

PROTOCOL

Welcome

Körper

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Permit me to bid you a most cordial welcome to our Sixth Bergedorf Round Table. A special welcome and thank-you-for-coming to the Principal Speaker of today's Round Table, M. Stéphane Hessel, and to the Moderator, M. François Bondy.

Whoever has kept abreast of our work and our Round Table topics knows that we do not meet in a festive mood to voice our opinions on a topic selected at random. Persons from the most diverse social spheres of work who, on the basis of their knowledge and their sense of responsibility, labor for the solution of the questions of decisive importance for the future development of the free industrial society meet here. What is said here, must be susceptible of translation into terms amenable to exact definition and analysis.

The topic of the last Round Table "The Fallibility of Educational Policies" was unfolded in front of the German background. Today, in a sense, we sit in front of the European loom in order to continue weaving this topic. What we here want to discuss and clarify is, as I believe, not conditioned by a temporary climate of ideas: despite all crises and world wars, the building of a united Europe started long ago. New, larger fields of forces were pioneered. It might be construed as mere play to recall that at the time of the Westphalian Peace, there were more than 400 independent European states. There were less than 100 at the Vienna Congress and only twenty at the Berlin Congress of 1878. At the Versailles Peace Conference, thirty was the number then. But these are only state contexts and only in part European contexts per se. Behind these stages of development are things-in-common. Since World War I, at least since World War II, the incentives, the experiences, the things-in-common have coincided more and more.

We all know that the difficulties in the sphere of education, which are to form our starting point tonight, do exist. Every national system of education - as the pedagogues tell us - rests upon institutions with institutionalized customs and modes of behavior. These are opposed by influences stemming from new political and economic-political realizations and necessities, from thinking in terms of major spheres, from social and technical revolutions, i. e., terms of reference that lie outside of the immediate sphere of education. This results in a series of questions. How is a basic social obligation such as education, not appearing to fulfill present necessities, to be coordinated? How is this Europe of today to be defined in terms of history, politics, economics, geography and culture? What are the inalienable modes of thought and the objectives of life it comprises?

We all do know that the bricks of the individual national systems of education in Europe all consist of the same material. They presuppose laws equally valid for everyone, the doctrines of Christianity, knowledge of the function of reason and logic, respect for facts and the conviction (and that is valid, I believe, not only, of the European but of the entire free Western sphere), that open discussion is necessary in order to reach a compromise between opposing positions and modes of thinking. They presuppose science and experiment as the basis for each improvement of the spiritual and physical situation in the life of man. They also presuppose terms and content of social justice and the extension of society incorporating them, and recognizing faith in the value of personality, a faith only postulated in a free society. We know that modern nations are the product of the post-Renaissance world and of the industrial revolution, i. e., they came into existence prior to the revolutionary changes of our century. We are not surprised that the men of today hold fast the inculcated world of their nation's nomenclature and live in the faith that their own nation is superior to the others. The early industrial phenomena have dissolved the old communities of interest and have led to antagonism among nations.

The social and industrial upheavals, especially in the time prior to and after World War II have, however, brought in their train new spreading modes of thought. We know that a national economy of the 20th Century is capable of life only within large complexes of nations living in solidarity with one another. All this has dawned on us but in the widest sense of the word it has not found access into our

system of education. As an industrialist, I know very well how to divide between theory and practice. I know that we live by both processes. You realize, however, that for me, and here I speak, as a man of the economy, practicable processes that lead onward are of special import. Out of diverse in no way haphazard or passing perceptions, there results the need for a new substructure of educating toward a more cohesive adjustment to the world and for the understanding of the problems of economy, by which we live. If we agree with these perceptions, it must be possible to design a working model and to start work on those parts that are necessary to help us along the way, as a whole, the way on which there is no turning back.

In this spirit, I hope that the address of this evening, and the discussion following upon it, will take us a step further. May I ask you, dear Mr. Hessel, to begin your address.

Hessel

Ladies and Gentlemen: I must begin right off by asking you to excuse me and by expressing the wish, I not disappoint you overly. I have prepared a very short talk and hope we shall have time to discuss it at length, adding, in the discussion, new ideas to the few to be presented in my talk. I must also ask you to pardon me that as a Frenchman I venture to speak to you in German. I hope that you will not note too much how poor my German in reality is, even if at first glance it might be termed fluent. The novelty of this Round Table is also a difficulty I hope to be able to overcome. I can only say in the discussion later on, if opportunity offers, I very gladly should like to answer questions on which I can present special data, i. e., questions which, for example, concern the French system of education or the various attempts France has made to cooperate with other countries in the sphere of education. You see, I am responsible, in the French Ministry of Education, for sending French professors and teachers to various countries with which France has special cultural relations and also to ensure this French representation in the international organizations in which France participates culturally.

Naturally, I read the minutes of the fifth meeting of the last Bergedorf Round Table with a great deal of interest, and above all, I read the statements of Dr. Altmann and Dr. Sombart, which appeared to me especially interesting and decisive for our colloquy today. In the original title of my talk, the word "solidarity" was very important. Due to a slight change in the title, this word is no longer contained in it, but I believe you will see that in the statements I should like to make, the ideas of new solidarities will come to the fore again and again.

Perhaps more clearly so than most of its European partners, France, at the moment, finds itself at the point of intersection of two great historical movements. Between them, this nation is seeking a new balance.

Therefore, if you will permit me to illuminate our problem as posed in the topic, and do so from my experience as administrator of cooperation between France and foreign countries in the sphere of education, then I should first like to attempt to clarify these two historical movements.

The first movement that has deeply assailed our people and our political institutions is de-colonialization, the gradual but irresistible detaching from the French people of communities of other continents, other colors, other religions, and, connected therewith, the translation of the severed bonds into new solidarities founded, for the most part, on culture and education.

In this process, whatever would attack the national feeling negatively and thus arouse it, must be guided into positive channels, must be pictured to the young French as a new, a magnificent, a difficult task, a task in which success strives for far wider objectives than holding fast to old ties.

However, the second historical movement comes on stage, simultaneously, - the growing together of West European nations. Here too one must not underestimate the negative moment: for the young French it is likely to appear as if he must forego much, the individuality of national history which, through the centuries, has gained the appearance of the exemplary for him, the universality of his culture, which he is loath to have limited within the narrower borders of a European community, no matter how much it be enlarged. Above all, this Europeanization means the acceptance of the codetermination of others for the future and the fate of the nation, and among these others, those who in history have so often been enemies or rivals.

Here again the positive element, the wider horizon, the new, the greater tasks and possibilities must step by step be received into the consciousness of youth. And that can only be attained through a new evaluation of the fundamental themes of human togetherness on earth at a time in which the great theses of the communist and the free world struggle over the spirits and the souls of the younger generation.

But now I should like to pass from France to Europe and pose the question, what deep-reaching changes in education and higher education can and must be instituted in order to evolve and make clearly conscious to the younger generation the positive, encouraging, challenging feeling of its new solidarities with the European partners on the one hand and the developing nations on the other.

Nevertheless much is already happening within and without the schools and the universities, within and without intergovernmental organizations and relationships, underlining and making palpable these solidarities:

- the European schools in Brussels, Luxembourg, etc.

- the school partnerships between neighboring countries (France, Germany, England, Belgium, Holland)
- the teacher exchange
- the student exchange and the university partnerships
- the entire program of the Council of Europe in the sphere of youth, education, culture
- the interest of the European Community in developing countries, as expressed, for example, in the European Development Fund and also in new discussions of the Bari Symposium, an interest the Bergedorf Round Table has already treated of in a previous meeting
- the influx, of students and technicians from Africa, Latin America or Asia into the European universities and centers of higher learning, where increasingly successful methods facilitate their access to the modern sciences and industrial know-how
- the dispatching of teachers, specialists, experts in all spheres of technology from Europe to developing countries, where they place at the disposal of the governments their experience, and acquaint themselves with the special problems of the corresponding country and people.

No young Frenchman, Englishman, German, Italian, Beneluxian, who does not, early in life, come directly into contact with the realities of Europe on the one hand, the problems of helping developing nations on the other, and who, if he so desires, is not able to think and to occupy himself therewith.

But does he desire to do so? The education communicated to him by his national scholastic system, the training he enjoys, is it such he does not misunderstand these problems, evaluate them negatively, does not invert them or even misinterpret them? Perhaps it is worthwhile to talk about that.

You see, as long as the basis of the training, as long as the "educere" of education leads toward the national community, just so long the problems of Europe and of the developing countries will have their effect accordingly in order to touch or change this national community. Europe, then, is a policy giving the national community a larger sphere of action, a goal for this or that land to increase its influence, a stimulating partnership for the country's

economy, or a sphere of conquest for its own language.

And the developing countries? They then become the new colonies, tinted by the recognition of political independence but considered as customers, who have become accessible to more than one nation now. The help offered them, and not grudgingly, strengthens national power, is proof of national progress, stresses national political influence in other continents.

Is it unrealistic to consider this conception as a danger? I personally do not believe so, and that for two reasons. First, because the fonts of solidarity used selfishly will soon dry up.

Thus, whoever occupies himself with Africans because he believes to consolidate his own position thereby, whoever strives to place his own nation at the head of Europe is given a difficult task, but he must find the energy for this task elsewhere than in the contact with a new human reality.

Secondly, because disappointment would be likely and violent if one perhaps expected that the aid given developing peoples be returned to one's own people in the form of recognition or gratitude, or if one believed the sacrifice of national sovereignty made on the altar of European unity could be calculated in such a way that the other partner sacrificed more of it.

Therefore the danger lies in that an education that although recognizing these two historical movements attempts to interpret them as if they were only a new field for the same forces, a new shading in the same picture, will prepares our youth to measure up to the new potentialities of the century.

But how would the other education look?

Here I should like to advance cautiously and merely make a few suggestions. We must, however, proceed from one point we find, after all, in all advanced countries, i. e., that the structures, the programs and training methods of the educational system are everywhere on the verge of changing, falling back before the urge to democratize, to dedicate more time to the all-round education of all children, rather foregoing range of knowledge in favor of fostering the capacity to understand.

Thus, the terrain is favorable. The new generation of teachers is, to a certain extent, prepared to give their profession a new meaning. This willingness must, naturally, be developed and nurtured, before all else.

Bondy

I believe that we can just permit a little time to pass before some of the questions and problems posed by this introduction are answered. For what we have now had is a glimpse of European education from that land in which a national humanistic education, the most marked in Europe, is extant and where, evidently, at the same time an alignment toward the European is taking place, the feeling is growing that spheres of power disappeared with the waning of the Empire but that duties and tasks have remained so that, translated into the European, this "imperialism" is not simply replaced leaving an indifference, rather is left what in the topic of tonight's talk is called a historic task, growing forth from a duty that concerns not only the states, their specialists and their civil servants but instead Europeans themselves as men vis-a-vis this new horizon, this new adventure of the developing new states.

Before we come to talk of these problems it would be well to interpose something complementary, i. e., to take a short look not at what in the individual countries emanates from national reforms but is coming directly into being on a European plane, and what is being undertaken in the sphere of forming the European, not only the minor but also the adult. For Europe is coming into being, but Europeans have not come into being - and that is a matter that concerns our generation, the most mature representative as much as our children.

Therefore I venture - and I hope that you permit me to do so - to request our friend Henri Schwamm, who has come here from Geneva, to report something on these attempts in European education, not as a rebuttal but in complement.

Schwamm

I, too, am a Frenchman and speak German badly, at that much worse than our speaker and I, therefore, should like to ask you to pardon me if now and again I should make a mistake.

To form Europe means, above all, to form Europeans; that is what our speaker said and explained so tellingly. Surely we all agree that a really united Europe cannot exist if we are not successful in formulating anew and, above all, in applying in practice in the school program, within the European framework, what one used to call an understanding of the rights and duties of citizenship. At the beginning of the century, Bergson called for what he termed a "supplément d'âme", a little more soul, for our technical age. More modest, we should like to say that the Europe of the economic institution, in which we are already living today, the Europe of the political institution of tomorrow, needs a supplement of citizenism, a little more European citizenism. The Common Market functions, we all know that. Doubtlessly, political Europe is coming into being. We must, therefore, worry about the psychical and moral foundation that this institution could only find in the consciousness and the will of the citizens of our states. This far we agree. But now the practical question poses itself: how must we proceed to awaken, yea, make possible this "supplement of citizenism" in the peoples. May I at this point briefly describe the image we in Geneva at the European Center of Culture have. We naturally realize that there are other methods, that other methods are possible, methods that could complement ours, as the case may be. Basic condition of every European civism, every European citizenism (if I may translate the word thus) is the consciousness of the realities in which the young European will live tomorrow.

Numerous persons do not understand the necessity for European union only because they do not recognize the present world situation and the role of Europe in a shrinking world. European unity, in the consciousness of men and especially of school-children, must not be an abstract idea or a pretext for party-political considerations, rather must it be expounded as a vital necessity. European citizenism must therefore emanate the more from accurate knowledge of our vital interests rather than from abstract duties of which one continues to talk and above all formerly talked in the "Civics Education Manual". A genuine civics education is much more than a civic institution. It does not suffice to tell the young people what their rights and privileges are; one must give them a vision of their personal opportunities for development and the means to realize this development. In other words, it is a matter of first analyzing the problems of social life before one creates the institutional framework.

Such an education we do not yet have. Civics, as taught today in most schools, bores the pupils. Why? For the very reason that civics speaks of the rights and privileges, the necessity for which the pupils do not recognize, the application of which the pupils very often do not understand. This education does not fit into the framework of our world of today and of our individual life. For the same reason the efforts toward European unity today still meet the resistance of certain teachers and are received by certain strata of the people with apathy because the solution of problems is proposed with which these teachers and these popular masses are not acquainted and as a logical result, feel no need to resolve. A donkey that is not thirsty, you cannot force him to drink - is an old French proverb.

Thus the question: how can one awaken the need for European civics, for European citizenism, in order to give the pupils the desire to accept into their minds and assimilate this citizenism? The answer to this practical question is as follows: in that the teachers and through them the pupils become conscious of the facts of today, and the problems of tomorrow, and in that one show that these realities call for European unity, require it, and that the solution of today's problems calls for keen understanding of citizenship.

Naturally, it is not enough to convey knowledge concerning European facts in order to form Europeans. Certain psychical and moral attitudes cannot be foregone and continue to constitute the motive power of every civics education. But one must absolutely begin with these facts, something one usually does not do. The European Center of Culture intends to describe these basic European facts in a modest teacher's guide comprising four main chapters.

1. The historical development of Europe
2. Today's economic conditions of Europe
3. The technical and economic demands
4. The consequences of de-colonialization

I should here like to give you only a few concrete examples in order to show you how we propose to proceed. At the end of the historical part we show how in 1945 Europe was completely ruined economically and only lived, as President Spaak says, by mercy of the Americans and in fear of the Russians. At this point in time Europe begins to unite in order to survive. In the economic section we want to explain why a greater European production and productivity requires a larger market. A further example: de-colonialization. It did not by any means ruin Europe economically, as was prophesied in many places, instead it is being consummated precisely at the time of the greatest economic flowering which Europe has ever known. It also is not by accident that this de-colonialization coincides with the beginning of European efforts toward unity. For the imperialism of our states stimulated their rivalries. Consequently, turning away from imperialism promotes their unification.

There are some examples, entirely concrete examples, we want to make accessible in a simple style to teachers and consequently also to the pupils. These, namely, are some of the facts that characterize Europe today and in consequence form the basis of civism, the understanding of European citizenship. From the description of these new facts—that be that condition the European situation today, we conclude the necessity for European unity, and that due to three reasons, which are very easy to understand:

1. to avoid the return of crises and wars that almost ruined all of us in Europe,
2. to realize our global capacity as European unit in the sphere of invention, production, management, leadership.

And finally

3. to be able to fulfill Europe's world-wide task, a task no one today would be capable of assuming if Europe were to fail.

The second part of this guideline will attempt to answer the question: what are the new duties within the framework of European unity as is coming into being, the necessity for which, now that the reader has finished the first part, we hope he understands and affirms. We, however, do not yet know how the political regimes of Europe will shape up; no matter what they will come to be, definite basic civil rules must be accepted by these regimes. The right to an organized opposition; more than one party and more than one solution; free expression of opinion and recognition of minorities, minorities that should not only be tolerated but rather aided; the right to work and recreation and social solidarity. Already there is a European code, a European jurisprudence; the European Charter of Human Rights has already been ratified, a European civil law is in the process of evolving. A united Europe must give to the citizen of every country more liberty and more genuine responsibilities, but also greater and more concrete possibilities for personal unfoldment; this, after all, is the ultimate objective of civic life. In our opinion, the best form of European unity is the federal form because it is freely chosen by the individual member states and above all, because it accepts our national differentiations; these have been in the past and will continue to be in the future the nutriment of the European genius.

Bondy

We have now heard two expositions attacking the problem with which we are occupied from different directions; the kinship in spirit is fairly identical. I believe all of us are happy that at the moment of such

solemn German-French state visits, such an un-solemn und private visit of these two French friends has taken place, and has enriched us. Three questions came to me while I listened to these two speeches, and with these three questions I should not like to venture to direct the discussion in a certain direction - I do not believe that that is what I am supposed to do - but I want to tell you these three questions anyway.

1. What is Europe? Every European nation in striving for a united Europe starts from different conditions, a different past and history and education, so that the methods and the path must consequently differ, even though the objective is the same.

2. How can Europe's citizens today consciously become Europeans? The first question is very concrete. Do we want to make Europeans only of the members of the six states, including three already

in a daring and beautiful organization termed by M. Hessel as the "Beneluxians", no less abstract a term than the political term "European?" Is that really the critérium? Is it not of our concern what the Danes, the Swedes, the Norwegians, the Austrians, the Spaniards, the Portuguese and other Europeans do? Or cannot they become Europeans of our type because it is only between us Six that the custom barriers are falling? The question therefore is: to whom is our need for European education directed? Does this European education coincide in space with the Europe of the Six, as appears to have been implied up to now?

3. The last question is directed to the content of this Europe: has there ever been a case that civics was taught of a state that did not exist; that one is making believe a State of Europe already exists because there are certain inceptions of European law and in part already established European authorities, and now one teaches the children: this, now, is Europe, a "state in being"; it will be and is not yet, but we are already telling you what it will be, and that you are Europeans. What constitutes the difference between civics and politicalizing education? For civics teaches that there are concrete institutions a large majority of the population accepts because they apprehend these institutions as self-explanatory. There is, thus, a constitution, a code of law, various authorities, the separation of powers; and then one tells the people how all this has been in operation for some time. That is civics, such as is implemented, especially in Switzerland, and, I fear, also bores at times. But at least one knows whereof one speaks. What now is civics for Europeans in view of the fact that this European state, this European authority, does not exist in the fullest sense of the word in which we recognize states? I believe General de Gaulle is absolutely right, that at present this state does not exist. He perhaps is wrong in not wanting that it ever exist, but it does not exist now.

I believe, the question definitely is as to where this education aims. We agree that we want to have Europeans more fully conscious of being Europeans. We, nevertheless, also agree that we do not want to ask our teachers to propagandize, to politicalize instruction and try to force Europeanism, at any price, as a definite trend, and to eliminate those accustomed to teach humanitarianism, in this case in terms of nationalism. I myself, naturally, do not have an answer; fortunately, as Moderator of the discussion, I am the least in duty bound to have an answer, but I should like to pose it to you as the third question.

Altmann

M. Hessel based his remarks on the situation in France. If we, now, process our history, the German history, in a fully European sense, we must take it as the history of Central Europe, in strong contact with the Slavic peoples. Especially, I believe, if one speaks of Europe's future, then one should be grateful the classic problem Germany-France has been ended, but one should realize, Europe's future lies in the conflict with the Slavic peoples and not in the processing of an exclusively Western European culture. And in this far I would support what Mr. Bondy said of Europeanism, the danger of a Western European monologue, which, after all, depends upon a very specific situation. That is the critical point; and the other is this processing of European culture within the meaning of a new world view. Is technology, for instance, something limited to Europe? Must not particularly this total array of facts lead today's youth beyond a historically evolved Western Europe? Is there yet the possibility to evolve a new world image revolving around Europe? Or does, for instance, the contact with the developing countries signify precisely the renunciation of an emphasized Europeanism, a wider conforming to these cultures than was ever the case in the age of colonialism? Regarding the situation of Germany specifically: it is not merely a question today of German pupils knowing that once upon a time there was a Königsberg! If the Germans do not realize - and this has nothing to do with reunification as a political goal - that their view, their horizon must not stop at the Elbe, rather that here lies a great historical task, then that would mean an especially great loss for Europe's consciousness.

A further criticism: in the two talks, I did not hear the word America once. It was dropped. But the influence of America on our culture is tremendous. If we thus narrow our horizon, it is only understandable why the population's reaction to the European program is so weak. The German population, especially, has a feeling it is in the midst of great world-wide conflict. For that reason, European unification cannot merely be conceived as the sole signification of European history.

Hessel

Those were very stimulating conjectures of Dr. Alt-mann's. I believe one should be very chary of looking at Europe merely as the sum of existing countries; that, perhaps, is what you attack. If one says: here are five, six, seven, eight countries; tomorrow they will be fused into a new unit, and that per se is the goal hoped for, then the very world image you conjectured is lacking. The world image must be viewed as a European project just now. For a European, in my opinion, it is not yet possible to draw his play of forces from fonts other than from the experience and the tradition of Europe, with its diversity, with its tolerance, and with its entire historic burden.

But the European's point of reference cannot be himself and he cannot feed upon himself, rather, it must be a project directed to the entire world, and in this context I consider the geographic borders of Europe quite unimportant, yes even the problem of the partition of Germany, although it is a difficult question.

For if Europeans, no matter from where they come geographically, together, in solidarity, back a project lying outside of any specific nation, then this project will attract those who feel themselves Europeans, and will unite them in common action. For this reason I consider action much more important, in this context, than mere contemplation. As concerns America, I consider it as very essential that we be conscious of a task which, from the standpoint of culture, is not identified with the task of America. Undoubtedly, there is weighty practical knowledge to be drawn from America, but if we feel ourselves as an overseas offshoot of American culture or even as overly included in the play of forces of the United States, we would have ill comprehended our own task.

Bondy

Dear M. Hessel, I do not ever want to hear a single word more about your German for which you think you must excuse yourself. But your reply has not eliminated the opposing viewpoints. Do you want to comment Mr. Sombart?

Sombart

I believe, indeed, that it would be wrong to separate the European problem from the major correlations. That was the error or the fault of the European movement of the first hour. The problem of European unification was seen in isolation, exclusively from the European perspective. The great event of the second phase of European unification, in which we now find ourselves, was introduced by the realization of the problems of developing countries, and this has made it possible to place the European problem in this correlation. This is also the way M. Hessel appears to view it. We find ourselves, and that is the common world image with which youth can identify itself, in one phase of the establishment of a world order. It is taking place through the reciprocal action of major spheres adjusting to each other, of continents, of regions.

As a matter of fact, for Europe the situation is different than for some of the other major spheres and regions. Europe's efforts to join the ranks and to find its place in a new world implies a regression in so far as Europe must abjure its world ideology. Europe, as a major sphere, has become a partner among partners. Here, however, appears to me to lie the decisive problem of European unification because by recognizing others as partners or being recognized as a partner, we must simultaneously loosen our hold on an extensive series of thought habits constituting the singular and the specific of the European, and in their place we must find something new.

The Frenchman is a member of the grande nation. The German can state that he stands in a historic development of two-thousand years. The European, however, who must deal with Asiatic or African partners, does not yet know what role he will play in this correlation.

Bondy

We have now, as I see, reached the difficulties of being a European. I hope that in the course of the evening we shall come back to the possibilities of being Europeans.

Rest

We spoke of the education of the European - whether it is right to take a step that is not the next step, but the second or even the third. It is, therefore, very much a question whether the Project "Europe" of which Mr. Sombart spoke relating to the viewpoint of training men, is specifically the phase which is posed to us as a present task. But under the viewpoint of how we shall educate our youth and our peoples to become Europeans, I am of the opinion, we must first seek to delineate this Project Europe. In the process of educating, it is necessary clearly to see the immediate goals otherwise we shall make more difficult the tasks which at the moment youth, and also these peoples, cannot by any means fulfill. To awaken a European sense of citizenship means that this sense of citizenship must first have been lived, and if one has not lived it and lived it thoroughly, very likely one has not the capacity to pass through the succeeding phases.

Coulmas

We have been cautioned not to think so much of the difficulties, but the difficulties of being a European do exist and little is gained by talking them into nonexistence. For that reason I should like to pose the question, whether the possibility exists at all to draw up a European education and to disseminate it as long as there is no European ego from the spirit of which this education would emanate.

For what is meant by European education is after all evidently not the continuation of the two-thousand year tradition of education rooted in Greece, rather an education, although it does tie up with it, that is nevertheless an active and modern expression of life of today's Europe, in statu nascendi uniting politically, a Europe whose existence is being elbowed and threatened by the two powers on the wings, the United States and Russia, but at the same time being provoked and encouraged by them to form and to consolidate itself in a new form. I therefore repeat: can this Europe not yet extant or extant for the moment as wish and conception, a Europe not yet capable of acting as a juridical person, can this Europe design and propagate an education of its own?

Does not this attempt resemble the undertaking previously stressed by Mr. Bondy, namely, developing citizenism without a state?

At this point one will object: no force is so dynamic and so out-going as the preconception, the postulate. The world today, as an example, is full of nationalisms and nationalists searching for their nations - nations which actually do not exist but whose existence the nationalists claim. Should not the Europeans proceed in the same manner and back a European education, a Europeanism, so to speak, so that Europe might obtain an ego?

Moreover, one will further interpose, Europe has developed a model of education that has become authoritative not only for us but for the entire world, finding its most recent expression in the technological civilization.

That, now, is certainly correct. But especially in the last-named characteristic - the dissemination of European education throughout the world - lies today's crux. One says that modern technological civilization is a gift of Europe to the world. That it is. But the world has not accepted it as such, it just usurped it. European civilization has become the world's standard civilization. It has been declared universal, belonging to all, and illegally denied many till now. In one word, European education no longer belongs to us; we therefore cannot recognize ourselves in it again, cannot declare it to be a specifically European education.

Bondy

In our conversation we have reached the parting of the ways between the Europe of established nations and the Europe of the "supranational" unity coming into being. It is no longer a case of a term of unity, such as we can postulate and derive from the past of European culture. Sonette, sonata, novel, numerous forms of art came into being on a European never on a national plane. It is a matter of unity as a new form of life and of education of the European presupposing this new form of life. Now, is this presupposition the attitude of an "elite" or can it, should it attempt to form the peoples, the people of Europe through education in the widest sense of the word?

Meyer-Abich

Your reference to the elite impels me to point to a moment, that Mr. Hessel previously stressed. I mean the role played by the masses. If Europe is to come into being, then it will come to pass not through the elites but through the masses; if that is to happen, then we need for all of Europe a language that the masses understand and speak. We cannot demand of everyone that they speak, in

the same measure, German, English, French, Spanish and Italian. The question which here poses itself is, which of these five languages is to become the European language. That it must be one language becomes especially clear if we recall the evolution of the United States. It was essential for the United States that it had one language. Although within the United States all European, Asiatic and other languages are cultivated, nevertheless the United States has one language in common and that is English. We, too, shall never attain to Europe and become Europe if we do not succeed in making one language the European language.

Coulmas

You mean the European mother tongue?

Meyer-Abich

No, naturally not a mother tongue, that is something everyone has - the European language of communication.

Bondy

Professor, at this table sit three muttering Swiss who do not go along with your theses.

Meyer-Abich

I beg to consider that I do not speak of the elite; for them it is a matter of course that they at least understand these five languages. But I speak of the masses, and of them one could at most demand that in addition to their mother tongue, they master another language from early youth on.

Walter

Mr. Meyer-Abich, we Swiss, for instance, have solved the language problem, in this connection, because all languages have equal rights and no unified language is demanded.

Meyer-Abich

Well, Switzerland is a small country.

Walter

That is all the more important for the other countries.

Bondy

I, too, would believe that Europe, in accordance with its historical roots, could better be compared with Switzerland than with the United States.

Schoberth

Mr. Meyer-Abich's question probably had to be asked in a European talk, even if in doing so he perhaps violated a taboo (would we here be able to make each other understand fruitfully if we used four, five languages with or against each other?). Surely Mr. Meyer-Abich is not a punch-card European; he meant no national tongue, as the philologists say, but a European commercial language, which should remove obstacles and assume practical-political, cultural, economic or better "technical" tasks. At least since founding of the EEC, everyone knows that our language communities are subject to new social conditions. They presuppose a spiritual lingua franca, whereby I do not mean a jointly practiced idiom, rather the mature comprehension for the way of life and the idiosyncrasy of European peoples as expressed through the medium of language. One should, therefore, learn more languages - that, indubitably, is a precondition for every type of European collaboration or solidarity; it prevents, moreover, the dreaded loss of individuality of the peoples. By the way, we, the European peoples, are in a position to trade in the form of the inner self of the other. Our languages are always the outline of the essentially European, and we are complete only within the spirit of Europe, as Heinrich Mann said, otherwise we are by turns piecemeal with insecure merit, the one in the eyes of the other.

Bondy

After this digression, we should turn again to the central question. How do we attack the Objective Europe?

Kogon

Our circumstances, our necessities and the complications we meet must be viewed from the goal we set ourselves. We ask ourselves which direction education should take while a "State of Europe" or the statehood of this Europe does not even exist. Well, as is known, national consciousness does not evolve from statehood but from a fullness of farther and deeper experiences; the European state of modern times is itself only one of the forms of nationhood. Renan, who asked the well-known question: "Qu'est-ce qu'une nation? C'est un plébescite jour par jour", gave the right answer long ago. I, therefore, am of the opinion, if the Europeans have the will to find their place in this so completely changed world, then they have to develop of a necessity the consciousness of solidarity of which M. Hessel spoke. They have no other choice. The solidarity of existence is typical of the neo-European. If the Europeans have this will, then they will attempt to conform the political forms to this will, or develop new forms. Statehood, therefore, is not primary, as appears to me. It has to be added onto - I in no way deny that - but I do not consider it as an irri-missible precondition. But as concerns the new solidarity, I cannot there find a sharp antagonism between European and global.

Rest

I agree with you completely, but I ask myself whether, what you state is possible in the educational process.

Kogon

That is something we must speak of later; but first let me evolve an idea further.

Mr. Sombart pointed out that present-day world events constitute regression for the Europeans. Certainly, however, under the presupposition that we do not understand how to carry through necessary transformations, isn't that so? If the Europeans actually would look upon their Europeanization primarily from the aspect of the question: "Whence?" then they would get no farther than history and their traditions. Two psychic characteristics appear to me, then, to be significant for the condition in which we find ourselves: fear and arrogance. Both are unsuited to make possible the transformations required. The power of transformation of the European, however, appears to me certainly to be a given fact.

A further remark regarding this: I find that the history of all of us should be considered and treated not so much with a view to its contents as with a view to the power, the individuality, the play of forces we have developed in individual phases. Stéphane Hessel has already hinted at this in his introduction: An example: during the intermission Dr. Altmann said to me he thought that peradventure thomism within the sphere of the Catholic Church is now proving itself quite sterile. I agreed with him, only I am not of the opinion that this is how it has to be - namely, not then when one makes one's own the original force of Thomas of Aquinas, as far as one is able to do so, the man, who took over the heathen Aristotle from Judaic-Arabian sources, and by doing so proved he had a tremendous power of transformation, of admitting into his thought and productively transforming alien contents, using it against Averroism, the materialistic-philosophic danger of his times.

Bondy

Could you perhaps refer this thought directly to the present?

Kogon

That is what I meant! That, precisely, is our task, the task of the Europeans. If today, with the same courage we are able to process in a European manner, assimilating but transforming, certain contents that appear markedly, for instance in the Asiatic and above all the Soviet Russian, then, I believe, we shall very much be able not to consider present history as a regression.

Bondy

But actually what contents?

Kogon

One can, naturally, only hint at it. Take the relationship between personalism and collectivism: no doubt it was the individual that the bourgeoisie culture of the past 150 years was directed to in Europe, and going out from Europe - not for all classes equally! The result, as everyone knows and comes to feel a hundredfold in the "administered world", is not the most consoling. To it is added the radical counter tendency of the Communists. Would it then not be right and desirable, to permit oneself to be challenged by the collectivist developments - which, after all, come into evidence multifariously in our own present-day civilization - to undertake the systematic attempt in the industrial society, with the help of, for example, daring decentralization, made possible by the modern electric-power industry, to impel forms of organization which would permit the individualized and collectivized individual in somewhat of an inner and outer harmony to revert again to a person, something that, after all, was the real meaning of the original efforts of Europe toward productivity? Instead, our fate is left essentially to the impulses evoked by the profit motive, to developments emanating from military requirements and to the effect of our remnants of tradition.

In order further to elucidate what I mean on hand of an example of the forming of consciousness.

In our European history nationalism has, among other things, played the very important role of developing collective forces and capacitating them to fight against the system of domination by absolutism. Nationalism of the Arabs today is the intransigence and intensification against colonialism or what they mean colonialism to be. If the Arabs should prove incapable of transforming nationalism, then, indeed, this could lead to a catastrophe - for us and for them. It must be one of the European tasks to see through this process of which we are capable because we have been scientifically trained to be critical of ideologies; we are the only ones in the whole world. If we then continue being solicitous of suitable cooperation in all we do, timely, correct and unceasing cooperation that convinces, then, I find that we shall render an essential contribution to the new world of solidarity of existence.

Walter

Our discussion today, after all, refers to two problems. One problem concerns ideology, the other problem institutions. What are the possibilities from the standpoint of institutions? What are the possibilities from the standpoint of ideology? I believe, one statement may be made: to expect that in the next generation the training of European masses, i. e., the broad population of the various countries, to become Europeans is, in my opinion, impossible of realization. For this we have no practical possibilities.

If one speaks of European education, then one can actually treat only the question of a European education within the framework or in the meaning of an elite called upon for definite political decisions. But another problem is added, namely, the question in what institutions such an education is to be based and to what situation this European organization should lead, if at all. If you consider the political development as a whole, then you have - I shall just take a single state - in this state, first of all, the community. There is the individual citizen of the community. In the state in question you also have the citizen of the community as citizen of the Kanton, as citizen of the Departement or as citizen of the province.

Bondy

I cannot quite surmise what you mean.

Walter

I purposely said Departement. The institutions in the various nations differ. Then, finally, comes the so-called national state. And now the road should lead, after all that more or less is the basic idea, to an intermediate sort of organization, conceived and instituted between the UN and these national states. For this intermediate institution a very definite ideology would have to be established. That, basically, is what we are discussing: what ideology can be established in order to give this European state, no matter what form it will assume, a spiritual foundation? I believe, one cannot consider this entire question and merely disregard this institution making some world-view structure or other. Rather, it is necessary to gain an idea how, after all, this European institution is to be formed. In order to make the discussion more concrete, I therefore take an example from Swiss history.

Swiss history, in this connection, is very instructive. Prior to 1798 we had a league of states of 13 "localities" (with so called associated localities). Here one could draw a parallel: the "Six" and the associated "Seven". That, approximately, would be the situation. Then came the invasion of Switzerland by the French Army in 1798, the collapse of the old state organization, a new social

structure and, then, the attempt to introduce centralism. What happened? This centralism did not work. The question of the "lingua franca" was conjoined. Why should we, in Europe, demand a standard language? So that by that very means language struggles with their passion be provoked? While actually today the problem is how to moderate.

What happened in Switzerland after 1800? In 1803 Napoleon forced a constitution on Switzerland, such as Switzerland, after 50 years of political struggles, realized in a similar form in 1848. Napoleon had recognized what was possible, actually, in the Swiss situation: a combination of centralism and federalism.

For that reason, attaining to the European through education cannot be divorced from the political institutions, in my opinion. One cannot conceive of Europe within the meaning of a centralistic system, whereby this very danger of the centralistic system, as appears to me, lies hidden behind the policies of de Gaulle because de Gaulle is the representative of a state organized centralistically, much more centralistically than most people dream who visit France. It is precisely this fact that appears to me to be essential.

We cannot separate the useful basis of the institutions and of the ideology, rather, we must place them in reference with each other. If that is not observed, if from the very beginning it is not assumed that the ideology is only the reflection, quasi a mental auxiliary of possible institutions, we shall accomplish little practically. In other words: Europe, as a political organization, is only possible as a "combination of centralism and federalism", a European ideology can only become effective in history if it protects the cultural and linguistic independence of the minorities, its members.

Bondy

Therefore, educating Europeans to think European presupposes a definite image of what this Europe could be; and not simply in general what one could distill from Europe from ideals.

Sombart

I would only say: the Europe idea is at the moment not a positive plan, rather is it something exacted of the Europeans. And the inquiry after the European Ego cannot be answered solely from the side of Europe. It results from a series of external necessities coming upon Europe, necessities that must be defined and described from a situation of constraint. Nevertheless, whoever participated in the last UNESCO conference does not inquire about the European subject. As soon as one departs from European territory, it immediately becomes clear to one what is meant by Europe and European tasks. It is only a problem for the Europeans themselves because for them the European destiny has come about via the national. This was a process within time limits; its effect was decisive, however, because it coincided with the expansion of the entire school system.

Mohler

We keep speaking here of "attaining to the European through education". Apparently someone has to be educated. That, in turn, permits of the conclusion that something is evidently not as it should be. Let's be honest: this whole Europe is not firmly grounded, somehow; all the Europe plans are somewhat air-drawn. With them one cannot get close to the masses. Whence this effect? I believe there are two reasons. The first reason - I should like to establish that with a catchword (please pardon me if I operate with catchwords, but it is a little faster this way) - the "teacher's pet complex". What after all does the man in the street see of this "Europe?" First of all he sees economic groups, which apparently out of economic and technical considerations deem it necessary that Europe unite. Very well, that he can understand. In addition, however, groups of idealists make themselves noticed; they place within this "Europe" very definite ideological contents. Europe, for them, is not merely a merging of related forces but, if one avows Europe, one is better than before doing so. I shall just let that stand as a premise. But permit me to state the conclusion right off that I should like to draw from it: there must be no discrimination, especially no ideological discrimination, otherwise Europe will not permit itself to be established. I am thinking for example of Spain - just as much as I am thinking of certain groups within certain nations. We can speak of this later.

Second point. I consider it wrong if the nations are called the real enemy of European efforts. God knows I am not a Gaullist, but I find that the nation and nationalism are made into the devil. After all, nationalism, in the real meaning of the word, does not place one's own nation above others, but instead merely states: my nation is that which is closest to me. That is the sense of nationalism. As a thesis I should like to propose: Europe can only be created through the nations. Divers examples could be quoted thereto. I should like to proceed from the French example, with which I am better

acquainted after many years of residence in France. In France there were (and are) those two groups of which I spoke. On one side those one calls the "technocrats"; thoroughly notable experts on administration, economy and technology who, as is known, have few supporters in French politics. On the other side the groups of idealists: often persons who embody both groups at the same time. Well, now, it appears to me very typical that these two forces, the greatest supporters of the Europe idea in France, never let it come to a genuine political decision. It therefore is not happenchance that Robert Schuman never held a plebescite - and what Mendes-France (unjustly in ill repute with the "Europeans") then did was not a stab in the back but a salutary disclosure of the actual relationship of strength. I find that one oversimplifies in condemning all hesitation concerning "Europe". Especially the Germans have it very easy: if one no longer is a nation, is instead a partitioned, an amputated nation, it requires no special effort to preach the surmounting of the nationalist stage. However one does - doesn't one - have to premise upon the fact that the French very probably are the closest knit nation in Europe. What I mean to say I want to sum up in a depiction: when de Gaulle offers Europe the skin off one knuckle, that is much more than when Monnet and Schuman offer a handful right off. For what Monnet and Schuman offer, remains platonic; what de Gaulle begrudges can be realized.

Rest

May I interrupt you? Would you agree if I said: just as in Germany the Bavarians are Bavarians and the Saxons of Lower Saxony are Saxons, in the same way the Germans in Europe should be Germans?

Mohler

Permit me to formulate it on hand of the example of the Bretons. The Breton movement of today differs in two regards from that between the two World Wars; first, the emphasis now is no longer on folklore but rather on the economic (i. e., the economic neglect of the Bretagne); secondly, today's Breton movement is no longer inclined separatistically, does not want to sever itself from France. What brought about this miracle? Well, quite simply the Europe idea. What the Bretons expect of "Europe" they have summed up in one sentence - the formulation is Yann Fouéré's: "The Breton room on the story of France in the house of Europe." For them, therefore, this "Europe" is expressly something that protects their individuality, that screens them against centralism there, where centralism is not necessary.

Bondy

Armin Mohler views a Europe the superstructure of which rests on nations without destroying them or abjuring them, and wishes that the nation should not destroy smaller communities through centralism but let them live and have value. But the conflict between national interest, understood in a narrow and exclusive sense, and a common European weal can take place nevertheless, perhaps not due to an actual clash of interests but rather for lack of comprehensive understanding; and in every nation today there are "Europeans", who interpret it as their concern to place this common European weal into the foreground again and again. Do we need such Europeans and if we do, how can we see to it that they gain in influence?

Hessel

I should naturally like very much that we soon return to the question: educating Europeans to think European. But we do have to know, perhaps more precisely than has been evolved up to now in the discussion, what we consider this European to be. Here, there are - aren't there - two images very clearly contrasted. One can picture a Europe, the left-over of the bygone great European expansionism of the 19th and even the 18th Century. One can say: we states, possessed of certain privilege especially concerning culture, we want to defend this culture jointly against the incursion from without of the conformism of ideas and ideologies in general. We have this high culture, we bury it here in our Europe, and then we pursue a European cultural policy making use of this instrument that can now be probably employed in conjunction with economic means, in order to continue to keep our privilege position in the world, even though it no longer rests upon military or other power.

This attitude I naturally consider very dangerous. I believe, moreover, that actually a different European image grows dynamically out of the history of Europe as a whole. Europeans, namely, at no point in time of their history have considered themselves definitely as ordained. Their specific attitude toward humanity is that humanity finds itself in the midst of a continual process of development. For that reason Europe is not a geographical unit, it also is not Western Europe or Eastern Europe or a mixture of them both. Europe is a cultural attitude toward the problems of humanity. Europe, above all,

is the content of a schooling and of an education. In most of the European countries and peoples, education is, to a certain degree, already European. We already experience our world not so much as nations but against the background of a general history. But this extended Europe has, up to now, not assumed any specific tasks. It has hidden itself somewhat from them. It has said: "Probably, Communism is, after all, a better formula for certain developing countries than our parliamentary democracy." "Yes, the Americans, they have so much money, they have so many possibilities, they should now occupy themselves somewhat more with the world. We can now take it easy. We have lived through our times and we can now rest on our privileges a little while." Such an attitude in an expanded world is, in my opinion, the great danger for Europeans. The world has expanded and has become more unified. Every undertaking has become more difficult and exposed to greater dangers. But especially of dangers such as these Europeans have never shied back; they have always been excited by them, have always been attracted by them. And, I believe, we should permit ourselves to be attracted by these tasks. We should train our children in such a way that they, by themselves, assume these tasks.

If we give them such an education, just as the Renaissance Humanists imbued their younger generations (only the elite, however, not the masses - that is the big difference) with the desire to change the world, in like manner we can bestow on our children the hope of evolving the Project Europe as a grand idea. I immediately add that Europe no longer can remain the sole great project - should be or will be. Other projects will come up. But I believe that an education can only address itself to a grand project. If it addresses itself to a limited project, it ceases to be true education; it is then probably mere conforming. And, I believe, the great danger, precisely in the sphere of technical economy, is that education becomes conforming; in other words, that people are taught how to conform completely to a society. But that is not an education.

Bondy

Thank you, that takes us squarely back to our topic. I believe Mr. Altmann wanted to say something a little while ago.

Altmann

It appears necessary to me to find a dividing line between two conceptions of European education or cultural policies. The one conception could look thus, that one needs a common organization. To it belongs the exchange of teachers, to it belongs finding the antitoxin for nationalistic interpretation of history, to it belongs perhaps the interchangeableness of diplomas, the contact between universities, and such more. That is one thing one would have to welcome and which doubtlessly also has effects of content on European education. The other question, however, and this question appears to me to be touched upon here is whether there can be a common European education, a higher education of "the" European. That appears to me an ideology that does not, without further ado, conform with the facts. Is a consciousness of history manipulatable?

Rest

Yes, one can do that.

Altmann

That is what you say. For me, in any event, it is questionable whether one can do that without further ado. We would have to have a complementary discourse concerning it. But for now I repeat: my doubts concerning European higher education, as presented here, do not concern the necessity of such an exchange, this community organization similar to the lowering of tariff barriers. But on the other hand: is it not known that all European nations are faced by the difficulty of maintaining their consciousness of history at all? Could not the very integration of Europe lead to a deformation of this consciousness of history?

Bondy

Is there not also in nationalism a deformation of the consciousness of history?

Altmann

Yes, yes, of course. But I mean a termination of the consciousness of history. You see, if in Germany one is as European as one is, that means at the same time - it might be a coincidence but I do not believe so - that one is nothing at all; that today you ask a normal deputy in Bonn concerning the past

fifty years of German history, of German foreign policy, and he can no longer give one an accurate answer. In addition there is a whole series of Ersatz-ideologies. Just think of the Europe mania in Germany. Professor Kogon mentioned the example of the Roman Church. There are the quite beautiful words of a famous Frenchman, who said: "The last great pillars of a European representation were the British House of Lords, the Prussian General Staff, the Roman College of Cardinals, and the Académie Française. This Roman Church, which we still conceive as an arch-European power, will today have to turn her back on a united Europe. It will even have to attempt to attain to a "de-Europeanization" of Catholic theology.

I saw a "European" book that was distributed among young people. It was a splendidly printed book. In it, Berlin was pictured as the "super-caravansary of the East." That just happened to the European Six. Mr. Sombart can give exact information on this. In it they did not even know where the Danube flows. Knowledge about Central and Eastern Europe was that exact!

Bondy

Europe is timely to such a degree that even very bad publishers make hay while the sun shines. Europe cannot be blamed for it.

Altmann

It was not a bad publisher; those were great authors. I want to terminate the matter by pointing something out. Shortly before the erection of the wall in Berlin, I met with students from the Russian Zone. They knew that probably there soon would be no further chance to come to the West and they all wanted to stay over there, for ethical religious reasons. These people said: "And now, are we actually dismissed from European history?" Mr. Sombart says yes so beautifully by referring to the fact that the British, after all, relinquished India.

But it might be that our fellow countrymen expect of us that we carry on the conflict for them spiritually because for the foreseeable future re-unification is not possible; that we show them the path to travel in this Eastern sphere of power. That, too, belongs to the European consciousness of history.

I do not mean thereby to turn against a European consciousness, I only want to say: if we do not include this far-reaching sphere, then we are not realistic, and all facts of European integration, as established at the moment within the framework of the "Six" are not facts sufficient to be able to detain the course of history of All-Europe.

Bondy

I am happy that something provocative was said, and I should like to comment that every time a few Europeans get together and attempt to be Europeans, there is always one who says: "Yes, but look at all the ones remaining outside." But, if no Europeans get together, everyone will remain outside, on the other side of the door. In such a case, there will be no Europeans at all.

Coulmas

I should like to side with Mr. Hessel against Europe-defeatism. If we give up and say: "We have made our contribution and can now withdraw", then our chances are really very slim. To have the will to give the world something of our own, therein lies our chance. However, wherein lies what we have to give? You say that the specifically European was the unrest, the diversity, the open-heartedness, the undogmatic, the not-committing-oneself-to-something, rather to let others obtain the floor also, the minority, the opposition, the opposing side - give them the opportunity to unfold. This play of forces has transformed itself in the course of the past century in a definite manner, and that mainly into what one calls the European work morale, the European ethics of labor, that wish without reason and not capable of being based on reason, existing only out of itself: to transform the world. With it, Europe has changed the world. Today actually all of humanity desires for itself the success of this spirit of work. "We want to have it as good as you", that is the sentence most often heard in developing countries; occasionally it is: "We want to be as efficient as you." But do the non-Europeans want or can they take over this spirit of work (by the way, nothing is said concerning its merit)?

Bondy

Yes, Mr. Coulmas, but in this sphere is not the United States more European than Europe itself?

Coulmas

Certainly, a branch, an affiliation. Only, my question to Mr. Hessel refers to those parts of the world that are not an offshoot of Europe. Concerning these countries I therefore ask: is the spirit of work exportable? Can it be assimilated by other regions of the world? Is it something we actually can give to the others? Or does this spirit only grow and flourish under definite preconditions? Is this a chance for the unification of the world under the European banner, or does this chance not exist at all?

Bondy

No, my dear Mr. Coulmas. We cannot go into your individual questions at the moment. In the final analysis, you too say that the attaining to the European through education presupposes a definite image of education, that cannot simply be distilled from ideals.

Kogon

I should like to refer directly to Mr. Altmann's line of thought.

Relinquishment of forms of domination and positions of domination is not identical with relinquishment of the problematic proposition going far beyond this relinquishment. Concerning this we agree, don't we, Dr. Altmann? Thus, for instance, I can relinquish the world position of imperialism and withdraw to other positions of domination, having to transform them, but nevertheless avail myself of the experience, taking advantage of it within the context of necessary world changes of today by carrying over into the new situations the consciousness of the problem. Secondly, I would say, that the establishment of new domestic forms of domination is not identical with a spiritual retreat, but, to the contrary, rather the attempt to gain a basis of security in order to get oneself in hand again, then to be able to sally forth with the forces of which M. Hessel spoke as essentially characteristic of Europeans.

I could therefore very well conceive of the possibility that in this Europe as organized by the "Six", namely, of the tariff barriers, as M. Bondy called it, a type of division of labor is undertaken in the European sense of the word regarding the tasks, with reference to the spiritual, political and cultural set of problems, and secondly, also concerning the type of solution. Thus, the Germans would have to give priority to the resolution of the problem of relationships with the Slavs by implementing corresponding policies, something they are not doing at all today. If they were to do this, they naturally should not do so in the spirit of the old national state, but would have to undertake it in the European spirit. Who could be more interested than the Germans to solve these difficulties which cannot be resolved, precisely, from the standpoint of the national state? And as they are partitioned, it is, after all, easier for them, as someone correctly stated. Although it is easier, they do not do so because they are bogged down in their past. Here, after all, in the purely political sphere, lies a problem of education.

Mohler

No, they do not do so as long as they feel that if they do, they must abandon the other Germans.

Kogon

No, the reverse: the Germans should cudgel their brains, and not only theoretically, how they can avoid abandoning them, but instead bring them into a better situation, together with the other Europeans, namely, with the Western Slavs. This presupposes a new relationship with the Russians and that, after all, is the problem.

Bondy

After the experience of many discussions in this country, I should just like to say: if you start to talk of German reunification, you will not talk of anything else this evening.

Kogon

Mr. Bondy wanted practical examples. Hardly have I taken the most important and the situation becomes so critical that he says, it would be advisable to choose others. Very well, I shall choose another example: Algiers. But there we are just as well off, aren't we? But to what avail: everyone knows that I was not thinking of reunification at all but of a change in the total status, which includes within itself a change in the partial status, and this change is possible on a European basis only. A division of labor in the specific type of answers, that is a European possibility. It goes far beyond the organization of the "Six" and could be cultivated far beyond that even.

Hess

In your introductory remarks, Mr. Bondy, you spoke of the danger of politicalizing education. It appears to me that you consider this danger as something very undesirable and still something very urgent. If it were carried out as contained in the plan of which Mr. Schwamm spoke, namely, if the teacher is given a short manual in which is laid down why, in the present situation of Europe in history and politics, a type of European unification is necessary and even appears inescapable, then, as far as I am concerned, that is not yet the politicalization of education but rather an explanation of existing facts. And the person being educated has to build on that, has to form his own opinion.

I do not believe that in this wise one brings himself into the danger of propagandizing some particular European ideology, a European Ideology which, like every other ideology, is alien to the European way of thinking. It is enough to give the people the facts from which they can draw their own conclusions that something has to be done but leaving them the liberty to decide the form in which this European unification has to be approached.

If we are convinced of something, why shouldn't we stand up for it? And if we are convinced of something, why shouldn't we tell the young people that we are convinced, and why? And why shouldn't we acquaint them with it, not in order to force it on them but to lay it before them for their own critical examination.

A second point: such an education includes within itself two dangers. The first, that the presentation of historical and political developments, especially since the second World War, could cause an attitude, among the young people too, similar to that of a herd of sheep when the wolf slinks around them, namely, that European unification is not considered as action but as reaction, as a crawling back into the pillbox. This, in my opinion, can lead to, and I believe it has-already in part led to Europeans losing their self-confidence, although naturally, on the other hand, the danger of arrogance is present, to which Professor Kogon has already referred.

A second danger is that this tearing down of nationalistic slat fences could lead to a further marked use of stereotyped phrases in a necessarily simplified teaching process, phrases that today are already causing so much damage.

Thirdly, concerning the exchange of teachers it would have to be said, that it appears to me, the problem of the social security of these teachers is causing difficulties. However, if there have been ways and means, within the framework of European communities, to establish and daily apply in practice a European order for the social security of migrant workers, then there should be a possibility and the ways to work out such a solution for the social security of exchange teachers.

This is my suggestion and I do not know whether it is a new one: in the attaining to the European through education, it is especially important to refer to the fact that in the various states exist differences of viewpoint. A Frenchman views the Great Revolution with other eyes than a German. That, in my opinion, is the point that up to now in no system of teaching has been emphasized sufficiently. I believe, it could be helpful there if not only teachers but also parts of textbooks were exchanged. Why not teach French history to Germans using a French textbook? Why not teach English history on hand of an English textbook?

Bondy

I would have believed the reverse, that it would be good for the French to learn French history from a German textbook.

Hess

Yes, that is what I wanted to suggest. Perhaps I did not express myself clearly enough. If a German student has to learn French history - fortunately he has to - why shouldn't he learn it from a French textbook? Contrariwise for the French. When the Frenchman has to learn German history, why not from a German textbook? And why not use a German textbook for Frenchmen studying French history?

Schoberth

Naturally, that would be exemplary but one should avoid illusory hopes on this point. A history book, after all, is not a chemistry book. It is, of itself, much to ask of mixed commissions at work, to expect them to create an ideally typical European interpretation of history, acceptable to the various national schools.

Dönhoff

I should very much like to guide the discussion back to the beginning. We first asked ourselves: how, actually does the world today look? And then we asked: how can the younger generation be educated? In doing so we strangely enough - and that I feel to be a sort of contradiction - implied that the point in question was educating the young person to become a European. To tell the truth, when I picture to myself the modern world, I personally feel that educating to form a European is almost an anachronism. While the discussion touched on this, I had to think of the bonmot that is going the rounds in Israel: "This is a state in which the parents learn the mother tongue from the children." If one translated this, one could say, for today's younger generation, terms such as Europe are something utterly self-explanatory. Thus, before we think about, and cudgel our brains, how Europe is to be taught, one would have to ask: how can we teach Europe to the elder generation?

In this connection, I believe that Europe - I must really excuse myself for saying such a thing at such a meeting - is already somewhat antiquated in a context of the history of the spirit. If I have to succeed in overcoming this modern world and, in a manner of speaking, furnish my own tools to do so, then Europe no longer is a waystation. If, however, I have to succeed in overcoming concrete present-day politics, namely the East-West conflict, then I must confirm what Mr. Altmann said, then indeed I find that what we understand Europe to be is unspeakably small.

How do we imagine we shall get out of this partitioned world in which we find ourselves? I must admit that the wall was built by the other side, materially - but spiritually we have solidified it. And if one speaks of Europe at all - not only, so to speak, in the commercial sense of the word of tariff barriers and the Common Market - then, I believe, our goal should be to somehow give our lost European members the opportunity to associate themselves again, to express it in modern terminology.

I see a great danger therein that this Group of the Six is made "impermeable", so to speak; that something very strange is happening: while the monolithic block in the East disintegrates, we do everything in our power to create a monolithic block in the West, integrated economically, politically and militarily. And, once our goal is reached, there will be absolutely no possibility for the Eastern Europeans, for instance, to live between the blocks. Therein I see a danger; for our concrete political goal, after all, should be to loosen the periphery of the Eastern empire, i. e., to find a possibility to give countries such as Poland, Hungary, the opportunity to associate themselves - not politically or militarily, that's something we cannot expect of them, but at least economically. That, however, is not possible precisely at the point of our creating a European ideology (Mr. Coulmas called it "Europeanism"). There must always exist the possibility to initiate this process - even if today it still appear unrealistic.

Bondy

That is the most massive attack against everything we have thought tonight, and I find that it would be well, if what will be said now, not hold fast to what has been said previously, but that it be taken into account; for, I believe, these really are fundamentally, completely different conceptions, conceptions from which the topic of educating Europeans to think European should not, in the first place, have been posed.

Dönhoff

I would not have dared to say what I did if you had not stated one could also make angry comments.

Bondy

What I said just now I meant in a positive sense, because what you said should lead us to become conscious of what we really mean fundamentally.

Schoberth

Your standpoint, Countess, as understandable as it is - in decisive points it gives us every reason to re-think and think over - appears to me, nevertheless, to have been presented from a very personal standpoint, especially where your point of inception is the younger generation. If youth shared the line of thought M. Hessel has presented to us, if it thought in European associations as a matter of course, perhaps our discussion tonight would be easier. For the youth of all political inclinations of the twenties, for example, Europe was also a matter of course - and then again, in the long run, it was not. This Europe must be striven for, it must be experienced. From the standpoint of my work, I cannot with an exuberance comparable to yours say that for this youth, so impoverished as concerns real expression, Europe already is a matter of course. At the moment it would interest me, on what you base your experience.

Dönhoff

On many, many conversations with youngsters, who consider, with a wry smile, our tortuous thinking about nationalism or the supranational as a funny sign of old age.

Sombart

How strange, that not the institutions . . .

Dönhoff

No, that is something else, Mr. Sombart. I began with the question of the education of youngsters. I believe that the governments should do something toward this end, and they are on a good road to establish the institutions, to prepare the way. But the consciousness of which was spoken here, that it had to be schooled and ideologies established, that, in my opinion, is useless.

Paulsen

I ask myself, whether all the people of our continent actually will be in a position, merely through mental effort, to discover this "Europe". We should state explicitly that we want "Europe", because we have become convinced that within the natural borders of Europe we can better fulfill the tasks of our times than on the former plane of national states. If we avow Europe, we shall, I believe, be able to view all previously discussed problems of education as very conventional and purposeful matters.

If, however, it is a question of arousing enthusiasm among youth for - "Europe" - a great new task, then it does not appear to me to be a good starting point if we all say that, after all, at the moment, Europe is to us nothing more than the avowal of the coercion of hard-and-fast political realities.

I believe, for this reason, that all of us should strive to describe clearly and unequivocally those new great tasks we mean when we speak of Europe, in order, thus, to impel our youth to become especially active. We have up to now been satisfied with naming a few cue-words - that is what I believe.

The creation of a "European law" has already been mentioned once, and a "European social policy" has also been mentioned. But that is not enough. It remains for us to state concretely what conceptions are conjoined individually with these cue-words. We must state the progress we all expect. But we should also, I believe, make the effort to designate the services our grand old Europe is capable of rendering to the remaining parts of the world. In this connection it appears to me sufficient to point to the developing countries, of which we spoke at various times already, although in a somewhat different connection.

Let us consider again the practical things already spoken of at our Round Table - the desirability of speaking several languages, exchange of students and teachers - are all these not merely means to enable our peoples to cooperate in the European standard of measurement?

All that - exchange of teachers and students, the capacity to speak several languages - will surely advance the responsive understanding of the peoples of Europe. But does it of itself describe the goal we wish all peoples of Europe to have?

Mr. Hessel, you said in your introductory remarks, it appeared to you to be very much a question of "doing something for Europe" and not only "talking about Europe". If I have repeated that correctly, I want to second your appeal with this, my contribution, to the discussion.

But permit me to say something further concerning a point understandably dear to my heart as a trade unionist - European social policy.

Please do not underestimate the difficulties which immediately result when it is a matter of determining a goal on which all European states are probably willing to agree at the present moment in time. We are very much in a position to generalize far-reachingly and to find formulas which all recognize as valid. But when one proceeds to evolve, to develop such formulas, then, very frequently, very rapidly, it becomes evident that the unification that made one happy, was made possible only by the preceding, far-reaching generalization.

Bondy

Mr. Paulsen, I want to heckle. If the "Six" of the Common Market, considered by the entire world as a revolutionary new fact and often deprecated only by us Europeans as something known, old and

antiquated, if these "Six" after long negotiations have agreed on how they can jointly help the new African states and together with them manage the economy, is that something concrete or is it something abstract?

Paulsen

That I would consider as something very much concrete. But I would be unequivocally happy about it only if now, already, I be permitted the conviction that the new African states acknowledge our will and our readiness to help them in overcoming their difficulties, acknowledge it as we would like to have it acknowledged. That, however, appears to me today not to be too certain.

Rest

It is difficult to think and discuss on two different levels of thought, on the political and the pedagogic. If I had had the opportunity to discuss with you - Mr. Altmann, Mr. Sombart and Countess Dönhoff - on the political plane, we would have agreed immediately and would not have clashed. It is completely erroneous to consider me suspect of Europeolatry or of Europeanism. What I wanted to touch upon was merely this, and for the moment it is something very abstract: the evolution of history we can master shows very clearly that the movement is toward ever larger units, toward larger social units in geographical space, and Europe is one of the more immediate larger units; Europe for us is an iterated form of speech freighted by history, clearly cognizable in culture, sociology and economy, standing in a world pushing to much larger units or syntheses.

Fifty years ago Germany made history - or the Germans believed so, and the French perhaps thought to the very last days that France was making history. That, I believe, is past and gone. Europe today is making history in that here a unit of larger dimensions is ready and waiting, in which, at the same time, recently grown, historically grown things have to be brought into the barns. From these things, sights can be adjusted on larger units, larger units that have to be sighted in history and must be striven for.

In education it is always necessary to begin with such an iterated form of speech. You cannot present some vision or other for the future and tell youth where it should stand. That is why I spoke of the Project Europe because I hold this Project Europe to be a concrete image which one can make into the goal of higher education for our youth today enabling youth to view historical actuality from a higher locality. Perhaps this Europe is just a bigger cave, but into this bigger cave falls far more light than into the small caves of the individual national states. We must permit our youth to experience this phase, otherwise, from a pedagogic, if youth lives outside of history, it will be placed in situations it cannot master. Youth needs a definite share of responsibility in history it can grasp. It appears to me that this share is Europe, not because of Europeanism or Europeolatry, or the "Six" and what is building there now, but from the vantage point of the philosophy of history, that evolution is urging to ever larger units. Teilhard de Chardin, in 1939, wrote to his French friends that he had read in the newspapers of the Allies their war aim was to divide Germany. And he commented: "Are you past saving! Have you not read the signs of history? We must think of something quite different. After all, one cannot divide now that it is a matter of closing ranks, of finding larger communities of life, and spheres of life, of economic activity." One must neither narrow down nor disperse and thus it appears to me: Europe is the next step, a step which will probably keep us busy another hundred years or more before it becomes meaningful pedagogically to serve larger spheres beyond Europe in this way. One should go ahead and test oneself in these larger spheres but the real task of education lies for us therein, first of all, historically to inform in the direction of Europe.

Altmann

What you are stating, Professor, why, that's mythology!

Rest

Why is that mythology?

Altmann

I shall tell you. Mythology is not an entirely correct expression, it is meant to discredit something. The British Empire was essentially larger. You say, Europe stands in a great historical process, in a world historical process, in which ever larger units are born. That is not true, instead, if today the English join the Common Market ...

Rest

Pardon. This England certainly was larger in territory, but in its thinking it was English, exclusively English. And in these spheres England made English history and in no event anything else.

Altmann

There you are, English was European, after all, and that was an identity.

Rest

For the English!

Schoberth

Is it not always and again exciting to see how thinking along continental lines can lead to a false interpretation of England's present-day position in Europe - precisely from the viewpoint of our topic and in looking toward the Asiatic and African peoples that have become restive.

Altmann

It is doubtlessly so that if France today joins other states, it is because she has lost her imperial sphere. Certainly, the world is growing larger and the tendency toward large spheres is recognizable but as concerns Europe - hasn't it become clear and evident here? - it signifies a narrowing of its livelihood. Europe dominated a large sphere, for us Europeans world history was merely European history, and to this conception we have bid goodbye today. I am not an opponent of integration, I must stress that once more, but mustn't we realize that Europe came into being after the second World War through American midwifery and because the European nations had nearly ruined themselves. They were no longer capable of maintaining their identity unless they combined. That this results economically in a new power I do not want to gainsay, however, we cannot simply state: it is evidence of a tendency to greater units. No, it is a diminution.

Rest

Quantitatively it is, perhaps, a diminution but in no event qualitatively.

Sombart

The European cultural policy was actually born in New Delhi at the great Conference of the UNESCO, where suddenly the chief British delegate, as representative of the British delegation with us in the European Council had till then been the slowest ship of the fleet, the convoy having to fix its speed accordingly, realized in a Saul-Paul experience, what Europe is. He said, that if in the spirit of a new solidarity we did not now jointly organize European problems, then we would simply be lost. Said it, returned, and now is director of the Culture Section of the Council of Europe. Problems of organization and problems of education go together closely. And here I should really like to ask where you, Countess Dönhoff, met these youngsters to whom Europe is self-explanatory.

My real problem, I meet it again and again, and to my consternation among the young as well as among people my age (not only Mr. Altmann) is the question: where, after all, do the resistances, these strange emotionalisms come from? I can only explain them to myself by the fact that, after all, it is not a matter of enthusiasm for a grand task, instead we must get on with a very unpleasant operation, of which we can hope that it will lead to new objectives.

Dönhoff

Do you mean resistance against the supranational, or do you mean resistance, for example, of General de Gaulle, who has been variously cited here this evening. What, actually, do you mean?

Sombart

Resistances against this process of the organization of European states considered necessary by really all of good will, an organization into a common economic and political association, capable of looking after European interests in the present world situation. These resistances are, I find, the interesting problem. Whereupon do they, after all, rest? It would be possible to make a long table of these resistances.

They appear among various strata, age groups, etc., with various clefs. I am ready to recognize a reality, if one shows me the values to which the reality today corresponds.

Schaeffler

Here, in this circle, it has surely become clear that as the ultimate objective we see Greater Europe. The question only is whether one today can say that all. My standpoint is: if Krushchev says the whole world will become communistic, then we can counter with: all of Europe will become European. That parts of Eastern Europe also belong to Europe that is, after all, self-explanatory.

What are the reasons we expect a Greater Europe in our sense of the word, a Greater Europe for which we should expand our education right now?

The Eastern European cultural wealth hardly differs from the Western and Central European. Human relationship being so great, can't we be considered as a unit?

Economically - not from today's standpoint but seen from the future standpoint - it is absolutely necessary to attain to Greater Europe. Once Smaller Europe is extant, one will recognize later that Greater Europe is also a requisite, i. e., a Europe including Eastern and Southern Europe.

From this result two questions:

1. Is it possible to tell Western Europeans today that we should think in terms of Greater Europe? One very probably can tell this to the Germans, perhaps one must tell them. The French, however, perhaps could not yet understand it so easily: they possibly would interpret it in such a way as if the Germans wanted to harness them, so to speak, in order with the French to seek revenge Eastward. But, after all, we do not mean the "German East", we mean the European East.

2. How could we navigate toward this objective of "Greater Europe"? Surely we realize that an expressly strong point of crystallization attracts. For

that reason the six EEC states are to be made such a point of crystallization. Once this structure is really strong, then it can attract all the rest. It must be very strong economically, industrially, commercio-politically, in foreign exchange - but also in its direction of thought, in its world view, so to speak.

Hessel

Commenting immediately on this last question, I should like to say a few words, perhaps from French experience.

I believe that there is no doubt that one cannot necessarily enthuse France over "Smaller Europe". Smaller Europe is perhaps an economically or politically interesting stage of development, but I believe no young Frenchman would like to imagine his future as separated culturally or economically, or politically, from England or from the other parts of Europe either.

On the other hand, I have often found that when one speaks with young Frenchmen concerning Europe, there immediately is a major difficulty. This difficulty, I find, always and again recurs in our discussion. Either one considers the world, and every intelligent person considers first the world and tells himself: what is the world situation, where is France, where am I in this world situation, and what can I do in order to take my rightful place in this world situation? And then Europe emerges for the first time as something simultaneously self-explanatory.

You were quite right, Countess, to say that that already is accepted as very much self-explanatory, and also as something limiting and to be overcome. Why should we, after all, point towards Europe, why should we not aim right off at a new order, a new social order of the world?

If one talks to young Frenchmen about their attitude concerning Europe, one soon finds that their great difficulty lies therein, that they have far-reaching cultural relations with all countries, including those outside of Europe. They feel themselves in close solidarity with Africa and also with Latin America, where there are many inceptions of French culture. And they ask themselves, why should we renounce these possibilities in order to adopt ourselves to the European element?

But the answer is - and the young Frenchman immediately recognizes it - that a single nation, no matter how strong it is and no matter how far its world relations reach, can no longer have a great voice in the world order. If a young Frenchman thus wishes that his thoughts and acts should not, in some way, remain sterile, he quite easily understands that he can only accomplish this if, with his European partners, he assume a common attitude toward the world, thinking in common. This wider attitude is what finally attracts and perhaps even enthuses.

Now I revert to this enthusiasm. I believe one should always differentiate between situation and task. We already find ourselves in the Situation Europe. If, therefore, we are told we must become

Europeans in order to found Europe, then this sounds antiquated and perhaps even unnecessary to us. The Situation Europe we sense already, although it is far from realized completely. But we sense it as a natural component of our personality.

The question now is: what does this being a European mean? How, after all, is Europe viewed by the outside world. I naturally learn this from the developing countries with whom we have special relations and to whom we frequently still say rather nationalistically: "Why don't you accept your help from France, after all, we have the same language, after all, we have the same methods of education, etc. Why do you want to go over to the Europeans?" Naturally, the "good Europeans" in France do not say that but, at any rate, there still are many administrations in France who have taken this attitude toward the former colonies.

What, now, do the partners of the outside world answer us? They already feel we are, due in great part to the Common Market, an exclusive, special part of the world, toward which they have a common, simultaneously both positive and quite negative attitude.

Europe, viewed from the outside, is the land of the past. It is the land of capitalism, which has not renewed itself. It is the land of colonialism which still shows very strong dominants. Thus, this image must now be relieved by another one.

This conversion is precisely the important thing, with which I began this evening. How, then, is it possible and is it possible? I believe it is possible insofar as the specifically European now is precisely the pedagogic. Here is where we return to education. Europe is seen by the outside world as an enormous opportunity to learn, to understand, of science, of technology, as a locality of the means, not as a locality of the objectives.

Up to now Europe is still a means. The young Africans and Asiatics know, that they will learn more in Europe than even in Soviet Russia or in the States. They are attracted by this pole of knowledge, expertise, investigation, which we represent here in Europe, probably through our ethics of work but also perhaps more deeply through our special relationship with rationalism and common sense, through our indefatigable Aristotelianism, which even thrusts politics into a certain category and does not mix it up with other matters. This opportunity to be a means has remained to us.

But for us this being a means is precisely the great danger. If we are only a means and not an objective, in other words, if we treat Europe as an instrument we place at the disposal of the remaining world without it being buttressed by a special perspective of a special world image, we shall be absorbed quite usefully, as perhaps Greek culture was absorbed by the Roman world, but we shall then lose something the Greeks perhaps also lost, if it did not pass into Christianity.

If, however, we do not want to be merely a means for the outside world, then we must transmit and expand our objectives. The conviction that all persons in all countries can attain to all positions, can assume all responsibility, i. e., the democratic tenant, holds the historic play of Europe's forces. Not to relinquish these but to adapt them to the new conditions of modern society would give us the opportunity to play an enormous role, precisely in our relations with the nations in the process of developing, developing nations that see and desire the means but would very much like to swallow them without swallowing the objectives of democracy. We must therefore give them the choice between Americanization as we fear it for ourselves, and Euro-peanization, i. e., collaboration in the unending search for new values and new opportunities for all. This might still sound somewhat arrogant, but at the moment I cannot formulate it more precisely.

Bondy

To the contrary. We all thank you for this contribution to the discussion, a contribution going to the heart of the matter. Professor Kogon, you wanted to say something else in this regard?

Kogon

My experience with younger people in Germany is quite extensive. I would thoroughly confirm that they already have a relatively well developed universal consciousness, but in it the European is no longer self-explanatory for them today. Many have grave doubts and for that reason skip over it and immediately go completely for the universal.

At the Darmstadt Institute of Technology I deal especially with the training of engineers. I am under the impression that a certain number, when they graduate and are sent abroad, are very open-minded. As Europeans they do not recognize themselves until they get out there, in the same way as has been related to us. But then they feel relatively at sea because they lack the specific education which should

extend far beyond the narrow limits of professional training. That means, that the rationality, for instance, of the capitalistic system or, if you want to put it that way, of the industrial-economic system, would have to be placed in an entirely different human correlation; this cannot, after all, be merely preached and, unfortunately does not come from tradition but from new experiences; these, however, our engineers still lack.

For that reason I believe it should be one of our tasks to find places and methods of education, especially at universities, for the technical cadre that Europe needs herself, whom we can confidently send out into the internationalized world - minorities brought to a point of world-wide European consciousness in their very professional training itself. How can that be done? Probably numerous and a variety of attempts have to be made not only at a European university, the establishment of which has been proposed, and probably it will be a matter of community living during the students' university experience.

Naturally, this includes a genuine reform of our educational institutions. When we see the new objectives, this reform can then be set in motion according to pedagogical theory. It surely is a matter of a joint European effort including, for instance, via the Centre Européen at Geneva.

Schwamm

I cannot explain to you in technical detail our planned educational effort because I am not an expert in such matters. The person in charge at the Centre unfortunately does not speak German sufficiently well to debate the matter. I should merely like to state to you that we have not taken this plan out of thin air but that we conceived it as an answer to the questions presented us by the teaching profession, and we want to implement it as such. You perhaps know of the existence of the European Teachers Association. It is unfortunate that evidently no teachers from secondary schools are present. In any event, they would confirm what Professor Rest said previously, that it is they who must take this first European step because they are under the impression the first step is a need in their school and age categories, and that they cannot begin with the third step. I have often heard speak of *mondialisme désincarné*. Very difficult to translate.

Bondy

Unsubstantiable world citizenship.

Schwamm

That, claim these teachers - i. e., the representatives of this European Teachers Association, which at least comprises some 10,000 active secondary school teachers - is one of the greatest resistances which they meet at present in their age classes.

Kochalski

We must here distinguish between terms of generations. In economy we work with a different rhythm of the generations than in the political society. The economy passes through phases in time determined by technical-economic development and growing ever shorter. That means, during the duration of a person's work capacity, which is growing longer through the increase in life expectancy, technical development passes him and decreases his acquired productive know-how. That, now, is a problem of a general nature. But Europe, due to its economy, is growing so rapidly that we have an enormous backlog. We today are far behind in general and professional education. Everything we do not do today and perhaps even let pass tomorrow is lost unconditionally by the coming generation and we can never again make it up.

The same applies to the educating of Europeans to think European. When, at the beginning of the discussion, it was stated here that although we can educate young people to become Europeans but did not know whether they wanted to be educated to become Europeans, we said: "Yes, then we first of all want to educate the teachers". We did not, that is true, ask the question whether the teachers will permit themselves to be educated, and thus we should have returned to the beginning of our topic.

If we want to educate and we do not state openly and clearly that we desire one Europe which later would become so attractive that it would draw the Eastern peoples into its orbit, then we, in Germany, will become unworthy of confidence and no one will accept a European education from us.

Dörling

It has become clear to us that the Western world must draw closer together. That is a political, economic and technical necessity. The livelihood of the free world cannot be maintained solely by having faith in it, but first of all by daily achieving the preconditions for the livelihood of all through higher productivity, greater efficiency and a higher standard of living. Higher productivity, however, presupposes collaboration among Europeans. The realization of this necessity surely must stand at the beginning of every education aimed at forming the European.

Böhme

Mr. Hessel, I should like to ask a question of you, which I should like, foremost, to be understood sociologically and not from a standpoint of cultural policies. Our questions, what Europe has to be in the sphere of education, in the sphere of its pluralistic societies, must base on the economic-technical facts and the cultural-social things given, under which European societies stand today. Our present-day forms of society in Europe, whether in the sphere of the German, the English, the French or the Swiss tongue, can be understood all of them from the sociological phenomena of the "division of labor in industry", a phenomena of a trans-national type, and can today be understood as a factum of irresistible world industrialization.

This "system of industry" that, starting from Europe, is today offered not only to the Europeans but also to the developing countries as the unquestionable export factor - this system of industry cannot as of yore be considered merely as an offer of means. The secondary system of industry, as Freyer calls it, has become the motor in the historical development of Europe, a motor that determines all forms of life.

Viewed from the European standpoint, the question is: what is Europe today under the sociological conditions of world industrialization? Can this system of industry be an objective for the persons living in this system? Is it the economic growth, the industrial prosperity, the idea which to the exclusion of all else

makes Europe capable of life or, rather, is the future Europe with its industrial concentration a "more" of that which makes it economically rich?

Can industry - and as a result thereof industrial society - root man in a more existentialist manner and form than it has done up to now after one-hundred years of industrial history, and can the secondary system of industry be offered to the non-European people as a meaningful sphere of life and work? That the industrial system has today become the fate of all of us, a lot we can no longer escape, is true beyond a doubt; there remains for the nonce an industrial discomfiture that has not been overcome.

Hessel

Briefly this. My answer surely is no. It is quite clear that industry, precisely in our European culture, is only one of the categories of European action and thought. The danger is precisely that it is viewed as a totality. For that reason, the other categories of culture must find their place in the setting of objectives.

Mohler

Must one be a European to the same degree in all categories? Are there not, moreover, categories in which it is entirely unnecessary, and such in which it is impossible?

Hessel

It is, after all, a European trait to differentiate between categories. We have that from the Greeks and we passed it on to the world. Originally, that was something no other continent had, this thinking in categories.

Mohler

Let us say spheres of life rather than categories. I believe there are spheres of life in which one must be a European and spheres of life in which one does not have to be. There, where one does not have to be, one should not force it. That exactly is the allergic point of European education with which the younger generation is being driven wild because one wants to Europeanize there where it is definitely not necessary, namely, in the sphere of the senses.

Bondy

Would you not rather say that Europeanizing makes gentle?

Mohler

I repeat: in the sphere of the soul Europeanizing is not necessary - in this sphere one will always feel as a member of his nation. In the technical-organizational sphere, however, Europeanizing is definitely necessary, likewise in the military sphere. One should not try to put all shoes on one last. I again return to my old topic: it is senseless, yea more, it is dangerous to consider the nations and Europe as antipodes, the one excluding the other. They are not contradictory. In certain spheres of life one belongs to a nation, in others one belongs to Europe. Now entering the universities and the military barracks is a generation tired of "national masochism". One hurts the cause of the Europe idea if one wants to make this generation believe one can only be a European if one turns his back upon one's nation.

Kogon

How, then, do you want to gain a better relationship with Eastern Europe, with the Poles, for instance? From a purely economics and technology standpoint, this is impossible. Or, in your opinion, is it possible at all any more?

Mohler

The relationship with Poland one need not view from the imaginary unity of Europe. That for the present, is a concrete problem between the Germans and the Poles.

Kogon

And it is precisely they who cannot solve it alone, in the old categories of thought.

Mohler

It was possible during a long time. One should not, after all, overlook the fact that the German-Polish antagonism is of a very recent date in history. One should not turn around dynastic and social tensions and stylize them as the people's. For centuries Germans and Poles lived next to each other and with each other without such a hatred between peoples. At any event, a good deal could be learned from the history of the German East concerning the possibilities of various peoples living together within a larger framework.

Körber

Is it not conceivable, for the very reason that this entire problem must be viewed as within the East-West tensions, that the Poles, whose traditional ties with France or with England are much better than those with Germany, can reach agreements with Germans much more easily if the Germans not only are included in a European association through treaties and economic communities, but if in a type of "new deal" in our educational system, we enclose those values which originally had created the good relations between, for example, Poland and France? If we belong to such an association, not only through treaties, but through changes in conceptions and modes of behavior, through changes in our mental attitude, we would be able to extend the hand of friendship much more rapidly and effectively, not only at the moment but for a long time to come.

Dönhoff

Yes, but Mr. Körber, European interests end at the Iron Curtain, don't they - if not before.

Rest

Questionable policies end at the Iron Curtain but not European thinking. After all, they are primitive people who let Europe end at the Iron Curtain.

Dönhoff

It's the governments . . .

Bondy

A somewhat surprising statement.

It is not only a question of what one wants but of what one can do. One builds Europe with the Europeans who today dispose to some measure over sufficient sovereignty so that they can relinquish some of it, and not with those who do not possess enough sovereignty to relinquish even some of it.

Lukaszewski

I ask myself, should it not be part of educating the Europeans to think European, of forming a European citizenship, that Europe not end at the Elbe River, and also not at the former East German border, that there are at least three nations in Eastern Europe who share in the essentials of the European with Western Europe?

What, really, are the essentials of the European? It is the tradition of tolerance, of the rights of man, of the parliamentary form of government, of humanism, of reformation, etc. The Poles, the Hungarians and the Czechs have this in common with Western Europe.

It appears to me that many Western Europeans are satisfied with the partition of Europe. There are many professors, journalists and politicians, who are busy building an ideological superstructure for the present political condition. One speaks of the "Western" philosophy, of the "Western" political tradition, of "Western" culture, "Western" civilization, etc., and one limits what is essential in Europe to Western Europe. One amputates the Eastern part of Europe from Europe.

In this connection I should like to call your attention to an important phenomena of which I already spoke several weeks ago in a lecture at Cambridge. One of the most interesting phenomena I have observed in the thought of the Poles in the past years is disappointment over Western Europe. There is a conviction among Polish non-communists, Polish catholics, liberals, etc., that Western Europe has renounced Eastern Europe. What can one do in this situation to maintain the spiritual individuality of Poland, the catholic, individualistic, humanistic individuality of Poland? These non-communists - and I stress that today it is they who have suffered under communism - say (in my lecture I cited a dozen publications of non-communists in Poland): one must reconcile oneself with Soviet Russia, one must rescue the Polish individuality of thought for the price of selling Polish sovereignty to Soviet Russia. In Western Europe, one should know about this.

M. Hessel said that we feel the solidarity of Europeans when we share in a mighty fear or a mighty hope. Why should it not be the mighty hope, the hope of a reunification of Europe?

Bondy

One always speaks of the unification of Western Europe as the narrowing of the Europe concept and thence of an indifference toward Eastern Europe: the question is, who needs more the overcoming of the national state and the national ideas of the 19th Century - the Western European or the Eastern European? France, Germany, Italy, Spain are nations and can live within the national framework. Many Central and Eastern Europeans cannot do so. If they continue living within the national framework after liberation from communism or its internal change, Hungary and Rumania could carry on war over Transylvania, the Poles and the Czechs would fight over Teschen. Ethnic minorities straddle state borders. The question whether Wilna is Polish or Lithuanian will remain a fighting question. If it is useful for any sphere to make a model of Europe that has other principles toward the individual than the principle of the unit with the same national speech, then it is Eastern Europe. I would say, if we ourselves in Western Europe create this European model of overcoming nationalism even if it is for narrow and egotistical motives, we thereby do the best we could possibly do for Eastern Europe in the present situation; because we create for the Eastern Europeans a framework in which they can later find a place, while in a sphere of purely national European states there is no peace for them, no place, and no future. No one encourages us more, we that work in European institutions, to look beyond nationalism, than the people who come from Eastern Europe, from Central Germany - in any event, it is true of all those I see, and I see quite a lot.

I wanted to ask another question of Professor Rest. I was not convinced of the allegedly great tendency to the unified major spheres. I have kept on thinking why, after all, I do not believe in it. In the United Nations there are today 105 sovereign states, sovereign states of frequently only 400,000 inhabitants. The trend to splitting up into ever smaller fully sovereign states is, outside of Europe, everywhere even stronger than the trend toward unification. I am under the impression that Europe does not find itself in a world trend but instead in a special trend, for the very reason that we have emptied to the dregs this cup of nationalism and are tired of it, while for others it is a new toy or a new experience. I just wanted to ask that as an interim question.

Rest

And nevertheless I believe that perhaps the achievements which nonetheless are present in this structure of the United Nations should not be underestimated by you. These phenomena, which always appear when the road leads toward a larger unit when these breaks and splits appear again and again, must not deceive us into believing that the path of history is not toward a greater unit because only in this way can the salvation of humanity be achieved. That only as a first answer.

What I really wanted was to tie directly to what you said, and also to a point of inception in what M. Hessel said. I believe in all calmness we can take a word out of our discussion, namely, the word that we believe under European education one must understand the enthusiasm of the masses or of youth for Europe. That is a complete misunderstanding of what education is. Education is a very serious and responsible doing.

Referring to education, one can use a comparison from physics: if an electron is stressed in the determination of locality, it loses its energy. In the moment in which we make Europe wild, in the meaning of jingoism, enthusiasm, I believe the matter can become dangerous. Then it will be impossible to lead forth our youth to the sober responsible tasks, namely, to take over a tradition on the one hand and to undertake the road to the future. That cannot be done by inciting and such like, but it is only possible through hard work, to create an infrastructure in the education system, in the sense that European teacher associations exist, that at the universities ever greater interrelationships are seen, ever more possibilities for cooperation are created, not a question of sentiment but of understanding: only in this way shall we emerge, only in this way shall we create for the future. That is how I should like to have education conceived, as a very responsible, serious work in practice, in the situation in history, in which we find ourselves. Everything else is something one casts off.

Education is not the conveying of clothes and suits, changing with the next change in fashion, rather is it the transforming of man, leading him to a personal decision regarding history. It, after all, appears to me in view of the many tasks we have worked out in our talks, crossing the entire human life, whether it be history, whether it be culture, whether it be economics, whether it be politics, or whatever else, that in the face of these tasks the field of European education, of which we speak, lies quite plainly before us, and that it is precisely not a matter of how to generate enthusiasm, rather of how one can raise up an achievement which from this Europe - who knows how long it will continue to have meaning in history - is viewed for the present as a task, a task of education.

In doing so and as a matter of course, all questions will be brought into play: where does Europe end and where does it begin? It is, after all, quite evident that we must feel a duty toward the East and toward Eastern Europe, because of the very burden of history. And if M. Hessel points to the categories, the tremendous play of forces of our history, of the spirit and of economy, one would have to supplement that the European school, the European university, has nothing to be compared to it in any other culture.

We know the mistakes of our history: capitalism, communism, colonialism, nationalism, etc. and etc., but for that very reason, after a difficult apprenticeship such as no one else in the world has had, we see through the ideologies and the power of mythological and primitive impulses in the peoples and in social groupings. Europe can teach what the dangers and the chances of the future history of humanity are.

I think, Dr. Mohler, if one rightly investigates what, after all, is our own in national matters - you would like to see the national excluded from the European - that you would then find very little. For what is really valuable in our national history is of European origin and is, in many instance, nurtured by the entire, differentiated and complex structure of our history.

Mohler

But are there not two roads to unity, one through the diversity, the other against this diversity? I find that the unity to which one arrives through diversity is much sounder. I find there is some levelling element, something even iconoclastic in the presently popular Europe ideology.

Rest

Then you misunderstand this Europe, because what defines this Europe lies, precisely, in this diversity, of which we want to surrender nothing, and must not surrender anything.

Mohler

Yes, that is what you say now.

Rest

This equalitarian, this levelling, is - in any event - never a genuine goal.

Bondy

A while ago, when we heard the introductory speech of Stéphane Hessel, I was a little bit afraid. I thought, he speaks too much of the developing states and of the tasks of Europeans in that part of the world; the rest will only speak of that and we shall forget entirely what Europe is to the Europeans. But now the very opposite is the case. We have been talking nothing but European about Europeans, and the topic he touched upon: "Do we have obligations at all toward non-Europeans and are our obligations not only as states but as Europeans?" - this we hardly have touched.

Altmann

If today we want to give aid to developing countries, it would be very naive to believe that now, after colonialism has died, we had the chance to convey to them European culture and tradition by talking them into it. Precisely that is not the case. Probably we shall have to start, in order to prevent a major clash between the African or Asiatic culture and technological civilization, which we above all convey, to show ourselves very capable of adapting ourselves. I merely mention the example of the Catholic mission, which would hardly advance a single step forward by merely expanding pure latinity.

To mention a concrete example: if the Cardinal of Tokyo, because he was educated that way, wishes to build a Gothic cathedral in Tokyo, one would, by all means, have to talk him out of it. The Cardinal of India is not capable of really speaking a single language of his country. He was educated in England, speaks a very good English and Latin fluently. Here we see the problem: that Europe's relationship to the developing countries cannot, without further ado, be based on the old thesis of the oral handing down of European civilization. The days are gone in which a colonial country was proud to build a small capital, a small English parliament, rather the problem at hand is genuine forms which perhaps can develop in a close union with European forms. But there, I believe, in contact with the world, Europe differs little from the United States.

Kogon

A short remark thereto. Naturally, the Americans and we are very similar as concerns the expansion of industrial economy. But there does exist, as appears to me, a considerable difference. The Americans are carrying on, I would say, a gigantic expansion of goodwill. In the form of goodwill they purpose to carry on the process of disseminating the "American way of life" in the world. The Europeans, on the other hand, find themselves, as Mr. Sombart stated, in regression. Mr. Hess believed that out of fear or out of arrogance there was even danger of retreating to the pillbox. If the Europeans - something that could be reached through exemplary education - began to identify their interests with others, as these identify theirs with the world (this is very difficult for us, certainly, because we are burdened by imperialism and colonialism, but we must attempt to do so in good faith), then the Europeans will again develop a productive imagination, i. e., they will return to their own historical fund of talents, which has made them capable of achieving what they have so far achieved for humanity's progress - the Europeans will then prove their specific rationality in the new forms of abundant existence, and that, after all, is something which we should be able to do better than the Americans.

Schoberth

Differently, but not better!

Kogon

If you wish - "differently", I don't care. The question "differently" and "better" is very complex. But we were speaking whether differences exist or not, weren't we.

Sombart

I want to add a word, if you permit. It is another idea. I believe that the cultural-political problem in this situation consists in that Greater Europe is the result of the culture of world industry. This culture of world industry is, to a certain extent, the inheritance and the gift of Europe to this world, and thus, the young Japanese and the young South American has something in common with the young European.

After all, thinkers such as Jaspers do not want to limit Europe to a region but want to view the whole world as Europe insofar as it participates in the achievements of European history.

Bondy

One question: how is it in Germany, is there contact with intellectuals from Eastern Europe, Russia and China? In France there is, in Italy and also in England. A week ago I was present when Ilya Ehrenburg was in Paris, and some people who could speak Russian spoke to him. A violent debate took place, which was very interesting. Polish intellectuals visit France and we see them all. And all French intellectuals know them. I do not believe that there is a lack of contact.

Kogon

You are completely right. But that is not valid for Germany.

Bondy

I can't speak for Germany, but I am surprised.

Kogon

Some still come to the editorial offices of the Frankfurter Hefte. But just a few.

Bondy

This digression was very interesting although very saddening as concerns contact with Eastern Europe. To make progress here, we must, I guess, clarify the Western European sphere and return to the topic for today "Educating Europeans to think European".

Schoberth

May I comment: where, after all, in our system of education (I am thinking especially of the universities) do we establish - and not only as a thesis - the paradigmatic situations from which, in due form, we can answer the questions of which we have spoken here? Where and how do we really establish them? We know of the activity of the international teachers associations, know approximately the work of the UNESCO and have grasped the thoughts presented by M. Hessel and Schwamm. They coincide here in Germany with the work of the Frankfurt University. But until these suggestions sicker through, change the existing, create new through-views, become institutionalized . . . Think of the various formative periods from which the teachers emanate, what moment of inertia is inherent in our curriculum. We shall not overcome the difficulties in one leap: we need much patience to ameliorate the frictions of the political workaday and to become resistant to prejudice.

Such difficulties should not be overvalued: they actually rest upon an insufficient insight, insight distorted by the passions of the day; they actually rest on unconditionally insufficient distortion-free knowledge. That is why Europe, if it is used too rapidly and too much as a political term has the effect of a prayer-mill liable to breakdowns. The word itself runs through quite smoothly but it lacks the content that would shore it up.

Not enough is done in the way of languages. I know fellow professors who say: "It is all the same to me where my students learn French or English." I am thinking about situations that are today approximately as they were at the time of my professional examination, because the science of the knowledge of foreign countries (the knowledge of the vital relationships of society out in front of our borders) is still today considered not as a meaningful task per se, but at best as a matter of the language instructor, to be passed along from the immediate responsibility of the university chair.

In Europe we are insufficiently acquainted with each other because we do not pursue vital correlations.

We must learn anew the language of European correlations - spiritual, political, economic - as we used to know it, although at that time not in the social breadth required today. To make clear this world of thought, from which action stems, is of decisive importance. This is not to be equated with One Thousand Words of English or French - every one can and should learn that much; it is rather a question of searching out the society behind the language. This process I call "working on Europe", finding out these attitudes of society molded during centuries, in order to be able to act jointly. Someone of us speaks of "Gewerkschaften", translates it with "trade unions" and does not know that, for instance, the Englishman (and the American) applies the term differently. One pats the other fellow's back and thinks one understood the other. Correlations of life, things in common, one cannot

just learn these. There where there is action with responsibility - this refers today to broad strata differentiated within themselves - this knowledge must there be taken for granted.

Where, therefore, on the various education levels do we create European paradigmatic situations? I am thinking of the road undertaken at the newly founded English universities of Brighton and York - outside of the traditional faculty order - new teaching and research groups are established, in conformance with the units of meaning of our times.

What is in the report of which you, M. Hessel, spoke, a report to be presented to the Association of European Ministers for Culture? Was this report written in a captive balloon drifting over our heads? When will discussion on the necessary breadth begin? Europe, after all, is not an abstract painting, which everyone can interpret in accordance with his taste and sense of art - or misinterpret it. The only reason we are playing discordantly is because we cannot keep time.

Bondy

These, precisely, are problems of European education, Mr. Schobert; despite the late hour, I do hope that Mr. Hessel will revert to this. To close, I should only like to ask an interim question, because, perhaps, a discussion should take place concerning it. Dr. Böhme asked a question no one answered: whether Europe represented any other idea at all than the idea of its own growth. Europe's success are economy, growth, industry. Because of it, Europe's cities change and not always toward beauty; too much, I think, is growing in too narrow a space. One does not quite know to what purpose, under whose planning, where it all leads, whether the growth has limits, whether some authority should determine how much growth is really good and healthy, which esthetic, urban and other human points of view should be valid in addition to industrial prosperity. That after all, was a compound question belonging in this evening's discussion, and I must say, I do not believe that up to now an answer has been given.

Hessel

I shall gladly try, although much of it I certainly will not be able to include, possibly because I did not understand it sufficiently.

After all, in our discussion we made a clear distinction between the content of Europe in education and the European guidelines for education. I should first like to speak of the content.

We naturally all noted that Europe is not a very good content for education. It is too narrow; one should like to consider culture as a world task and not as knowledge of Europe. On the other hand, the term has not, up to now, been represented with sufficient clarity so that one could rightly describe it as a content of education and accept it into education. I believe that is true to a certain degree, although not wholly. I note, for instance, not without regret, how little is known, even in circles of very cultured and interested persons, of the European organizations, and how uninformed these circles are concerning the institutions and collaboration in the international field of work. I believe a certain content "Europe" does have to be placed in education. It is very important that we become more strongly conscious - scientifically and sociologically - of how much has already been done to establish bonds between Europeans, and that, naturally, not only the "Six" or the states that want to become associated with the "Six", rather the states which take part in the Council of Europe, the states that take part in the OECD, and other groups of unofficial and official organizations which, after all, do achieve much, to bring Europeans closer together, although sometimes in a minor sphere.

I, therefore, believe that a certain content "Europe" must be placed in education, and that for all stages. Education is not only a taking culture unto oneself but a preparation for action. A European can today no longer implement correctly technical, economic, professional action, if he does not know how the various European states work together. There is, therefore, definitely a content.

That the content need not be overly burdened with civisme, the sense of European citizenship, concerning that, we are quite in agreement. It surely was not useless that an entire generation of outstanding intellects, during the years 1945 to 1955, undertook this work and, so to speak, freed the field of all the ice that encumbered it.

But now I pass from the content to the guide lines of education. Concerning this, the most important thing was said tonight. As peoples of Europe, as nationals of various European nations, we have certain tasks, and only through an education adapted to the situation can we undertake, understand, interpret and shape them correctly. Here I am in accord with Mr. Kochalski, who told us how important it was not to let pass the moment in which education begins, because, after all, there will always be one generation between the moment in which something is introduced in education and the moment in

which it springs into life in the entire generation. I believe that we are face to face with a difficult task there.

Our educators, and with that I do not mean only the teachers but all persons training youth, are usually ultra-conservative in Europe, not politically but in matters of their profession. If we compare them with American or with Soviet-Russian teachers and professors they are heavily burdened from the side of tradition. They do know how they should teach their subject but, due to their tradition, they are not very well prepared to admit new elements into education.

Here I am, really, not in agreement with Mr. Coul-mas, who thought that one first had to have a Europe before one could give education a European orientation. To the contrary, I believe that education always means betting on the future. In all great historical periods in which educators have played a great political and social role, as for instance in France at the end of the 19th Century, they anticipated the outcome of the evolution of their period. They gave their tradition and their vision to the children, as a future in retrospect.

Thus, I also believe that it, after all, is correct that our educators assume first the European attitude of education, even as a risky matter, of which it is not at all certain that in the course of evolution it not break apart. Perhaps evolutions do terminate much more rapidly than we believe. I consider that unconditionally as an important consideration, that we must always take into consideration the speed with which history is taking its course, and how very much, due to this very fact, education must not lag behind.

What are the possibilities for paradigmatic experiments in education of which Mr. Schoberth spoke? And how is it set forth in this report for the Ministers of Culture of Europe? To this I should like to say: the first statement of this report is that in all European countries the system of education is on the verge of changing very rapidly and very extensively. Here are set down all the laws that our lands have. If, for instance, many more children go to school and remain in school, this means that the content of their schooling must, after all, really be newly thought through and newly installed. That is the encouraging element in the present European situation, that we are not remaining static but that there is an evolution in which one can now precisely take a hand in order correctly to orient the many teachers we must train.

Perhaps you say that this is a bad moment because the teachers are already overburdened with all types of programs and methods. But for this very reason there must be a correct transformation. One will not be able simply to carry the system along. One will not simply be able to give the type of culture given to hundreds of thousands of children, to one million children, in the same way. One must evolve new tasks and new objectives of education. Looking away from the content Europe, all European countries will be faced with approximately the same problems and the same questions, for instance, the question of advancing industrialization, and also the question of aid to the developing countries.

We need, as partners of the developing countries, many more technicians, specialists, engineers, administrators, teachers to tackle these problems, and tackle them in a manner which can no longer be nationalistic. For the internationalizing feature of aid to the developing countries is, after all, a phenomena that perhaps is still weak, but certainly in ten years, when this generation shall have been formed, may be very strong. That does not, however, mean that we shall not educate any more Frenchman, any more Germans, any more Italians; to the contrary. That will surely continue for decades. But these Frenchmen, these Englishmen, these Italians, these Germans will have an objective in pedagogy, in the world image, which will make them into especially good partners of European countries and will facilitate to advance European collaboration. That probably would be the most essential content one could place in this process of education.

To make it clear by means of three sentences taken from this report: the first is, to find a better expression for the term "culture générale", general culture, so that this component part of education, which frequently weighs very heavily and is so important, can be better defined. One should not keep thinking that there cannot be general education without Latin. The matter in hand is to define the term general culture without overburdening the education program.

The second and perhaps the most important is learning foreign languages, so that one really experiences them, and through them, come into another field of culture beside one's own. I am thinking there of languages with a very strong content of culture. I also know, however, that we are still teaching foreign languages very badly in our schools, probably because we are teaching them much too much with a view to general culture, to classical literature. If one learns them with a view to practical use, one comes more easily into the understanding of the other country and its culture. But that is an open question I should not like to discuss here.

As a final point, the persons making the report suggest that one should carry out a general classification of the degrees and diplomas of the various European states so that they become interchangeable, at least within Europe.

Bondy

We owe a debt of gratitude, and I really have thereby been spared the traditional task to attempt a resume after five hours of discussion: I find that the positive, beyond all ideological and political discussion, what was to be said regarding the topic "Educating Europeans to think European", has been evolved in all points in this closing speech, so that I could only weaken it by an additional closing speech.

Körber

Ladies and Gentlemen:

At the close of the evening, we are glad that we did not fall into Utopian thinking and did not seek an artificial parallelogram of forces. We have not labored for Europe due to some ideology or due to the fascination of the economy. It became clear to us, however, that this Europe, for its own sake and for the sake of the world allied with it, is a comprehensive pedagogical task. Europe should not come into being for reasons of economic rationalism, nor out of social necessities, or for similar expedencies alone. If the only basis were the profitableness of European existence, we would have to be very careful. Viewed from outside, Europe constitutes an extraordinary power. But from within its borders, the general knowledge of its solidarities is still insufficiently secured. Europe was a content of consciousness for the leading strata of the past two centuries. Today, due to other reasons, it must become a form of life for all strata of European peoples. Europe has been refined sufficiently in history. If today, under the spur of necessity due to conflicts, it appears as a community of interests, this is not of itself bad and in no way a sign for the growing commercializing of human behavior. Interests rest on facts; if one knows about them, one avoids erroneous hypotheses. The discomfiture we did feel on occasions appears to me due less to dissatisfaction or to doubts but rather to the knowledge of the difficulty of the common road.

Here lies the educational task. It is part of our responsibility to guide our decisions in such a way that they promise greater stability of the European social order, lastingly. As we have not received rules handed down by word of mouth, we must meet in such solidarities as we perceive. The tasks of education, thus, are given the character of roadsigns in order to prevent wrong identification and to avoid that this Europe become an exclusive club. Therefore education must be interwoven with the outreaching contents of this Europe, more strongly so than up to now. What was meant by Europe at this Round Table was evolved above all through the interpretations, steeped in life, of our principal speaker. In the name of all the participants of the Round Table, I thank most cordially Messrs. Hessel, Schwamm and Bondy for the precise analyses and suggestions and for the lively guidance of the discussion making possible challenge and response.

The discussion was closed with the recommendation that the Seventh Round Table be invited for October 15, 1962, with the topic "Overcoming the Price-Wage Problems, and the Wage-Price Autonomy of Management and Labor", (Principal Speaker: Prof. Dr. Theodor Pütz, University of Vienna; Moderator: Prof. Dr. Gottfried Bombach, University of Basel).