



Kroll, Pierre. Unnamed caricature, in *Le Soir*, January 26, 2007, last accessed April 19, 2013, http://www.tv5.org/TV5Site/publication/galerie-164-6-Pierre_Kroll_Belgique.htm.

United States of Europe: Desired State for the European Union or Federalistic Utopia?

By Ellinor Evain

Master of European Studies with a Humanistic Profile

Supervisor: Vassilis Petsinis

May 2013

ABSTRACT

Due to the current return of federal aspirations among European politicians in relation to the current economic crisis and integration dead end, this thesis is interested in examining if the United States of Europe, meaning a federal union of the Member States of the European Union (EU), would be a desired state of integration or if it is still a federalistic utopia. Using the theoretical approach of federalism in combination with Critical Discourse Analysis we have analysed discourses by José Manuel Barroso and Daniel Cohn-Bendit and Guy Verhofstadt (prominent EU politicians) in an attempt to understand why the United States of Europe would be the necessary and most beneficial step to take in future integration processes. The analysis of the discourses by EU politicians showed that a federal Europe is beneficial since it will give the opportunity for the EU to become more powerful on the international stage and better the decision-making. It will also allow more democracy and more participation for the citizens in the political sphere. However, there are also proponents of the idea that a federal Europe is and remains a utopia: nationalist and populist extreme right parties which are overall very popular in Europe at the moment. We have discussed the specific case of the Front National and a discourse by its leader Marine Le Pen using the theoretical approaches of ethnosymbolism and banal nationalism combined with Critical Discourse Analysis. This part showed that a federal Europe is still very much utopian, because citizens are still identifying with the national state and the ideas of parties such as the Front National are very much appealing: return to national protectionism, national identity and maintaining sovereignty. The fate of the European Union and its integration very much depends on what the citizens want for themselves.

Keywords: federalism – United States of Europe – ethnosymbolism – banal nationalism – Front National.

Table of content

1. Introduction.....	1
1.1 Background.....	1
1.2 Previous Research.....	2
1.3 Definition of Research Topic and Structure.....	3
1.4 Theoretical Framework.....	4
1.4.1 Federalism and the concept of the United States of Europe.....	4
1.4.2 Ethnosymbolism and Banal Nationalism.....	6
1.5 Method.....	7
1.6 Source Criticism.....	10
2. Analysis.....	12
2.1 United States of Europe as a Desired State of Integration for the European Union.....	12
2.1.1 Out with old – in with the new?.....	13
a) Arguments against intergovernmentalism, nationalism and populism.....	14
b) Arguments for the federalisation of Europe.....	17
2.1.2 For a ‘Transnational Revolution’ in Europe.....	22
a) Arguments for the federalisation of Europe.....	22
b) Arguments against intergovernmentalism, nationalism and populism.....	28
2.2 United States of Europe as a Federalistic Utopia: The case of the Front National.....	34
a) The glorification of the French Nation.....	35
b) The critique of Europe and the outside world.....	40
3. Conclusion.....	46
References.....	48
Literary Sources.....	48
Internet Sources.....	50

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

The economic crisis in the European Union (EU) has led to the revival of nationalistic tendencies in most of the Member States whether part of the Eurozone or not. Promises about economic protectionism and return to national production attract more and more European citizens when the European Union seem unable to find any viable and long-term solutions to deal with the crisis. All over Europe, Euroscepticism is a political force to be counted with¹. Even the usual solid pro-European core of the founding Member States (France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Italy with the exception of Germany and Luxemburg) is affected by this problematic trend. Cas Mudde even claims in one of his essays that the populist nationalist parties of the extreme right are “a pathological normalcy”². In this work, special attention will be given to the case of France and the Front National (FN) led by Marine Le Pen.

So what can be done to counter these hostile movements and return to a permissive consensus where the citizens of the EU accept the deepening of European integration? Some see the EU yet as an ‘unfinished’ project, a hybrid, an ‘in-between’ at its current stage. Voices have risen at the top of the EU structure claiming that a federation of the Member States would be a good solution to get out of the economic and political crisis. Proponents of this view range from the President of the European Commission, José Manuel Barroso³, the German Chancellor Angela Merkel⁴, and prominent EU politicians in the form of former EU Commissioner Guy Verhofstadt and MEP Daniel Cohn Bendit in their book *Debout l'Europe! Manifeste pour une Révolution transnationale en Europe. (For Europe! Manifesto for a Transnational Revolution in Europe)*⁵ Barroso advocates a ‘federation of nation states’ based on past achievements, while Daniel Cohn Bendit and Guy Verhofstadt wish for the national level to completely disappear and morph into the federal structure of the European Union. We will discuss this more thoroughly in the first part of the work.

¹ Hartleb, Florian. *After their Establishment: Right-wing Populist Parties in Europe*, Research Project for the Konrad Adenauer Foundation “Rechtspopulistische Parteien in Europa”. Brussels: Centre for European Studies, 2011.

² Mudde, Cas. “The Populist Radical Right: A Pathological Normalcy”, in *West European Politics* 33(6) (2011a): 1167-1186.

³ Barroso, José Manuel. “State of the Union 2012 Address”, September 12, 2012, last accessed November 11, 2012, http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-12-596_en.htm.

⁴ Pop, Valentina. “EU to be federalised in the long run, Merkel says”, EUObserver, November 7, 2012, last accessed November, 11, 2012, <http://euobserver.com/institutional/118126>.

⁵ Edited by André Versaille, Paris: Actes Sud, 2012.

The idea of a federal Europe is not a new one, because at the beginning of the EU's construction (when known as European Coal and Steel Community and thereafter European Economic Community) it was thought that there would be a 'spillover effect'⁶, which implied that when integration was done in the economic field, it would automatically transfer to other fields (mainly political and cultural). Some even called it the 'United States of Europe'. Winston Churchill was one of the first ones to use this term in his speech at the University of Zurich in 1946. He declared that "Our constant aim must be to build and fortify the strength of the United Nations Organization. Under and within that world concept we must re-create the European Family in a regional structure called, it may be, the United States of Europe."⁷

Although an old idea, it seems that the "The United States of Europe" concept could be a potential counter-argumentation and even a solution to the revival of nationalistic tendencies that Europe is experiencing right now. So the problematic question that needs to be discussed is: **"The United States of Europe: A desired state for the Union or federalistic utopia?"**

1.2 Previous research

Previous research has been carried out in both aspects that will be examined here: the idea of federalism in the European Union and the exploration of nationalistic tendencies in the Western European Member States. Michael Burgess explores federalism in the European Union from its creation to the year 2000 in his *Federalism and the European Union: The Building of Europe, 1950-2000*.⁸ It will be an interesting basis to understand how the idea of a federalistic Europe emerged in the first place. We will try to explore the notion in the light of nationalistic tendencies and the current identity crisis the EU is facing. Other works on the subject include *Federalism in the European Union*, edited by Elke Cloots, Geert De Baere and Stefan Sottiaux⁹ and *The Federal Vision: Legitimacy and Levels of Governance in the United States and the European Union* edited by Kalypso Nicolaidis and Robert Howse¹⁰. *The*

⁶ Pollack, Mark A. "Theorizing EU Policy-Making", in *Policy-Making in the European Union*, edited by Helene Wallace, Mark A. Pollack and Alasdair R. Young (eds), 6th edition, Chapter 2, 17-18. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

⁷ Churchill, Winston. "Speech at the University of Zurich", Council of Europe's Parliamentary Assembly's website, September 19, 1946 last accessed March 10, 2013, http://assembly.coe.int/Main.asp?link=/AboutUs/zurich_e.htm. See also, Churchill, Winston. "United States of Europe" in *The Pro-European Reader*, edited by Dick Leonard and Mark Leonard, 13-16. New York: Palgrave Macmillan and the Foreign Policy Centre, 2002.

⁸ London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, 2000.

⁹ Oxford: Hart Publishing, 2012.

¹⁰ Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Pro-European Reader by Dick and Mark Leonard¹¹ provides us with speeches that advocate European Unity and also to some extent a federal structure for the organisation of the European Union.

In what concerns research about nationalistic tendencies in Western Europe, extensive literature can be found: Montserrat Guibernau¹², Matthew Goodwin¹³, Florian Hartleb¹⁴ and Cas Mudde¹⁵ are among those authors that try to give answers about why the right wing populism and nationalistic tendencies have become so popular in the EU. However in this essay, we will focus on the specific case of France and a discourse from the Front National and their Eurosceptic attitude. We will try and link this to the idea that a federal Europe in current times is a utopia that is only shared by EU politicians.

1.3 Definition of research topic and structure

This thesis will be divided among the two main hypotheses that are developed here: namely on the one hand, that the United States of Europe is a desired state for the European Union and a solution to the deep economic but also identity crisis of the hybrid construction that the EU is. On the other hand, we have the United States of Europe as a federalistic utopia in the light of the revival of nationalistic and populist tendencies in Europe with its most recent addition being Beppe Grillo's Five Star Movement in Italy collecting 24 per cent of the Italian citizens' votes.¹⁶ Since almost no EU country is an exception to the rule, you might wonder what the European Union is doing to counter this movement.

Using a speech by the President of the European Commission, José Manuel Barroso (12 September 2012) and the recently published book *Debout l'Europe! Manifeste pour une Révolution Transnationale en Europe* (2012) by Daniel Cohn-Bendit and Guy Verhofstadt – prominent EU politicians – we will try to understand why a federal Europe, and the ideal of the United States of Europe, is a desired state for the European Union. The exploration of their arguments will take place in the first part of the work. The second part of the thesis will demonstrate how these ideas are problematic because of the nationalistic tendencies all over

¹¹ New York: Palgrave Macmillan and the Foreign Policy Centre, 13-16.

¹² Guibernau, Montserrat. "Migration and the rise of the radical right: Social Malaise and the failure of mainstream politics", Policy Network paper. London: Policy Network, March 2010.

¹³ Goodwin, Matthew. "Right Response. Understanding and Countering Populist Extremism in Europe", A Chatham House Report. London: Royal Institute of International Affairs, 2011.

¹⁴ Hartleb, F. 2011.

¹⁵ Mudde, C. 2011a, 1167-1186.

¹⁶ Fox, Benjamin. "Italy in Turmoil after election delivers hung Parliament", February 26, 2013, last accessed February 26, 2013, <http://euobserver.com/political/119188>.

Europe. The interesting case that we will examine here is the French one (Front National), making the core of European integration weakened. The population of one of the founding states of the EU is challenging its authority and the United States of Europe seems to belong to federalistic fantasies. The EU is challenged by a popular Front National in France, a national populist party that has been present in French politics for over forty years. Its political impact has been growing ever since its creation culminating in Jean-Marie Le Pen's participation in the second round of the presidential elections in 2002 against Jacques Chirac. He earned 18% of the votes representing over five million French people.¹⁷

Of course other case studies could be relevant for this essay but France seems to be particularly interesting as the ideology of the Front National has been pretty similar from the creation of the party by Jean-Marie Le Pen in 1972 to its takeover by the daughter, Marine Le Pen. Another aspect is that France is at the core of the European Union, one of the founding countries, which appears to have lost faith in the European project. Moreover, although clearly against Europe, the Front National still wants to get its voice heard on the European level and both father and daughter are Members of the European Parliament (MEPs).

1.4 Theoretical Framework

1.4.1 Federalism and the Concept of the United States of Europe

In this essay, we are going to oppose a renewed **federalistic theoretical approach** and the concept of the '**United States of Europe**' to the rising **nationalistic tendencies** which are observed in almost all EU countries, focusing here specifically on the case of France. As we discussed above, the term United States of Europe was first coined down by Winston Churchill in his speech at the University of Zurich on the 19 September 1946. For him, the United States of Europe was first and foremost a solution to the animosity between France and Germany after the Second World War.¹⁸ "It is to re-create the European Family, or as much of it as we can, and provide it with a structure under which it can dwell in peace, in safety and in freedom. We must build a kind of United States of Europe."¹⁹ At this time, a potential federalistic Europe was to be mostly based on security and guarantee for peace to

¹⁷ Goodwin, M. 2011, 2.

¹⁸ Churchill, W. 19 September 1946, last accessed March 10, 2013. See also, Churchill, Winston. 2002, 13-16.

¹⁹ Ibid.

allow the destroyed nations to be rebuilt. We will see in the analysis what current European politicians want it to be based on.

By federalistic theoretical approach we imply the

(...) advocacy of federal principles for dividing powers between member units and common institutions. Unlike in a unitary state, sovereignty in federal political orders is non-centralized, often constitutionally, between at least two levels so that units at each level have final authority and can be self governing in some issue area.²⁰

We can assume that for the European Union, this would mean that the EU would be the federal entity and the Member States would be the sub-authorities under the federal framework. By looking at Barroso's and Verhofstadt and Cohn-Bendit's arguments, we will seek to define the ideal of a Federal Union as a desired state of integration. According to Ben Rosamond, a federation and federalism has two main advantages: "The first is the prevention of the capture of a system by any one group."²¹ "The second advantage is that the federated state becomes a stronger unit in the face of external threat." One of the main problems is that it reproduces a state-like entity along with its problems of organisation and legitimacy.²²

Rosamond adds: "Institutions matter, either as human creations to inaugurate a transnational federalist legal order, or as advocates shaping mass ideational change in favour of federation as a preferred structure of governance."²³ Barroso and Verhofstadt and Cohn-Bendit all represent EU institutions (European Commission and EU Parliament) and therefore studying their discourses is important to understand how a federal union is a desired state for the Union. The fact that institutions help shape mass consciousness is essential here, since the discourse about a federal Europe is supposed to first and foremost convince the European citizens that the United States of Europe are beneficial for them. We will examine their use of rhetorical figures and sentences to try and convince others to favour federation for the future of Europe.

²⁰ Føllesdal, Andreas. "Federalism", in *Stanford Encyclopedia Online*, March 9, 2010 last accessed November 11, 2012, <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/federalism/>.

²¹ Rosamond, Ben. "Federalism, Functionalism and Transactionalism", in *Theories of European Integration*, The European Union Series edited by Neil Nugent, William E. Paterson, Vincent Wright, Chapter 2, 26. New York: Macmillan Press Ltd, 2000.

²² Rosamond, B. 2000, 26-27.

²³ *Ibid*, 29.

1.4.2 Ethnosymbolism and Banal Nationalism

Hechter defines nationalism as followed: “It has long been held that nationalism consists of political activities that aim to make the boundaries of the nation – a culturally distinctive collectivity aspiring to self-governance – coterminous with those of the state.”²⁴ We will examine how the case of France (Front National) reflects a wish through political discourses to come back to national protectionism and distance national politics from the supranational level of power, from the European Union.

The counter theoretical approaches to federalism that we are going to use here derive from nationalism and are: ethnosymbolism and banal nationalism. Ethnosymbolism, mainly developed by Anthony D. Smith can broadly be summarized as: “(...) the term refers to an approach which emphasizes the role of myths, symbols, memories, values and traditions in the formation, persistence and change of ethnicity and nationalism.”²⁵ In this essay, we will try to analyse the use of symbols related to the nation in the political discourse of the Front National in France. The specific discourse will be the one delivered on the 1 May 2012 about Jeanne D’Arc.²⁶ We will also relate this discourse to the political programme of the Front National at the 2012 French presidential elections²⁷ and to current wider discourse of nationalism in Europe.

According to Anthony D. Smith, ethnosymbolism has three main advantages compared to other nationalistic theoretical approaches: : 1) it identifies the people that are likely to start a nationalistic movement; 2) it puts forward the importance of memories, values, myths and symbols and 3) it tries to explain why and how nationalism is so popular.²⁸ In this thesis we are interested in the arguments by nationalist/populist leaders, in particular Marine Le Pen, and how by using rhetorical figures, metaphors etc., she undermines the ideal of the United States of Europe.

²⁴ Hechter, Michael. “Nationalist Puzzles”, in *Containing Nationalism*, Chapter 1, 7. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

²⁵ Smith, Anthony D. quoted in “Ethnosymbolism” in *Theories of Nationalism: A Critical Introduction*, edited by Umut Özkirimli, 2nd edition, Chapter 5, 143. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

²⁶ Le Pen, Marine and Jean-Marie Le Pen “1er Mai: Discours de Jean-Marie Le Pen et Marine Le Pen à Paris”, May 1, 2012, last accessed May 2, 2013, <http://www.frontnational.com/videos/1er-mai-2012-discours-de-jean-marie-et-marine-le-pen-a-paris/>.

²⁷ Front National, Political Programme for the presidential elections of 2012, “Une Europe au service des peuples libres” last accessed May 3, 2013, <http://www.frontnational.com/le-projet-de-marine-le-pen/politique-etrangere/europe/>.

²⁸ Quoted in Özkirimli, U. 2010, 144.

Criticism has been addressed to ethnosymbolists such as the fact that their theoretical approach is conceptually confused and lacks rigour, underestimation of differences between modern nations and earlier ethnic communities and finally they reify nations.²⁹ These aspects need to be considered during the analytical part of this thesis.

For this essay we are also going to use the theoretical approach developed by Michael Billig entitled 'banal nationalism'. For him nationalism is not only occurring in times of crisis (meaning war or other threats to the nation) but it is also reproduced in everyday life:

For such daily reproduction to occur, one might hypothesize that a whole complex of beliefs, assumptions, habits, representations and practices must also be reproduced. Moreover, this complex must be reproduced in a banally mundane way, for the world of nations is the everyday world, the familiar terrain of contemporary times.³⁰

The fact that the regime of nations is governing the world appears to be normal and that is why nationalism needs to be reproduced on a daily basis to maintain the nations and sense of belonging of the citizens. This implies that symbols of the nations are displayed in everyday life and Billig argues that this phenomenon goes mostly unnoticed by the citizens:

However, this reminding is so familiar, so continual, that it is not consciously registered as reminding. The metonymic image of banal nationalism is not a flag which is being consciously waved with fervent passion; it is the flag hanging unnoticed on the public building.³¹

This theoretical approach fits well with ethnosymbolism since they are both interested in representations of the nations (traditions, symbols, etc.). We will try to identify if this banal nationalism is used by the Front National to promote national interests against the supranational will.

1.5 Method

The main method that will be used in this essay is Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Although constituted by different currents, all Critical Discourse Analysis approaches share

²⁹ Özkirimli, U. "Ethnosymbolism", in *Theories of Nationalism: A Critical Introduction*, 2nd edition, Chapter 5, 157-165. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

³⁰ Billig, Michael. "Introduction" in *Banal Nationalism*, 6. London/Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 1995.

³¹ Billig, M. 1995, 8.

three main ideas: the notion of discourse, the critical impetus and the notions of ideology and power.

CDA sees discourse – language use in speech and writing – as a form of ‘social practice’. Describing discourse as social practice implies a dialectical relationship between a particular discursive event and the situation(s), institution(s) and social structure(s), which frame it. The discursive event is shaped by them, but it also shapes them. That is, discourse is socially constitutive as well as socially conditioned – it constitutes situations, objects of knowledge, and the social identities of and relationships between people and groups of people. It is constitutive both in the sense that it helps to sustain and reproduce the social status quo, and in the sense that it contributes to transforming it. Since discourse is so socially consequential, it gives rise to important issues of power. Discursive practices may have major ideological effects – that is, they can help produce and reproduce unequal power relations between (for instance) social classes, women and men, and ethnic/cultural majorities and minorities through the ways in which they represent things and position people.³²

This definition is one of the most complete ones and shared by most of critical discourse analysts but some variations can be found depending on the current of CDA chosen. CDA and the notion of discourse are the most relevant method for this essay since we are going to analyse discourses about federalism and nationalism from EU and French politicians. As much as we will examine the language and rhetorical figures used in the different discourses, we will also look at the context behind and how it influences the formation of discursive structures. We will also try to identify how these discourses influence the context in which they are displayed and if they can transform the hegemonic discourses that exist in European societies.

The second aspect that is essential in CDA is the critical impetus. “(...) CDA emphasizes the need for interdisciplinary work in order to gain a proper understanding of how language functions in constituting and transmitting knowledge, in organising social institutions or in exercising power.”³³ This implies that an interdisciplinary approach makes a study of

³² Wodak, Ruth and Michael Meyer. “Critical Discourse Analysis: History, Agenda, Theory and Methodology”, in *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, edited by Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer, 2nd edition, Chapter 1, 5-6. London/Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2009.

³³ Wodak, R. and M. Meyer 2009, 7.

discourses more relevant and improves the understanding of societal issues and the interconnection of things.

The third and final aspect that CDA observes is the concepts of ideology and power. “Critique regularly aims at revealing structures of power and unmasking ideologies.”³⁴ By power we mean the “(...) way that people are positioned into roles through discursive structures, the way that certain people’s knowledge is disqualified or is not taken seriously in contrast to authorized knowledge.”³⁵ In this work, we will examine our discourses in relation to hegemonic discourses in EU and French societies and institutions and if our discourses are considered as authorized knowledge. Alongside power we also have the concept of ideology which “(...) is often characterised as false consciousness or an imagined representation of the real conditions of existence; the position from which this falseness is apprehended is that of critique and stands outside ideology.”³⁶ We will try to determine if the contrasting discourses can be considered as part of a bigger ideology that can influence mass consciousness.

Using **Critical Discourse Analysis** we will explore in the first part the main components that make the federalistic discourse a realistic one in the current times. Moreover, we will see how it can be a viable solution against nationalistic tendencies. For this first part, we will mostly examine discourses that are in favour of a federation of Nation States and what the main components of this federalistic stance are. We will observe the reasons that make the advocacy of a federation of nation states relevant in the current economic and political climate of Europe. We will mostly focus on the political and the cultural arguments in this section of the essay. In the second part of this essay, using the specific case study of France, we will examine the nationalist/populist discourses that make the ideal of the United States of Europe a federalistic utopia at the moment.

As with other methods we can distinguish some limitations that Critical Discourse Analysis has failed to address up until now. These include: the simplistic character of the approach; gender, race and class are seen as stable and not questioned according to the context in which they are studied; the choice of the passive voice in the analysis and finally, only few CDA

³⁴ Wodak R. and M. Meyer 2009, 8.

³⁵ Mills, Sara. “Discourse Analysis and Critical Discourse Analysis”, in *Discourse: The New Critical Idiom*, Chapter 6, 133. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, 2004.

³⁶ Mills, Sara. “Discourse and Ideology”, in *Discourse: The New Critical Idiom*, Chapter 2, 29. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, 2004.

scholars consider the link between a text and the discursive and political context in which it is written.³⁷

1.6 Source Criticism

In this part we will examine the relevance of the primary and secondary sources that are going to be used develop our two hypotheses: on the one hand, the United States of Europe as a desired state of integration for the European Union and on the other hand, how this can still be considered a federalistic utopia. To evaluate the relevance of the sources we will use the seven arguments developed by Martha Howell and Walter Prevenier in their book *From Reliable Sources: An Introduction to Historical Methods* (Chapter 2, part B, 2001: 60-68): 1) the ‘Genealogy’ of the document; 2) the Genesis of the document; 3) the ‘Originality’ of the document; 4) the Interpretation of the document; 5) Authorial Authority; 6) Competence of the Observer and finally 7) the Trustworthiness of the Observer.³⁸

The first and the second arguments can be analysed together here. The first one refers to the question if the document is an original, a copy of the original or a copy of a copy.³⁹ The discourses by José Manuel Barroso, Guy Verhofstadt and Daniel Cohn-Bendit and Jean-Marie and Marine le Pen (former and current leader of the Front National) are original transcriptions of the discourses made by the different politicians. One aspect that is important to consider is that the discourses by Verhofstadt and Cohn-Bendit and the Le Pen were originally in French but the quotations have been translated. The original version can be found in the footnotes. The translations are of my own doing and try to represent the original intended meaning of the politicians with as most accuracy as possible.

The second argument is interested in the origins of the sources, namely “(...) where the source was produced, by whom, and when.”⁴⁰ Questions to be considered here are: “What kind of institution or individual produced a source, with what authority, under what circumstances? What surrounding events gave the date or place special meaning?”⁴¹ Regarding José Manuel Barroso, Guy Verhofstadt and Daniel Cohn-Bendit’s contributions,

³⁷ Mills S. 2004, 137.

³⁸ Howell, Martha and Walter Prevenier. “Technical Analysis of Source”, in *From Reliable Sources: An Introduction to Historical Methods*, 1st edition, Chapter 2, Part B, pp. 60-68. Cornell: Cornell University Press, 2001.

³⁹ Howell, M. and W. Prevenier 2001, 61.

⁴⁰ Howell, M. and W. Prevenier 2001, 62.

⁴¹ Ibid.

we can see the background of the European institutions, the European Commission and the European Parliament. Verhofstadt and Cohn-Bendit wrote their book with their background as founders of the Spinelli group (informal group at the European Parliament which advocates federalism) in mind. José Manuel Barroso expresses his opinion on the state of the Union in his quality of President of the European Commission. Marine Le Pen expresses the opinions of her political party in her authority as leader of the Front National. All discourses should be examined in the context in which they have been pronounced, namely the deep Eurocrisis and identity crisis the EU is facing. This is linked to the fifth argument – authorial authority – which related to the reliability of the source, if the author was present during the events described or if it is written later.⁴²

In what concerns argument three and four, the originality and interpretation of the documents, we can say that we need to identify in what tradition these texts have been written. We also need to consider if the documents are using rhetorical figures or images that have been already used in the past. Moreover, the interpretation implies the deciphering of the intended meaning of the documents.⁴³ We will see later in the analysis how this process unfolds in our sources.

Finally, the sixth and seventh arguments discuss the observer, its competence and its trustworthiness.⁴⁴ The competence part relates to the cognitive aspects (psychological state of mind, selection of information, prejudices, etc.) that could have influenced the author in his account. The trustworthiness part considers the possibility of the withholding of information and knowledge by the author to conform to the hegemonic discourse. This includes inconsistencies, lapses and suppressions.

After discussing in detail our primary sources, we will briefly summarise what secondary sources will be used. To develop and support the arguments of this thesis we will rely on different scientific articles and books that discuss from different points of view the topic we are interested in here. For the first part - centred around the idea that the United States of Europe are a desired state for the EU - we will base ourselves on previous research in the field of federalism and the EU such as the book by Michael Burgess⁴⁵, articles by Joanne Bay

⁴² Howell and Prevenier 2001, 65.

⁴³ Ibid, 63-4.

⁴⁴ Ibid, 66-8.

⁴⁵ Burgess, M. 2000.

Brzinski⁴⁶, Dennis C. Mueller⁴⁷, or Fernando Mendez et al.⁴⁸ among others, to give a general framework for the analysis of the discourses. These articles and books will enlighten us on the history of federalism in the European Union and we will try to give the subject a renewed point of view by analysing current discourses about federalism. As we can see by the dates of the first sources, they are written after the Maastricht Treaty of 1992 which defined the European Union and its fields of competence. The idea of a federalistic Europe has been recently debated by European politicians in the context of the economic crisis and this is what will be the main concern in this thesis.

For the second part, the one defending the idea that the United States of Europe is a federalistic utopia at the moment, we will use the help of authors such as Cas Mudde (2011a and b), Matthew Goodwin (2011), Montserrat Guibernau (2010) and Florian Hartleb (2011) to get an overview of the similarities between national/populist discourse in Europe, especially its Western part. The nationalistic stance is in sharp contrast to the federalistic one and that is why it is interesting to explore as a counter argumentation. In the light of ethnosymbolism and banal nationalism, we will attempt to point out the common rhetorical figures of the discourses.

2. Analysis

2.1 United States of Europe as a Desired State of Integration for the European Union

The idea of federalism in the context of the European Union is not a new one, quite the contrary: the founding fathers such as Jean Monnet, Altiero Spinelli and Winston Churchill believed that a Union between the old belligerent countries France and Germany should be of a federal kind. On the 19 September 1946, in a speech given at Zurich University, Winston Churchill claimed: “The structure of the United States of Europe, if well and truly built, will be such as to make the material strength of a single state less important. Small nations will

⁴⁶ Bay Brzinski, Joanne. “Changing Forms of Federalism and Party Electoral Strategies: Belgium and the European Union”, in *Publius: The Journal of Federalism*, 29:1 (Winter 1999): 45-70. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

⁴⁷ Mueller, Dennis. C. “Federalism and the European Union: A Constitutional Perspective”, in *Public Choice*, 90 (1997): 255-280. Amsterdam: Kluwer Academic Publishing, Springer).

⁴⁸ Mendez, Fernando. et al. “Direct Democracy in the European Union: How Comparative Federalism can Help us Understand the Interplay of Direct Democracy and European Integration”, in *Revista de Ciencia Política* Volumen 29:1, (2009): 57-83. (Instituto de Ciencias Políticas).

count as much as large ones and gain their honour by their contribution to the common cause.”⁴⁹ That is one of the core assumptions of the federalistic approach, namely that states of different sizes decide to join forces because it benefits them more than to stand alone in world politics.

This feature is described by Michael Burgess as followed: “self-rule and shared rule are combined in at least two orders of government/governance, each acting directly upon its citizens, in which the constituent units enjoy significant autonomy in matters of local concern but have voluntarily agreed to pool their sovereignty in matters of common concern.”⁵⁰ In the European Union, the European institutions (the Commission, the European Parliament...) represent the ‘federal’ level while the nation states embody the local units that have given up sovereignty in certain fields of politics for the common cause. And as Churchill said, the smaller states have an equal say to bigger states in European affairs because of an elaborate system of representation. Despite this, most agree that the EU is far from a full-fledged federation and even that the federal idea died with the founding fathers altogether. The still strong intergovernmental character of the Council of the European Union (representing the Ministers of the Member States) and the fact that nation-states still decide most of the direction of the integration is headed towards make the federal idea quite illegitimate.

However, alongside the long lasting economic crisis, there is a revival of the federalistic ideology as a solution to the economic downturn and political stagnation of the EU. Using critical discourse analysis as a method and a renewed federalistic approach, we will try to demonstrate that the ‘United States of Europe’ is a desired state for the European Union. We will analyse in detail the 2012 State of the Union address by José Manuel Barroso, President of the European Commission and the book by two prominent Members of the European Parliament, Daniel Cohn-Bendit and Guy Verhofstadt, *Debout L’Europe! Pour une Révolution Transnationale en Europe*.

2.1.1 Out with the old – in with the new?

In this section, we will analyse the line of argument and the rhetorical figures that are part of José Manuel Barroso’s “2012 State of the Union Address” using Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). One of the main aspects of CDA is that discourse is socially constituted by the

⁴⁹ Churchill, W. 19 September 1946, last accessed March 10, 2013.

⁵⁰ Burgess, M. 2000, 68.

context in which it appears.⁵¹ With regard to this discourse, we can see that it is a formal address to the Plenary session of the European Parliament in Strasbourg on the 12 September 2012. Therefore we can deduce that the vocabulary is to be formal and we can see that in how Barroso addresses his audience: “Mr President and Honourable Members” appear several times under the short discourse.

We will use the framework of analysis of CDA which is composed of nine elements to look at two main types of arguments advocated by Barroso: arguments for the federalisation of Europe and arguments against intergovernmental, nationalistic and populist attitudes. The nine elements are: 1) the kind and form of argumentation; 2) certain argumentative strategies; 3) the intrinsic logic and composition of texts; 4) implicit implicatures and insinuations; 5) the collective symbolism; 6) idioms, sayings and clichés; 7) actors; 8) references and 9) the particulars of the sources of knowledge.⁵²

a) Arguments against intergovernmentalism, nationalism and populism:

In the first part of his discourse, José Manuel Barroso advocates arguments against intergovernmentalism, nationalism and populism separately. Barroso compares European meetings to “(...) boxing events” where nation-states are “(...) claiming a knockout victory over a rival.”⁵³ This is a “vicious spiral” for Barroso because Member States agree on solution but then undermine them and create problems of credibility for the European Union. He also argues that despite all the efforts to reform, the citizens, international partners and global markets are not responding to the willingness of the Union to tackle the economic crisis.⁵⁴ Therefore a federation could be a solution to the disagreements that plague the decision-making of the EU. Andreas Føllesdal argues that “Federations can facilitate some objectives of sovereign states, such as credible commitments, certain kinds of coordination, and control over externalities, by transferring some powers to a common body.”⁵⁵

Criticism is directed towards the incompetence of the Member States in facing the challenges the world throws in their way. “The reality is that in an interconnected world, Europe’s

⁵¹ Wodak, R. and M. Meyer 2009, 5.

⁵² Ibid, 28.

⁵³ Barroso, J. M. 12 September 2012, last accessed November 11, 2012.

⁵⁴ Barroso, J. M. 12 September 2012, last accessed November 11, 2012.

⁵⁵ Føllesdal, A. 9 March 2010, last accessed November 11, 2012.

Member States on their own are no longer able to effectively steer the course of the events.”⁵⁶ Barroso refers to several actors in his discourse, namely the European Commission, European Parliament, Member States and the rest of the world. At first, it seems that it is the European Union institutions against the Member States with the EU institutions holding the ultimate solution to the problems of the Members States, namely the federal stance. We will see later that the President of the European Commission hesitates on the nature of the federation and his advocacy of a role for the Member States in the process. “Let me tell you frankly, If it was left to the Member States I can tell you they will not resist pressure from big corporations or large external power.”⁵⁷ “We cannot continue trying to solve European problems with national solutions.” Member States need to come together and deepen integration to face external challenges.

The Spinelli Group (encompassing prominent pro-European politicians who will be discussed later) agrees with this statement of the President of the European Commission.⁵⁸ The fear of the growing globalisation and loss of sovereignty of the Member States on the international stage should be counter-acted by more integration in economic, social and political fields to become a force to be counted with. This deepening of integration will ultimately lead to a federal Europe where: “(...) once agreed upon, the capacity of a federal contract to be self-enforcing so that none of the players, at various territorial levels, oversteps its bounds so as to threaten the viability of the federal polity.”⁵⁹ The nation-states would become members of the larger federal polity that the European Union would achieve for the greater good, the common cause.

Special criticism is addressed to the countries in crisis. “The most vulnerable countries must leave no doubts about their willingness to reform.” (...) “But the stronger countries must leave no doubts about their willingness to stick together.” “To REFORM TOGETHER.” (original emphasis)⁶⁰ In exchange of the willingness to reform their countries’ economy, the vulnerable countries should be able to count on the stronger countries to support them. As a result, more integration is needed, especially to be able to control the finances of the Eurocrisis countries. Joanne Bay Brzinski claims that “However, the EU's member states

⁵⁶ Barroso, J. M. 12 September 2012, last accessed November 11, 2012.

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ See also Spinelli Group, “A federal step forwards to end the eurocrisis”, Shadow European Council Conclusions, p. 1, October 2011, last accessed April 23, 2013, <http://www.spinelligroup.eu/>.

⁵⁹ Mendez, F. et al. 2009, 60.

⁶⁰ Barroso, J. M. 12 September 2012, last accessed November 11, 2012.

jealously guard their sovereignty and seek forms of confederation that allow them to retain much of their power. This balancing act between European integration and national sovereignty reflects the problems inherent with developing multiple governments and populaces.”⁶¹ A federation of nation-states has been a problematic issue since the nation-states are still very important forms of governance in Europe.

This preservation of national sovereignty is a dilemma for Barroso. It is not a viable solution if the European countries want to have a say in international affairs. The President of the Commission does not handle the Member States with kid gloves. “The Commission is very aware that in the Member States implementing the most intense reforms, there is hardship and there are – sometimes very painful – difficult adjustments. But it is only through these reforms that we can come to a better future. They were long overdue. Going back to the status quo ante is simply impossible.”⁶² He does not hesitate to pinpoint the painful truth: that the Member States did not handle their affairs properly. Along a completed integration in the political field, a fiscal federalism is needed to enforce control over economic questions to avoid newer problems such as the current Eurocrisis in the future. “The federal constitution incorporates a formal allocation of powers and competences between the central and constituent units with a firm basis in sources of revenue and expenditure which provide the framework for fiscal federalism.”⁶³

Finally, the President of the Commission points out the dangers of nationalistic and populist tendencies. The evolution of the markets “undermines” the citizens’ trust and “(...) it is fuelling populism and extremism in Europe and elsewhere.”⁶⁴ Populism and nationalism are particularly hot issues in contemporary Europe and we will discuss this aspect later in this work. Populism is a “threat”, Europe is needed to oversee that “(...) these worrying developments [are] brought into check.”⁶⁵ The European Union and more integration is clearly the counter movement, the barrier and solution to these negative forces. Barroso argues that

⁶¹ Bay Brzinski, J. 1999, 59.

⁶² Barroso, J. M. 12 September 2012, last accessed November 11, 2012.

⁶³ Burgess, M. 2000, 268.

⁶⁴ Barroso, J. M. 12 September 2012, last accessed November 11, 2012.

⁶⁵ Ibid.

We must use the 2014 election to mobilise all pro-European forces. We must not allow the populists and then nationalists to set a negative agenda. I expect all those who call themselves Europeans to stand up and to take initiative in the debate. Because even more dangerous than the skepticism of the anti-Europeans, is the indifference or the pessimism of the pro-Europeans.⁶⁶

Barroso wishes to show that pro-European forces still exist in Europe. The problem is that these forces have been forgotten because of the massive rise of anti-EU forces in the form of the nationalist and populist movements. He wants to mobilise the Pro-Europeans in the 2014 election to the European Parliament. The Parliament is considered by most people to be the most democratic of all EU institutions because it directly represents the European citizens. We can clearly see that he tries to bring the citizens around the idea that more integration is needed, eventually transforming into a fully-fledged European federation, where economic, political and social fields are fully integrated and under the control of the overarching federal structure that would be embodied by the European Union of the future. We will now turn to the arguments for the federalisation of Europe.

b) Arguments for the federalisation of Europe:

The kind of argumentation presented in this essay is divided between the arguments for the federalisation of Europe and ones against intergovernmentalism, nationalistic and populist attitudes. We can see that José Manuel Barroso borrows some argumentative strategies from the past notably when he refers to the return of Greece to the European Family.⁶⁷ He uses a rhetorical figure once used by Winston Churchill. The European family seems to be an important metaphor while referring to the European Union.⁶⁸ This point refers to point nine in the method of analysis of discourse, namely references. He fuels the discourse of the present with a reference to past rhetorical figures.

In the 2012 State of the Union Address, Barroso uses other types of collective symbolism to emphasize the importance of moving towards a federal Europe. “(...) we are all in the same boat.” “(...) interdependence of our destinies.” “Because when you are on a boat in the middle

⁶⁶ Ibid.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ “What is this sovereign remedy? It is to re-create the European Family, or as much of it as we can, and to provide it with a structure under which it can dwell in peace, in safety and in freedom. We must build a kind of United States of Europe.”, in Churchill W. 19 September 1946.

of the storm, absolute loyalty is the minimum you demand from your fellow crew members.”⁶⁹ Some other people have used the metaphor of the boat to refer to the European Union.⁷⁰ This metaphor relates to the aspect of a federation that Burgess describes as followed: “Federation is based on unity and diversity which are formally recognised by the combination of ‘self-rule and shared rule’ in a written supreme constitution.”⁷¹ The fact that we are all in the same boat refers to unity among Member States of the EU and this unity is achieved through shared rule which is dictated by the ‘proto-constitution’, the Lisbon Treaty.

One of the arguments towards the federalisation of Europe brought up by Barroso is the vital need for integration to address the current challenges coming both from inside and outside the EU. More integration is a “(...) matter of urgency” “indispensable” and that the current state of integration is “(...) not sufficient. We must go further.” “But mere coordination is no longer adequate (...)” “(...) globalisation demands more European unity.” “More unity demands more integration.”⁷² This is related to what Teun A. Van Dijk refers to as semantics and event models of the discourse. Event models are the way events are represented in discourse. Semantics refers to the concepts and propositions used in the discourse.⁷³ We can see here that Barroso represents globalisation and intergovernmental coordination as an inefficient way of doing policy-making and as the main challenges that the European Union is facing. The solution seems to be the Federal union.

“Federal arrangements may enhance the *political influence* of formerly sovereign governments, both by facilitating coordination, and — particularly for small states—by giving these member units influence or even veto over policy making, rather than remaining mere policy takers.” (original emphasis)⁷⁴ A European federation would be a desired state of integration for the European Union and the positive outcome to help the Member States of the EU reassert their sovereignty on the global scene. It is particularly important for the smaller Member States which would obtain more power. “Sharing sovereignty in European means

⁶⁹ Barroso, J. M. 12 September 2012, last accessed November 11, 2012.

⁷⁰ Ray, Leonard. “Don’t rock the boat: expectations, fears and opposition to EU policy-making” in *European Integration and Political Conflict*, edited by Gary Marks and Marco R. Steenbergen, Chapter 3, 51-61. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. See also Cohn-Bendit D. and Verhofstadt G. 2012, 34.

⁷¹ Burgess, M. 2000, 268.

⁷² Barroso, J. M. 12 September 2012, last accessed November 11, 2012.

⁷³ Van Dijk, Teun A. “CDA: A Socio-Cognitive Approach” in *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, edited by Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer, 2nd edition, Chapter 3, 79. London/Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2009.

⁷⁴ Føllesdal, A. 9 March 2010, last accessed November 11, 2012.

being more sovereign in a global world. In today's world size, matters."⁷⁵ Barroso advocates "(...) an active and influential Europe."⁷⁶ It is essential for the European Union to be powerful to make its voice heard in negotiations with international partners. One voice, a common voice is needed to make the EU's position in international organisations influential.

Another theme that is discussed by Barroso in his discourse is the looks of the federation in itself. Martin Reisigl and Ruth Wodak describes discourse as "a cluster of context-dependent semiotic practices that are situated within specific fields of social action"; "socially constituted and socially constitutive", "related to a macro-topic" and "linked to the argumentation about validity claims such as truth and normative validity involving several actors who have different points of view".⁷⁷ Barroso's discourse and his semantics are shaped by the context in which they are pronounced namely the Eurocrisis and the political problems of the EU. They are socially constituted by the context but they also socially constitute the context since Barroso argues that this is the only way to solve the issues the European Union is dealing with. The discourse is related to many macro-topics most notably economy, politics and social matters.

Today, I call for a federation of nation states. Not a superstate. A democratic federation of nation states that can tackle our common problems, through the sharing of sovereignty in a way that each country and each citizen are better equipped to control their own destiny. This is about the Union with the Member States, not against the Member States. In the age of globalisation pooled sovereignty means more power, not less.⁷⁸

Although Barroso clearly uses the word federation in his arguments, the looks of it resemble more those of a confederation because of the mentioning of the Member States as playing a role in this future federation. The President of the Commission clearly wants the Member States in the process of building the federation. Federick K. Lister's fifteen points list about the characteristics of a confederation reinforces this view.⁷⁹ For Lister, "Confederation unites

⁷⁵ Barroso, J. M. 12 September 2012, last accessed November 11, 2012.

⁷⁶ Ibid.

⁷⁷ Reisigl, Martin and Ruth Wodak. "The Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA), in *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, edited by Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer, 2nd edition, Chapter 4, 89. London/Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2009.

⁷⁸ Barroso, J. M. 12 September 2012, last accessed November 11, 2012.

⁷⁹ Lister, Frederick K. "The nature of Confederal Governance", *The European union, the united nations and the revival of confederal governance*, Chapter 1, 33-34. London: Greenwood Press, 1996.

states without depriving them of their statehood.”⁸⁰ This is advocated by Barroso when he says that it does not call for a superstate and that the future Union will not be built against the Member States. And “Confederation embodies mutually acceptable working solutions to hegemonic and other problems that may emanate from any inequalities of power and resources among its larger and smaller member states.”⁸¹ This characteristic supports the idea that each country and each citizen should be able to have a say about the path towards their destiny. The fact that he mentions the word ‘each’ before the words ‘country’ and ‘citizen’ clearly indicates that all countries (big or small) are equal in the work to tackle common problems.

Finally, Siegfried Jäger and Florentine Maier discuss the issue of discursive limits which are what is not sayable in a discourse about a particular topic.⁸² Barroso seems to want to overcome these limits with his rather provocative statement: “Let’s not be afraid of the words: we will need to move towards a federation of nation states. This is what we need. This is our political horizon.”⁸³ In his discourse, Barroso tries to influence and convince the Members of the European Parliament (MEPs) that they should not be afraid to face the truth anymore. More integration is essential, a federation is vital for the survival of the European Union and its Member States in the wider world.⁸⁴

“Let’s be frank about this not everything can be at the same time a priority. Here, some self-criticism can probably be applied.”⁸⁵ Barroso does not hesitate to be realistic about what the EU can achieve and that it should focus on different things at different times. “Let me be very clear: in Europe, we need no more walls dividing us!”⁸⁶ Here we have a reference to the Cold war and that we should not submit to the divisive and fragmentation discourses advocated by the nationalists. “No one will be forced to come along. And no one will be forced to stay out. The speed will not be dictated by the slowest or the most reluctant.”⁸⁷ This reinforces the idea

⁸⁰ Ibid. For more details about confederations see also Mueller, D. C. 1997, 259 and Fabbrini, Sergio. (ed.) “Introduction: Why compare the EU and the US?”, in *Democracy and Federalism in the EU and the US: Exploring Post-national Governance*, 10. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, 2005.

⁸¹ Lister, F. K. 1996, 33-34.

⁸² Jäger Siegfried and Florentine Maier. “Theoretical and Methodological Aspects of Foucauldian CDA and Dispositive Analysis”, in *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, edited by Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer, 2nd edition, Chapter 2, 49. London/Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2009.

⁸³ Barroso, J. M. 12 September 2012, last accessed November 11, 2012.

⁸⁴ Ibid.

⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁸⁶ Ibid.

⁸⁷ Ibid.

of a confederation which is a voluntary union between nation-states. Barroso is not afraid to address his detractors which mainly are the populists and nationalists that have managed to access many national political arenas lately. The rhetoric is reinforced by the use of the pronouns “I” and “me” making this his own attempt and arguments to the European Parliament. This discourse is clearly one defending the European way.

He also makes repetitions using the word “realistic” ten times while associating first negatively with the current situation of the Union which is not realistic in the long run and second in a positive manner (associating it with words like “stronger”, “united”) while advocating a federal Europe as the only realistic solution for the future. He asks rhetorical questions to his audience insisting on the fact that the current situation is quite unrealistic and something should be done about it:

But let me ask you - is it realistic to go on like we have been doing? Is it realistic to see what we are seeing today in many European countries? Is it realistic to see taxpayers paying banks and afterwards being forced to give banks back the houses they have paid for because they can not pay their mortgages? Is it realistic to see more than 50% of our young people without jobs in some of our Member States? Is it realistic to go on trying to muddle through and just to accumulate mistakes with unconvincing responses? Is it realistic to think that we can win the confidence of the markets when we show so little confidence in each other?⁸⁸

The rhetorical questions clearly are meant for raising awareness among the Members of the European Parliament to act on and give concrete answers not only to the outside world but also to the European citizens (the young people in particular) who are the most affected by the current economic and political inertia. We can see an attempt by the President of the European Commission to bring the Members of the European Parliament to his line of argument. This discourse is one that is supposed to convince the audience that a federal Europe should influence integration in the future. He concludes his discourse by stating:

Europeans I believe has a soul. This soul can give us the strength and the determination to do what we must do. You can count on the European Commission. I count on you, the European Parliament. Together, as Community institutions we will

⁸⁸ Barroso, J. M. 12 September 2012, last accessed November 11, 2012.

build a better, stronger and a more united Europe, a citizens' Union for the future of Europe but also the future of the world.⁸⁹

In his conclusion, the President of the European Commission emphasises the need for a joint effort by the European Parliament and the European Commission to carry through the project that will lead to a better future for the European Union, to a federation of the nation-states of the EU. Despite speaking about a "federation of nation states" with the Member States, we can see that Barroso's arguments tend to lean towards a confederation in the first place. It is not totally out with the old - in with the new - but rather building on the old with new tools. We will see that this is a very different stance from the one advocated by Cohn-Bendit and Verhofstadt who advocate a need for a "Transnational Revolution" in the European Union.

2.1.2 For a 'Transnational Revolution' in Europe

This section will focus on the analysis of the ideas advocated by Verhofstadt and Cohn-Bendit in their book. The context in which this book was written is similar to the one for Barroso, namely the concerns about the economic and integration crisis of the European Union. An important aspect to take into account with regard to the context of this book is the fact that both Daniel Cohn-Bendit and Guy Verhofstadt are co-founders and members of the Spinelli Group⁹⁰, composed by pro-Europeans (Jacques Delors, Mario Monti among many others) committed to advance the federal question in Europe. This will probably play a major role in how the arguments are presented in the book. We can also observe that the arguments conveyed in their discourse/manifesto follow a similar pattern as the one that Barroso uses in his discourse, namely arguments for the federalisation of Europe and arguments against intergovernmentalism, nationalist and populist attitudes.

We will consider the nine elements that we discussed above that are part of Critical Discourse Analysis. The nine elements are: 1) the kind and form of argumentation; 2) certain argumentative strategies; 3) the intrinsic logic and composition of texts; 4) implicit implicateurs and insinuations; 5) the collective symbolism; 6) idioms, sayings and clichés; 7) actors; 8) references and 9) the particulars of the sources of knowledge.⁹¹

⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁹⁰ Spinelli Group's website, last accessed April 23, 2013, <http://www.spinelligroup.eu/>.

⁹¹ Wodak, R. and M. Meyer 2009, 28.

a) Arguments for the federalisation of Europe:

Chapters one and two of this manifesto for a ‘Transnational Revolution’ in Europe are essentially focusing on the looks of the United States of Europe and why it is a desired state of integration for the European Union.

First, Cohn-Bendit and Verhofstadt, two convinced federalists, do not hesitate to use war metaphors to advance their arguments about the federalisation of Europe. “*Only a frontal attack can save us.*” (original emphasis)⁹² The MEPs criticise the ineffectiveness of the current measures and recommend frontal attack and even counter-offensive against nationalistic stances. “Let’s not allow purely national calculations compromise this objective. It is time for us for a counter-offensive. An offensive for more and not less Europe. A choice for a united Europe instead of one anachronic and divided union of nation-states.”⁹³ More unity should be preferred because a union of nation-states is a mistake and nationalism is hindering progress in integration. Norman Fairclough argues that CDA is critical in the sense that it addresses the wrongs of society.⁹⁴ We can see here that Cohn-Bendit and Verhofstadt are critical because they try to address some of the wrongs of the society of the moment (the economic crisis and the rise of nationalism in European countries) and they need to be fought with radical solutions such as a more united federal Europe.

“The old nation-states of Europe will not surrender without a fight. They will not spontaneously give up new competences to a postnational federal Europe. There will be a fight. There will be a fight. No with weapons of course.”⁹⁵ The nation-states are reluctant to give up their sovereignty even if according to Cohn-Bendit and Verhofstadt, a federal Union is needed. They insist that it is not going to be an easy task since the Member States will not give up without a fight. There will be a struggle to advance the federal idea in Europe as a

⁹² “*Seule une attaque frontale peut encore nous sauver.*” (original emphasis) In Cohn-Bendit D. and Verhofstadt G. 2012, 9.

⁹³ “Ne permettons pas que les calculs purement nationaux compromettent cet objectif. L’heure est venue pour nous de la contre-offensive. Une offensive pour ‘plus’ et non ‘moins’ d’Europe. Un choix pour une Europe unie plutôt qu’une union divisée et anachronique d’États-nations.” In Cohn-Bendit D. and Verhofstadt G. 2012, 9.

⁹⁴ Fairclough, Norman. “A Dialectical-relational approach to CDA in Social Research”, in *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, edited by Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer, 2nd edition, Chapter 7, 163. London/Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2009.

⁹⁵ “Les anciens États-nations d’Europe ne rendront pas les armes sans combattre. Ils ne céderont pas spontanément de nouvelles compétences à une Europe postnationale et fédérale. Il faudra se battre. Il faudra combattre. Pas les armes à la main, naturellement.” In Cohn-Bendit D. and Verhofstadt G. 2012, 65.

potential form of integration. William H. Riker quoted in Beramendi defines a federation as “(...) a willingness on the part of politicians who accept the bargain to give up independence for the sake of the union either because they desire protection from an external threat or because they desire to participate in the potential aggression of the federation.”⁹⁶ Cohn-Bendit and Verhofstadt advocate that both national and European politicians should give up their aspirations and work towards unity and a federal Europe that can protect Europe against the challenges it faces, especially globalisation.⁹⁷ This idea is related to one brought forward by the Spinelli Group: “The leaders of the EU have it all wrong; it’s not about transferring sovereignty but recovering sovereignty – in the face of challenges and threats that are of global essence, no European country can claim to be sovereign.”⁹⁸ The importance of a federation is reflected in the fact that European countries cannot cope in the international arena anymore and they will only recover sovereignty if they decide to pull it into the common pot to make them more powerful.

Second, they discuss the looks of the federation in itself. We can see that they base themselves and take as a reference, ideas from different documents⁹⁹ of the Spinelli Group, which they belong to, to frame their arguments for the federalisation of Europe. These documents discuss the possibility of a Federal Act comprising: first a banking union; second an economic and fiscal Union and third a political Union which all are mentioned by the two MEPs. “The construction of a European political union represents an unprecedented historical opportunity to bring democracy out of its national historical context and become a true transnational democracy based on the federal model.”¹⁰⁰ A federal Union is a desired state of integration and a possibility to overcome the nation-state with a transnational democracy ready to face the challenges at hand. Democracy has long been associated with the notion of nation-states and the Spinelli group members believe this should be changed to meet the

⁹⁶ Riker, W. H. quoted in Beramendi, Pablo. “Federalism”, in *Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*, edited by Carles. Boix and Susan. C. Stokes, *Oxford Handbooks of Political Science*, Robert. E. Goodin (General ed.), Chapter 31, 770. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

⁹⁷ Cohn-Bendit D. and Verhofstadt G. 2012, 13.

⁹⁸ Spinelli Group, “Only a European federal union can solve the crisis- Federal Union or disintegration”, Shadow European Council, Brussels, June 28, 2012, last accessed April 23, 2013, <http://www.spinelligroup.eu/>.

⁹⁹ Ibid See also Spinelli Group, “A federal step forwards to end the eurocrisis”, Shadow European Council Conclusions, October 2011, last accessed April 23, 2013, <http://www.spinelligroup.eu/>, and Spinelli Group, Statement “Against the temptation of a Franco-German *coup de chefs d’Etat* shared leadership for a truly democratic and federal European Union”, December 2011, last accessed April 23, 2013, <http://www.spinelligroup.eu/>.

¹⁰⁰ Spinelli Group, December 2011, last accessed April 23, 2013, p. 3.

challenges of globalisation. “Not an unsteady Union which would collapse at the first sign of a crisis. A federal Europe, a real political, economic, budgetary and fiscal Union.”¹⁰¹ Cohn-Bendit and Verhofstadt argue it is important to create a federal Union to be able to prevent future crises both economic and political.

They do not hesitate to employ the term United States of Europe in their line of argument.

More than United Nations of Europe, we need the United States of Europe, that is a federal Union with a federal power and federal rules. It is not the nations that form the core and heart of Europe. Europe has the citizens at its heart. And the core of the European politics cannot be limited to the pursuit of national interests.¹⁰²

Federal Europe is not a place where the nation-states are central to its construction but it is rather the citizens that should be given this power. And, according to Cohn-Bendit and Verhofstadt, this should be reflected in a single democratic European government that would be elected by the European citizens.¹⁰³ Where Cohn-Bendit and Verhofstadt want to get rid of the national level altogether, we saw that Barroso claimed that the federation should not be done against the Member States but with them. Moreover, the idea of a European government elected by the European citizens was briefly discussed by Barroso too when he mentioned that the 2014 European Parliament elections should be taken over by pro-European forces.¹⁰⁴

Norman Fairclough argues that

Discourses may under certain conditions be *operationalized* or ‘put into practice’, which is a dialectical process with three aspects: they may be *enacted* as new ways of (inter)acting, they may be *inculcated* as new ways of being (identities), and they may be physically *materialized*, e.g. as new ways of organizing space (...). (original emphasis)¹⁰⁵

Cohn-Bendit and Verhofstadt try to operationalise the discourse of federalism within the dialectical process of European politics as one of the dominant discourses that should be considered in future integration discussions. They want the discourse of federalism to be

¹⁰¹ “Pas une Union qui serait chancelante des la première crise. Une Europe fédérale, une véritable union politique, économique budgétaire et fiscale.” In Cohn-Bendit D. and Verhofstadt G. 2012, 58.

¹⁰² “Plutôt que des Nations unies d’Europe, nous avons besoin des États-Unis d’Europe, c’est-à-dire une Union fédérale avec un pouvoir fédéral et des règles fédérales. Ce ne sont pas les nations qui forment le cœur de l’Europe. L’Europe a les citoyens en son cœur. Et le cœur de la politique européenne ne peut se résumer à la poursuite des intérêts nationaux.” In Cohn-Bendit D. and Verhofstadt G. 2012, 50.

¹⁰³ Cohn-Bendit D. and Verhofstadt G. 2012, 53.

¹⁰⁴ Barroso, J. M. 12 September 2012, last accessed November 11, 2012.

¹⁰⁵ Fairclough, N. 2009, 165.

enacted and interaction about the European economic crisis should not only include intergovernmental discourses but also federal ones. The inculcation of this discourse should of course happen with politicians of the nation-states and Europeans ones but more importantly with the citizens. Dennis Mueller defines federalism as followed:

Federalist government. Two or more levels of government exist, each of which has primary if not sole responsibility for particular collective decisions. An individual is a citizen of the federal state and of each of the lower levels of government in which she resides. She participates directly or elects representatives to the legislative assemblies for each level.¹⁰⁶

Therefore, to build the United States of Europe, European citizens should be allowed to have a say about the form of government that would eventually rule them in a multi-layered fashion. When this will be achieved, then the last part of Norman Fairclough's argument, the physical materialisation of the discourse will be possible. For a federation, this implies the overarching federal government and lower levels of government which would be the nation-states and potentially the regions. The division of powers between these different levels of government will probably be guided by the principle of subsidiarity which implies the decision-making process should be as close as possible to the citizens and also that the EU only intervenes if the Member States fail to address an issue at the national level.¹⁰⁷ Barroso agrees with that statement by stating that "Subsidiarity is an essential democratic concept and should be practiced."¹⁰⁸ The subsidiarity principle will be an essential element for the well-functioning of the United States of Europe.

Ben Rosamond argues that "In federalist terms, the journeys from both starting points (sociological and constitutional) will lead to the same destination: a clearly defined supranational state."¹⁰⁹ Cohn-Bendit and Verhofstadt agree with this argument and push it even farther: "Either a European federal state, a European postnational polity emerges; or the single currency disappears. No alternative solution can be considered."¹¹⁰ For them there is no other alternative than a federal Europe. If the supranational state does not come into being there is a risk for the Euro but also the European Union as an institution to collapse and

¹⁰⁶ Mueller, D. C. 1997, 259.

¹⁰⁷ Lisbon Treaty, Treaty of the European Union, Article 5, paragraph 3.

¹⁰⁸ Barroso, J. M. 12 September 2012, last accessed November 11, 2012.

¹⁰⁹ Rosamond, B. 2000, 26.

¹¹⁰ "Soit un Etat fédéral européen, une Europe politique postnationale voit le jour ; soit la monnaie unique disparaîtra. Aucune solution intermédiaire ne peut être envisagée." In Cohn-Bendit D. and Verhofstadt G. 2012, 11.

eventually disappear. The United States of Europe is not only a desired state for the Union, it is a necessity. This is due to the dominant discourse of intergovernmentalism's incapability of solving the economic crisis but also the identity crisis of the European Union. Cohn-Bendit and Verhofstadt argue "Only one message must come through: there is no nationalist future for our continent. The future of Europe will be postnational or will not be."¹¹¹ A real European government should be formed by the European Commission and the European Parliament while the Council of Ministers should merely morph into a Senate.¹¹² The European Union should move towards a state-like structure at the supranational level.

Finally, they discuss the role the United States of Europe should play in the future. "A political Union that will represent the European Member States on the international scene. Because nowadays not one Member State, how powerful it may be, does count in the important moments."¹¹³ The federal Union will replace the nation-states as the main actor on the international stage in discussions with other countries and in international organisations. "*Now or never*. European unification is not a European question. It is also global challenge." (original emphasis)¹¹⁴ European integration is not only a necessity for the European countries but also for other countries and international partners because of the need for one common voice and agreement on the politics. "Classical theorists commend federalism for its ability to accommodate commonalities of different political taste and protect political liberties at the same time."¹¹⁵ A federation would bring forward the common interests of the Member States on the international stage and also protect European values and way of living of the European citizens. "Either we firmly opt for a federal Europe, the United States of Europe. Or we will fall back into our nationalist old ways."¹¹⁶

¹¹¹ "Un seul message doit désormais passer : il n'y a pas d'avenir nationaliste pour notre continent. L'avenir de l'Europe sera postnational ou ne sera pas." In Cohn-Bendit D. and Verhofstadt G. 2012, 59.

¹¹² Cohn-Bendit D. and Verhofstadt G. 2012, 65.

¹¹³ "Une Union politique qui représente les États européens sur la scène mondiale. Car aucun État membre, aussi puissant soit-il, ne compte plus aujourd'hui dans les moments importants." In Cohn-Bendit D. and Verhofstadt G. 2012, 58.

¹¹⁴ "*Maintenant ou jamais*. L'unification de l'Europe n'est pas une question européenne. Il s'agit également d'un défi mondial." (original emphasis) In Cohn-Bendit D. and Verhofstadt G. 2012, 66.

¹¹⁵ Beramendi, P. 2007, 760.

¹¹⁶ "Soit nous optons résolument pour une Europe fédérale, les 'États-Unis' d'Europe. Soit nous retomberons tous dans nos errements nationalistes." In Cohn-Bendit D. and Verhofstadt G. 2012, 60.

The United States of Europe is the ultimate solution to overcome the past which was very much influenced by the nation-states. “A European Federal Union must be created. A European federal Union which would allow Europe to participate as fast as possible in the postnational world of tomorrow.”¹¹⁷ In this part, we have seen that the United States of Europe imagined by Cohn-Bendit and Verhofstadt will include a complete integration in the economic, budgetary and politics fields. This integration will ultimately lead to the creation of a supranational state which will render the national level useless and which will represent all the Member States on the international stage. The core of this federation will not be the nation-states but the citizens. After examining the main arguments for the federalisation of Europe, we will now turn to Daniel Cohn-Bendit and Guy Verhofstadt’s critique of intergovernmental, nationalist and populist attitudes.

b) Arguments against intergovernmentalism, nationalist and populist attitudes:

Chapters three and four of the manifesto are focusing on the critique of nationalism and populism. “*Let’s not fall into defeatist traps. The European Union is probably the greatest progress the Old continent has known in the last millennia.*” (original emphasis)¹¹⁸ There is an insinuation that nationalism is a defeatist approach and that the European Union is the solution to defeatism. The nationalist discourse has become important in recent years in Europe. Sara Mills defines discourse as followed: “Thus, a discourse is not a disembodied collection of statements, but groupings of utterances or sentences, statements which are enacted within a social context, which are determined by that social context and which contribute to the way that social context continues its existence.”¹¹⁹ The critique of national and populist attitudes is enacted in the social context of the economic crisis. Cohn-Bendit and Verhofstadt try to disprove the dominant intergovernmental discourse that is shaping the policy-making towards solving the economic crisis at the moment. Their manifesto is part of the ‘what is not sayable’ which exists in discourse, because the federalist discourse is not the dominant one in European politics at the moment.

¹¹⁷“Une Union fédérale européenne doit voir le jour. Une Union fédérale européenne qui permette aussi rapidement que possible à l’Europe de participer au monde postnational de demain.” In Cohn-Bendit D. and Verhofstadt G. 2012, 67.

¹¹⁸ “*Ne tombons pas dans les pièges du défaitisme. L’Union européenne est probablement le plus formidable progrès qu’ait connu le vieux Continent au cours du dernier millénaire.*” (original emphasis) In Cohn-Bendit D. and Verhofstadt G. 2012, 33.

¹¹⁹ Mills, S. 2004, 20.

Another aspect of Critical Discourse Analysis is power relations.¹²⁰ We can see that Cohn-Bendit and Verhofstadt are discussing the power struggle between the hegemonic intergovernmental discourse and the federal minority one. They try to challenge the dominant discourse and tip the power scale in their favour. “The unification demonstrates that tenacious nationalist reflexes and secular rivalries can be overcome.”¹²¹ The European project is an asset that can tackle nationalist movements. According to the two MEPs, the continuation of the intergovernmental alternative could have disastrous consequences for Europe but also for the rest of the world.¹²² The federal discourse needs to overcome the intergovernmental one and also nationalist and populist attitudes.¹²³ The metaphors of the boat (which was also used by Barroso in his discourse) and of fighting against the negative forces of nationalism are associated with the idea that the European Union cannot fall into a lethargic state. Cohn-Bendit and Verhofstadt advocate a European thinking as a solution to the crisis of integration of the European Union. “Hope has been born out of the European unification and it has always been a source of inspiration. We are appalled by the continuous attacks of the Eurosceptics who push us to abandon ship, or even worse, to sink it.”¹²⁴ The European Union is once again compared to a boat which is on the verge of sinking. A federation is beneficial for the European ship, since European unification has been a source of inspiration for the outside world. The United States of Europe would be the next step in the process of unification.

“Let’s calculate the cost of non-Europe and the one of the fragmentation suggested by these Hamelin pied pipers for whom even the existing states are too big.”¹²⁵ The reference to the Pied Piper of Hamelin may be a metaphor for the exclusionist politics of nationalist parties who want to exclude immigrants and people different from the national ethnies from their countries just as the Pied Piper did with the rats. The two MEPs seem to challenge the nationalists in their core assumptions that non-Europe and national protectionism should

¹²⁰ Mills, S. 2004, 16 and Jäger, S. and F. Maier 2009, 37 and 39.

¹²¹ “Cette unification démontre que les réflexes nationalistes tenaces et les rivalités séculaires peuvent être surmontés.” In Cohn-Bendit D. and Verhofstadt G. 2012, 33.

¹²² Cohn-Bendit D. and Verhofstadt G. 2012, 34.

¹²³ Cohn-Bendit D. and Verhofstadt G. 2012, 34.

¹²⁴ “L’unification européenne a fait naître l’espoir et a toujours été une source d’inspiration. Nous sommes atterrés par les attaques incessantes des eurosceptiques qui nous poussent à abandonner le navire ou, plus grave encore, à faire couler le bateau.” Cohn-Bendit D. and Verhofstadt G. 2012, 41.

¹²⁵ “Calculons le coût de la non-Europe et celui de la fragmentation de notre continent proposée par les joueurs de flûte de Hamelin pour qui même les États existants sont trop grands.” Ibid. The Hamelin flute player is a character from one of the Grimm Brothers’ tale “The Pied Piper of Hamelin” who chased rats from a city by playing his magical flute. For more information see the town of Hameln’s website, last accessed May 12, 2013, http://www.hameln.com/tourism/piedpiper/rf_sage_gb.htm.

prevail. CDA is interested in the “(...) way that people are positioned into roles through discursive structures, the way that certain people’s knowledge is disqualified or is not taken seriously in contrast to authorized knowledge.”¹²⁶ The power struggles observed here are clearly between the nationalists and the federalists with the federalists being the underdogs at the moment. This is due to the fact that the federal discourse is a minority one but through their manifesto, Cohn-Bendit and Verhofstadt attempt at convincing people to reverse the trend and move towards the United States of Europe, a desired state of integration for the EU. Authorised knowledge at the moment is mostly nationalist (intergovernmentalist) and the federalist discourse has been disqualified for a while. Drawbacks from the refusal of the Constitutional Treaty and the painful acceptance of the Lisbon Treaty demonstrate the marginalisation of the federalist discourse. But the economic crisis shows that the intergovernmental response is not the best one either since Member States have huge problems agreeing with how it should be done. The federalist alternative should be given consideration alongside the hegemonic discourse of intergovernmentalism.

Moreover, there is a sharp critique of the ideology of nationalism. Ideology can be a constitutive part of discourse. Sara Mills argues that ideology is a “(...) false consciousness or an imagined representation of the real conditions of existence; the position from which falseness is apprehended is that of critique and stands outside of ideology.”¹²⁷ This is the main argument of Cohn-Bendit and Verhofstadt in their critique of nationalism: nationalists have a twisted vision of the world which does not correspond to reality. Nationalism is also a negative ideology which has led to several problems in Europe, especially conflicts and wars. “The heirs of these oppressive and murderous ideologies lurk in shadows of populist and xenophobic movements. We should not allow the ghosts to resurface. We should not forget the wrenches of our history.”¹²⁸ Our interpretation of the world is formed through discursive structures. Discourse is also exclusive because it delimits our field of knowledge. Then the knower needs to be able to enter discourse to make his/her knowledge known to other people with questions of authority and legitimacy into mind. Our actions determine how a statement is interpreted.¹²⁹ Nationalism has been one of the dominant discourses that have

¹²⁶ Mills, S. 2004, 133.

¹²⁷ Mills, S. 2004, 29.

¹²⁸ “Les héritiers de ces idéologies liberticides et meurtrières restent tapis dans l’ombre des mouvements populistes et xénophobes. Ne permettons pas que ces fantômes refassent surface. N’oublions jamais les déchirures de notre histoire.” In Cohn-Bendit D. and Verhofstadt, G. 2012, 36.

¹²⁹ Mills, S. 2004, 46-47.

framed the consciousness of people for several centuries but its most radical side is what should be fought according to Cohn-Bendit and Verhofstadt.

“We must defuse the untruthful rhetoric of Europe’s enemies.” (original emphasis)¹³⁰ They also debate the insanity of some assumptions from the nationalists and populists, especially concerning the fact that every nation should have a state of its own which would imply 350 states only in Europe.¹³¹ Moreover, they discuss the outdated character of the nationalistic and populist rhetoric mostly drawing from the past and their maladjustment to the contemporary multicultural reality. Criticism is raised towards the unrealistic promises of nationalist and populist movements.¹³² *“We must turn our back on the apocalypse prophets and on their old national and securitarian moons. We must refuse the confinement of peoples and nations behind so-called frontiers that would protect them.”* (original emphasis)¹³³ Nationalists are described very negatively, being apocalypse prophets and Cohn-Bendit and Verhofstadt do not beat around the bush in their criticism of nationalism. People in Europe should not be confined behind frontiers for security reasons because these frontiers cannot protect them. Through this argument, the MEPs defend the Schengen area and the free movement of people throughout Europe which is one of the essential freedoms and core values of the European Union.

They also stress the untruthful characteristic of nationalistic claims: “In short, nationalist rhetoric is lying: never do the frontiers of the people correspond to those of the States. This explains, among other things, why nationalism has plunged Europe in wars so many times.”¹³⁴ Playing with the idea of one nation – one state is really dangerous because it has most of the time led to war. Their solution: a federal European Union which is currently far from being achieved.¹³⁵ *“We must not believe the shameless lies of the leaders of the nation-states when they tell the citizens of Europe that the nation-states are the core of the Union. That the Union*

¹³⁰ *“Désamorçons la rhétorique mensongère des ennemis de l’Europe.”* (original emphasis) In Cohn-Bendit D. and Verhofstadt, G. 2012, 36.

¹³¹ Cohn-Bendit D. and Verhofstadt, G. 2012, 37.

¹³² Ibid, 37-8 and 40.

¹³³ *“Tournons le dos aux prophètes de l’apocalypse et à leurs vieilles lunes nationalistes et sécuritaires. Refusons le cantonnement de ‘peuples’ et de ‘nations’ derrière des frontières qui soi-disant les protégeraient.”* (original emphasis) In Cohn-Bendit D. and Verhofstadt G. 2012, 46.

¹³⁴ “Bref, la rhétorique nationaliste ment : jamais les frontières des peuples et des États ne coïncident. Ce qui explique, entre autres, pourquoi le nationalisme a tant de fois plongé l’Europe dans la guerre.” Ibid, 47.

¹³⁵ Cohn-Bendit D. and Verhofstadt G. 2012, 57.

is merely a confederation of independent nations.” (original emphasis)¹³⁶ Only Europe and a European vision can bring about a solution for the future of Europe. Measures from the past have not sufficed and that is why the European project is failing at the moment.¹³⁷ Nation-states are afraid to give in to a federal Union in the name of their sovereignty. What they do not realise however is that their sovereignty is not important in current geopolitics of the world.¹³⁸ The two MEPs also believe that for a true federation to emerge, the nationalists in the European Parliament should leave and give up their position to people that actually support the European integration project.¹³⁹ A Europe of nation-states is a relic from the past and should be replaced by a powerful supranational organisation such as the United States of Europe so that Member States of the European Union are able to face the challenges ahead of them.

Critical Discourse analysts advocate the following:

Because they argue that language is a central vehicle in the process whereby people are constituted as individuals and as social subjects, and because language and ideology are closely imbricated, the close systematic analysis of the language of texts can expose some of the workings of the texts and, by extension, the way that people are oppressed within current social structures.¹⁴⁰

This is what we have attempted to examine in the first part of this work. The language used by Barroso and Cohn-Bendit and Verhofstadt is a European, federal one which up until now has been oppressed in the wider debate about European integration. They try to convince both European institutions and the general public (mostly European citizens) that the United States of Europe is a way of being and a desired future state of integration for the EU. Currently, their federal discourse is oppressed in the social structures which are dominated by the intergovernmental and nationalist discourse but it should be considered as a viable alternative for the future of the European Union. The future does not seem so bright for the EU and the Euro at the moment and to avoid an ill-fated collapse of the influential European institutions, new thinking should be brought to the table. In the mind of Barroso and Cohn-Bendit and

¹³⁶ “*Ne croyons pas aux mensonges éhontés des leaders des États-nations quand ils racontent à leurs citoyens qu’ils seraient le fondement de l’Union. Que l’Union serait simplement une confédération de nations indépendantes.*” (original emphasis) In Cohn-Bendit D. and Verhofstadt G. 2012, 50.

¹³⁷ Cohn-Bendit D. and Verhofstadt G. 2012, 52 and 61-2.

¹³⁸ Cohn-Bendit D. and Verhofstadt G. 2012, 57.

¹³⁹ Cohn-Bendit D. and Verhofstadt G. 2012, 64.

¹⁴⁰ Mills, S. 2004, 118.

Verhofstadt, this implies a federation of nation-states, maybe even the United States of Europe.

Although looking as a good solution towards the economic turmoil and political immobilisation of the European Union, the new ‘federalists’ seem to have different conceptions on how the future of integration should look like and also at what pace the integration should go (confederation vs. fully-fledged federation). While Barroso advocates the *petits pas* strategy, meaning a step by step integration including the Member States, Cohn-Bendit and Verhofstadt urge us to join forces as soon as possible to build the United States of Europe (EU institutions as the main political force) or they warn us: there might not be any Union anymore.

However, this is not the only issue the federalists need to consider when planning a ‘United States of Europe’. Mueller argues “This article's thesis is that the process by which European integration has moved forward has in effect dictated the form that integration takes, and that European citizens have not been allowed to decide whether or not they want a true federalist structure for the European Union.”¹⁴¹ Burgess agrees with this idea: “It is clear, then, that the source of public fears and anxieties about the idea of a federal Europe derives from a fundamental misunderstanding about the meaning and implications of the word ‘federal’.”¹⁴² Even if Barroso and Cohn-Bendit and Verhofstadt mention the citizens as important actors, European politicians have failed until now to bring the citizens on board the federal ship and explain the fundamental assets the ‘United States of Europe’ could give them in a context of a globalised world. Instead, European citizens turn to nationalist forces because the European Union has been several times accused of not being legitimate, not democratic enough. This issue should be tackled before trying to build the federal Union.

Moreover, we can even argue that the United States of Europe is a federalistic utopia with regard to the rise and establishment in governments and parliaments all over Europe of anti-European forces which we will analyse in the section below. We will focus on the case of the Front National in France which is the prototype of this successful nationalist wave in the current economic and political climate.

¹⁴¹ Mueller, D. C. 1997, 256.

¹⁴² Burgess, M. 2000, 29.

2.2 The United States of Europe as a federalistic utopia: the case of the Front National

As we have demonstrated in the above part, the idea of a federal Europe and the United States of Europe are mainly that of European politicians. One of the main issues with this is that they have not managed to bring the people of Europe behind the idea. It has been argued that the permissive consensus that long ruled in the EU (European citizens accepting European integration without protesting) is dead. The ‘democratic deficit’ and lack of legitimacy are also serious problems that the European Union has had problems dealing with.¹⁴³ This is most recently reflected in the overwhelming victory in national elections and European ones of nationalist and populist parties all over Europe. Parties such as the Austrian Freedom Party (FPÖ), the Danish People’s Party (DF), among a plethora of other parties, have been supporting their respective national governments for several years. The newest addition in the family of the populist parties is Beppe Grillo’s Five Star Movement in Italy. Almost all EU countries (excluding Germany and Luxembourg) have now some kind of populist or extreme right parties in their parliament. These parties share similar ideologies of anti-establishment (critique of mainstream parties) and exclusionary views about immigration and minorities.¹⁴⁴

By focusing on the case of France, we see that even the usually strong core of European integration (founding Member State) is not protected from extreme ideas and return to nationalistic politics. The Front National is also one of the examples of nationalist parties that has lasted the longest, over forty years to be exact with a peak when Jean-Marie Le Pen accessed the second round of the presidential elections in 2002. His successor, his daughter, Marine Le Pen scored an incredible 17,90% in the first round of the presidential elections representing exactly 6,421,426 votes, a tenth of the French total population.¹⁴⁵ This indicates a steady progress of the Front National and makes it a relevant case to study the counter-argumentation of the federalists. We will also see that the ideology is quite consistent making it an interesting case to study for the assumption that the United States of Europe is a federalistic utopia.

¹⁴³ Pollack, M. A. 2010, 39. See also Sbragia, Alberta M. “Post-national democracy as post-national democratization” in *Democracy and Federalism in the EU and the US: Exploring Post-national Governance*, edited by Segio Fabbrini, Chapter 11, 168. London/New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, 2005.

¹⁴⁴ Goodwin, M. 2011, 12.

¹⁴⁵ French Ministry of Domestic Affairs, “Résultats de l’élection présidentielle de 2012”, last accessed May 6, 2013, [http://www.interieur.gouv.fr/Elections/Les-resultats/Presidentielles/elecresult_PR2012/\(path\)/PR2012/FE.html](http://www.interieur.gouv.fr/Elections/Les-resultats/Presidentielles/elecresult_PR2012/(path)/PR2012/FE.html).

In this section we will focus on a discourse by Jean-Marie and Marine Le Pen on the 1 May 2012 which glorifies the 600th birthday of Jeanne d’Arc, a French historical figure.¹⁴⁶ Since it is a discourse that is available on video, we will be able to see the context in which it is delivered. Using ethnosymbolism, banal nationalism and Critical Discourse Analysis, we will try to relate this discourse to the political programme of the Front National and to the wider discourse of nationalism that is currently popular in Europe. Most importantly, we will attempt to demonstrate that the United States of Europe is a federalistic utopia that is only advocated by a minority of European politicians.

As we have mentioned before, context is essential when carrying out Critical Discourse Analysis. The context of this discourse is quite interesting: it is delivered on the 1 May 2012, 1 May being Labour Day, usually used by left politicians to demonstrate. Marine Le Pen and her father Jean-Marie Le Pen seem to appropriate themselves the day and claim it to be the Jeanne d’Arc’s day, a day of celebration of the nation. The discourse is delivered in Paris in front of thousands of people and filmed by lots of cameras. They address directly their audience who is filled with people waving the tricolour (French flag) and chanting their names when they arrive on stage. We can see that their arguments are divided into two main themes: first the glorification of the French nation and second the critique of the European Union and the outside world. We will examine these arguments in the following sections.

a) The glorification of the French nation

Jean-Marie Le Pen and Marine Le Pen both use the rhetorical figure of Jeanne d’Arc to represent the French nation and its glorious past. Jeanne d’Arc is clearly considered as a political myth. Anthony D. Smith defines it as followed: “Political myths are stories told, and widely believed, about the heroic past that serve common collective need in the present and future.”¹⁴⁷ This is one aspect of the theoretical approach of ethnosymbolism which is interested in myths, symbols, memories and traditions which helped form and change a

¹⁴⁶ Le Pen, M. and J. M “1er Mai: Discours de Jean-Marie Le Pen et Marine Le Pen à Paris”, May 1, 2012 last accessed May 2, 2013 <http://www.frontnational.com/videos/1er-mai-2012-discours-de-jean-marie-et-marine-le-pen-a-paris/>.

¹⁴⁷ Smith, Anthony D. (ed.) “An Ethno-National Revival?”, in *Nations and Nationalism in a Global Era*, Chapter 3, 63. Oxford: Polity Press, 1995.

particular nation.¹⁴⁸ We will mainly focus on this characteristic of ethnosymbolism in the analysis of the discourse by Jean-Marie and Marine Le Pen.

A political myth is also:

This kind of didactic history as other characteristics: an emphasis on the heroic and dignified, a belief in the example of virtue, a story of the origins and early wanderings of the community, perhaps also of liberation from oppression and unification, an account of the foundation of polity, above all a myth of the golden age of warriors, saints and sages (...).¹⁴⁹

We can clearly see that the example of Jeanne d'Arc used both by Jean-Marie and Marine Le Pen in their discourse about the greatness of the French nation is a political myth borrowed from the past to explain the glorious origins of France.¹⁵⁰ Jean-Marie Le Pen especially describes Jeanne d'Arc in detail: she is a young girl who died before she was twenty years old and who helped the French army to fight the English armies who were in control of France since 1420 and the treaty of Troyes.¹⁵¹ Jean-Marie Le Pen emphasises the difficult situation people were in at that time until: "All or almost everything is lost when Jeanne arises. She is the daughter of a farmer of the French country at the borders of hostile territories."¹⁵² He insists on a characteristic of ethnosymbolism which is the mythical nature which has been given to the persona of Jeanne fighting to re-claim the ancestor of the French Nation from the Englishmen. "She does not know yet (...) that France and history await her."¹⁵³

"But this young virgin transcended by faith and love is not destined to mystical contemplations like Bernadette and Thérèse. She is destined for action. Her voices order her to human action, even superhuman action (...)."¹⁵⁴ Jeanne is definitely an example of virtue

¹⁴⁸ Smith, A. D. quoted in Özkirimli, U. 2010, 143.

¹⁴⁹ Smith, A. D. 1995, 63.

¹⁵⁰ Le Pen, M. and J. M. "1er Mai: Discours de Jean-Marie Le Pen et Marine Le Pen à Paris", May 1, 2012 last accessed May 2, 2013 <http://www.frontnational.com/videos/1er-mai-2012-discours-de-jean-marie-et-marine-le-pen-a-paris/>, (04 min 20-05 min 26) and (18 min 38-18 min 41)

¹⁵¹ Le Pen, M. and Jean-Marie Le Pen 1 May 2012, last accessed May 2, 2013, (04 min 20-05 min 26)

¹⁵² "Tout est perdu ou presque quand survient Jeanne. Elle est fille de paysan du pays de France aux confins des terres hostiles." In Le Pen, M. and J-M. Le Pen 1 May 2012, last accessed May 2, 2013, (06 min 04-06 min 15)

¹⁵³ "Elle ne sait pas encore (...) que la France et l'histoire l'attendent." In Le Pen, M. and J-M. Le Pen 1 May 2012, last accessed May 2, 2013. (06 min 23-06 min 32)

¹⁵⁴ "Mais cette jeune vierge transcendée par la foi et l'amour n'est pas destinée aux contemplations mystiques comme Bernadette ou Thérèse. Elle est vouée à l'action. Ses voix l'appellent à l'action

which fought for the liberation of the French nation and was then elevated to the rank of saint in the twentieth century. She is the perfect example to use to show the common ancestry of the French people. Jean-Marie Le Pen also insists on how glorious Jeanne d'Arc's destiny was and how this political myth is one that belongs only to the French nation.¹⁵⁵ This is problematic for the construction of a federal Europe. Even if it would attain economic and political integration and unification, it still lacks the characteristic of the nations that shapes the sense of belonging of its citizens to them, namely a true common identity. A European identity has been widely debated several times without finding a satisfactory answer to the question of what it is. As long as the Europeans do not have a common identity, their sense of belonging will remain to nations and a federal Union will remain a dead end.

Jean-Marie Le Pen argues that France is still influencing the rest of the world both culturally and politically even if its population is becoming more and more a minority in its own territory.¹⁵⁶ This shows the commitment of nationalist parties to their common ancestry and glorious past which should influence the present and the future.¹⁵⁷ More than ethnosymbolism, we can even say that the Le Pen use ethnocultural nationalism in their discourse. Ethnocultural nationalism is defined as followed by David Brown:

Ethnocultural nationalism is based on the myth of common ancestry, and of inherited ownership of an ancestral homeland. It focuses on the belief that the community shares some distinctive racial, religious and linguistic attributes, which are then seen as the 'proof' of common ancestry.¹⁵⁸

This is clearly used with the example of the glorious life of Jeanne d'Arc. Jean-Marie Le Pen's discourse about Jeanne d'Arc is conditioned by the glorious past and ancestry which is shaping his present vision of the French Nation.¹⁵⁹ This is related to the socially constitutive and socially constituted character of discourse. The glorious past and the current economic crisis are used to socially constitute the discourse but the discourse also constitutes the

humaine, et même surhumaine (...)." In Le Pen, M. and J-M. Le Pen 1 May 2012, last accessed May 2, 2013. (06 min 48-07 min 25)

¹⁵⁵ In Le Pen, M. and J-M. Le Pen 1 May 2012, last accessed May 2, 2013. (08 min 50)

¹⁵⁶ "Mais son rayonnement éclaire encore aujourd'hui le monde malgré un territoire et une population de plus en plus minoritaires." In Le Pen, M. and J-M. Le Pen 1 May 2012, last accessed May 2, 2013. (03 min 06-03 min 15)

¹⁵⁷ Özkirimli U. 2010, 143.

¹⁵⁸ Brown, David. (ed.) "Contentious visions: civic, ethnocultural and multicultural nationalism", in *Contemporary nationalism: civic, ethnocultural and multicultural Politics*, Chapter 7, 128. London/New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, 2000.

¹⁵⁹ Torfing, J. 2005, 14.

context. Jean-Marie Le Pen advocates the return to ancient values and we should learn from the past in shaping our future. Michael Billig argues that “At regular, but intermittent intervals, the crisis occurs, and the moral aura of nationalism is invoked: heads will be nodded, flags waved and tanks will roll.”¹⁶⁰ This we can clearly see in the discourse by Jean-Marie and Marine Le Pen except the tanks part. The crisis mentioned by Billig can be considered to be in our case the economic crisis that affects the EU.

Moreover, the Front National is a populist party which could be problematic for the EU since it means that they claim to represent the people and the European Union need the European citizens to create its United States of Europe. The Front National claims to represent the French people and helping them emancipate themselves from the corrupt society in which they are living. Marine Le Pen states: “Mes amis, le grand changement viendra du peuple.” (My friends, the great change will come from the people)¹⁶¹ Matthew Goodwin argues that “(...) PEPs portray themselves as outsiders in the party system, as underdog parties that represent the true voice of a ‘silent majority’, and as the only organizations willing to address sensitive issues such as immigration and the integration of Muslims.”¹⁶² As ‘representatives’ of the silent majority (meaning the citizens), the populist parties have an advantage over the European Union insofar as citizens relate more to their nations than to the supranational structure.

Populist ideology has two core features: first is the exclusion of other groups of people, especially immigrants and minorities. Second is the rejection of mainstream politics.¹⁶³ These arguments are also developed more thoroughly by Matthew Goodwin. The populist parties see the immigrant and minority groups as a threat to the national culture, the social order, economic stability and a burden to the welfare state.¹⁶⁴ “In all this, an ideological consciousness of nationhood can be seen to be at work. It embraces a complex set of themes about ‘us’, ‘our homeland’, ‘nations’ (‘ours’ and ‘theirs’), the ‘world’, as well as the morality of national duty and honour.”¹⁶⁵ When dealing with the theme of immigration, we can see that populist parties are excluding those immigrants that are seen as not belonging in the ‘us’ and

¹⁶⁰ Billig, M. 1995, 4.

¹⁶¹ Le Pen, M. and J-M. Le Pen 1 May 2012, last accessed May 2, 2013. (25 min 28-25 min 31) (1 h 07 min 16)

¹⁶² Goodwin, M. 2011, 14.

¹⁶³ Özkirimli, U. 2010, 146. See also P. Taggart (ed.) “Populism, the People and the Heartland”, in *Populism*, Chapter 8, 94. Buckingham/Philadelphia: Open University Press, 2000.

¹⁶⁴ Goodwin, M. 2011, 13 and 17.

¹⁶⁵ Billig, M. 1995, 4.

the 'nation' and place them in a category of 'them'. This is the process of othering where everyone that is not the like of the citizens of the nation is excluded.

“Mainstream parties are lumped into a single ‘corrupt’ and ‘out-of-touch’ elite and are ‘all the same’. They are attacked ‘for focusing on obsolete issues, while at the same time suppressing political issues associated with the real conflict between national identity and multiculturalism’.”¹⁶⁶ This argument is presented by Marine Le Pen in her discourse. “We do not use roundabout strategies. No calculations and no schemes. No gloomy thoughts, no manipulation.”¹⁶⁷ She claims to represent the true politics against corruption of mainstream politics. The mission of the Front National is to bring into light manipulation and corruption of other politicians.¹⁶⁸ “Shame on those that do not take into account the people but still aspire to govern them. Whose contempt for the people is unfathomable because it denies people’s aspiration to liberty, generosity and greatness.”¹⁶⁹

Marine Le Pen clearly states her discontent for mainstream politics and how they believe to represent the people. She even makes a reference to the influential French philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau by quoting him: “Jamais on ne corrompt le peuple mais souvent on le trompe.” (“You can never corrupt the people but often you can fool them.”)¹⁷⁰ According to Marine Le Pen, mainstream politicians who are mostly supporting the EU are corrupted and inapt to govern the people of France. The only party that is true to the people is the Front National and that is why they should continue their struggle against the establishment.¹⁷¹ Another denomination that would fit the Front National is extreme right party. These parties share common traits such as exclusionism, nationalism, anti-permissivism, xenophobia and intolerance among others.¹⁷² We have distinguished these characteristics in both Jean-Marie Le Pen and Marine Le Pen’s discourses. This ideology and values have been quite consistent

¹⁶⁶ Goodwin, M. 2011, 14.

¹⁶⁷ “Chez nous pas de stratégie détournée. Pas de calculs et de combines. Pas d’arrière pensée, pas de manipulation.” In Le Pen, M. and J-M. Le Pen 1 May 2012, last accessed May 2, 2013. (21 min 35-21 min 43)

¹⁶⁸ In Le Pen, M. and J-M. Le Pen 1 May 2012, last accessed May 2, 2013.

¹⁶⁹ “Honte à ceux qui considèrent ainsi le peuple et aspire pourtant à le diriger. Dont le mépris pour le peuple est insondable puisqu’il nie l’aspiration du peuple à la liberté, à la générosité et à la grandeur.” In Le Pen, M. and J-M. Le Pen 1 May 2012, last accessed May 2, 2013. (22 min 45-23 min 05)

¹⁷⁰ Le Pen, M. and J-M. Le Pen 1 May 2012, last accessed May 2, 2013. (23 min 35- 23 min 41)

¹⁷¹ Ibid. (23 min 58-24 min 00) (24 min 35-25 min 05) (27 min 17)

¹⁷² Ignazi, Piero. (ed.) “From Ideologies to Parties”, in *Extreme Right Parties in Western Europe*, Comparative Politics Series, Chapter 2, 27. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003. See also Rydgren, Jens. “Is extreme-right wing populism contagious? Explaining the emergence of a new party family”, in *European Journal of Political Research*, Vol. 44, (2005): 413-4370. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

for the last forty years. This is a dilemma for the European Union since most of these values contradict its own. The European Union and federalists have real contenders in the nationalist parties since the paradigm of nationalism is still strong and citizens are still mainly feeling attachment to their nations. It will be really difficult for the federalists to reverse this trend and make their own discourse the dominant paradigm.

Finally, “One might predict that, as a nation-state becomes established in its sovereignty, and if it faces little internal challenge, then the symbols of nationhood, which might once have been consciously displayed, do not disappear from sight but instead become absorbed into the environment of the established homeland.”¹⁷³ The symbols of nationhood may have been forgotten by the majority, but the Front National is clearly trying to counteract banal nationalism by using ethnosymbolism in their discourse. The myths and other symbols representing the French nation are used to be able to differentiate the French nation against other nations and create a common ancestry. The symbols that have been quite forgotten by French citizens, such as the flag, the national anthem (only waved and sung at sporting events) alongside the mysterious Jeanne d’Arc, are all re-appropriated by the Front National to claim back a glorious national past that should guide the French nation into the future.

b) The critique of Europe and the outside world

A second theme debated in the discourses by Jean-Marie Le Pen and Marine Le Pen is the critique of Europe and the outside world which are incapable of dealing with the crisis. Jean-Marie Le Pen argues “As during the times of Jeanne, France is condemned to disappear, prisoner of the ambiguous structures of the European Union. She has lost the essential of her sovereignty.” National sovereignty and France’s greatness are threatened by the European Union. He also argues that immigration is a lethal threat towards France.¹⁷⁴ This argument is shared by other national populist parties, some focusing on external migration, other on their internal minorities, people different from the national ethnies they are advocating.¹⁷⁵ Marine Le Pen openly criticises the advantages given to people of colour and from a different

¹⁷³ Billig, M. 1995, 41.

¹⁷⁴ “Comme aux temps de Jeanne, la France est condamnée à disparaître, prisonnière des structures ambiguës de l’Union Européenne. Elle a perdu l’essentiel de sa souveraineté.” In Le Pen, M. and J-M. Le Pen 1 May 2012, last accessed May 2, 2013. (14 min 00-14 min 13)

¹⁷⁵ Goodwin, M. 2011, 13; Guibernau, M. March 2010, 10-11; Taggart, P. 2000, 94 and Hartleb F. 2011, 23.

religion: positive discrimination. She rejects the ideas of “(...) Obligation du métissage, la richesse d’une société multiculturelle” (“(...) obligation of interbreeding and the richness of a multicultural society”). She claims that her party is honest, righteous and patriotic and that their arguments are legitimate.¹⁷⁶ These arguments are opposed to the ideas advocated by the European Union which is a proponent of the multicultural societies and “unity in diversity”. The theme of immigration and its danger to the native society is shared by many national populist parties in Europe.¹⁷⁷ So is Euroscepticism.

Hartleb defines Euroscepticism as followed: “The ‘soft’ form of Euroscepticism signifies the qualified rejection of certain aspects of the integration project or the EU in its current institutional form.”¹⁷⁸ The Front National is a notorious Eurosceptic party and this is clearly shown in the discourse by Marine Le Pen. There is a harsh critique of the European Central Bank (ECB) and its austerity measures. According to Marine Le Pen, economic growth is impossible without protectionism.¹⁷⁹ This is in clear contradiction with what was advocated by the federalists in their ideal of the United States of Europe where all the power and financial policies will be under the control of the European Union. She also argues that the last of the French national sovereignty disappeared when the Stability pact was signed. The French President is called an “employee of the European Central Bank (ECB)” who is just applying the decisions of the European Commission and a slave to Angela Merkel.¹⁸⁰ The critique of mainstream politics is one of the aspects of populist rhetoric which is visible here in Marine Le Pen’s discourse.

There is also a process of victimisation going on where the discourse of the Front National is the minority one against the hegemonic mainstream politics/European Union.¹⁸¹ The Front National also claims that this minority discourse is representative of the views of the silent majority.¹⁸² The silent majority is the citizens that disagree with how politics are carried out at the moment in their country. “Although most citizens in Europe support democracy as a form of government, large numbers are dissatisfied with the way their national democracy is

¹⁷⁶ Le Pen, M. and J-M. Le Pen 1 May 2012, last accessed May 2, 2013. (35 min 14-35 min 19) (55 min 34) (56 min 54)

¹⁷⁷ Hartleb F. 2011, 23.

¹⁷⁸ Hartleb F. 2011, 38. See also Smith, A. D. 1995, 122.

¹⁷⁹ Le Pen, M. and J-M. Le Pen 1 May 2012, last accessed May 2, 2013. (30 min 54-32 min 01)

¹⁸⁰ Le Pen, M. and J-M. Le Pen 1 May 2012, last accessed May 2, 2013. (29 min 09-30 min 01)

¹⁸¹ Ibid, (27 min 02).

¹⁸² Ibid, (48 min 25-50 min 15) (01 h 03 min 20). For more information about the silent majority see Taggart, P. 2000, 93.

functioning and distrustful of institutions in society.”¹⁸³ These citizens are more inclined to vote for parties such as the Front National. If the European Union is to build the United States of Europe, democracy needs to be improved in the European institutions to make it more legitimate to its citizens.

The Euroscepticism advocated in the discourses by Jean-Marie Le Pen and Marine Le Pen is clearly taken from the Front National’s party programme for the French presidential elections of 2012. The Commission is criticised as being undemocratic because it is not directly elected and also it distributes the powers of legislation to the European technocrats.¹⁸⁴ This criticism has been addressed by the federalists José Manuel Barroso, Daniel Cohn-Bendit and Guy Verhofstadt by suggesting that the future European government should be elected by the European citizens.¹⁸⁵ The political programme of the Front National also suggests that the European Union is the slave of the financial market which forces it towards a federal Union and abandoning the nations. A solution for the FN would be to come back to the national currencies and abandon the euro.¹⁸⁶ This is the counter-argumentation to what the federalists advocated, namely that to take control over the markets and over the crisis, a federal Europe and the euro as a strong currency are needed. Daniel Cohn-Bendit and Guy Verhofstadt even suggested that all kinds of nationalist thinking should be abandoned and replaced by a supranational entity that would be able to deal with the problems of the European Union and the economic crisis¹⁸⁷.

The Pro-Europeans believe they can use the failure, which is their failure, of the euro to push an economic and budgetary integration of the eurozone: as always, the failure

¹⁸³ Goodwin, M. 2011, 21.

¹⁸⁴ Front National, Political Programme for the presidential elections of 2012, “Une Europe au service des peuples libres” last accessed May 3, 2013, <http://www.frontnational.com/le-projet-de-marine-le-pen/politique-etrangere/europe/>.

¹⁸⁵ Barroso, J. M. 12 September 2012, last accessed November 11, 2012. See also Cohn-Bendit D. and Verhofstadt G. 2012, 65.

¹⁸⁶ Front National, Political Programme for the presidential elections of 2012, “Une Europe au service des peuples libres” last accessed May 3, 2013.

¹⁸⁷ Barroso, J. M. 12 September 2012, last accessed November 11, 2012. See also Cohn-Bendit D. and Verhofstadt G. 2012, 9, 27 and 65.

of a European policy should be treated with more European federalism, as Molière's doctors treated their patients' anemia with a good bleeding...¹⁸⁸

Marine Le Pen also states "Ils sont européistes et mondialistes. Nous sommes nationaux et patriotes. (...) Ils sont pour l'Europe fédérale et celles des marchands, pas nous." (They are pro-Europeans and globalised. We are nationalist and patriotic. (...) They are for the federal and the merchants' Europe, we aren't.)¹⁸⁹ As long as Eurosceptic parties such as the Front National, the Austrian Freedom Party and Jobbik in Hungary, among many others, are influential in their national political spheres, the idea of a federal Europe remains a utopia imagined with good intentions in mind by European politicians. The European Union and supporter of the United States of Europe clearly need a solid counter-argumentation to the theoretical approach of nationalism which is still the hegemonic discourse. This argumentation should stress the benefits of the creation of a federal Union which should be submitted to the European citizens.

According to the Front National, France is suffering from its membership in the EU, being a net contributor while other countries get the benefits such as United Kingdom, the Netherlands and Sweden among others. Moreover, the opening of the borders has had a negative effect for France, massive immigration seeking to benefit from its social security system.¹⁹⁰ Unfortunately for proponent of a federal Europe, lots of citizens around Europe start to believe the nationalist rhetoric that the membership of their country in the European Union is detrimental to their economy and their sovereignty. The latest stunt we have seen is from David Cameron, UK's Prime Minister who is considering a referendum for continued membership of the United Kingdom in the EU.¹⁹¹ The Front National in its political programme goes even farther by advocating that:

We now have to create the basis of a Europe which is respectful of the popular sovereignties, of national identities, of languages and cultures, and of real service to

¹⁸⁸ "(...) les européistes pensent tirer prétexte de cet échec, qui est leur échec, pour une intégration économique et budgétaire de la zone euro : comme toujours, l'échec d'une politique européenne doit être traité par plus de fédéralisme européen, comme les médecins de Molière traitaient l'anémie de leurs patients par une bonne saignée..." in Front National, Political Programme for the presidential elections of 2012, "Une Europe au service des peuples libres" last accessed May 3, 2013.

¹⁸⁹ Le Pen, M. and J-M. Le Pen 1 May 2012, last accessed May 2, 2013. (57 min 10-57 min 14) (57 min 26-57 min 29)

¹⁹⁰ Ibid.

¹⁹¹ Cameron, David. "David Cameron's EU speech – full text", in *The Guardian*, January 23, 2012, last accessed May 5, 2013, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2013/jan/23/david-cameron-eu-speech-referendum>.

the people by acting concretely. A Ministry of Sovereignities will coordinate the re-negotiation of the Treaties and **the restoration of our national sovereignty in all the domains where it has disappeared.** (original emphasis)¹⁹²

The return to an association of free European states is in total contradiction with the idea of the United States of Europe and federal unification. For Anthony D. Smith you need to have a core ethnic to make a federation work.¹⁹³ The European Union has failed up until now to truly construct ‘the European people’ because of the allegiance of people mainly remains towards their nation-states.¹⁹⁴ This is why a federal union is, for the moment, to be considered a utopia. Anthony D. Smith claims that “We can hardly imagine, then, that a European economic and political union, or a European federation, will abolish or erode the deeply ingrained historic identities and cultures of the very diverse peoples of Europe.”¹⁹⁵ The idea of a federal Europe is doomed to failure as long as the peoples of Europe have not embarked on the journey with the European politicians. It does not help the federalists that “Casting its long shadow across the continent from east to west, the ‘spectre of nationalism’ refuses to be exorcized.”¹⁹⁶ This is a real dilemma for the proponents of a federal Europe.

Michael Billig argues that “Nationalism, far from being an intermittent mood in established, is the endemic condition.”¹⁹⁷ Cas Mudde¹⁹⁸ agrees with that statement, even calling nationalism a “pathological normalcy”.

Three decades of activism by the populist radical Right have taught some hard lessons. First, it is not a ‘normal pathology’, alien to European democracies, but its opposite, a pathological normalcy. Populist radical right parties offer simplistic, radical variants of views shared by large pluralities, often majorities, of the population. Thus, these parties have a fertile ground in which to grow.¹⁹⁹

¹⁹² “Il faut désormais jeter les bases d’une Europe respectueuse des souverainetés populaires, des identités nationales, des langues et des cultures, et qui soit réellement au service des peuples par des actions concrètes. Un ministère des Souverainetés coordonnera la renégociation des Traités et **la restauration de notre souveraineté nationale dans l’ensemble des domaines où elle a disparu.**” (original emphasis), in Front National, Political Programme for the presidential elections of 2012, “Une Europe au service des peuples libres” last accessed May 3, 2013.

¹⁹³ Smith, A. D. 1995, 119.

¹⁹⁴ Smith, A. D. 1995, 55.

¹⁹⁵ Ibid, 125.

¹⁹⁶ Ibid, 121.

¹⁹⁷ Billig, M. 1995, 6.

¹⁹⁸ Mudde, C. 2011a, 1167-1186. See also Tim Bale, ‘Cinderella and her Ugly Sisters: The Mainstream and Extreme Right in Europe’s Bipolarising Party Systems’, in *West European Politics*, 26(3) (2003): 67–90. London: Taylor and Francis Group.

¹⁹⁹ Mudde, C. Fall 2011b, 9.

Jens Rydgren even claims that extreme-right wing populism is contagious.²⁰⁰ The fact that nationalistic tendencies have become the ‘trend’ in most European countries shows that the United States of Europe is still a utopia. The idea of a federal Europe is threatened by the arguments of nationalist parties, especially the Front National’s ideas. Cas Mudde argues that once these parties are in the government, they need to work hard to maintain their position. Lots of them have imploded, unable to deal with the success.²⁰¹ This is not true of the Front National which has been present in French politics for over forty years. Matthew Goodwin argues that these parties are not a flash in the pan, they continuously gain support with each election.²⁰² As long as these parties are influential in national political spheres, federalists should continue to dream their idealistic United States of Europe. It would not help to apply the quite radical stance of Daniel Cohn-Bendit and Guy Verhofstadt where the national level of power completely disappears to leave place to a supranational state. Not unless the European citizens make a sharp U-turn in their sense of belonging and choose the European Union over their national allegiance. The people are essential in the success of the federal enterprise.

Finally, “(...) nationalism is the ideology by which the world of nations has come to seem the natural world – as if there could not possibly be a world without nations.”²⁰³ This argument by Michael Billig shows how difficult it would be to create a United States of Europe in which the European nations would disappear and lose all their sovereignty. Anthony D. Smith agrees with this statement by claiming that nationalism holds that citizens’ loyalty are primarily to their nations and that people can only be free and fulfilled through their belonging to a nation.²⁰⁴ Therefore it seems that there is still a long way to make people accept the benefits of the supranational level and a prospective federation of European states. It is not surprising to observe that the United States of Europe is for the moment a federalistic utopia confined to the most enthusiastic European politicians.

²⁰⁰ Rydgren, J. 2005, 413-437.

²⁰¹ Mudde, C. Fall 2011b, 9.

²⁰² Goodwin, M. 2011, 2.

²⁰³ Billig, M. 1995, 37.

²⁰⁴ Smith, A. D. 1995, 55.

3. Conclusion

The purpose of this thesis was to test the concept of the United States of Europe as a desired state for the European Union or if it is a federalistic utopia. We have seen valid arguments to prove that it is a desired state of integration by the President of the European Commission, José Manuel Barroso and MEPs Daniel Cohn-Bendit and Guy Verhofstadt. Among arguments for a federal Europe as a desired state for the European Union were its benefits for the decision-making process, the representation at the international level and to build a stronger Europe for the future to solve and potentially alleviate problems such as the current economic crisis. In the postnational world of tomorrow, a federation of the European nation-states would become handy since all policies will be integrated and allowing the Union to speak on behalf of several states. We have been able to examine two ways of proceeding: first there is the step-by-step approach advocated by Barroso where the Member States will play an active role in the transition towards a federation of nation-states (disguised in the looks of a confederation). Second, we have the more radical approach advocated by Daniel Cohn-Bendit and Guy Verhofstadt where a supranational government should be created with the ability to control all the policy areas that the nation-states have jealously guarded up until now, most importantly the financial and budgetary ones. In this scenario, the national level will ultimately disappear to leave the stage to a powerful United States of Europe.

The federal discourse seems legitimate in the sense that the intergovernmental stance has been proven ineffective because the Union is facing its worst economic and identity crisis in its history. Michael Burgess claims that the EU is a case of federalism without a federation.²⁰⁵ This is true in the sense that the European Union has institutions that resemble ones of a federation but it fails to have one people to govern. Maybe the Union should move towards a federation for its own sake. Whether the choice is the step-by-step approach of Barroso or the more proactive immediate fully-fledged federation of Cohn-Bendit and Verhofstadt is entirely dependent on the pro-Europeans. The important aspect is that a majority should be onboard. The Union still needs to work on legitimacy issues of its institutions and policies among its citizens. The same goes for the federal ideal of the United States of Europe.

However, right now, there is a strong opposition to the federal idea, making the United States of Europe a federalistic utopia. The main problem that the federalists are facing is parties on the extreme right of the political spectrum. Whether nationalist or populist, extreme or radical,

²⁰⁵ Burgess, M. 2000, 29.

these parties such as the Front National in France are damaging the federal project. The supremacy of national sovereignty, the claim to represent the people and the return to economic protectionism are among many of the ideas of these parties that are detrimental to the United States of Europe. All over Europe, some citizens are rallying behind nationalist protectionist ideas and their popularity does not appear to decrease at the moment. These parties and their ideology seem legitimate as the European Union and especially the European Commission are ordering severe austerity measures that are deeply dissatisfying for the European citizens of the Eurozone. And let's face it, politics and democracy in particular is about what citizens think. A main criticism addressed to the European Union is that it is too far from its citizens and cannot relate to them. This should definitely be the first step in the process of moving towards the United States of Europe: convincing the European citizens.

In the end, it is a question about the legitimacy of the federal idea amongst the European citizens. "The people are the source of sovereignty, and the actions of governmental institutions must be grounded in the will of the people."²⁰⁶ This could be a potential field to explore in the future. Research should be carried out on measures taken by the European Union to convince the European citizens of the legitimacy and the benefits of the federal idea. The one million citizen initiative is not enough. The policy-making process needs to be more democratic. The European Union must act and fast in order not to lose its battle against the extreme right parties and in its advocacy of the United States of Europe as a desired state of integration for the Union which benefits all its citizens.

²⁰⁶ Caporaso, James A. "The Emergence of the EU Supranational Polity and its implications for democracy", in *Democracy and Federalism in the EU and the US: Exploring Post-national Governance*, edited by Sergio Fabbrini, Chapter 4, 59. London/New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, 2005.

References:

Literary Sources:

Bale, Tim. "Cinderella and her Ugly Sisters: The Mainstream and Extreme Right in Europe's Bipolarising Party Systems." *West European Politics*, 26(3) (2003): 67-90. London: Taylor and Francis Group.

Bay Brzinski, Joanne. "Changing Forms of Federalism and Party Electoral Strategies: Belgium and the European Union", *Publius: The Journal of Federalism*, 29:1 (Winter 1999): 45-70. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Beramendi, Pablo. "Federalism", in *Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*, edited by Carles Boix and Susan C. Stokes, *Oxford Handbooks of Political Science*, Robert E. Goodin (General ed.), Chapter 31, 752-781. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Billig, Michael. *Banal Nationalism*. London/Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 1995.

Brown, David. "Contentious visions: civic, ethnocultural and multicultural nationalism", in *Contemporary nationalism: civic, ethnocultural and multicultural Politics*, Chapter 7, 126-134. London/New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, 2000.

Burgess, Michael. *Federalism and the European Union: The Building of Europe, 1950-2000*. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, 2000.

Caporaso, James A. "The Emergence of the EU Supranational Polity and its implications for democracy", in *Democracy and Federalism in the EU and the US: Exploring Post-national Governance*, edited by Sergio Fabbrini, Chapter 4, 55-75. London/New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, 2005.

Churchill, Winston. "United States of Europe", in *The Pro-European Reader*, edited by Dick Leonard and Mark Leonard, 13-16. New York: Palgrave Macmillan and the Foreign Policy Centre, 2002.

Cloots, Elke, Geert De Baere and Stefan Sottiaux (eds). *Federalism in the European Union*, Modern Studies in European Law series: 33. Oxford: Hart Publishing, 2012.

Cohn-Bendit Daniel. and Verhofstadt Guy. *Debout l'Europe! Manifeste pour une Révolution Postnationale en Europe*, edited by André Versaille. Brussels: Actes Sud, 2012.

Fabbrini, Sergio. (ed.) "Introduction: Why compare the EU and the US?", in *Democracy and Federalism in the EU and the US: Exploring Post-national Governance*, 1-24. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, 2005.

Fairclough, Norman. "A Dialectical-relational approach to CDA in Social Research", in *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, edited by Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer, 2nd edition, Chapter 7, 162-186. London/Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2009.

Guibernau, Montserrat. "Migration and the rise of the radical right: Social Malaise and the failure of mainstream politics", Policy Network paper. London: Policy Network, March 2010.

Goodwin, Matthew. "Right Response: Understanding and Countering Populist Extremism in Europe", A Chatham House Report. London: Royal Institute of International Affairs, September 2011.

Hartleb, Florian. *After their Establishment: Right-wing Populist Parties in Europe*, Research Project for the Konrad Adenauer Foundation "Rechtspopulistische Parteien in Europa", Brussels: Centre for European Studies, 2011.

Hechter, Michael. "Nationalist Puzzles", in *Containing Nationalism*, Chapter 1, 1-17. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Howell, Martha and Walter Prevenier "Technical Analysis of Source", in *From Reliable Sources: An Introduction to Historical Methods*, 1st edition, Chapter 2, Part B, 60-68. Cornell: Cornell University Press, 2001.

Ignazi, Piero. "From Ideologies to Parties", in *Extreme Right Parties in Western Europe*, Comparative Politics Series, Chapter 2, pp. 20-34. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Jäger Siegfried and Florentine Maier. "Theoretical and Methodological Aspects of Foucauldian CDA and Dispositive Analysis", in *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer (eds), 2nd edition, Chapter 2, p. 49. London/Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2009,

Lisbon Treaty, Treaty of the European Union, Article 5, paragraph 3.

Lister, Frederick K. "The nature of Confederal Governance", in *The European union, the united nations and the revival of confederal governance*, Chapter 1, 17-52. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1996.

Mendez, Fernando, Mario Mendez and Vasiliki Triga. "Direct Democracy in the European Union: How Comparative Federalism can Help us Understand the Interplay of Direct Democracy and European Integration", in *Revista de Ciencia Política* Volumen 29:1 (2009): 57-83, Instituto de Ciencias Políticas.

Mills, Sara. "Discourse and Ideology", *Discourse: The New Critical Idiom*, Chapter 2, 26-42. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, 2004.

Mills, Sara. "Discourse Analysis and Critical Discourse Analysis", *Discourse: The New Critical Idiom*, Chapter 6, 116-143. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, 2004.

Mudde, Cas. "The Populist Radical Right: A Pathological Normalcy", in *West European Politics* 33(6) (2011a): 1167-1186. London: Taylor and Francis Group.

Mudde, Cas. “Who’s Afraid of the European Radical Right”, in *Dissent* (Fall 2011b): 7-11. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Mueller, Dennis C. “Federalism and the European Union: A Constitutional Perspective”, in *Public Choice*, 90 (1997): 255-280. Amsterdam: Kluwer Academic Publishing, Springer.

Nicolaidis, Kalypso and Robert Howse (eds). *The Federal Vision: Legitimacy and Levels of Governance in the United States and the European Union*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Pollack, Mark A. “Theorizing EU Policy-Making”, in *Policy-Making in the European Union*, edited by Helene Wallace, Mark A. Pollack and Alasdair R. Young, 6th Edition, Chapter 2, 15-44. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Ray, Leonard. “Don’t rock the boat: expectations, fears and opposition to EU policy-making” in *European Integration and Political Conflict*, edited by Gary Marks and Marco R. Steenbergen, Chapter 3, 51-61. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Reisigl, Martin and Ruth Wodak. “The Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA), in *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, edited by Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer, 2nd edition, Chapter 4, 87-121. London/Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2009.

Riker, William H. quoted in Beramendi, Pablo. “Federalism”, in *Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*, edited by Carles Boix and Susan C. Stokes, *Oxford Handbooks of Political Science*, Robert E. Goodin (General ed.), Chapter 31, 770. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Rosamond, Ben. “Federalism, Functionalism and Transactionalism”, in *Theories of European Integration*, The European Union Series edited by Neil Nugent, William E. Paterson, Vincent Wright, Chapter 2, 20-49. New York: Macmillan Press Ltd, 2000.

Rydgren, Jens. “Is extreme-right wing populism contagious? Explaining the emergence of a new party family”, in *European Journal of Political Research*, Vol. 44 (2005): 413-437. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Sbragia, Alberta M. “Post-national democracy as post-national democratization” in *Democracy and Federalism in the EU and the US: Exploring Post-national Governance*, edited by Sergio Fabbrini, Chapter 11, 167-182. London/New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, 2005.

Smith, Anthony D. “An Ethno-National Revival?”, in *Nations and Nationalism in a Global Era*, Chapter 3, 51-84. Oxford: Polity Press, 1995.

Smith, Anthony D. “Supra- or Super-Nationalism?” in *Nations and Nationalism in a Global Era*, Chapter 5, 116-146. Oxford: Polity Press, 1995.

Smith, Anthony D. quoted in “Ethnosymbolism” in *Theories of Nationalism: A Critical Introduction*, edited by Umut Özkirimli, 2nd edition, Chapter 5, 143-144. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Taggart, Paul. “Populism, the People and the Heartland”, in *Populism*, Chapter 8, 91-98. Buckingham/Philadelphia: Open University Press, 2000.

Torring Jacob. “Introduction: Discourse Theory: Achievements, Arguments and Challenges”, in *Discourse Theory in European Politics*, edited by David Horwarth and Jacob Torring, 1-32. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

Van Dijk, Teun A. “CDA: A Socio-Cognitive Approach” in *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, edited by Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer, 2nd edition, Chapter 3, 62-86. London/Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2009.

Wodak, Ruth and Michael Meyer. “Critical Discourse Analysis: History, Agenda, Theory and Methodology”, in *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, edited by Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer, 2nd edition, Chapter 1, pp. 1-32. London/Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2009.

Özkirimli, U. “Ethnosymbolism”, in *Theories of Nationalism: A Critical Introduction*, 2nd edition, Chapter 5, 143-168. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Internet Sources:

Barroso, José Manuel. “State of the Union 2012 Address”, website of the European Union, September 12, 2012, last accessed November 11, 2012, http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-12-596_en.htm.

Cameron, David. “David Cameron’s EU speech – full text”, in *The Guardian*, January 23, 2013 last accessed May 5, 2013, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2013/jan/23/david-cameron-eu-speech-referendum>.

Churchill, Winston. “Speech at the University of Zurich”, Council of Europe’s Parliamentary Assembly’s website, September 16, 1946, last accessed March 10, 2013, http://assembly.coe.int/Main.asp?link=/AboutUs/zurich_e.htm.

Fox, Benjamin. “Italy in Turmoil after election delivers hung Parliament”, EUObserver, February 26, 2013, last accessed February 27, 2013, <http://euobserver.com/political/119188>.

French Ministry of Domestic Affairs, “Résultats de l’élection présidentielle de 2012”, last accessed May 6, 2013, [http://www.interieur.gouv.fr/Elections/Les-resultats/Presidentielles/elecresult_PR2012/\(path\)/PR2012/FE.html](http://www.interieur.gouv.fr/Elections/Les-resultats/Presidentielles/elecresult_PR2012/(path)/PR2012/FE.html).

Front National, Political Programme for the presidential elections of 2012, “Une Europe au service des peuples libres”, last accessed May 3, 2013, <http://www.frontnational.com/le-projet-de-marine-le-pen/politique-etrangere/europe/>.

Føllesdal, Andreas. “Federalism”, in *Stanford Encyclopedia Online*, March 9, 2010, last accessed November 11, 2012, <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/federalism/>.

Hameln town “Tourism”, Hameln town’s website, last accessed May 12, 2013, http://www.hameln.com/tourism/piedpiper/rf_sage_gb.htm.

Kroll, Pierre. Unnamed Caricature, in *Le Soir*, Fondation Cartooning for Peace: Paris Bibliothèques, January 6, 2007, last accessed April 19, 2013, http://www.tv5.org/TV5Site/publication/galerie-164-6-Pierre_Kroll_Belgique.htm.

Le Pen, Marine and Jean-Marie Le Pen. “1er Mai: Discours de Jean-Marie Le Pen et Marine Le Pen à Paris”, May 1, 2012, last accessed May 2, 2013, <http://www.frontnational.com/videos/1er-mai-2012-discours-de-jean-marie-et-marine-le-pen-a-paris/>.

Pop, Valentina. “EU to be federalised in the long run, Merkel says”, *EUObserver*, November 7, 2012, last accessed November 11, 2012, <http://euobserver.com/institutional/118126>.

Spinelli Group’s website, last accessed April 23, 2013, <http://www.spinelligroup.eu/>.

Spinelli Group. “A federal step forwards to end the eurocrisis”, Shadow European Council Conclusions, October 2011, last accessed April 23, 2013, <http://www.spinelligroup.eu/>.

Spinelli Group, Statement “Against the temptation of a Franco-German *coup de chefs d’Etat* shared leadership for a truly democratic and federal European Union”, December 2011, last accessed April 23, 2013, <http://www.spinelligroup.eu/>.

Spinelli Group, “Only a European federal union can solve the crisis- Federal Union or disintegration”, Shadow European Council, Brussels, June 28, 2012, last accessed April 23, 2012, <http://www.spinelligroup.eu/>.