

---

# Imagining European Identity:

---

## French Elites and the

---

## American Challenge in the

---

## Pompidou–Nixon Era

---

AURÉLIE ÉLISA GFELLER

### Abstract

*Charles de Gaulle has cast a long shadow over French political history and history writing. In exploring the French response to the United States' 1973 'Year of Europe' initiative, this article challenges the dominant scholarly paradigm, which emphasises continuity between the 1960s and the 1970s. Drawing on a wide range of French and US archives, it demonstrates that renewed concerns about US power spurred the French elites both to reappraise the value of collective European action in foreign policy and to foster a pioneering concept: a politically anchored – as opposed to a geographically circumscribed – 'European identity'.*

Charles de Gaulle has cast a long shadow over French history and history writing. As a result, the scholarship on French political history during the 1970s tends to underscore the lasting influence of his legacy. European integration is no exception.<sup>1</sup> In investigating the French response to the United States' 1973 'Year of Europe' initiative, this study challenges this paradigm. Specifically, it demonstrates that renewed concerns about US power in 1973 prompted the French elites both to rearticulate and to transform the vision of a 'European Europe' advanced by de Gaulle in the early 1960s.<sup>2</sup> Not only did Georges Pompidou's government abandon

Swiss National Science Foundation/European University Institute, Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, Via delle Fontanelle 19, I-50014 San Domenico di Fiesole (FI), Italy; aurelie.gfeller@eui.eu. The author wishes to thank Anne Deighton, Harold James, Philip Nord, Maurice Vaisse and Laura Weinrib, as well as two anonymous referees for their comments and advice. All translations of quotations from untranslated sources are by the author.

<sup>1</sup> Gérard Bossuat, *Faire l'Europe sans défaire la France. 60 ans de politique d'unité européenne des gouvernements et des présidents de la République française (1943–2003)* (Brussels: P.I.E. Peter Lang, 2005); Anne Dulphy and Christine Manigand, *La France au risque de l'Europe* (Paris: Armand Colin, 2006).

<sup>2</sup> A handful of articles and one recent book on the Year of Europe ignore significant elements of the story. They either investigate the British and the US perspective, or they rely exclusively on the papers

its misgivings towards the mechanisms for European Policy Co-operation (EPC) established in 1970, but the French also spurred efforts to define and assert a 'European identity'. This was a pioneering concept. Through the early 1970s, the term had chiefly been used to designate a geographically circumscribed cultural heritage.<sup>3</sup> In 1973 and 1974, by contrast, French officials and press institutions, as opinion-makers, applied it to the emerging European polity. They played a leading role in forging the ground-breaking Declaration on European Identity published by the nine member states of the European Communities (EC) in December 1970. The concept of a politically anchored European identity, moreover, quickly surged to the forefront of French political vocabulary. This discursive shift has largely been overlooked in the scholarship on French foreign and European policy.<sup>4</sup> I maintain that it was an important step towards greater identification with the nascent European entity on the part of the elites. The Gaullian notion of a 'European Europe' had appealed to a 'union of states'. The term 'European identity', by contrast, implied that the nascent European entity could function as a locus of political legitimacy alongside and – possibly in competition with – the nation state. How did a US initiative foster the discursive construction and the popularisation of a politically grounded European identity? Drawing on a wide range of sources, including Pompidou's papers, recently declassified materials from the French foreign ministry (Quai d'Orsay), US government records and press archives, this essay proposes an answer to this intriguing

of French President Georges Pompidou: Marloes Beers, 'European Unity and the Transatlantic Gulf in 1973', in Giles Scott-Smith, ed., *European Community, Atlantic Community?* (Paris: Soleb, 2008); Keith Hamilton, 'Britain, France, and America's Year of Europe, 1973', *Diplomacy & Statecraft*, 17 (2006), 871–95; Jussi M. Hanhimäki, 'Kissinger et l'Europe: entre intégration et autonomie', *Relations internationales*, 119 (2004), 319–32; Claudia Hiepel, 'Kissinger's "Year of Europe" – A Challenge for the EC and the Franco-German relationship', in Jan van der Harst, ed., *Beyond the Customs Union: The European Community's Quest for Deepening, Widening and Completion, 1969–1975* (Brussels: Bruylant, 2007), 277–96; Catherine Hynes, *The Year That Never Was: Heath, the Nixon Administration and the Year of Europe* (Dublin: University College Dublin Press, 2009); Pierre Mélandri, 'Une relation très spéciale. La France, les Etats-Unis et l'année de l'Europe, 1973–1974', in Association Georges Pompidou, ed., *Georges Pompidou et l'Europe* (Brussels: Editions Complexe, 1995), 89–131; Alastair Noble, 'Kissinger's "Year of Europe", Britain's Year of Choice', in Matthias Schulz and Thomas A. Schwartz, eds., *The Strained Alliance: US–European Relations from Nixon to Carter* (Cambridge University Press, 2009). The Year of Europe is also discussed in the first historical monograph on EPC: Daniel Möckli, *European Foreign Policy during the Cold War: Heath, Brandt, Pompidou and the Dream of Political Unity* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2009). Möckli's focus, however, is on the triangular diplomacy between Britain, France and West Germany – rather than France per se – and on key individuals within these three countries (president/prime minister, foreign ministers), with comparatively less emphasis on the views of other actors both within and outside government.

<sup>3</sup> See Robert Frank and Gérard Bossuat, eds., *Les identités européennes au XXe siècle. Diversités, convergences et solidarités* (Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 2004).

<sup>4</sup> Georges-Henri Soutou, 'Georges Pompidou et Valéry Giscard d'Estaing: deux réconciliations et deux ruptures avec les Etats-Unis', *Relations internationales*, 119 (2004), 303–18; Georges-Henri Soutou, 'L'anneau et les deux triangles: les rapports franco-allemands dans la politique européenne et mondiale de 1974 à 1981', in Serge Bernstein and Jean-François Sirinelli, eds., *Les années Giscard. Valéry Giscard d'Estaing et l'Europe, 1974–1981* (Paris: Armand Colin, 2006), 45–79; Georges-Henri Soutou, 'Le président Pompidou et les relations entre les Etats-Unis et l'Europe', *Journal of European Integration History*, 6 (2000), 111–46; Maurice Vaisse, 'Les "relations spéciales" franco-américaines au temps de Richard Nixon et Georges Pompidou', *Relations internationales*, 119 (2004), 345–62.

question. In paying due attention to language and in highlighting the interconnections between words and power, the forthcoming study also fills a gap in the existing literature on the Year of Europe.<sup>5</sup> There was more to the French–US debate over the United States’ proposed transatlantic statement than ‘legalistic’ squabbling.<sup>6</sup> This seemingly innocuous declaration of intent aroused heated controversy because different wordings were perceived as legitimising competing geopolitical visions.

### A delicate diplomatic dance: France and the Year of Europe

On 23 April 1973, Henry Kissinger, who was then serving as US President Richard Nixon’s chief foreign policy adviser, gave the address at the annual luncheon of the Associated Press on the topic ‘The Year of Europe’.<sup>7</sup> The White House archives show that despite its odd timing – well into the first half of 1973 – this initiative owed little to the gaining momentum of Watergate.<sup>8</sup> Planning had begun as early as October 1972.<sup>9</sup> In focusing on Western Europe after the Vietnam War, the White House pursued a dual objective: to revitalise, and rekindle elite support for, the Atlantic Alliance in an era of nuclear parity; and to bring the defence, political and economic ‘interrelationships [between Western Europe and the United States] into a balance more satisfactory to the US’.<sup>10</sup> In other words, US officials – especially in the Trade and Treasury Departments – wanted Western Europe to make economic concessions – particularly with respect to the planned enlargement of the EC and defence burden-sharing – in exchange for continued military assistance.<sup>11</sup> In his speech, Kissinger gave its leaders something of an ultimatum. Calling for a new ‘Atlantic charter’, he declared

<sup>5</sup> The only exception is an article focusing on the US perspective: Pascaline Winand, ‘Loaded Words and Disputed Meanings: The Year of Europe Speech and Its Genesis from an American Perspective’, in Jan van der Harst, ed., *Beyond the Customs Union: The European Community’s Quest for Deepening, Widening and Completion, 1969–1975* (Brussels: Bruylant, 2007), 297–315.

<sup>6</sup> Kissinger, Memorandum for the President, 11 Dec. 1973, NPM, NSC, Kissinger office files, trip files, 43.

<sup>7</sup> ‘Kissinger: Address at Associated Press Luncheon’, in *USA Documents*, 26 (1973).

<sup>8</sup> The resignation of Nixon’s closest aides – Bob Haldemann, his chief of staff, and John Ehrlichmann, his aide in charge of domestic affairs – lay only a few days ahead.

<sup>9</sup> In November 1973, Kissinger complained that the NSC staff had not moved swiftly enough to prepare a new initiative on Europe (Telephone conversation (telcon) Kissinger/Peter Flanigan, 17 Nov. 1972, Nixon Presidential Materials (NPM), National Security Council (NSC), Kissinger files, telcons, 17). A week later, he commissioned a trans-departmental study of all current and future issues in transatlantic relations: National Security Study Memorandum 164 (NSC, NSSM 164, 18 Dec. 1972, NPM, NSC, Institutional files, 194).

<sup>10</sup> NSC, NSSM 164.

<sup>11</sup> Linking the United States’ spiralling balance-of-payments deficit to foreign defence spending, a number of US political leaders were calling for troop redeployment. See Diane B. Kunz, ‘Cold War Diplomacy: The Other Side of Containment’, in Diane B. Kunz, ed., *The Diplomacy of the Crucial Decade: American Foreign Relations During the 1960s* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994), 80–114; Francis J. Gavin, *Gold, Dollars, and Power: The Politics of International Monetary Relations, 1958–1971* (Chapel Hill, NC, and London: University of North Carolina Press, 2004). At the same time, the January 1973 EC enlargement to include Britain, Denmark and Ireland implied tariff increases on sensitive products. France, moreover, insisted on including ‘reverse preferences’ in the preferential trade agreement to be (re)negotiated with former French colonies and Commonwealth countries, which the United States firmly opposed.

that this document should be ready in time for Nixon's trip to Europe in the autumn. Heedless of European sensitivities, he proceeded to contrast the United States' 'global interests and responsibilities' with Western Europe's 'regional interests'.<sup>12</sup>

Kissinger spoke against the backdrop of deteriorating Franco-American relations. A lull in bilateral relations had occurred during the final months of de Gaulle's rule and the first two years of Pompidou's presidency.<sup>13</sup> As of 1971, however, Nixon's unilateral decision to suspend dollar-gold convertibility – the cornerstone of the Bretton Woods monetary order – had strained relations with France. Although Pompidou subsequently brokered a dollar devaluation agreement, fixed rates soon gave way to a floating rate regime, leaving him with a bitter feeling. Progress in US-Soviet détente further damaged the French-US relationship. Following the 1972 US-Soviet Strategic Arms Limitation Talks agreement (SALT 1), the June 1973 US-Soviet Agreement on the Prevention of Nuclear War came across in France as undermining the credibility of US nuclear deterrence. Worse, perhaps, these two agreements raised the spectre of a US-Soviet 'condominium'.<sup>14</sup>

French appraisals of Kissinger's speech were overwhelmingly negative. Foreign Minister Michel Jobert pointedly summarised Pompidou's and his own views: 'It's none of his business!'<sup>15</sup> Jobert struck a Gaullian note: 'It was the same old view; the US pressed for strengthening the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) beyond its present scope and structure, and it requested its members to abide by the prevailing US foreign policy consensus.'<sup>16</sup> French officials largely shared Jobert's assessment of the Year of Europe as a US attempt to reassert its leadership.<sup>17</sup> Future Foreign Minister Jean Sauvagnargues, who was then serving as ambassador in Bonn, chastised the Nixon administration for seeking to build a US-ruled 'global alliance' (*groupement mondial*), in which 'Europe' – used, as was often the case, as shorthand for both European states and the EC – would play a subservient role.<sup>18</sup> Mirroring official criticisms, the leading French press institutions voiced concern over the US quest for dominance. Alluding to Kissinger's proposal to include Japan in a revitalised Atlantic partnership, *Le Monde* eloquently posed the question: 'why should the Atlantic Alliance not be extended to the Pacific Ocean, since it already encompassed the Mediterranean?' There was an obvious answer: 'this gigantic oceanic construct' posed a threat to 'Europe's distinctiveness'.<sup>19</sup>

Elsewhere in Western Europe, Kissinger's speech received mixed reviews. The British foreign secretary, Sir Alec Douglas Home, welcomed Kissinger's language as

<sup>12</sup> 'Kissinger: Address at Associated Press Luncheon'.

<sup>13</sup> Vaisse, 'Les "relations spéciales"'; Soutou, 'Georges Pompidou et Valéry Giscard d'Estaing'.

<sup>14</sup> French officials frequently used this term to analyse US-Soviet relations. See, e.g., Jacques Kosciusko-Morizet (ambassador in Washington), diplomatic dispatch 65, 9 July 1973, French Foreign Ministry (MAE), Soviet files 1971-6, 3693.

<sup>15</sup> MAE, oral archives, Jobert, interview, 18 Sept. 1990.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>17</sup> François de Rose (ambassador to NATO), telegram 861-70, 26 April 1973, MAE, US files 1970-5, 1137; Jean-Bernard Raimond (foreign policy adviser to the president), Note, 3 May 1973, Centre historique des archives nationales (CHAN), 5AG2 1021.

<sup>18</sup> Sauvagnargues, telegram 1998-2006, 26 Apr. 1973, MAE, US files 1970-5, 1137.

<sup>19</sup> Headline, *Le Monde*, 25 April 1973.

‘realistic and timely’ but wished the EC had had more time to ‘find its way to common positions with greater deliberation’.<sup>20</sup> On a long-planned visit to Washington, the West German federal chancellor, Willy Brandt, offered little besides goodwill, and successfully petitioned Nixon to drop the phrase ‘Atlantic charter’. Although they harboured reservations about certain aspects of the US plan – notably its treatment of economic and defence issues as ‘one ball of wax’ – British and West German authorities wished to give US entreaties a constructive response.<sup>21</sup> Other EC countries were keen to prevent their exclusion from quadripartite talks between the United States, France, Britain and West Germany. A consensus soon emerged among France’s EC partners on using EPC to draft a proposed US–European statement.

Facing US and EC pressure, Paris resorted to dilatory tactics. Archival records reveal that France was less devious than Kissinger made it out to be in his memoirs. Through most of the summer, Quai officials endeavoured to ‘buy time’<sup>22</sup> rather than build a European ‘coalition of negation’.<sup>23</sup> At the 23 July meeting of EPC, Jobert did not agree to a ‘declaration approach’.<sup>24</sup> Quite the opposite: he resorted to a strategy of deliberate delay and urged his EC colleagues to focus on a list of transatlantic dialogue topics instead.<sup>25</sup> In line with an earlier British proposal, he also pressed for a common definition of European identity. The British Foreign Office (FCO) had suggested characterising the EC’s identity vis-à-vis the United States. In appropriating this idea, the Quai d’Orsay gave it a wider dimension. Jobert’s declared objective was to define European identity in and of itself (as opposed to in relation to the United States) and to proclaim it everywhere (*tous azimuts*).<sup>26</sup>

Due to mounting US, West German, British and Italian pressure, the Quai d’Orsay reappraised its strategy. At the beginning of the summer, the FCO had proposed issuing two declarations: one that pertained to NATO, and the other to EC–US relations. In August, it presented the Quai d’Orsay with a proposed EC–US draft statement. Quai officials recommended endorsing the British approach in order to prevent West Germany and Italy from giving in further to US pressure.<sup>27</sup> In late August, Jobert lent his support to the British document subject to modifications that underscored the distinctiveness of the EC and its member states. In doing so, he was building on the Franco–British axis that marked Pompidou’s presidency.<sup>28</sup> Soon thereafter, the EC foreign ministers entrusted the Danish EC presidency with the task of submitting the finalised draft to newly appointed Secretary of State Kissinger.<sup>29</sup>

<sup>20</sup> Quoted in Hamilton, ‘Britain, France, and America’s Year of Europe’.

<sup>21</sup> Quoted in *ibid.*

<sup>22</sup> François Puaux (political director), Note pour le ministre, 20 Aug. 1973, MAE, EC files 1971–6, 3810.

<sup>23</sup> Henry Kissinger, *Years of Upheaval* (Boston, MA: Little, Brown, 1982), 189.

<sup>24</sup> Möckli, *European Foreign Policy*, 166.

<sup>25</sup> MAE, Puaux, Note pour le ministre.

<sup>26</sup> MAE, Europe directorate, circular telegram 446, 24 Jul. 1973, MAE, EC files 1971–6, 3810.

<sup>27</sup> MAE, Puaux, Note: rapports Europe Etats-Unis, 27 Aug. 1973, MAE, EC files 1971–6, 3810. On the Anglo–French axis, see Möckli, *European Foreign Policy*, 49–55.

<sup>28</sup> MAE, Puaux, circular telegram 511, 6 Sept. 1973, MAE, US files 1970–5, 1137.

<sup>29</sup> MAE, Puaux, circular telegram 523, 12 Sept. 1973, MAE, EC files 1971–6, 3792.

EC governments' behaviour met with disappointment in Washington. Kissinger and his aides had envisioned US-led multilateral talks. They were confronted instead with a 'fait accompli'. Kissinger bluntly conveyed his dissatisfaction to the Danish envoy on 25 September: 'for the US it is a new and extraordinary phenomenon in that Europe speaks with one voice, which we welcome, but that in the preparations of its position we were not consulted'.<sup>30</sup> Beyond the procedural dimension, the lack of prior consultations meant that the content of the EC document fell far short of US expectations. It did not hint at any new framework for resolving transatlantic economic and military issues. Rather than exalting transatlantic unity, it highlighted the distinctiveness of unifying Europe. The Nixon administration, however, was not about to admit defeat. It would be quick to try and regain the initiative.

### **Irreconcilable visions of European unity? The 1973 draft EC–US declaration**

The draft EC–US declaration triggered an intense round of bargaining. As early as 29 September, the Nixon administration set out a series of amendments, which France vigorously rejected. French officials and press commentators analysed the ensuing discussions as a contest between competing visions of European unity. France, they argued, conceived of a united Europe as an independent world actor; the United States, by contrast, viewed it as part of a tightly knit Atlantic community placed firmly under US leadership. The French arguments against the US amendments were rooted in fears of national decline and loss of national identity. Yet they were couched in a characteristically European idiom, with an emphasis on the distinctiveness of the emerging European entity.

The US amendments introduced a long-contentious concept in French–US relations, namely 'partnership'. John F. Kennedy's 1962 call for a US–European partnership – reiterated in his 1963 address in the Frankfurt Assembly Hall – had aroused suspicions in Paris. Kennedy had taken great care to stress that such a partnership would rest on a basis of 'full equality'.<sup>31</sup> De Gaulle, however, was unconvinced.<sup>32</sup> A decade later, French authorities were still reluctant to enter into an alliance 'between wolf and sheep'.<sup>33</sup> Pompidou clearly disliked the word. 'I certainly do not want it', he wrote in the margins of a report.<sup>34</sup> The Quai d'Orsay thus

<sup>30</sup> Memorandum of conversation (memcon) Kissinger/Knud Borge Andersen, 25 Sept. 1973, NPM, NSC, presidential memcons, 1027.

<sup>31</sup> John F. Kennedy, Address at Independence Hall, 4 July 1962, available at [www.jfklibrary.org/Historical+Resources/Archives/Reference+Desk/Speeches/JFK/003POFo3IndependenceHallo7041962.htm](http://www.jfklibrary.org/Historical+Resources/Archives/Reference+Desk/Speeches/JFK/003POFo3IndependenceHallo7041962.htm) (last visited 2 March 2009). On Kennedy's 'grand design for Europe', see Pascaline Winand, *Eisenhower, Kennedy, and the United States of Europe* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993), 190–1; Erin R. Mahan, *Kennedy, de Gaulle and Western Europe* (Houndmills and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), 126–7.

<sup>32</sup> Frédéric Bozo, *Deux stratégies pour l'Europe. De Gaulle, les Etats-Unis et l'Alliance atlantique, 1958–1969* (Paris: Plon, 1996), 90–1.

<sup>33</sup> Roger Massip, 'Editorial: de Copenhague à Tokyo', *Le Figaro*, 24 Apr. 1973.

<sup>34</sup> Pompidou, margin comment, 12 Dec. 1973, CHAN, 5AG2 1054/2.

successfully petitioned its EC partners to expunge all lexical variants of the term from the proposed US changes.<sup>35</sup>

French opposition to the concept of partnership was rooted in an awareness of power asymmetries. To the Quai d'Orsay there could only be a meaningful partnership between two equal partners, which remained elusive in the context of US–European relations.<sup>36</sup> The French daily *Le Figaro* shared the government's misgivings. A transatlantic partnership, it stated, implied that 'Europe' would 'tag along behind its powerful American "partner"'.<sup>37</sup> Etienne Burin des Roziers, permanent representative to the EC, spoke along similar lines. In this term, he claimed, was subsumed the United States' desire to reduce the EC to a docile ally.<sup>38</sup>

'Interdependence', an increasingly popular construct in US political circles and academia in the 1970s, proved just as divisive. The ascendancy of this concept may be traced to declining US power in an era of economic crisis and nuclear parity. Harvard professors Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye defined 'complex interdependence' as an ideal type characterised by numerous channels of communication, lack of hierarchy of inter-state negotiation topics and reduced usability of force.<sup>39</sup> Their argument implied that complex interdependence reduced the ability of the superpowers to influence outcomes based on their military superiority. French officials, by contrast, interpreted interdependence as denoting European subordination. Linking the two concepts of interdependence and partnership, Burin des Roziers maintained that they laid the basis for strengthened US dominance in Western Europe and in the EC in particular.<sup>40</sup> Burin des Roziers was certainly among those who thought that the adjective 'interdependent' could be interpreted as 'I depend, you rule'.<sup>41</sup> French dailies were similarly suspicious of the term. *Le Figaro* praised the government's efforts to resist growing US–European 'interdependence' and thereby assert 'Europe's personality'.<sup>42</sup> The communist left similarly viewed transatlantic interdependence and European independence as antagonistic concepts.<sup>43</sup>

French officials coined the word 'globalisation' to designate a related concern: cross-issue bargaining. They had been criticising for some time the putative goal of the Nixon administration to pursue cross-topic transatlantic negotiations, but they did not use the term 'globalisation' until after Kissinger's Year of Europe speech. I found its first occurrence in a Quai circular telegram dated 26 April 1973.<sup>44</sup> Chastising

<sup>35</sup> Pierre Pélen (ambassador in Copenhagen), telegram 906–10, 18 Oct. 1973, MAE, US files 1970–5, 1137.

<sup>36</sup> MAE, circular telegram 260, 28 Apr. 1973, MAE, US files 1970–5, 1137.

<sup>37</sup> Jacques Jacquet-Francillon, 'Etats-Unis: une mauvaise humeur tactique', *Le Figaro*, 9–10 March 1974.

<sup>38</sup> Burin des Roziers, telegram, 4 Oct. 1973, CHAN, 5AG2 1021.

<sup>39</sup> Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye, *Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition* (Boston, MA: Little, Brown, 1977).

<sup>40</sup> Burin des Roziers, telegram 3365–90, 6 Oct. 1973, MAE, US files 1970–5, 1137.

<sup>41</sup> Joseph S. Nye, 'Independence and Interdependence', *Foreign Policy*, 22 (Spring 1976), 130–61.

<sup>42</sup> Jacques Ogliastro, "'C'est la fin de la dispute la plus inutile du monde", dit Jean Sauvagnargues', *Le Figaro*, 20 June 1974.

<sup>43</sup> Yves Moreau, 'Editorial: Graves abandons', *L'Humanité*, 11 Dec. 1974.

<sup>44</sup> MAE, political directorate, circular telegram 254, 26 Apr. 1973, MAE, US files 1970–5, 1137.

the United States' 'globalisation intentions', this cable stated – as the Quai d'Orsay would in numerous other instances – that trade, currency and defence issues were best discussed within separate, specialised institutions: the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and NATO.<sup>45</sup> Throughout the protracted negotiations over the EC–US declaration in autumn 1973, French diplomats used this term to repel any proposed wording that could imply a negotiating link between economic and military matters.

French–US disagreements also centred on the notion of 'institutionalisation'. Since the early 1970s, the Nixon administration had called for a more formalised EC–US consultation framework. The two-stage process by which EC countries had reached consensus on a draft declaration prior to submitting it to Kissinger had given the matter added urgency. One of the proposed US amendments was therefore designed to prevent this scenario from occurring again. It provided for 'consultative and cooperative arrangements' between the United States and the EC/EPC.<sup>46</sup> In December 1973, Kissinger reiterated his wish to have 'frank consultations' on issues affecting US interests 'before final decisions are taken by the Community'.<sup>47</sup> He prefaced his demand by saying that the United States had 'no intention of becoming a tenth member of the Community', but to no avail. Any institutionalised EC–US ties, Pompidou had told Brandt in November 1973, meant granting the United States the status of a 'censor' or even an EC member.<sup>48</sup> To Jacques Kosciusko-Morizet, the French ambassador in Washington, the procedure used by the nine EC countries to put together the draft declaration was essential for the self-assertion of 'Europe'.<sup>49</sup>

In crystallising disagreements over the organisation of the West, the draft EC–US declaration encouraged dichotomous thinking in both Paris and Washington. US officials endeavoured to buttress their stance through mutually exclusive categories: Atlantic cohesion and Atlantic disunity. In September 1973, Kissinger urged EC leaders to decide whether they wished to build 'Europe' at the expense of Atlantic relations, or instead wanted to strengthen the transatlantic relationship.<sup>50</sup> He put it more crudely in his December 1973 report for Nixon: 'Clearly our recent tough talk has had its impact and we can expect the Europeans to curb their impulse to show their "identity" by kicking us.'<sup>51</sup> French decision- and opinion-makers, in turn, advanced

<sup>45</sup> Jacques de Beaumarchais (ambassador in London), telegram 2864–70, 4 Oct. 1973, MAE, US files 1970–5, 1137; Puaux, Note pour le ministre, 13 Oct. 1973, MAE, EC files 1971–6, 3792; 'Le "sommel" de Reykjavik', *Le Monde*, 3–4 June 1973; 'Avant son voyage à Bonn, Moscou et Londres, Kissinger aux Neuf: "A vous de jouer..."', *L'Aurore*, 22 March 1974.

<sup>46</sup> Outline for a Declaration of Principles between the United States of America and the European Community and its Member States, quoted in full in MAE, Europe directorate, telegram 563, 1 Oct. 1973, MAE, US files 1970–5, 1137.

<sup>47</sup> Kissinger, Talking Points for the President on European Aspects of the Trip, 22 Dec. 1973, NPM, NSC, Kissinger office files, trip files, 43 (emphasis in original).

<sup>48</sup> Memcon Pompidou/Brandt, 27 Nov. 1973, CHAN, 5AG2 1012.

<sup>49</sup> Kosciusko-Morizet, telegram 5928, 27 Sept. 1973, MAE, US files 1970–5, 1137.

<sup>50</sup> Memcon Kissinger/Andersen, 25 Sept. 1973, NPM, NSC, presidential memcons, 1027.

<sup>51</sup> Kissinger, Memorandum for the President, 11 Dec. 1973, NPM, NSC, Kissinger office files, trip files, 43. Brent Scowcroft to Kissinger, undated [Dec. 1973], NPM, NSC, Kissinger office files, trip files, 42.



another set of binary categories. They reasserted the notion of a ‘European Europe’, opposing it to an ‘Atlantic Europe’.<sup>52</sup> The Quai’s political director, François Puaux, for instance, used these two categories to analyse the stance of his EC counterparts on the US amendments.<sup>53</sup> *Le Monde* recognised that setting a ‘European Europe’ against an ‘American Europe’ was an oversimplification. ‘[But] just as a good caricature reduces the human physiognomy to its essentials’, it stated, ‘this [formula] brought into sharp focus the terms of the debate.’<sup>54</sup>

### **Building a common political identity: the Declaration on European Identity**

Just as talks over a putative EC–US statement came to a standstill, EC countries issued their Declaration on European Identity. This document, published in Copenhagen on 14 December, affirmed the building blocks – institutional, political, economic and cultural – of a united Europe.<sup>55</sup> Although it grew out of joint EC discussions, it was closely modelled on a French draft. The French lead in this initiative did not imply any plain endorsement of supranational principles. Indeed, Quai d’Orsay officials remained prickly about sovereignty issues. In spurring efforts to define a politically anchored European identity, however, they moved beyond the strictly national reference framework that had shaped de Gaulle’s call for a ‘European Europe’.

The initial French draft, dated 20 July 1973, struck a defensive note.<sup>56</sup> Its basic principle was differentiation. Any definition of European identity, it stated, meant distinguishing the EC from other political entities. Several of its definitional provisions referred to the colonial past of EC states and their efforts to retain sway in the developing world. The text, moreover, equated ‘identity’ with ‘independence’, and it specified the conditions for maintaining European independence – notably a European defence force and efforts to safeguard the diverse cultural legacy of ‘Europe’. The cultural element reflected enduring anxieties over Americanisation, as did a series of books published during the 1970s.<sup>57</sup> It also spoke to the long-standing

<sup>52</sup> De Gaulle used the phrase ‘European Europe’ on several occasions, notably in his 23 July 1964 press conference at the Elysée Palace: Charles de Gaulle, *Discours et messages*, 5 vols. (Paris: Plon, 1970), IV, 228.

<sup>53</sup> Pélen, telegram 911–8, 19 Oct. 1973, MAE, US files 1970–5, 1137.

<sup>54</sup> Maurice Duverger, ‘Europe européenne ou Europe américaine’, *Le Monde*, 1 June 1973. See also Henri de Kergorlay, ‘Entre Paris et ses partenaires: une vieille querelle qui rebondit avec chaque crise’, *Le Figaro*, 15 Feb. 1974; Yves Moreau, ‘L’Europe atlantique’, *L’Humanité*, 14 Feb. 1974.

<sup>55</sup> ‘Declaration on European Identity’, *Bulletin of the European Communities*, 12 (1973), 118–22.

<sup>56</sup> MAE, Europe directorate, Note: réunion ministérielle – relations Europe/Etats-Unis, 20 July 1973, MAE, EC files 1971–6, 3810.

<sup>57</sup> Raymond Aron, *Plaidoyer pour l’Europe décadente* (Paris: Robert Laffont, 1977); Alain de Benoist, *Vu de droite. Anthologie critique des idées contemporaines* (Paris: Copernic, 1977); Jean-Marie Benoist, *Pavane pour une Europe défunte. L’adieu aux technocrates* (Paris: Denoël-Gonthier, 1978); Henri Gobard, *La guerre culturelle. Logique du désastre* (Paris: Copernic, 1979); Jean-François Revel, *Ni Marx, ni Jésus. De la seconde révolution américaine à la seconde révolution mondiale* (Paris: Robert Laffont, 1970); Jacques Thibau, *La France colonisée* (Paris: Flammarion, 1980).

role of the French state in promoting cultural influence (*rayonnement*).<sup>58</sup> The draft ended on a Gaullist note: ‘Europe’ should not be reduced to a geopolitical ‘stake’, ‘a subject of bargaining’ or ‘a subservient group of states’.<sup>59</sup>

Although reflecting the same desire to preserve European – that is, ultimately, French – influence and cultural distinctiveness, the draft presented by the Quai d’Orsay in September 1973 was more carefully worded.<sup>60</sup> The concept of independence was less central to the definition of European identity. The document reiterated France’s rejection of institutionalised, ‘globalised’ EC–US talks. The range of topics discussed under the heading ‘European identity vis-à-vis the rest of the world’, however, was broader, including not only the United States and former colonies but also India, China, Canada, Eastern Europe and détente.

The two other drafts submitted, by Britain and Ireland respectively, differed in focus. The British document was entitled ‘The Identity of the Nine vis-à-vis the United States’. Although starting with a general definition of European identity, it explicitly sought to lay the basis for a transatlantic dialogue.<sup>61</sup> The Irish draft, by contrast, put forward a definition that emphasised the institutional underpinnings of the EC and the intention of the EC heads of state or government to achieve a ‘European union’ by 1980, as stated in their 1972 Paris summit communiqué.<sup>62</sup>

Ensuing EPC talks on European identity stumbled at defence and foreign policy matters. The Quai d’Orsay was wary of Britain’s suggestions to refer to a ‘common foreign policy’ and to stipulate that EC states’ bilateral contacts with third countries would rest on jointly pre-agreed positions. To French diplomats, such provisions were designed to make EPC more ‘constraining’.<sup>63</sup> France and Denmark opposed Britain’s proposal to call for a ‘European defence policy’. Interestingly, the Quai d’Orsay’s July memorandum had referred to a ‘European defence’.<sup>64</sup> This shift most likely reflected Pompidou’s doubts over the EC states’ readiness to co-ordinate their defence efforts, let alone build a common defence force.<sup>65</sup> France and Ireland also

<sup>58</sup> Alain Dubosclard et al., *Entre rayonnement et réciprocité. Contributions à l’histoire de la diplomatie culturelle* (Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 2002); François Roche and Bernard Pinau, *Histoires de diplomatie culturelle des origines à 1995* (Paris: La documentation française, 1995).

<sup>59</sup> MAE, Europe directorate, Note: réunion ministérielle, 20 July 1973.

<sup>60</sup> MAE, Coopération politique européenne CSCE (73) 65F De l’identité européenne, 4 Sept. 1973, CHAN, 5AG2 1021.

<sup>61</sup> European Political Cooperation GC (73) 37 UK: The Identity of the Nine vis-à-vis the United States, 4 Sept. 1973, MAE, EC files 1971–6, 3810.

<sup>62</sup> RM (73)17P: Rapport du Comité politique sur les délibérations du Comité concernant l’identité européenne, 7 Sept. 1973, MAE, EC files 1971–6, 3792. ‘Communiqué’, *Bulletin of the European Communities*, 10 (1972), 14–26.

<sup>63</sup> MAE, Europe directorate, Note: Comité politique des 12 et 13 novembre, 9 Nov. 1973, MAE, EC files 1971–6, 3795.

<sup>64</sup> MAE, Europe directorate, Note: contenu possible d’un document à élaborer sur l’identité européenne par rapport aux Etats-Unis, 20 July 1973, MAE, EC files 1971–6, 3810.

<sup>65</sup> Memcon Pompidou/Heath, 21 May 1973, CHAN, 5AG2 1014; Memcon Pompidou/Heath, 16 Nov. 1973, CHAN, 5AG2 1015.

rejected Britain's suggested reference to 'an adequate and autonomous defence within the Atlantic Alliance'. French officials interpreted this provision as enhancing NATO's Eurogroup, to which France did not belong. Pompidou had made it clear that 'we will not let ourselves be led into NATO through the Eurogroup'.<sup>66</sup> All these issues were settled after a few weeks of negotiation. The final wording on defence was inspired by a French suggestion.<sup>67</sup> The Quai d'Orsay also imposed Pompidou's foreign policy formula: a 'European policy' rather than a 'common foreign policy'.<sup>68</sup>

On 14 December, the EC foreign ministers chose to publish in Copenhagen what they had initially conceived as an internal working paper. The Copenhagen Declaration on European Identity was based on the French draft, but a certain amount of revision had occurred. Parts I and II still described the internal characteristics of the EC ('The Unity of the Nine Member Countries of the Community') and its identity vis-à-vis the rest of the world ('The European Identity in Relation to the World'). Part III, in contrast, was new. It sketched the future of European unification ('The Dynamic Nature of the Construction of a United Europe'), with an emphasis on building 'a genuinely European foreign policy' and transforming 'the whole complex of... [intra-EC] relations into a European Union'.

The Copenhagen Declaration broke new ground in affirming the civilisational and cultural underpinnings of a united Europe. Neither the EC's founding documents (the 1957 Rome and the 1965 merger treaties) nor contemporaneous reports and statements (the 1970 and 1973 EPC reports, the 1969 Hague and 1972 Paris summit statements) had used words such as 'culture', 'value' and 'civilisation' in connection to a united Europe.<sup>69</sup> Culture had been one of the pillars of de Gaulle's 1960 proposal for intergovernmental cooperation, along with foreign policy, economics and defence.<sup>70</sup> The committee in charge of discussing this proposal had created a group responsible for drafting proposals for cultural cooperation.<sup>71</sup> The words 'culture' and 'civilization' had been mentioned in both versions of the Fouchet Plan – named after the committee's chairman, Christian Fouchet.<sup>72</sup> Not only had the

<sup>66</sup> Pompidou, margin comment on summary document dated 18 Aug. 1972, CHAN, 5AG2 1014.

<sup>67</sup> MAE, Europe directorate, Note: Comité politique des 12 et 13 novembre.

<sup>68</sup> Pompidou, press conference, 27 Sept. 1973, CHAN, 5AG2 1035; Pompidou, margin comment on Raimond, Note pour Monsieur Balladur, 13 Nov. 1973, CHAN, 5AG2 1035.

<sup>69</sup> Treaty establishing the European Economic Community, Luxembourg, Publishing Services of the European Communities, undated, 5–183; 'Treaty establishing a single Council and a single Commission of the European Communities', *Official Journal of the European Communities*, 152 (1967); 'Statement from the Paris Summit', *Bulletin of the European Communities*, 10 (1972), 14–26; 'Davignon Report', *Bulletin of the European Communities*, 11 (1970), 9–14; 'Second report on European political cooperation on Foreign Policy', *Bulletin of the European Communities*, 9 (1973), 14–21.

<sup>70</sup> On the Fouchet Plan, see the special issue of the *Revue d'Allemagne et des pays de langue allemande*, 29, 2 (1997). See also Maurice Vaïsse, *La grandeur. Politique étrangère du général de Gaulle, 1958–1969* (Paris: Fayard, 1998), 175–90.

<sup>71</sup> Corinne Defrance, 'La culture dans les projets d'union politique de l'Europe (1961–1962)', *Revue d'Allemagne et des pays de langue allemande*, 29, 2 (1997), 289–302.

<sup>72</sup> 'Draft Treaty – Fouchet Plan II (18 January 1962)', in *Selection of Texts Concerning Institutional Matters of the Community from 1950 to 1982* (Luxembourg: European Parliament, 1982), 119–21.

Fouchet Plan foundered on concerns about de Gaulle's intention to torpedo the Community institutions, but it had also referred exclusively to a 'union of states'. As evident from its title, the Declaration, in contrast, encompassed both EC states and the Community. In highlighting cultural elements and shared values, the 1973 text thus provided the nascent European entity with a broad value and civilisational basis:

1. The Nine European States might have been pushed towards disunity by their history and by selfishly defending misjudged interests. But they have overcome their past enmities and have decided that unity is a basic European necessity to ensure the survival of the civilization which they have in common.

The Nine wish to ensure that the cherished values of their legal, political and moral order are respected, and to preserve the rich variety of their national cultures. Sharing as they do the same attitudes to life, based on a determination to build a society which measures up to the needs of the individual, they are determined to defend the principles of representative democracy, of the rule of law, of social justice – which is the ultimate goal of economic progress – and of respect for human rights . . .

...

3. The diversity of cultures within the framework of a common European civilization, the attachment to common values and principles, the increasing convergence of attitudes to life, the awareness of having specific interests in common and the determination to take part in the construction of a United Europe, all give the European Identity its originality and its own dynamism.<sup>73</sup>

Such statements may seem innocuous. Unlike recent efforts to issue a European constitution, European officials made no attempt to specify the content of the EC's civilisational heritage.<sup>74</sup> The political values listed in Paragraph 1 – representative democracy and respect for human rights, the rule of law and social justice – had already acquired quasi-universal status. It was nonetheless the first attempt by EC governing elites to define jointly the European project in broader political and cultural terms.

The Copenhagen Declaration marked an important milestone in the construction of a politically bounded European identity. In acting as a catalyst, the 'American challenge' – to quote the title of Jean-Jacques Servan-Schreiber's famous book – gave it a defensive twist.<sup>75</sup> The mindset of French officials and their EC counterparts, however, was not solely defensive. European diplomats forged a consensus on a broad definition of European identity that encompassed the various facets of the emerging European polity – including culture, politics and foreign policy. Before long, this endeavour had struck a chord with wider segments of French elite opinion.

<sup>73</sup> 'Declaration on European Identity'.

<sup>74</sup> On the controversy over the Christian roots of a united Europe, see Gérard Bossuat, 'Histoire d'une controverse. La référence aux héritages spirituels dans la Constitution européenne', *Matériaux pour l'histoire de notre temps*, 78 (April-June 2005), 68–82.

<sup>75</sup> Jean-Jacques Servan-Schreiber, *Le défi américain* (Paris: Denoël, 1967).

### A new legitimising category of French political life

French discussion of a European identity did not remain confined to a small circle of bureaucrats. The term quickly became a keyword in French political discourse, as evidenced by government records and press commentaries. Journalists and government actors primarily referred to the distinctiveness of a united Europe with respect to the outside world. Yet they also occasionally emphasised its internal characteristics, pointing the way to a broader understanding of the term.

In the early 1970s, French officials had sporadically used the phrase ‘European identity’ in connection with the EC, but the concept of a politically defined European identity did not gain wider currency until summer 1973.<sup>76</sup> French diplomats used it during the negotiations over the EC–US draft to buttress their opposition to US policy. Pompidou and Burin des Roziers censured the September 1973 US amendments, arguing that they threatened ‘Europe’s identity’.<sup>77</sup> Two months later, Quai secretary-general Geoffroy de Courcel reiterated French opposition to institutionalised EC–US talks on the grounds that EC countries had only just begun to forge a common identity.<sup>78</sup> Quai officials also referred to European identity to repel the notion of a transatlantic partnership and the US–Japanese plan for a triangular declaration.<sup>79</sup> Quai Asia director Henri Froment-Meurice told Japan’s French ambassador that any triangular designs would undermine the EC’s efforts to define a separate identity.<sup>80</sup>

The concept of European identity also became central to wider discussions of world affairs. In the wake of the fourth Arab–Israeli war, in October 1973, French officials used it as they watched with consternation France’s (and Britain’s) *de facto* exclusion from the ceasefire and peace negotiations. After initial hesitation, the Quai d’Orsay developed a three-pronged approach to the Middle East crisis and the ensuing oil price shock: strengthen France’s bilateral ties with Arab oil producers, promote a Euro–Arab dialogue as part of a broader consumer–producer co-operation strategy, and foster an EC energy policy based on France’s *dirigiste* take on the oil trade. The Nixon administration developed a competing blueprint for solving the oil crisis: enhanced co-operation among oil-importing advanced countries. French officials thus invoked the nascent European identity in an effort to win over their eight EC partners. After the February 1974 Franco–EC split over energy, Sauvagnargues wrote that the eight’s capitulation to US pressure had seriously jeopardised European identity.<sup>81</sup>

<sup>76</sup> Memcon Pompidou/Brandt, 4 July 1972, CHAN, 5AG2 1011.

<sup>77</sup> Burin des Roziers, telegram, 4 Oct. 1973, CHAN, 5AG2 1021; Pompidou to Brandt, 16 Oct. 1973, CHAN, 5AG2 1009.

<sup>78</sup> Geoffroy de Courcel to French embassy in Washington, telegram 749, 11 Dec. 1973, MAE, US files 1970–5, 721.

<sup>79</sup> Burin des Roziers, telegram 3365–90, 6 Oct. 1973, MAE, US files 1970–5, 1137; René de Saint-Légier (Quai America director), Note: relations franco-américaines, 7 June 1974, MAE, US files 1970–5, 725.

<sup>80</sup> Froment-Meurice, Note: entretien avec l’ambassadeur du Japon, 24 Oct. 1973, MAE, US files 1970–5, 1137.

<sup>81</sup> Sauvagnargues, telegram 643–7, 14 Feb. 1974, MAE, economic directorate, 450.

More broadly, French officials subsumed under the concept of European identity their ideal of a European world actor. Speaking in front of the Rotary Club of Toledo, Ohio, Kosciusko–Morizet urged US authorities to accept ‘Europe’s’ claim to world influence and its attendant ‘duty’ to assert its ‘identity’.<sup>82</sup> In a set of hitherto undiscovered documents – handwritten notes and a memorandum on European reliance – newly appointed Foreign Minister Sauvagnargues equated in 1974 the assertion of a European identity with that of a European voice in the international arena.<sup>83</sup>

This line of argument resonated with press institutions as shapers, if not the mouthpiece, of elite opinion. *Le Figaro* warned that US demands implied an unwanted interference in the EC’s internal affairs and hence sounded the death knell for European identity.<sup>84</sup> On a more general level, the French daily linked the concept of European identity to the forging of a European position in international affairs. Praising the EC countries’ decision to try to define a common identity, it stated that they would finally be able to speak ‘with a single voice’.<sup>85</sup> Likewise, *Le Monde* journalists implied that a European identity presupposed a European foreign policy.<sup>86</sup> In his newspaper column, Raymond Aron, a leading figure of the French intelligentsia, similarly suggested that the concept of European identity encompassed a common European diplomacy.<sup>87</sup>

Some commentaries – although mostly from outside governmental circles – already hinted at a more broadly conceived, politically defined European identity. In a speech in Washington, D.C., the French European Commission president, François-Xavier Ortoli, drew an analogy between European and US identity:

Just as Californians and Texans travelling to Europe are viewed as ‘Americans’, I have come here as a ‘European’. I can sense that a European identity is emerging in our nine EC member states, and I believe that the European people must live in ever closer union.<sup>88</sup>

Ortoli remained vague about the nature of this emerging European identity. Pierre Drouin was more specific in *Le Monde*. Making a normative claim, he cautioned that a united Europe would only find its identity if it fostered a distinct societal model, eschewing the trappings of dogmatic Marxism and the ‘Promethean frenzy’

<sup>82</sup> Kosciusko–Morizet, *Etats-Unis, Europe, France: Convergences et Obstacles*, 12 Nov. 1973, MAE, US files 1970–5, 725.

<sup>83</sup> Sauvagnargues, [Notes manuscrites rédigées pendant mes vacances d’août 1974 en Corse], Aug. 1974, MAE, Private Archives (PA), 373; Sauvagnargues, *Organisation de l’Europe* [Mémorandum sur le Conseil européen remis au président à mon retour de Corse], Sept. 1974, MAE, PA, 373.

<sup>84</sup> Yann de l’Ecotais, ‘La Communauté n’est pas un club anti-américain’, *Le Figaro*, 18 March 1974.

<sup>85</sup> Headline, *Le Figaro*, 7 Sept. 1973.

<sup>86</sup> Maurice Delarue, ‘La réunion de Copenhague’, *Le Monde*, 11 Sept. 1973; Paul Fabra, ‘La crise de l’énergie: une politique commune reste à inventer’, *Le Monde*, 10 Dec. 1974.

<sup>87</sup> Raymond Aron, ‘II. L’identité perdue’ (*Le Figaro*, 15 Feb. 1974), in Raymond Aron, *Les articles de politique internationale dans Le Figaro de 1947 à 1977*, 3 vols. (Paris: Editions de Fallois, 1990–1997), III, 1350.

<sup>88</sup> SEC(73)3412-F: Déclaration faite par M. François-Xavier Ortoli, 30 Sept. 1973, Historical Archives of the European Union, Emile Noël deposit, 1566.

of American consumerism.<sup>89</sup> In the wake of the fourth Arab–Israeli war, *Le Figaro* journalist Roger Massip merged the older, cultural meaning of the term with its new, politically circumscribed acceptance. European nations, he stated, should act jointly to regain their influence in Middle Eastern and world affairs and to safeguard their distinct ‘civilization’ and ‘identity’.<sup>90</sup> In another instance, Massip defined European identity in institutional terms. Its assertion, he claimed, required strengthening the EC institutions: the Commission, the Council of Ministers and the European Parliament (EP). He thus urged the EC heads of state or government to forge ahead with institutional reforms.<sup>91</sup>

By 1974, ‘European identity’ had become a key legitimising category of French political discourse. Reflecting its origins in multilateral diplomacy, the term was primarily used to conjure up the vision of a European world actor. In line with the Copenhagen Declaration, however, French decision- and opinion-makers had also begun to give it a socio-cultural substance. This was a first step towards a wider understanding of this concept.

### Conclusions: words and beliefs

In fuelling Franco–US rivalries, US plans to revitalise the Atlantic alliance, together with the Middle East crisis, prompted Pompidou’s government to try and build the emerging European entity as a world actor counterbalancing US power. Kissinger said as much in his memoirs: ‘An American initiative enabled Jobert to pursue the old Gaullist dream of building Europe on an anti-American basis.’<sup>92</sup> Use of the United States as a defining ‘other’ was rooted in a long tradition of positioning it as a mirror and foil to European societies, dating back to Alexis de Tocqueville’s *Democracy in America*.<sup>93</sup> Since the inter-war years, the United States had typically served as a reference in discussions of modernity.<sup>94</sup> In France, such commentaries often included elements of anti-Americanism: Americanisation was portrayed as a threat to France’s national culture and identity.<sup>95</sup> In 1973, by contrast, French decision- and opinion-makers set the United States against a united Europe. This

<sup>89</sup> Pierre Drouin, ‘Une Communauté sans prophète’, *Le Monde*, 15 Dec. 1973.

<sup>90</sup> Roger Massip, ‘Sauver la Communauté’, *Le Figaro*, 1 Nov. 1973.

<sup>91</sup> Roger Massip, ‘Editorial’, *Le Figaro*, 9 Dec. 1973.

<sup>92</sup> Kissinger, *Years of Upheaval*, 165.

<sup>93</sup> Alexis de Tocqueville, *De la démocratie en Amérique* (Paris: C. Gosselin, 1835–1840).

<sup>94</sup> Emilio Gentile, ‘Modernity: Fascism and the Ambivalent Image of the United States’, *Journal of Contemporary History*, 28, 1 (1993), 7–29; Mary Nolan, *Visions of Modernity: American Business and the Modernization of Germany* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994); Marjorie A. Beale, *The Modernist Enterprise: French Elites and the Threat of Modernity, 1900–1940* (Stanford University Press, 1999); Ruth Ben-Ghiat, *Fascist Modernities: Italy, 1922–1945* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001).

<sup>95</sup> Studies of French anti-Americanism include Denis Lacorne, Jacques Rupnik and Marie-France Toinet, eds., *L’Amérique dans les têtes. Un siècle de fascinations et d’aversions* (Paris: Hachette, 1986); Richard F. Kuisel, *Seducing the French: The Dilemma of Americanization* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1993); Philippe Roger, *L’ennemi américain. Généalogie de l’antiaméricanisme français* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 2002); Seth D. Armus, *French Anti-Americanism (1930–1948): Critical Moments in a Complex History* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2007).

paradigm was not wholly new. The Gaullian concept of a 'European Europe' had already been constructed in opposition to the United States. Not only did French government actors and press commentators in 1973 help to anchor this paradigm firmly in political consciousness, they also added a layer of complexity to French political discourse. Unlike 'a European Europe', the notion of a politically anchored European identity challenged the primacy of the nation-state as the paramount unit of political legitimacy. The 1973–4 popularisation of this concept thus was a significant step towards a greater allegiance to the European polity on the part of the French elites – one that revived and strengthened the pro-European tradition fostered by a number of French leaders under the Fourth Republic, notably among the Christian democrats (Robert Schumann, Pierre Pflimlin), the socialists (Guy Mollet, Christian Pineau) and the left radicals (René Mayer, Maurice Faure).<sup>96</sup>

This new keyword in the French political vocabulary was particularly significant because the Yom Kippur War spurred the Quai d'Orsay to Europeanise its Arab policy and because Pompidou's April 1974 death in office subsequently opened the way to a re-charting of French foreign and European policy.<sup>97</sup> In May, the French elected a centrist to the presidency, Valéry Giscard d'Estaing, thereby putting an end to sixteen years of Gaullist rule. Giscard did not have much room to manoeuvre, given Gaullist dominance in the government coalition. Nonetheless, he spearheaded reforms that marked a departure from the intergovernmental Gaullist model. The final statement of the December 1974 Paris summit, which was shaped in part by French proposals, provided for both (intergovernmental) institutionalised summitry – the European Council – and enhanced supranational decision-making and legitimacy – notably through an extension of the scope of majority voting in the Council of Ministers, the direct election of the EP through universal suffrage and strengthened EP powers. This set of supranational reforms was proof that, as the newly elected president, Giscard was determined to reorient, if only slightly, the course of France's European policy.<sup>98</sup> Some of these proposals would only materialise under his successors, but Giscard would face down the Gaullists on the issue of democratic representation, paving the way for the first elections to the EP in June 1979.<sup>99</sup> All in all, the institutional *relance* of 1974 helped to flesh out the notion of a politically defined European identity.

In its 1973 definition, the concept of European identity encompassed the ideal of a European world actor. In the wake of the first oil price shock, EC countries failed to match words with deeds. In summer and autumn 1973, they did speak with a

<sup>96</sup> On the stance of the Christian democratic party, the Popular Republican Movement (MRP), on European integration see Serge Berstein, Jean-Marie Mayeur and Pierre Milza, eds., *Le MRP et la construction européenne* (Brussels: Editions Complexe, 1993). On France's European integration policy under the Fourth Republic see Bossuat, *Faire l'Europe sans défaire la France*, 46–81.

<sup>97</sup> On the Europeanisation of France's Arab policy, see Aurélie Éliisa Gfeller, 'Re-envisioning Europe: France, America and the Arab World, 1973–1974', Ph.D. thesis, Princeton University, 2008.

<sup>98</sup> Aurélie Éliisa Gfeller, 'Valéry Giscard d'Estaing et la relance européenne: nouvel éclairage sur la création du Conseil européen et les réformes institutionnelles du sommet de Paris (1974)', *Revue d'histoire diplomatique*, 4 (2009), 341–60.

<sup>99</sup> Thierry Chopin, 'Le parlement européen', in Serge Berstein and Jean-François Sirinelli, eds., *Les années Giscard. Valéry Giscard d'Estaing et l'Europe, 1974–1981* (Paris: Armand Colin, 2006), 153–89.



single voice to the United States, and they even issued a common declaration on the Arab–Israeli conflict. With skyrocketing energy bills, however, France’s EC partners saw fit to accommodate US concerns. They lent their support to the November 1974 creation of the International Energy Agency (IEA), which France did not join until 1992. The controversial EC–US draft statement was shelved, but in June 1974, NATO members – France included – signed a declaration that contained stronger language on inter-allied consultations than French authorities had initially been prepared to accept. Nonetheless, the years 1973 and 1974 were a critical moment in the strivings of the EC/European Union (EU) towards international self-assertion. The Year of Europe and the Middle East and oil crises, together with the Conference for Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE), gave EPC a burst of momentum shortly after its creation.<sup>100</sup> The Copenhagen Declaration, moreover, was an important landmark in the construction of a European political identity and should not be dismissed as a mere ‘footnote in EU history’.<sup>101</sup> Subsequent documents – the 1978 Copenhagen European Council statement, the 1992 Maastricht Treaty and the 1999 Amsterdam Treaty – elaborated on its founding political principles.<sup>102</sup> The twin notions of civilisational unity and cultural diversity would become central to EC/EU political discourse, as exemplified by the phrase ‘unity in diversity’ in the 2004 draft Constitutional Treaty. And ‘European identity’ has to this date remained a key category of French political life.<sup>103</sup>

<sup>100</sup> On EPC and the CSCE, see Möckli, *European Foreign Policy*, 99–139; Angela Romano, *From Détente in Europe to European Détente: How the West Shaped the Helsinki CSCE* (Brussels: P.I.E. Peter Lang, 2009).

<sup>101</sup> Ine Megens, ‘The December 1973 Declaration on European Identity as the Result of Team Spirit among European Diplomats’, in Jan van der Harst, ed., *Beyond the Customs Union: The European Community’s Quest for Deepening, Widening and Completion, 1969–1975* (Brussels: Bruylant, 2007), 317–38.

<sup>102</sup> Vlad Constantinesco, ‘Le rôle du Conseil européen dans la formation d’une identité européenne’, in Marie-Thérèse Bitsch, Wilfried Loth and Raymond Poidevin, eds., *Institutions européennes et identités européennes* (Brussels: Bruylant, 1998), 435–47.

<sup>103</sup> See, e.g., President Nicolas Sarkozy’s much-remarked 2007 Strasbourg speech: MAE, Discours du président de la République devant le Parlement européen (Strasbourg, 13 Nov. 2007), available at [www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/fr/europe\\_828/avenir-europe\\_14204/traitelisbonne\\_18255/discours-m.-nicolas-sarkozy-devant-parlement-europeen-strasbourg-13-novembre-2007\\_56337.html](http://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/fr/europe_828/avenir-europe_14204/traitelisbonne_18255/discours-m.-nicolas-sarkozy-devant-parlement-europeen-strasbourg-13-novembre-2007_56337.html) (last visited 12 May 2009).