibilities, as a Community, to the world. In fact, we already see this sense of world responsibilities developing as unity in Europe begins to affect Britain, America, and many areas of the world. European unity is not a blueprint, it is not a theory, it is a process that has already begun, of bringing peoples and nations together to adapt themselves jointly to changing circumstances.

European unity is the most important event in the West since the war, not because it is a new great power, but because the new institutional method it introduces is permanently modifying relations between nations and men. Human nature does not change, but when nations and men accept the same rules and the same institutions to make sure that they are applied, their behaviour towards each other changes. This is the process of civilization itself.²³

We have extensively quoted Monnet so that the readers will have clear understanding of the philosophy which determined, and continues to determine, all the overt and covert actions of Europeans after the Treaty of Rome.

IV

VIKRAM SARABHAI LIBRARY
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT
VASTRAPUR, AMMEDABAD-380015

Monnet's proposition is very attractive and has great appeal. One would like to believe that his institutional approach and theory of change would change the behaviour of European nations towards each other and thus contribute to European unity, and consequently to the European community's behaviour towards non-European communities. He perceived the fear in the minds of non-European communities of the potential formidable power of a United States of Europe. He tried to pacify such fears by saying that European nations were changing, that they no more believed in nineteenth century power philosophy, and that the natural attitude of European Community will be to make European nations aware of their responsibilities, as a community, to the world.

After reading Monnet many questions come to mind. Perhaps these would be obvious to any person of average intelligence and education belonging to the non-European communities, but may not occur to Europeans and people of European origin.

The first and foremost is: why should we believe what Monnet says? His primary concern, his basic objective is European unity. What happens to the rest of the world is only consequential and hence of secondary importance. Once the primary objective of European Unity is achieved, Monnet's logic may or may not work, and United Europe may or may not behave with the expected sense of responsibility towards the non-Europeans. The next generation of European leaders may not respect Monnet's approach for peaceful change in the world order. During fermentation of mesh a vinegar-fly may spoil everything. So also a dictator during a ferment of change. Nobody refers to Monnet as "humanist". On the contrary, Brooks calls him, "arch-European",²⁴ and tells us "Monnet never talks about 'mankind' or 'humanity'.²⁵ Monnet was a tactician and practical man. Assuring the non-European communities may or may not be a part of his strategy to reduce immediate, direct confrontation to the process of European Unity. But doubts remain.

There is a reason for such doubts. Over the centuries, European intellectuals developed every kind of social, economic and political philosophies and theories to suit every kind of situation. There are theories on feudalism, mercantilism, capitalism, all shades of socialism, communism, fundamentalism, and so on. There are theories on entrepreneurship and *Laissez-faire* and again on protectionism; on democracy and totalitarianism; on nationalism to global order; on liberty, equality, fraternity to survival of the fittest and Whiteman's burden; on ruthless exploitation of natural resources and also on limits to growth and conservation; Malthus's theory on population and those challenging it. You name it and they have it. All these theories were evolved to suit the need of the time and as such were very convenient and practical. These came handy and were very effectively applied for the benefit of Europeans. None came in the way of European expansion, prosperity and wars. And these are very selectively and effectively used even now while dealing with each other and especially with non-European communities who are often not sure which theory will be used against them and when. And now we have Monnet's 'Behavioural Change Through Institutional Approach' theory. Will it prove any better for the non-European communities than those evolved earlier?

Even if one believes in Monnet's philosophy, there are no indications that the behaviour and attitude of European community towards the non-European communities has been changing over the last forty years. The feelings expressed during the recent NAM summit forcefully bring out this point. One can argue that such processes take a long time and things would be better in future. One could be idealistic, but then as Monnet advised one must be very practical, and proceed step by step never anticipating the next step. In that case, non-European communities too must get the benefits step by step from the expected step by step changes in the behaviour of the European community, and not in remote future. Monnet also advised that "Political unity can be built only on self-evident material interest." If a decent world political order is the goal, then there should be evidence that material interest of the non-European communities are also taken into consideration. So far the evidence is contrary.

V

Of the four motives behind the formation of the Common Market, one refers to 'loss of past greatness, prestige and political influence of the Europeans', and their desire to regain these. Such 'European' feelings look rather improper from non-European perspective. Europeans' past greatness, prestige and political influence was in relation to non-European communities and product of imperialism, and colonialism. Greatness or prestige is a comparative term. To regain these means at a cost to somebody else, namely the pride and prestige of non-European communities. Why should Europeans feel loss of pride, prestige and greatness when non-European communities gained freedom and started participating on equal terms in various forums like the United Nations? So long as this desire to regain past prestige and political influence determine the attitude and behaviour of the European Community, it would be difficult for non-European communities to accept Monnet's philosophy.

The two other motives behind the formation of the Common Market refer to aggressive German nationalism. European integration was needed to substitute European nationalism for German nationalism. This would channelise German nationalism, which imposed devastating war on Europe's soil, in such a way that no more wars would be fought on Europe's soil.

Germans are the largest racial block²⁶ in Europe, and today with French they are the most dominating members of the EEC. Under supra-national EEC people of Europe hope to contain the German aggressiveness. Present division of German race is merely a passing phase in the history of Europe. One can predict that the two Germanys will be united before the end of 1990. The German "racial block" will continue to be the largest homogeneous block in Europe determining future actions of EEC. One cannot be sure that European Community will effectively overcome certain underlying traits which only fifty years back supported the "Racial Determinist" philosophy under Nazi Germany. As bad coins circulate fast, so also the bad attitudes and behavioural traits, and instead of overpowering such traits, there is an inherent danger that in the process of integration entire Europe may get infected by such traits. Then Europe's march from Nationalism to Supra-European Nationalism to Racialism would be the most logical historical process. In fact, Supra-European Nationalism is emerging as a synonym for European racialism, or to coin a new term, Euracialism. It is this Euracialism which is under the ferment for change in East European countries and Russia, and not the love for democracy as most people think. And this Euracialism is bound to influence the communities of European origin outside Europe, since seeds of such racial attitudes are always dormant in these societies. Such a process may ultimately lead to *War of Races* (replacing War of Ideologies) among Homo Sapiens since history shows that groups of men by and large never behave sapiently while dealing with groups with different physical traits, and where control on resources are involved. Non-European communities have experienced this in the past.

Monnet's proposition of "Unity of West" to bring Europe, USA and Russia together can be viewed from two altogether different perspectives. Under the first perspective one can hope that if these three super powers come together then tension in the world would be reduced, and consequently the threat of thermonuclear war. Hopefully, these three super powers will then spend less on armaments and, instead of competing for weapon markets and political influence over the non-European countries, would collectively help in the development of these countries. This will bring peace in the world, which inspite of all the great religions and socio-political philosophies, eluded mankind all these thousands of years. Human race can then collectively think of far greater achievements in the field of science and technology, and confidently go on Space Odyssey colonising other planets of solar system and beyond.

The other perspective is just the opposite and rather bleak. The "Unity of West", "Common European Home" could be seen as "Unity of Communities of European Origin". The concept of "European Origin" is the most potent concept EEC strategists have introduced in their efforts to unite European communities. It is also linked with the motive of regaining prestige and political influence of the Europeans. The concept of European origin expands Europe's racial, economic and political linkages beyond the geographical boundaries of Europe. It covers Europe and all the European settlements in North America, Canada, South America, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa, as well as those of White Russians up to the Urals and beyond. Thus, it leads to Supra-European racial organization vis-a-vis the non-European communities of Africa and Asia belonging to the Black, Brown and Yellow races which are now surrounded on all sides by the White race. During early expeditions and colonization there were war of races but on limited, isolated fronts managed by individual nation-states of Europe. Under the combined power of the supra-national institutions managed by the community of European Origin under the planned direction of EEC and the emerging United States of Europe, the future "War of Races" would bring untold misery to the communities of

non-European origin. Seen from this perspective EEC is not only being evolved as a supra-mercantile, supra-national organisation, but also a prelude to ultimate War of The Races. This is rather a frightening though more likely scenario.

Such observations might be considered by some as over-reaction, alarmist, paranoid, wicked or doomsday prophesies. Race is a rather unpopular word and generally not referred to openly. Massive literature on EEC is produced by European and American scholars. However, few have analysed EEC from the racial perspective. We have one article,²⁷ perhaps only one of its kind, by Professor Ali A. Mazrui, an African Professor, which provides the racial perspective. Incidentally, his article is published in the same book in which Jean Monnet's "A Ferment of Change" is published. In his article Professor Mazrui brings out many dimensions of African attitude towards EEC. One should read his article carefully as perhaps it also reflects the feelings of Asians. Some of his important observations are presented below:

No European leader nowadays is likely to consider it wise to discuss openly the full implications, for Europe's future, of a racially self-conscious Afro-Asia. And yet as influential a columnist as James Reston, writing in *The New York Times*, has claimed that those implications are certainly not absent from European thinking at the highest level. Claiming official sources for his statements he has said that for Britain the need to keep talking to the Russians--and, implicitly, to have a united Europe--arises in part from considerations of future protection against the pressure of races far more numerous than the white races. Looking at the same long-range future, a French official, talking to Mr. Reston, forecast that "the great conflict at the end of the century will not be ideological but racial."²⁸

Mr. Reston himself concedes that this may be a wrong forecast but, in his own words, "it is being said, not by broom philosophers, but by some of the most influential officials in the Western world." Mr. Gaitskell, also addressing himself to Americans in reference to Europe and the underdeveloped world, has expressed the fear lest the European Common Market should develop into something "inspired by its own form of nationalism behind a high tariff wall."²⁹

But even if Mr. Reston is merely theorizing, Mr. Gaitskell unduly fearful, and the issue of race undiscussed in the counsels of Europe, that issue is still, in the estimation of many Africans, implicit in the logic of European plans. Inevitably, Europeans have both a regional and a racial identity. In American eyes, Europeans may be little more than inhabitants of another continent--cousins, perhaps, across the Atlantic. But to Africans and Asians they are both inhabitants of another continent and members of another race or group of races. European plans that are detrimental to African interests, actually or potentially, cannot therefore avoid racial implications.³⁰

Mazrui's observations are also applicable to Asian interests. Though written in 1963, these are still valid as could be seen from the feelings expressed recently in Japan.

The use of Super 301 against Japan by the U.S. has been a spark that has ignited Japan's Asian nationalism, according to report in the U.S. press. Ms. Ayako Doi, Washington correspondent for *The Japan Times*, in an article in the *Post* quotes an editor of a respected

weekly as saying: "How many centuries has it been since a coloured race last made a realistic challenge for global hegemony? Now, for the first time in several centuries, the Japanese race has proven that Asians can once again stand on an equal footing with the white man.³¹

Thus, racial dimension is very much present in the thinking on both the sides--the European as well as the non-European. And if these are not controlled in time war of races will be inevitable. The French official's remark (reported by James Reston) that the great conflict at the end of the century would not be ideological but racial, may lead to a self-fulfilling prophecy. Under the present day technological advancement the implications of such racial conflict will be far more disastrous to non-European communities than what they have had experienced so far.

In the early expeditions and colonisation Europeans annihilated many non-European communities whenever they found it necessary, and which they could do without much cost.³² However, on many instances they did not do so as it would be dysfunctional and impractical. Some they allowed to live as slaves since cheap labour was needed. In other cases they needed the native population for exploitation of local natural resources. There were four factors that came in the way of annihilation of non-European communities. Firstly, with the technologies available then, it would be a costly affair in terms of man, money and material to destroy the entire non-European communities especially in densely populated regions. Secondly, inspite of its fast growth sufficient European manpower was not always available to replace the native population for exploitation of natural resources. Thirdly, technology and machines were not available to replace human labour required for production. Fourthly, non-European communities were also the markets for goods and their complete destruction would have affected the European economy.

Such were the circumstances then, which are very different from the present ones. In the past it took nearly two hundred years for Europeans to establish their supremacy over the non-European communities. Now the technologies of transport, warfare, communication etc. are so advanced that the same results could be achieved, may be, within twenty days or even in twenty hours with the help of modern thermonuclear and chemical weapons and delivery systems. With advancement of science and technology Europe now needs fewer men for exploitation of world's natural resources. There are labour saving machines and robots. Large populations can be destroyed at relatively less cost with the help of atomic and chemical weapons (as proved by the Bhopal experiment), germ warfare and space weapons. Chemical and germ warfare is more convenient as it can selectively destroy population without damaging the physical and natural assets. People of European origin already possess all these technologies and continue to develop these. It is obvious they would not like the non-European communities to have these for fear of retaliation. Hence emphasis on non-proliferation treaty and attack on Col. Gaddafi's chemical factories. Population of European origin is also now sufficiently large for further colonisation. Technology is also now so advanced that this population can live comfortably under any kind of agro-climatic condition--from burning desert to coldest tundra. In short, they can conveniently enjoy all the resources of earth without the help of non-European stock. In fact, they do not need them any more for economic development of European stock on Earth. What they need is land and resources alone.

This is a frightening scenario - something from science fiction - especially for the non-European communities, and also for the communities of European origin if the non-European communities, in the meanwhile, develop sufficient capabilities to retaliate. Hence, all the hurry for the United Europe.

This, then is the other perspective from which Monnet's proposition of 'Unity of West' can be viewed. As we have seen Monnet perceived this scenario and tried to pacify the non-European communities saying that European nations were changing and once the United States of Europe was formed these nations would behave with a sense of responsibility. As we discussed earlier this may or may not happen. Mazrui and James Reston provide a word of caution. These authors in a way warn that opportunity is the greatest enemy of honesty, and vigilance is the price of freedom. If non-European communities are not vigilant, behave like ostrich and become complacent by short-term gains from EEC operations, often at a cost to other non-European communities, they would then be providing unrestricted opportunities to United Europe to be wicked. In the past, Europe discovered New World - a concept which did not take into account the old communities of these lands and their civilizations such as of Incas and Mayas. Under Monnet's philosophy the Europe is now constructing a New World - a new world for the Europeans, even if it may lead to War of Races. End of the century is not very far, and the French official's prophecy and James Rustons theory about the racial war by the end of the century will be validated soon. Hopefully, Nostradamus' prophecy will not come true.³³

These two different perspectives on 'Unity of West' raise a few questions:

1. Is there any guiding/balancing factor inherent in European community that will keep the community on the path presented under the first perspective, and discourage it from the path presented under the second perspective?
2. Is there an objective, independent internal monitoring system/institution in Europe to see that European Community behave as proposed by Monnet and move in the direction presented under the first perspective.
3. Is there an external, non-European, monitoring system/ Institution to watch over the operations of EEC?
4. Is there any international Organization/Institution which can effectively monitor and influence the operations of EEC/United States of Europe so that it moves on the path presented under the first perspective?
5. Will USA and other communities of European origin join Europe to form a racial block?
6. If EEC/United States of Europe takes a racial path as discussed under the second perspective what would be reaction of its member countries/constituent units?
7. Will USA support EEC/United States of Europe even if it moves on racial path?
8. Should non-European communities continue to deal/negotiate with EEC individually as at present, or should they form organization and institutions for collective bargaining/negotiation with EEC. In other words, is anti-thesis of EEC is non-EEC?

These questions are important because supra-national EEC regime is evolved and operating outside the United Nations Organisation. Even though UNO has been looking into EEC policies and operations and their impact on developing countries from time to time, its effectiveness in influencing EEC is doubtful. So also of the Commonwealth, and NAM. If United Europe follows the path as discussed above under the second perspective, in not too distant a future UNO will go the way of the League of Nations which was disbanded after the Second World War, in 1947. So also will the Commonwealth. Who can then possibly influence United Europe if it goes on the wrong path? Possibility of European Community going the 'wrong way' is much more if and when the Common Market fails to fulfil the high expectations raised by it, than if it succeeds. Crisis of expectations and associated frustration of population provides fertile soil for the growth of facism as has happened in Europe many times in the past. America, which initiated the process of European unity under the Marshall Aid, could be one such power that can influence EEC operations in favour of under-developed countries, unless it itself is unduly influenced by the EEC. Even though majority of its population is of whites, it is a multi-race nation, and the only country in the world which fought a civil war to abolish slavery. Question is: Will it produce another Lincoln; not *after* people suffered as in the past, but *before*, to prevent the sufferings?

Similar is the question for the UK. Is it a Trojan Horse, or a watch dog to see that the Fortress Europe does not produce another French genius - Napoleon or a German genius - Hitler, or a crossbred of these two geniuses, to determine what is good for Europe and what is good for mankind? Or, will it join the bandwagon to be a continuing part of modern history which, as Leo Tolstoy observed "has postulated its own aims--the welfare of the French, German, or English people, or in its highest abstraction, the welfare and civilization of humanity in general, by which it usually meant that of the people occupying a small north-westerly portion of a large continent".³⁴ Perhaps, they will produce another Churchill to tell them later, "HOW THE ENGLISH-SPEAKING PEOPLES THROUGH THEIR UNWISDOM CARELESSNESS AND GOOD NATURE ALLOWED THE WICKED TO REARM".³⁵

The third influential power, though not readily visible, is Israel and the Jewish Community in USA and Europe. An estimated million-and-a-half Jews were gassed to death by the Nazis in the Auschwitz-Birkneau Complex in Poland during the Second World War only 50 years back. Vaiju Naravane reports that the Jewish Community once again fears that there is fresh anti-semitic onslaught under way in Europe and the Catholic Church is going so far as to write a new revisionist history to erase all memories of the holocaust.³⁶ Jewish Community can not forget the millions of its adults and children tortured and killed brutally by Hitler's fascist hordes, and one can hope that it will see that the Franco-German collaboration for the United Europe does not repeat the history. In his review of the Simon Weisenthal Story, Editor of the *Illustrated Weekly of India* advises us that one has to constantly battle against public amnesia, and reminds us of one simple axiom: "It will happen again if you forget it. If you ignore this simple axiom, you are condemned to repeat history, to repeat its most painful episodes again and again and again. That is why people like Simon Weisenthal are so important".³⁷ One can expect Jewish Community to join hands with others to see that such history is not repeated again.

IV

The fourth motive behind the formation of the Common Market was 'an enhanced standard of living for the member countries'. This purely economic motive is laudable, so long as the objective is not achieved at the cost of under-developed countries of Asia and Africa. For centuries their economies were controlled by the European nations. Only during the last forty years or so they got an opportunity to try on their own to improve their standard of living which was always, and still now, much below that of Europeans.

Two major factors associated with standard of living are population and agricultural production. On both the fronts European community face problems. Europe has been, and still is, one of the most densely populated regions of the world. Five of the twelve EEC countries, namely, U.K., the Netherlands, German Federal Republic, Belgium and Luxembourg, have higher density of population than India. Historically, density as well as rate of growth of European population has been higher than Asia. Between 1650 to 1929 density of population in Europe increased from 26 to 126, while in Asia it increased from 15 to 57. During this period Europe's population increased by 4.8 times, while that of Asia 3.8 times.³⁸ This higher rate of growth of European population has been inspite of high death rates during major famines, epidemics and war, vast movement of population to New World countries since the 16th century, and greater agricultural productivity and industrialisation. Between 1821 to 1932 alone nearly 70 million Europeans migrated to New World countries and Asiatic Russia. Between 1946 and 1957 further 6.6 million Europeans migrated to New World countries. In spite of such massive migrations, density of population in Europe remained very high.

The population of New World countries also increased very fast due to high rate of growth and continuous high immigration from Europe. Taking into account European population plus migration of Europeans to the New World countries and other parts of the World and their growth of population upto 1929, Willcox reported that "The non-European stocks in the world have increased since 1650 about 3.2 times; the European stocks about 6.4 times, or twice as fast."³⁹

Monnet in his paper 'A Ferment of Change' observed:

Modern medicine is steadily increasing our prospects of life, so that the population of the world is increasing fantastically fast. The United States, which had 76 million people in 1900 and has 180 million today, will probably reach a population of 300 million in the year 2000 - a fourfold increase. America can afford this. But we all know what terrible pressures on resources the growth of population is creating in Asia. There, the number of people will have multiplied five times in a century, from 850 million in 1900 to almost 4000 million in the year 2000.⁴⁰

Monnet is silent on Europe's own population. As in the case of industrialisation so also in population growth Europe has an early start. Its current low rate of population growth is reached *after* the density of population has already reached a very high level, and *after* continuing heavy immigration to New World countries. What other countries are "achieving" now on population front, Europe achieved long back. Monnet referred to fast rate of growth of population of United States and Asia. From European perspective the economic implications of such population growth in US and Asia are many. Firstly, with increasing

population these countries themselves require increasingly greater part of their agricultural and other resources to satisfy their own increasing needs and desires. This increasingly affects the availability of agricultural and other commodities to Europe. While during the present transition period availability of these commodities may not be a serious problem, in future availability of these commodities to match the unsatiable demands of already over populated nations of Europe will be a problem. And Europeans, especially West Europeans, are acutely aware of this. Secondly, with the growth of their own population, in future United States and other New World countries may not absorb the same level of immigration from Europe as in the past and in post-war period.

As regards food, other agricultural commodities and forest products, Western Europe to a considerable extent depends upon imports. In Europe, there is a relationship between higher density of population and higher industrialization on the one hand and net import of food and agricultural commodities on the other. For example, UK, Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg, all are net importers of food and agricultural commodities. There are many other countries in Europe which are superficially self-sufficient. Their statistics mainly refer to *production* of foodgrains, especially cereals, meat, milk and milk products, poultry and eggs. Production statistics to prove self sufficiency is deceptive, especially when it comes to livestock products. One must see the inputs that go in livestock production. If a country does not produce all the *organic matter* needed to feed its livestock population and depends on imports of feed ingredients (e.g. rice bran, de-oiled cake, etc.) to that extent the country cannot be considered self-sufficient in agriculture. All these organic matters are product of land and import of these indicates that some other country's land is "used" to get these. Such self-sufficiency merely indicates the capacity to import. Hence, a country may be self-sufficient in food by production statistics but not agriculturally so. Many European countries are self-sufficient or even surplus in livestock products only by incomplete production analysis. At the aggregate level, self-sufficiency in agriculture means self-sufficiency in organic matter or bio-mass needed to satisfy country's demand. The organic matter could be in the form of cotton, jute, silk, oilseeds, oil-cakes, cassava, timber, wood products like pulp, hide, skins, bones, wool, hair, tea, coffee, cocoa, sugar, and so on. All these are direct and indirect products of land.

In the production of these, land, man and capital are, in a way 'blocked'. For the importing country it means somewhere, some land, labour and capital is used for its benefit. And for the exporting country it means some of its land, labour and capital is used to support the demand at some other place. Export of agricultural commodities and products means loss of precious organic matter to the exporting country and gain to the importing country. It is the organic matter that conserves the fertility of soil and stops degradation of land and environment. For maintaining soil fertility and environmental balance, organic matter must be replaced either directly or through animal chain.

Historically, Western Europe has been deficient in food, other agricultural commodities and forest products.⁴¹ It evolved various mechanisms to overcome the food supply problems that beset the Western and Central Europe in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. These mechanisms, though evolved in earlier period, are of great significance even now as they are still in operation. In his classic work Wilhelm Abel has described the evolution of these mechanisms, the basic component of which are 'international division of labour' and 'Zonal

Economy'. He wrote:

As transport grew cheaper and the political obstacles to commerce began to fade away, the local differences which had become noticeable in the sixteenth century evolved into an international division of agrarian labour. At first the thickly-populated and highly-industrialized north-western corner of Europe bounded by the triangular London-Paris-Ruhr district was regarded as 'the town' and 'the world'. Round this 'urban area', writes Schiller, (1940:11f), spread 'an intensively exploited zone of improved cultivation and horticulture. Next to that stretched the great east European corn-belt. The outermost ring was formed by the yet more extensive cultivated areas overseas'. Between the last two zones lay Europe's peripheral agricultural areas, especially those of the Mediterranean lands whose share in the world agricultural trade consisted almost entirely of a few special crops such as semi-tropical and dried fruits. The intensive zones supplied the animal and horticultural products consumed in the industrial areas; from the extensive zones came the agricultural raw material needed for industry itself, and also the livestock products from the steppes. During the nineteenth century still other supply zones came into being, especially in America and the Far East.

In the heart of industrial Europe some areas still remained under less intensive forms of agriculture. In spite of the extensive type of farming practised in the overseas supply zones, a number of them began to manufacture dairy products which soon entered into competition with the dairy-farming areas of the old world (Denmark, the Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland and Ireland). But on the whole this 'zonal economy' prevailed and, because of it, the peoples of Europe were better fed.

That, in very rough outline, answers the question of how the food supply problems that beset western and central Europe in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries were overcome. The answer is incomplete, however, as long as only consumption and supply are considered. It is time to bring the other aspects of the economy of food supply into the picture: trade turnover, price structure, farming returns and their fluctuations.⁴²

EEC's operations within and outside Europe, to enhance the standard of living of Europeans, can be analysed using the concepts of zonal economy and international division of agrarian labour. The questions to be asked are:

Does the zonal economy concept continue to operate within Europe? At the heart of EEC is the 'London-Paris-Ruhr district'. Is EEC trying to re-establish the supremacy of this region as 'the town', 'the world' with sophisticated, high-tech industries, seat of United Europe's government, financial institutions, etc? Other regions in Europe to be developed to provide this central region food (with intensification of agriculture, and livestock industries), and industrial products (especially those produced by heavy industries and chemical industries, and those which add to pollution), and industrial components (for assembly in the central region). Under the Common Market, man, money and materials can move freely within the EEC region. This freedom would encourage movement of people from high density to low density regions in Europe. On the other hand, with the development of other European regions migration of people from less densely region to the central region would be reduced. In less densely populated regions in Europe agricultural and pastoral activities are relatively more

predominant, and the standard of living of those involved in these activities is relatively low compared to industrial workers. EEC's Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) takes care of this by providing, among other things, highly incentive prices for agricultural commodities and livestock products. This has helped in increasing the productivity as well as providing higher income to farmers. Since food is the most important aspect of economy, from the beginning a major component of EEC's budget is earmarked for CAP, and major part of it is for heavily subsidising agricultural and livestock production.

Following complex land use, crop and livestock planning--an optimisation exercise--under CAP, EEC is today self-sufficient and even surplus, in foodgrains, especially wheat, and livestock products except beef and mutton. Still, as discussed earlier, it has to import livestock feedstuff, other agricultural commodities and forest products. Thus, on the one hand European Community is world's largest food importer, it is also one of the most important exporter of certain food commodities (such as wheat, skimmed milk powder, butter etc.). This gives it both market power and a key role in influencing agricultural policies world wide. It is from this context one has to see its operations in "Overseas Supply Zones".

After the loss of colonies, Europe has to re-establish its linkages with the overseas supply zones. EEC's major efforts are in African countries, especially those which were French colonies. Its development support to Asian and African countries is directly or indirectly linked with its own agricultural and/or industrial interests. In African quarters fear is expressed that EEC is attempting a particular kind of international division of labour, under which Africa would remain an agricultural continent indefinitely, and would be reduced to a status of excessive economic dependence on Europe--a status which amounts to "neo-colonial" status. Such fears are very aptly described by Mazrui:

And Africa as a whole might learn too late that she could not, in President Nkrumah's words, improve even her standard of living by remaining an agricultural continent indefinitely or "improve the skills and ingenuity of her people by keeping them solely as workers in rural areas(14).

Within the context of this reasoning, the EEC freshly underlines the fact that "class" or national income divisions on a global scale coincide with race divisions as between white and coloured peoples. To the extent that the EEC has already tempted the bulk of French-speaking Africa with the carrot of associate membership, and may tempt others, the Community can be regarded as one of those devices which President Sekou Toure' once condemned as calculated "to make of all Africa the continent of the proletarian peoples"(15) And if the word "calculated" suggests malicious intent and is unjust to the motives of Europe, then one can, as an alternative, support the view of the *New Statesman* on the EEC and blame at least "blind economic forces" for "dividing the world into a white bourgeoisie and a coloured proletariat.(16)⁴³

It was these deep-rooted concerns of Africans which were behind the severe criticism of the draft declaration prepared by Yugoslavia in the September 1989 NAM summit meeting at Belgrade. Their criticism indicates that the concerns of Africans, presented by Mazrui in 1962, are still very much alive even after nearly thirty years of EEC operations in Africa. These concerns are of equal importance to us also. In our country we are not as critical and forthright

as Africans while analysing our relations with EEC. Either we are ignorant,⁴⁴ or we are more diplomatic, or both. One would, however, expect that our policy makers in government and industry, when tempted by immediate or short-term gains from any association with EEC, will also keep in mind the motives and calculations of EEC in developing its relations with us.

In their perpetual struggle for food and agricultural commodities, each European nation has used every possible means to safeguard its food and agricultural as well as industrial interests. Any rigid dogmatic approach regarding trade policies was never followed. The concept of free trade has always been a matter of convenience to be followed or discarded according to one's immediate interests. Even when each West European nation carved out 'overseas economic zones' and 'areas of influence', this did not lead to free trade or free competition among European nations and between the colony and the imperial power. In fact, colonised people were subjected to all manners of oligopolistic, monopolistic and absolutist control in the name of free enterprise and *Laissez faire* under theories of imperialism. In short, throughout its history Western Europe devised and followed various kinds of tariff protection, non-tariff measures and interventions in agricultural markets to safeguard its food and agricultural interests. These are reported by Wilhelm Abel⁴⁵ and B.H. Slicher Van Bath⁴⁶ and many others. Some of the best analyses of the Western Europe are presented by Michael Tracy,⁴⁷ and S.B. Clough and C.W. Cole.⁴⁸

Some of the principles of international trade were laid down during these early periods. For example, Colbert of France under Louis XIV, who gave great importance to trade with colonies, and to exploit these founded a number of monopolistic chartered companies between 1664 and 1670, believed that 'one nation could improve its position only at the expense of the others', and commerce 'a perpetual and peaceable war of wits and energy among all nations'. His rules for tariff were simple: "reduce them on imports of raw materials and exports of manufactured and colonial goods; raise them on imports of manufactures and exports of raw materials".⁴⁹

Throughout the history of Western Europe, commerce was never a 'peaceable war'. On the contrary it always led to military war. One notices repetition of following action-reaction pattern: Tariffs to protect one's interest from others' onslaught—Tariff wars - military action - peace settlements - non-conformity by one party or other - second cycle of tariffs, tariff wars, military action, peace settlement, - ad infinitum.⁵⁰ Under the Common Market by 1992 there will be completely tariff-free European Economic Community. So, no more tariff wars among the European nations. However, historically evolved and tested principles of trade and commerce are being followed with the same vigour while dealing with other nations. Simultaneously, strong protectionist measures are introduced by EEC creating, what is popularly known as "Fortress Europe". That is how EEC plans to enhance the standard of living of its people.

Success on economic front is essential for EEC. On this depends the achievement of its political objective, namely the United Europe. It is obvious that it will try to achieve it at any cost, using all possible means. And it is well-versed in all such means. During the last four centuries, in their ruthless efforts for dominating the world each West European nation and Europe collectively, has accumulated vast intellectual resources, experiences and skills, besides material assets.⁵¹ Their scientific orientation and technological abilities are of the highest order, only recently matched by USA, USSR, and Japan. But what is more important is their

accumulated experience. They have unmatched experience of exercising political and economic control over their erstwhile worldwide empires and far-flung colonies. Their skills in political manipulation, manoeuvring and divide-and-rule game are superb. They have not only learnt how to exercise political power and economic control over other people, but have also mastered the diabolic art of influencing and controlling the minds of these people. The subjugated people, always kept on the defensive, could not think beyond their immediate sufferings and wants, and continue to be on the defensive even after becoming independent.⁵² In contrast to these peoples' rather narrow, limited vision--a frog in the well orientation--conditioned by centuries of subjugation, the Europeans, historically have had global orientation and long-term perspective especially where trade and commerce are involved. Due to such orientation their capabilities in strategic, long-term planning, both in terms of time, space, and details are formidable. While most of the non-European countries generally think in terms of annual or at the most short-term import-export of their commodities and accordingly try to plan their production, the European nations systematically think in terms of long-term global production and markets, and do meticulous planning and use all possible means to influence decisions in those countries where their interests are involved. Towards this various international institutions and forums have been deliberately evolved and effectively used. We have already mentioned earlier how in the past Europeans developed every kind of social, economic and political theories and philosophies and effectively used these for the sole benefit of Europe. While dealing with EEC, non-European communities have to keep in mind all these formidable strengths of the European community.

NOTES

1. Along with Monnet were many others, notable among them were the then members of the Executive Commission of the European Common Market: Walter Hallstein (President), Robert Margolin (Vice-President), Sicco Mansholt (Vice-President), Giuseppe Caron (Vice-President), Robert Lemaignan, Jean Rey, Hans von der Groeben, Lambert Schaus, and Lionello Levi Sandri. These were from different member countries of EEC.
2. For Monnet's analysis of basic reasons for European Unity, and his approach see Jean Monnet, "A Ferment of Change" in Lawrence B. Krause (ed), *The Common Market: Progress and Controversy*, Prentice-Hall Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1964, pp.40-50 (Reprinted from the *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol.1, No.3; Year of Publication not given). See also Monnet's Introduction to Richard Mayne, *The Community of Europe*, W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., New York, 1962, see also p.13.
3. For detailed description on European population and migration, see Author's Working Papers on *European Population in Historical Perspective*, and *European Migration*, (mimeographed), available with author.
4. John Brooks, *The European Common Market*, Economica Books, Smith, Keynes and Marshall, Inc., Publishers, New York, 1963, p.27. See also pp. 12-14 and 62-68 for Brooks' biographical sketch of Jean Monnet.
5. Krause, *op.cit.*, pp.3-5
6. *Ibid*, p. 5
7. Brooks, *op.cit.*, p.12.
8. Krause, *op.cit.*, p.5.
9. Shawn Tully, "Europe Gets Ready for 1992", in *Fortune*, February 1, 1988, p.64.

10. *Ibid*, p.68
11. As reported in *The Times of India*, Ahmedabad edition, August 23, 1989.
12. Rajiv Desai, "The New Kremlin perspective is decidedly racist", in *The Times of India*, Ahmedabad Edition, July 31, 1989. According to Desai, official spokesman of Soviet Foreign Ministry, Gennadi Gerasimov said, "We're not about to replace your Bata shoes with Bally (of Switzerland). At least not yet."
13. As reported by L.K. Sharma, *The Times of India*, Ahmedabad edition, September 4, 1989,
14. Monnet, "A Ferment of Change", *op.cit.*, p.42.
15. *Ibid.*, p.46
16. *Ibid.*, p.48
17. *Ibid.*, p.49
18. Brooks, *op.cit.*, p.66
19. Monnet, *Op cit*, p. 40
20. *Ibid*, p. 41
21. *Ibid*, p. 43
22. *Ibid*, p. 47
23. *Ibid*, pp. 49-50
24. *Op cit.*, facing page 69, Epilogue.
25. *Ibid*, p. 68. We don't know whether before writing his article in September 1962, Brooks had a chance to read Monnet's "A Ferment of Change" in which he did use such terms as *man's progress*, *mankind*, *humanity*, *human rights*, *human dignity*, *peace of world*, *world*, and *under-development*, though each mostly once, and mostly in the context of Europe.
26. This concept of "Racial Block" was propounded by Winston Churchill and is elaborated in Author's working paper on European Population in Historical Perspective, (mimeographed), available with author.
27. Ali A. Mazrui, "African Attitudes to the European Economic Community", in Krause, *op.cit.*, pp.121-35. (Reprinted from *International Affairs*, January 1963)
28. Mazrui's reference (5): James Reston, "The Problems of Race in World Politics", *The New York Times*, December 15, 1961.
29. Mazrui's reference (6) Speech at Luncheon of the New York Liberal Party, February 18, 1962. See "Danger of EEC 'Nationalism'", *Guardian*, February 19, 1962.
30. Mazrui, *op.cit.*, pp.125-6.
31. As reported in *Deccan Herald*, July 18, 1989.
32. This was systematically done in North and South America, Australia and part of Africa.
33. Nostradamus, a French astrologer and seer of the 16th century (1503-1566) who, it is believed predicted air travel, the Second World War, and many other historical events, also predicted war towards end of this century, possibly in 1995. It is said that his prophecies affected many political decisions of France in the past such as construction of Maginot line. His prophecies have been used as a propaganda machine by many, e.g. by Hitler as well as by British Intelligence. See Erika Cheetham, *The Prophecies of Nostradamus*, Corgi Books, 1988.
34. Leo Tolstoy, *War and Peace*, (Translated by Louise and Aylmer Maude), Oxford University Press, London, (India Paper edition), 1951, pp.489-90.

35. Winston Churchill, "Theme of the Volume", *The Second World War, Volume I: The Gathering Storm*, Cassell & Co. Ltd., London, Third Edition, 1950, p.xiii.
36. Vaiju Naravane, "Auschwitz Convent Stirs Passions", *The Times of India*, September 22, 1989.
37. 'Editors Choice: The Weisenthal Story' (Murderers Among US: The Simon Weisenthal Story, a telefilm for BBC), *The Illustrated Weekly of India*, June 4-10, 1989, p.78.
38. By 1950, population in both the regions increased by nearly 5.5 times, and since then growth of population of Asia was faster than Europe. Sometime between 1986 and 1990, for the first time in history density of population in Asia will be higher than in Europe.
39. W.F. Willcox (ed.), *International Migrations, Vol.II: Interrelations*, Gordon and Breach Science Publishers, New York, 1969, p.82.
40. *Op.cit.*, p.41.
41. For detailed discussion on this and agricultural related aspects discussed in following paras, see author's forthcoming book, *Feeding Europe's Teeming Millions: Past and Present*, Centre for Management in Agriculture, Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad, 1990.
42. Wilhelm Abel, *Agricultural Fluctuations in Europe: From the thirteenth to the twentieth century*, (translated by Olive Ordish), Methuen & Co. Ltd., Paperback edition, 1986, pp.276-7.
43. Mazrui, *op.cit.*, pp.128-29; Mazrui's references: "14: See *Ghana Today*, February 28, 1962; 15: "Africa's Destiny," *Africa Speaks* (eds.James Duffy and Robert A. Manners) (Princeton: D. Van Nostrand, 1960), p.37; 16: "The International Class System," *New Statesman*, September 21, 1962.
44. Professor Sovani of Gokhale Institute of Politics and Economics, Poona, mentioned in 1965 about "the colossal ignorance that prevails in India about the EEC". See N.V. Sovani, *The European Economic Community*, J.S.S. Institute of Economic Research, Dharwar 4, 1965, p.1.
45. Abel, *op.cit.*
46. B.H. Slicher Van Bath, *The Agrarian History of Western Europe: A.D. 500-1850* (translated by Olive Ordish), Edward Arnold (Publishers) Ltd., London, 1963.
47. Michael Tracy, *Agriculture in Western Europe: Challenge and Response, 1880-1980*, (Second edition), Granada Publishing Ltd., London, 1982.
48. S.B. Clough and C.W.Cole, *Economic History of Europe*, D.C. Heath and Company, Boston, 1952.
49. *Ibid*, p.344.
50. For discussion on protectionist measures in Europe see Author's working paper on "Protection of Food and Agricultural Interests in Europe".(Mimeographed), available with author
51. Centuries of investments in development of land and water resources, cities and countryside, forests, historical sites, libraries, museums (stocked with articles plundered from other countries as well), had resulted into such assets. These made the present day Europe so beautiful, pleasant and productive, and impressive to the casual visitor to Europe.
52. India's approach to international economic relations, especially in relation to EEC has always been defensive. For further discussion on the subject, see author's working paper "EEC: Reactions Abroad and in India", (mimeographed), available with author.

I.I.M. - WP - 841

PURCHASED
APPROVAL
GRATIS/EXCHANGE
PRICE
ACC NO.
VIKRAM SARABHAI LIBRARY
I. I. M. AMFEDARAD.

IIM
WP-841