

European peace project: federalist perspective

Mykola Gnatiuk

E-mail: mgnatyuk@gmail.com

Doctor in Political Sciences,

National University of “Kyiv–Mohyla Academy”, Political Science Department

(Kyiv, Ukraine)

ABSTRACT

The European peace project has become a popular topic for public discussions but not so much as a scholarly enterprise. Despite an initial spur at the beginning of integration, today little research exists on security causes and outcomes of integration. This study contributes to closing this gap in the literature by examining the European peace project from a federalist perspective. Relying on federalists' works and security models this study examines ways proposed by federalists to more secure Europe and assesses the security function of the created integration communities that were set up in Europe after the Second World War. A number of important findings emerge from the analysis. First, security reasons paved the way to European unification, and European integration was intended to strengthen peace on the continent. Second, the federalist normative approach proposed the most radical security solution, which could serve as ideology, but could not be applied as an integration model in which primary units are nation-states. Third, from a federalist perspective European integration is not a primary security solution, nonetheless, it is capable to change relations between member-states and help overcome national resistance to uniting Europe.

KEYWORDS: integration, security, European security order, European Union, federalism, political unification, foreign policy

Received : 1/08/2022

Revised :

Accepted : 7/09/2022

Introduction. The European security order capable of maintaining peace and preventing a large-scale war has been a craving idea for many generations of Europeans. Since the beginning of European integration after the Second World War, the continent has not experienced a major war until recently. The current security predicament in Europe is a tragedy that should have been avoided. The big question is how?

At a time of a major war on the continent, an issues of conflict drivers and an effective European security architecture come to the front. There could be applied a number of international relations theoretical accounts that consider the matter (Mearsheimer, 2014), but it must be noted that the security problems facing Europe today are not new, and the discussion of their solution has rather had a long history.

One of the ideas for an effective European security order that gave rise to European integration is the one of a united Europe. Only this way a region that is organized under a single political leadership is capable of maintaining order and stimulating development, eliminating the possibility of an interstate confrontation. Centuries of wars between European states have brought them to the realization of a simple fact – to be peaceful Europe ought to be integrated. Currently, Europeans made a huge leap toward unification by virtue of the European Union.

After two devastating major world wars, for more than seven decades integration has become the strategy for securing peace and reconciliation in Europe. Sharing this idea, nevertheless, there are questions to be answered, since the integration neither has been spreading over the entire continent, or the EU embodies full-fledged political unification. Very first European organizations, the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) and the European Economic Community (EEC), incited debates about whether regional organizations were suited to settle disputes and conflicts among states (Haas, 1958). The delegation of national sovereignty rights to a regional (European) authority seemed to tame nationalism and fostered the peaceful resolution of international conflicts. However, the key question is how to overcome the reluctance of states to give up sovereignty (Börzel, 2013, p. 504), has remained unanswered.

There is no generally accepted explanation of how European integration has been functioning as a peace project. One side to it is functional cooperation, mostly in economic areas of “low politics” that helps solve common problems (Mitrany, 1965) and the role of regional institutions giving rise to a new political community in which states would settle their conflicts peacefully (Eilstrup-Sangiovanni, 2005). This cluster of theories appeals to a fundamental change in the way that member-states see their interests, having renounced force as an unacceptable means of resolving conflicts, and has formed a “security community” (Deutsch, 1954).

The other cluster for theorizing the European peace project seeks explanations outside the European integration and arguing that without the overcoming security dilemma there is no way to integration. Even having taken part in integration, states remain resilient in areas of “high politics” (Hoffmann, 1966) and need appropriate security arrangements, e.g. NATO, as an incentive for cooperation.

Since the creation of the European Union in the 1990-s, theories shifted their focus on its role in the political transformation of the post-soviet states regarding integration and conditionality as peacebuilding force. Consequently, a question of how integration was contributing to regional security was transformed into one of how accession to the integration project contributed to security? The EU is considered as a polity with its own political system and policy-making and emphasizing Europeanization and socialization effects (Risse, 2001).

No matter what the theories say, European integration, now with Ukraine as a candidate to the EU, represents a focal point in developing European order that constrains a nation-state's urge to turn to armed violence for resolving their disputes. For that matter, exploring the way integration contributes to a more secure regional environment can provide more tools for better understanding of modern security problems. The current security situation in Europe has been posing many questions and the finding an answer requires normative or empirical-normative theorizing, that can serve as the general guideline. With a new war on the continent, the fundamental question of "How the European security order should be built?" arises ones again.

Reminisced of the times when the integration started, early international integration theories can offer useful insights into the "European security order problem". There was two main normative theory that guided the integrated Europe - federalism, and functionalism. Their main point for normative theorizing was how to build European security order by means of integration?. In this regard, tracing their legacy is quite helpful to form a comprehensive picture of the current European security predicament and ways to address it.

This article examines federalist approaches to constructing the European security order by means of integration. Federalism is not a security theory, but it is a backdrop against which the current European peace project can be evaluated, and offers answers to security-related questions like why integration is important to strengthening peace? After all, Jean Monnet, a founding father of European integration and the first Head of the High Authority of the ESCS, famously described his approach as "functionalist federalism".

Framing European integration as a peace project that has absorbed a number of ideas of federalists at least at the normative level requires to address a federalist solution to war problem and its implementation by the integration process in Europe that started in the 1950-s. Examining the federal route to European security, the article (1) considers the models of strengthening security by means of political unification to which federalism appeals, 2) explores projects and ideas for peace achievement in Europe by political unification, 3) accesses the ways the federalist ideas influenced and were incorporated into European integration project after WWII.

In the context of the Russia's war in Ukraine, the employment of the normative approaches not only offers useful insights into the causes of conflicts but more importantly presents guidelines on how the international

community should react. The federalist theory also informs many other aspects of European integration research, such as exploring the actorness and power of the EU and European security governance in the region.

Federalism and a security theory: towards political unification

Federalism is not a security theory in the exact sense, it rather appeals to a set of principles on which a new world order could be structured. The federalist security solution premises on nation-states' inability to sustain peace, and shares the idea of uniting mankind under a common political power. Historically there have been plenty of such projects emphasizing the necessity for some supranational body designed to resolve disputes between political units. The United Nations, an international organization for maintaining and building peace among its members, and the European Union, European integration project, are the closes contemporary incarnations of this idea.

The idea of the creation of supranational bodies for maintaining peace assumes that international relations are more prone to conflicts than societies within polities. In contrast to international politics, modern nation-states have monopolized the use of violence and built a hierarchical system of relations within their territories. Instead, international relation is a system in which there is no high authority, and order within this anarchic system is maintained by a power balance between main units – great powers.

Transferring these “internal” political practices to the global level can be advantageous for controlling war but there are at least a couple of approaches to how the unification of political power should be accomplished. The spectrum of possible solutions extends from structured cooperation without a clearly defined pooling of authority to a world federation. The latter is capable to eliminate the conflict-prone practices in international politics, the former is suitable for mitigating the impact of anarchy on international security.

Three types of common political entities can be distinguished with different degrees of unification of political power. At one extreme end of this continuum is a voluntary association of states, that cooperate among themselves, at the other is a full-fledged universal state. Their common denominator is the idea that the nation-state acting on their own and pursuing national interests are posing a threat to peace and it is dangerous if they are left outside the common political structure. Furthermore, this superstructure is necessary for building a consensus, as it has the necessary tools and pieces of machinery for finding solutions when security challenges are arising, and it should possess the means for its decision implementation.

The limitation of a nation-state through power unification is not so implausible as it may seem. The initial steps to the unification of political power can be traced to establishing the United Nations. With some degree of pulling power, this international organization was initiated by states to create conditions for peace and to maintain security by common effort. Currently, the only institution capable of legally employing force for

maintaining peace is the UN Security Council, and all member states are obligated to comply with Council decisions.

At this level of unification, common institutions don't possess autonomous authority for policy-making, and decisions are made by conferences of national heads of states or their representatives. No wonder that in most cases the UN is incapable to find a solution to an urgent security issue as the UN Security Council is operating on the principle of great powers unanimity. When security issues arise that pose a threat to peace, the UN can mount an effort to restore peace but only if there is a consensus among veto holders. When the goals and interests of key actors diverge, and national interests dominate, there is little incentive for cooperation, and this "concert of states" system for peace maintenance does not work.

The UN does more for maintaining security than a "concert of states" does, though. The creation of the UN can be considered a step in the direction of political unification. The universal international organization offers a platform for states to harmonize their interests and cooperate in solving common problems. In a globalized world, it is becoming increasingly difficult for states to act contrary to generally accepted norms, but as Russia's aggression against Ukraine demonstrates it is not always imperative.

The primary goal of UN security facilitation is to encourage states to resolve disputes peacefully and to prevent their aggressive behavior. Moreover, the UN also contributes to peace by encouraging economic development, welfare, and tolerance. The United Nations Charter considers its role as a center "for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends" (Article 1 (4)) (United Nations Charter, 1945). By defining their role this way, the UN and other international organizations mitigate the consequences of international anarchy, giving hope that the interstate system will be rather stable.

The next step on a road to strengthening security through political unification is a confederation. This type of maintaining peace has more chances for success, as it requires setting up an autonomous high authority. In contrast to the UN system, where nation-states remain key decision-making units and act on the principle of sovereign equality, a confederation requires permanent decision-making and management bodies that structure relations between states. Its policymaking is organized in the conjunction of confederal and national levels, with states in charge of common solutions and their implementation. The administrative bodies of the confederation are more like secretariats or analytical units than executive structures. In the absence of a central implementation mechanism, violations of agreements by states do not entail significant consequences.

The differences between the confederation and the above-mentioned IO are many, but the most crucial one is the confederation's closeness to a political union. For maintaining peace, a confederation mounts a dominant power in case of aggression. For this reason, member states transfer their armed forces under joint command and establish a coordination center for their deployment. As a security organization, a

confederation depends on the contributions of member states and loses its effectiveness in the absence of internal unity.

Besides aggerating power against other players, this kind of political unification has also internal functions of peace maintaining and dispute resolutions among member-states. Many projects of European unity included the proposal of a confederation as a form for the pursuit of common interests as opposed to national ones. In this regard, the recent political and security developments in the European Union follow this path, albeit with a significant modification as its activities are broader and extend beyond the boundaries of defense or foreign policy alone. The core of European integration is the common market functioning as a single system, overcoming national limitations.

The third type in our classification of political entities contributing to sustained security order is a federation. In this type of unification for peace nation-states are deprived of significant power in favor of a federal government. Since war is a natural and inevitable attribute of the modern international system of nation-states, the peace project should be based on replacing the system itself, not improving it. A world federation appears as the most radical solution that requires the relinquishment of national sovereignty, including the use of instruments of violence.

In such a system, peacekeeping takes place according to the model of maintaining order within the framework of any modern state entity. Proponents of a federal state usually point out that such a political entity should possess sufficient powers to perform key functions of the state, including peaceful resolution of internal conflicts. Nations retain the maximum amount of autonomy to resolve internal affairs, but regulation of common goods (transport, communication, control of production) must be transferred to the upper level. The security role of the federation also requires its ability to implement key state functions at the level of citizens, not political unites.

Federalist approaches appeal to a comprehensive security solution such as a world federation but other options have been discussed by meeting certain criteria, e.g. a level of democratization or regional proximity. Discourse on the unity of “politically mature” states is dominant in modern Western societies, albeit not going closer to a state form. They operate together within many international institutions – G7, NATO, OECD, and EU. Moreover, not only democracies but also states that are in transition to democracy are considered eligible for such unity. Such approaches offer transition solutions with plenty of variations and help incorporate a federalist solution into a more complex political reality.

Democratization for building peaceful relations among states is a rather controversial idea (Yakushik, 2019, p. 47). Similar to the democratic peace thesis stating that democracies do not fight among themselves, democratization for peace don't offer a full picture and doesn't propose a universal solution while confrontation cannot be excluded from interstate relations based exclusively on internal political rules, non-

mentioning foreign policy considerations. Moreover, the grouping of democratic states may be perceived as a kind of political alignment.

The idea of regional federations has also many shortcuts as a security model. Proponents of the regional approach emphasize that many problems leading to war have their unique regional characteristics. Therefore, the creation of regional federal entities is a step toward solving security problems and gives impetus to the world political union. In this case, regional federations become fundamental components for moving on to the world federation and both these transformations can occur in parallel. The downside to this assessment is the fact that regional federations may act as nation–states competing and fighting among themselves, just as nation–states do.

Despite the fact that the security solution seems implausible, as federalists demand “dismantling the absurd architecture of the modern world” (Claude, 1988: 408), however it has created a normative foundation for European integration and affected considerably European peace project. At the same time, the European integration project combines many characteristics of different types of political unification and is “a sovereign political and legal entity contains, in a rather bizarre form, the features of a federation, a confederation, and an interstate (international) union (Yakushik, 2021, p. 178).

Ideas for peace by political unification in Europe

A security discourse has shaped the idea of European integration and political unification in many ways. Just before the creation of the first European community, in the aftermath of WWII, a European federation seemed as the only possible political path, propagated by the Resistance Movements [Lipgens, 1968]. The European state was widely supported by public activists and politicians. One of the most famous and powerful appeals in this regard was Winston Churchill’s speech in Zurich, in September 1945, in which he called for the creation of a United States of Europe following the model of the United States of America (Churchill, 1946).

The post-war “federalist moment” is extremely important for the maturing of the European integration project, although it gives only one perspective on the security motives behind the European project and ways they could be addressed. To explore this variety of ways to build peace by unification one must return back in time at least for half of the millennia as European political tradition is quite rich in proposals for the unification of Europe. These security solutions reflect the environment under which they were born and even preceded the nation–state system, flaws that federalists wanted to remove.

The very first plans for Europe unification, dated back to the early Middle Ages, expected Christianity to form the glue for integration, although the driving forces for political union had been external – the necessity to overcome internal contradictions that weaken Europeans against external enemies. The creation of a

politically unified entity, usually on a confederal basis, was seen as a step toward peace, more cooperation, and, as a result, aggregated power.

European unity is a way to address demanding political problems that make European states weaker than their enemies. Peace and internal security are urgent prerequisites for related power. In fourteen centuries, Pierre Dubois, French jurist, and politician in his work “Of the Restoration of the Holy Land” argued that eradication of war between Christian nations is possible only if one state was dominated or a confederated “Christian republic” was formed (Dubois, 1306). Another plan by Antoine Marini floated the same idea of a confederation of Christian states, a hundred and a half-century later.

Some contemporary researchers believe that the framework outlined in early plans of European unity has many similarities with the modern European Union (Delanty, 1995), especially the way principal decisions are made. Dubois and Marini suggested a unified political body with kings in charge of the union’s affairs. Amazingly similar operates the European Council, the EU institution that defines the general political direction and priorities of the European Union, where “democratically elected kings” – heads of states and governments – decide important issues among themselves, each having a veto.

The emergence of a new form of political organization, a nation-state, in the late seventeenth century, made the appeal to Christianity less politically imperative, but the main unification leitmotif of overcoming confrontation between European states becomes more prominent. Under new Westphalian rules, states were engaged in large-scale religious wars, which were extremely devastating, even before the advance of the industrial revolution. In such an environment, the search for effective security ideas became more acute.

Not surprisingly, the next century watched plenty of peace proposals, almost all of them argued for some form of political unification. The “Great Plan” of Maximilien de Bethune (Duke of Sully) called for a united Europe with new administrative boundaries between states, which should be redrawn to ensure “parity in strength” (Maximilian de Bethune, 1638). William Penn advocated an idea of a European Parliament to strengthen peace in Europe (Penn, 1693). Abbot de Saint-Pierre’s Project for Settling an Everlasting Peace in Europe was so successful in describing an early prototype of the European Union (De Saint-Pierre, 1714), that nowadays entered the school curriculums.

The common denominator for these peace proposals was to find an effective and plausible model to secure peace in Europe by means of political unity. The regional association should be capable to limit the sovereign power of its members (by a common army in Duke Sully’s plan or by imposing sanctions in Abbé de Saint-Pierre’s vision) and include all main security actors (not always “European”, e.g. William Penn did not rule out the possibility of “Turks or Muscovites” participating in the peace project in Europe on equal terms).

For modernity, with its manifestation in French Revolution, the problem of the struggle between nation-states became more acute. It was time for the flourishing of a European nation-state not its withering. The industrial revolution changed the way the wars were fought, allegiance to a state had made wars patriotic,

and regional security had become a function of the balance of powers between major states (the terms state and power became interchangeable, e.g. “great/major power”). These powers transformed the European continent into an arena for the clashing of their “national interests”, with two “world wars” in the first half of the twenty’s century.

The new security reality shaped an acceptable ground for the development of the federalist idea of overcoming anarchy in Europe by the way of creating a federal entity known at the time as Pan-Europa. A red cross in the middle of the golden sun, first used by crusaders, became a symbol of the continuity of ideas of European political unification, now adopted by the Pan-European movement. According to one of the founders of the movement, it is “the oldest known symbol of supranational European brotherhood” (Coudenhove-Kalergi, 1953).

As a new incarnation of European unification, a “Pan-Europe” meant “the political and economic consolidation of all states from Poland to Portugal into a federal union” (Coudenhove-Kalergi, 1926). Such a consolidation paves the way to internal order and should make Europe strong against new opponents. The new global political competition seemed to make a European federation inevitable.

In the new world European states became “overglobalized” and overstretched to the extent that only a united Europe could preserve its economic and political position and independence. From this time on two options lay ahead for Europe: either to become 1) an arena for competition for new non-European great powers and be divided into spheres of influence, or 2) develop and strengthen its own actorness by unification into a federation. Marvelously, the European integration project undergone these two options simultaneously.

European integration as a peace project

Since 1950-s European integration has been supposed to solve regional problems, suggesting a framework for a new security order, and as such, it can be positioned on the line in the above-presented continuum of the three types of political unification – from the cooperation **without a clearly defined political structure to the creation of a world (regional) federation**. The influence that federalists had on the development of European integration is essential, but to what extent did the integrated framework of the 1950-s implement the federalist concept of strengthening security?

The federalist ideas were incorporated into the formal integration process, but mostly as ideological argumentation. Many federalist ideas such as “common market”, “common European army”, and “common foreign policy” push Europeans to unity and serve as a signpost for building a common Europe. Nonetheless, the idea of a European federation and a design of new European Communities were unharmonious in terms of security solutions and stood apart.

A major federalist point was to eliminate the European nation-states which were unable to “quench the thirst for peace” (Lipgens, 1968, p. 6) and replace them by a federal one. In contrast, the ongoing European integration is between European nation-states and doesn’t intend to limit their sovereignty politically. After all, nation-states’ inability to guarantee security to its citizens during the two World Wars and the erosion of its ideological foundation due to the legacy of Nazism, doesn’t mean that Europe was ready to change fundamentally its core political framework.

In the famous Ventotene Manifesto “For a Free and United Europe”, known as a charter of the movement for federal Europe, Altiero Spinelli and Ernesto Rossi called for the destruction of the old system that splits Europe into sovereign nation-states. To them, the states have turned from guardians of civil liberty into an instrument of war, and in peacetime, they are instruments of preparation for a new war. The European government has to be established, which would secure that power of European nation-states would not be instruments of destruction, barbarism, and suppression (Spinelli, 1942). Assessing political thought of Resistance Movements during World War W. Lipgens argues that the idea of a European federation was commonly acknowledged as having the means to implement its will and impose it on the national constituents and permanently solve the problem of war (Lipgens, 1968, p. 13).

The European federal government ought to be powerful enough to protect states that are part of the federation, and also be able to keep them at peace. The Resistance Movements shared the belief that the European federation should be a sovereign entity with competencies in foreign policy, defense, and economy. A direct comparison can be drawn with former American colonies, that formed the United States to guarantee security and avoid war among themselves in the future (Deudney, 1995).

The federation, formed by a republican constitution, could put an end to the existing anarchy in Europe and become an example to follow, and give impetus to the creation of a world government. Further global political unification was deemed necessary to avoid the reemergence of nationalism. Other forms of security orders were considered ineffective, especially ones that lack military tools for implementation.

Federalist security decision contrasts with mechanisms of collective security, mistakes of which should not be repeated. In this regard, the doctrine of non-interference in the internal affairs of sovereign states, that forms a foundation of the UN security order is unsuccessful and powerless. The system requires the unanimity of the associated states, which pursue their own security goal, rather than maintaining the existing order. The epithet for security failure became the League of Nations. Nearly every declaration of the European resistance movements pointed at flaws of the League of Nations framework that existed before WWII. Among its defects were an absence of “autonomous power, independent of the national sovereignties and over them” and “it possessed neither political authority nor material power for carrying out its decisions which would have been superior to those of the states” as it was outlined in one of the assessments of a French Resistance Movement (Lipgens, 1968, p. 11).

Another side of the federalist idea is represented by Winston Churchill, who famously called for the United States of Europe. Unlike the Resistance Movements, his vision of a federation was influenced by the new political reality of the Cold War and confrontation between the USA and the USSR. On September 19, 1946, in Zurich six months after his speech in Fulton, USA, in which he noted that “from Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic, an iron curtain has descended across the continent” (Churchill, 1946a), Churchill called for “the recreation of the European Family”, the first step to which must be a partnership between France and Germany (Churchill, 1946b, p. 2).

Churchill’s Zurich speech had little in common with the security ideology of European federalists, which tried to offer an alternative to a discredited nation–state. Churchill’s United States of Europe was more a military–political union for power mobilization rather than a control mechanism over nation–states. In June 1940, Churchill, then Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, made a similar proposal for a federation of the UK and the French Republic, “an indissoluble union ... not two nations, but one Franco–British Union” with common defense, financial and economic policy, as well as foreign policy and common dual citizenship (Monnet, 1978, p. 28). The new Union was supposed to support France in its confrontation with Germany, but the new French government reached an armistice agreement and laid arms.

Churchill’s call for the United States of Europe is also an antithesis of the “other tragic Europe” with national antagonism and enmity. The European must not repeat the mistakes of post–First World War settlement when Germany was forced into reparations. Churchill was appealing to restoring the national spirit by abandoning the “sins of the past” and building a European family based on trust. In his opinion, the United States of Europe should make national interests less important, and “small nations will count as much as large ones and gain their honor by their contribution to the common cause” (Churchill, 1946b, p. 2).

This new variant of the European federation was a marker that the task of abandoning a nation–state system became more and more unattainable. The end of the Second World War and the fall of totalitarian regimes did not create a political vacuum, which was supposed to be filled by a new federal entity. The recovery of European states and the hardening of the grip of the occupying powers as well as the unfolding of the Cold War left the European federation no political future, even though the idea remained dominant in the European post–war discourse.

European integration as a peace project reflected this new political reality. The very first integration steps gave the impression that they would lead to a federal Europe, in particular the negotiations on the European Defense Community and the related proposal to establish a European Political Community (Spinelli, 1966, p. 19). With their failure, it became obvious that new European communities, ECSC and EEC, and Euratom, didn’t centralize political power, just as the whole project didn’t implement constitutional principles of the federal system (Forsyth, 1996, p. 26).

Efforts to create the United States of Europe were obviously too radical, and therefore provoked opposition from political actors in most European states. As a result, the lack of the necessary degree of harmonization of the national interests and the extremely strong loyalty of the population to the national states made the federalist model of European integration premature. The new Communities included a limited number of participants – only six, not all European states, their authority was clearly not sufficient to restrain national states.

Despite the significant changes European communities brought to the relations between states, from the federalists' point of view they looked quite moderate and did not eliminate key drivers of war. Federalists stood for radical changes in the European security order and European federation as a counterweight to nation-states. New integrated Communities constrained nation-states somehow, however they remained the main players in the integration game. Alan Milward famously called this new form of European political unification “European rescue of the nation-state” (Milward, 1992).

An innovative experiment in the field of regional cooperation did bring a change in relations between states, though. Just as early unification ideas suggested and Churchill called for, the European peace project creates a unity of European states, giving them tools to make decisions together and set aside political differences. In this regard, new regional institutions could establish conditions for preventive war and have binding properties that solve credible commitment problems among member states – “even in the case of volatile preventive war dilemmas” (Eilstrup-Sangiovanni, 2005, p. 99).

A nation-state as a primary unit of political relations had survived, however returning to business as usual among states was impossible as Europe got an outside security pacifier – the security guarantee from the USA. Integration in form of regional institutionalization was supplemented, and even permitted, by a defense alliance, NATO, that reduced the likelihood of a major war between European countries. It did not mean that the security dilemma between leading European states has been overcome, but it has been considerably mitigated (Gnatiuk, 2022, p. 18). For instance, the security threat to France from Germany, which had been rearmed, decreased after the transnationalization of the coal and steel markets (ECSC) and the incorporation of the German armed forces NATO command structure.

Just as federalism sought to move away from exclusively interstate practice in international relations by means of a federation, established European Communities have been altering the relations among nation-states with a less authoritative but complex system of international institutions. Albeit the intergovernmental mode in the EU remains, the security landscape in the part of Europe where integration took place has changed dramatically over the course of seventy years, whereas the rest of nonintegrated Europe lives under old rules, the federalists have desperately sought to eliminate.

The integration nevertheless gave hope that the power of Europeans would be increasing and eventually it would lead to the implementation of the federalist model (Forsyth, 1967, p. 483). In this way, federalism

became associated with the integration project in Europe and shifted its security emphasis from an idealistic vision of a world federation and the construction of a European "third force" to a more modest, but also more realistic vision of the more centralized European Union and Europeanization of the whole continent.

Conclusion. This paper sets out to examine how the European peace project corresponds with federalist ideas for building European security order. It was argued that the current European security challenge today is reminiscent of the security predicaments that Europe has been facing for a long time. The discussion of the federalist perspective extends the possibilities for achieving peace and the ways the European security order can be organized and can contribute to a better understanding of the security contribution of European integration. The European peace project and the federalist approach to security fall into the same mode of consolidation of peace by political unification, nevertheless occupying different points of the spectrum. The first one appeals for cooperation in transforming national practices, the later strives to replace European nation-states with the European one in order to overcome the international anarchy.

The paper proceeded to outline the arguments federalists set up for strengthening security and contrast them with other approaches for solving security issues within the framework of the unification of political power, such as a universal IO, e.g., the UN and its Security Council, and a confederation. Since war is a natural and inevitable attribute of the modern international system of nation-states, federalist insists on replacing the system itself, not improving it. The federal solution is sweeping and is driven by the need to eliminate the main source of conflict – the interests of national states. Other types of political unification just "mitigate" the anarchic nature of interstate interaction by international cooperation institutions.

After examining the normative assumptions of federalism, the article assesses the discourse on political unification in Europe after WWII and the federalist legacy in European integration process. It is clear that security considerations were the main driving force behind integration, and the "federalist momentum" was extremely powerful in the final phase of the Second World War. However, the integration model differs considerably from the federalist blueprint. European integration is an important step toward a new European security order that employs a certain form of political unification. European peace project operates by mitigating anarchy in relations between member-states with considerable role for new regional institutions, which establish conditions for cooperation and problems solution among member states. Federalism indicates that such a security order should be able, if not overcome, to limit national ambitions and include all participants in security interaction. Nowadays, as in the early 1950s, it seems that the integration should lead to the creation of a federal Europe, but there are no mechanisms that would push states to give up their national sovereignty.

References

- Börzel, T. A. (2013). Comparative Regionalism: European Integration and Beyond in *Handbook on International Relations, second edition* (pp. 503-531). London: Sage.
- Churchill, W. (1946). *The News of Peace ('Iron Curtain Speech')*. March 5, 1946. Westminster College, Fulton, Missouri. <https://winstonchurchill.org/resources/speeches/1946-1963-elder-statesman/the-sinews-of-peace/>
- Churchill, W. (1946). *Universität Zürich, 19 September 1946*. https://www.churchill-in-zurich.ch/site/assets/files/1807/rede_winston_churchill_englisch.pdf
- Claude, I. L. (1988). *Swords Into Plowshares: The Problems and Progress of International Organization*. Random House.
- Coudenhove-Kalergi, R. (1926). *Pan-Europe*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Coudenhove-Kalergi, R. (1953). *An idea conquers the world*. London: Hutchinson.
- De Saint-Pierre Ch. (2010). *A Project for Settling an Everlasting Peace in Europe First Proposed by Henry IV of France, and Approved of by Queen Elizabeth, and Now discussed at large, and made practicable by the Abbot St. Pierre*. Michigan: Gale ECCO.
- Delanty, G. (1995). *Inventing Europe: idea, identity, reality*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Deudney, D. (1995). The Philadelphian System: Sovereignty, Arms Control and Balance of Power in the American States Union, Circa 1787-1861. *International Organization*, 49 (2), 191-228.
- Deutsch, K. (1954). *Political community at the international level: problems of definition and measurement*. New York: Doubleday.
- Dubois, P. (1949). De Recuperatione Terrae Sanctae. (Of the Restoration of the Holy Land.) in Wynner E., Lloyd G. *Searchlight on Peace Plans. Choose Your Road to World Government* (p. 31). New York : EP Dutton and Company, Inc.
- Eilstrup-Sangiovanni, M. & Verdier, D. (2005). European Integration as a Solution to War. *European Journal of International Relations*, 11(1), 99-135.

- Forsyth, M. (1996). The Political Theory of Federalism: The Relevance of Classical Approaches in Hesse, J. & Wright, V. (ed.). *Federalizing Europe?: the costs, benefits, and preconditions of federal political systems* (pp. 25–46.). Oxford : Oxford University Press.
- Forsyth, M. (1967). The political objectives of European integration. *International Affairs*, 43(3), 483–497.
- Gnatiuk, M. (2022). Integration and the European Security Solution: Overcoming the Security Dilemma. *Ukrainian Policymaker*, 10, 18–26. <https://doi.org/10.29202/up/10/3>
- Haas, E. (1958). *The Uniting of Europe: Political, Social, and Economic Forces, 1950–1957*. Stanford: Calif. Stanford University Press.
- Hoffmann, S. (1966). Obstinate or Obsolete? The Fate of the Nation–State and the Case of Western Europe. *Daedalus*, 95, 862–915.
- Lipgens, W. (1968). European Federation in the Political Thought of Resistance Movements during World War II. *Central European History*, 1 (1), 5–19.
- Maximilian de Bethune. Due de Sully (1949). The Great Design of Henry IV of France, as attributed to him by Sully in his Memoirs in Wynner E., Lloyd G. *Searchlight on Peace Plans. Choose Your Road to World Government* (pp. 34–35). New York : EP Dutton and Company, Inc.
- Mearsheimer, J (2014). Why the Ukraine Crisis Is the West’s Fault. The Liberal Delusions That Provoked Putin. *Foreign Affairs*, 93(5), 77–89.
- Milward, A. (1992). *The European Rescue of the Nation–State*. London : Routledge.
- Mitrany, D. (1965). Prospect of Integration: Federal or Functional. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 4, 119–149.
- Monnet, J (1978). *Mémoires* (Mayne, R., Trans). London: Collins, 1978.
- Penn W. (1693). *An Essay towards the Present and Future Peace of Europe by the Establishment of a European Diet, Parliament or Estates*.
http://olddownload.libertyfund.org/Texts/LFBooks/Penn0200/PDFs/0479_Pt13_Peace.pdf.

Risse, T., Caporaso, J., and Green, M. (2001). Europeanization and Domestic Change. Introduction in Cowles, M., Caporaso, J. & Risse, T. *Transforming Europe: Europeanization and Domestic Change* (pp. 1-20). Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press.

Spinelli A., Rossi E. (1941). *The Ventotene Manifesto*. The Altiero Spinelli Institute for Federalist Studies. http://www.cvce.eu/obj/the_manifesto_of_ventotene_1941-en-316aa96c-e7ff-4b9e-b43a-958e96afbcecc.html

Spinelli, A. (1966). *The Eurocrats; conflict and crisis in the European Community*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1966.

UN (1945). *United Nations Charter*. <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter/chapter-1>

Wynner, E. & Lloyd, G. (1949). *Searchlight on Peace Plans. Choose Your Road to World Government*. New York : E. P. Dutton and Company, Inc.

Yakushik, V. (2019). The Status of Cultural and Religious Communities in the Context of Post-Colonial Discourse in Ukraine in *Challenges of Postcolonialism: Philosophy, Religion, Education: materials of the 5th International Scientific and Practical Conference (Kyiv, May 16-17, 2019)*, (pp. 44-48.). Kyiv, Publishing House of NDPU.

Yakushik, V. (2021). In Search of Conceptual Platforms for East-West Cooperation, Global and Regional Integration Projects. *Philosophy and Cosmology*, 27, 174-183.