

	Malfatti 1972	3 leaders 2020
Matters of concern	European unity / united Europe, economic integration and political unification, our friendships, the development of less favoured nations, new cooperative relationships	Partnership with UK, common future of 27, climate neutrality, job creation, just technological transition
Matters of authority	Treaties of Rome and Paris, civil wars in Europe (i.e. not to be repeated), worries of the present, uncertainties of the future, scientific and technical progress, economic and social forces, goal of better quality of life, splintered sovereignty (i.e. need to repair it), liberty, security and progress, the 'original' institutional structure / edifice	The agreement with the UK, the free movement of people, a level playing field on environment, labour, taxation and state aid, shared geography and history, common purpose and shared mutual interests, size of internal market, power in international trade, vibrancy of democracy, collective economic power, European Green Deal

Interpretation

Malfatti's speech has one dominant matter of concern – the unity of Europe, which is later broken down or spelled out using terms like “economic integration and political unification” and “new cooperative relationships with all the peoples of the earth” (implying that European unity goes together with a harmonious vision of globalisation). The rest of the speech is devoted to aligning these concerns (or goals) with matters of authority (the things that make us do things). These include institutional realities that either constrain or enable the activities of the Community (the Treaties and the institutional structure), the lessons of history, structural factors (economic and scientific development) and fundamental values. He claims that these are matters which the idea of European unity “stems from” or “draws its strength from”; that they “thrust us along” (the road to unification) or “drive us on”. Sometimes there is a circularity to the relationship: e.g. Malfatti calls on his audience to “defend” the institutional structure of the Community “so that the very nature of the nascent Community can express itself”. The institutional structure is a matter of authority inasmuch as it authorises certain courses of action, but it is also a matter of concern because it cannot be taken for granted and has to be actively defended and strengthened.

The article by the three leaders introduces two distinct matters of concern – the future partnership with Britain (the theme of the first half) and the common future of the remaining member states (the theme of the second half). In respect of the first, they take a hard line by naming several matters of authority that limit what the EU is prepared to agree to in the ongoing talks. These are the agreement already signed (in 2019) and the principles on free movement and level playing fields that are ‘red lines’ for the EU negotiators. However, they also invoke the shared history and geography as authoritative factors that should make it possible to achieve a ‘friendly’ partnership. In respect of the second matter of concern (which is later broken down into three key policy goals of

climate neutrality, job creation and a just digital transition) they authorise a certain vision of a common future by invoking structural factors like the size of the EU as an economic space and the vibrancy of its democracy. Only one institutional reality is convoked – the European Green Deal (which, since it is an official policy, dictates how the EU and states must act).

What's interesting is the change in how the ambitions of EU leaders are formulated nearly 50 years later. Malfatti is quite open in advocating "political unification". These days, EU leaders are much more cautious in their choice of words, preferring the ambiguous phrase "common future". Similarly, they are more reticent than their predecessor in extolling the state-like features of the EU's institutional structure (Malfatti's "common edifice"). If Malfatti saw this as a matter of authority, today's leaders know that some member states are 'concerned' about institutional questions (would like to reform them). We could deduce that the institutions (or some aspects of them) have been downgraded from matters of authority to matters of concern.