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Abstract: European Press was a periodical coming out in the years 1951–1980, published by the Central European Federal Youth Movement (since 1959 the Central European Federalists). It was an organisation of federalists-emigrants from Central European countries who considered it necessary to establish a Central European federation. Such a federation was supposed to be a way to improve the development of Central European countries and also a method to free them from the yoke of communists. European Press was a press organ which propagated this idea. The information contained in the journal remains valid today, especially in relation to the ideological layer of European integration and its political and social foundations.
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Introduction. Characteristics of the Central European Federal Youth Movement and the Central European Federalists

In April 1951, the first issue of European Press magazine came out. It was a press organ of an organisation called the Central European Federal Youth Movement (CEFYM). CEFYM was established in 1948 and was an international organisation founded by young students (emigrants from Central European countries politically dependent on the USSR), including Anzelm Jerzy Cydzik, K. Mochliński, J. Opolski, J. Krok–Paszkowski. It was a pro–independence organisation whose aim was to fight for the rejection of communism by the homelands of its members and the independence of these countries from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR). The goal was therefore the same as that of all national and international organisations of Central European pro–independence emigration after World War II (e.g. International Peasant Union – IPU,
Polish People’s Party – PSL, National Party – SN, Croatian Peasant Party and many others). However, unlike these political parties and organisations, CEFYM was founded with the aim of propagating one method only to liberate the homelands subjugated by the communists – it was supposed to be the federalisation of Europe, and above all – of Central and Eastern Europe which included Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Albania, as well as the USSR itself, Finland, Greece, and Austria.¹

CEFYM had the following structures: General Assembly, CEFYM Council, Executive Committee, subcommittees for various issues and CEFYM branches. The head office was located in London. Branches could be founded in all non-communist countries around the world. CEFYM was a partially closed organisation – at least formally – because any young person could become a member of the organisation, but they had to be from a Central European country. Apart from the obvious recognition of the objectives and the program, additional requirements consisted of a written application with the signature of two CEFYM members and with the support of the national community. A candidate for a CEFYM member could not be a former member of a communist or fascist organisation.²

Membership requirements slightly limited chances for prospective members. For example, they did not admit those who, having found themselves in the West after their escape would, for example, have to become members of a communist organisation. From the record on the requirement to have the support of the national community, it can be concluded that CEFYM had the ambition of becoming an organisation representing the Central European nations referred to above.

The main goals of the organisation included:

- uniting young men and women from Central European countries, aged between 16 and 35, in a fight for establishing a Central European Federation and a fight for the unity of Central Europe, for freedom and liberation from the communist yoke;
- maintaining the idea of building a United Europe and a World Government on the principles of a regional federation;
- promoting the idea of the federation through the press, public meetings, radio, and cultural and social ventures;
- analysing federal and other issues related to the region of Central Europe;
- cooperating with other organisations with similar goals, such as the Council of Free Central and Eastern European Youth, Federal Central European National


Organisations, Federal Union, European Federalist Youth, European Youth Campaign, World Government Association, and others.3

In 1959, a new organisation was developed from CEFYM: Central European Federalists (CEF). In practice, CEFYM actually transformed into CEF. This is evidenced by the same organisational structure and personnel of the authorities. CEFYM remained a youth organisation. *European Press* naturally became the organ of CEF. The objectives of CEF remained the same as those of CEFYM.

The method of achieving the organisation’s goals was to inform the world about the situation in the countries subjugated by the communists and propagate the idea of federalisation of Europe. The carriers of this information were to consist of the organisation’s own press organ and conferences, meetings, etc. organised by it. Additionally, CEFYM/CEF paid a lot of attention to cooperation with similar organisations promoting the ideas of federalisation in Europe – that is with the entire integration movement in Europe.

**Principles and the appearance of European Press**

The aims and tasks of the magazine were laid out in its first issue by the first editor-in-chief and publisher, George Pop (from Romania). The periodical was supposed to be a place for publishing, propagating and explaining the idea of federalisation of Europe. However, G. Pop also expressed a hope that the magazine would become the “Tribune of Truth” when it comes to all problems, with open columns for both supporters and critics. Further in his preface, George Pop provided a description of his times and indicated the course of action to be taken to improve reality. According to him, the situation in the world had been deteriorating constantly since the end of the war. He blamed this on the USSR which had gone on an ideological and military offensive. He was afraid that it would succeed, which would result in a time of terror, poverty and hunger for Europe and the world. He explained that Soviet Russia had already enslaved its own citizens and began to enslave the neighbouring nations. He pointed out that this was possible because, before the war, all European nations had operated in a narrow framework of nationalism, caring exclusively for their own interests. It had been used by such oppressors as Adolf Hitler, Benito Mussolini, and Joseph Stalin. He pointed out that it would not have been possible if Europe had been united. None of these dictators would have dared

---

to attack a strong community. Therefore, the aim was to strive for a federation of Central European countries that would secure peace in Europe and thus in the world.\textsuperscript{4}

The initially outlined programme of the periodical was continued until the end of its publication. However, the issue of the quality of life and events in the countries behind the Iron Curtain was also an important thematic area discussed by the authors and promoted by the editors and CEFYM/CEF. Sometimes, these topics dominated individual issues of the magazine. The third important category of information provided was CEFYM/CEF organisational matters. \textit{European Press}, as an organ of the Movement, became an important source about the history and activities of this organisation.\textsuperscript{5}

\section*{Editors}

The data contained in individual issues of \textit{European Press} make it possible to reconstruct, but only to a limited extent, the list of editors and publishers of the journal. The first editor, and the publisher of numbers 1 and 2 from April and May 1951, was George Pop, chairman of the CEFYM Press Sub–Committee. However, on 29 May 1951, he resigned from this function, on account of his poor health and other duties.\textsuperscript{6} The next combined issue (3 and 4) from September 1951 was published by Eugen T. Nadas, vice–president of the Executive Committee of CEFYM and a member of the Press Sub–Committee.\textsuperscript{7}

January 1953 brought a change of chairman of the Press Sub–Committee (usually referred to simply as the Press Committee) with Z. Uhlir becoming the new boss. In his appeal to the CEFYM members, he stated that one of the most important issues for the organisation’s activities and goals was the creation of a federation of Western Europe. It was supposed to have a great impact on the possibility of establishing and developing the Federation of Central Europe. Therefore, he announced that there was going to be more information in the periodical on this subject.\textsuperscript{8}

The Press Committee was composed of: Z. Uhlir – chairman, L. Ponia, M. Zimowski – members, and J. Krzysztofik – typist.\textsuperscript{9}

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{4} George Pop, “From the editor,” \textit{European–Press}, May, 1951, 1, 5.
\bibitem{5} Especially that there is no uniform archive of the organisation. The materials about its provenance can probably be found in the legacies of the members of its authorities. It is possible, for example, that A.J. Cydzik’s collection stored at the Polish Institute and the Sikorski Museum in London, contains only issues of the magazine and individual materials related to CEFYM/CEF.
\bibitem{6} “Resignation of the Editor,” \textit{European Press}, September, 1951, 1.
\bibitem{7} \textit{European Press}, September, 1951.
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No other information about the publisher appears in *European Press* until the issue for September–October–November 1964. It is then that information appears about W. Nowak being the Reviewing Editor. This information was provided in subsequent issues, up to the issue for the fourth quarter of 1972. Only the addresses of the editor were changed.

Then, it was not until the issue from the summer of 1978, that it was reported that A.J. Cydzik – the general secretary of CEF – was also the publisher of the journal, which would not change until the last issue from the winter of 1980. It seems safe to assume that Cydzik, as the secretary general, was also the publisher of previous issues since 1973.

### Periodisation and the layout

When deciding to publish the magazine, monthly periodisation was accepted. Taking into account the conditions of emigration, it was a serious challenge. Soon, the graphic layout of the magazine testified to it.

The first issues of the magazine were published in accordance with the rules of the press release. It was printed on newsprint paper in a printing house but soon, in 1953, the layout changed and the bulletin was issued in the form of duplicated typescript. The material starting the issue, “From editors”, says that the editorial office expects the “Bulletin” to become a platform for the exchange of information on federalisation, and at the same time to be a place for discussing the problems young people encounter in places of residence and activity.\(^{10}\)

The printed version was not reintroduced until 1964, and from then it was kept until the magazine ceased to be published. However, the return to the printed version resulted in periodisation. From that time – from the issue for April–May–June 1963 – the magazine was published at three–month intervals – as a quarterly. Sometimes, issues would come out covering a period of four months. From the summer of 1973, *European Press* was coming out every six months: in winter and in summer, although its masthead informed that it was a quarterly.

The masthead of the journal also changed. In the first issues, published in the form of a classic magazine, the masthead consisted of the large “EUROPEAN – PRESS” title printed throughout the whole page, with the “C.E.F.Y.M. PUBLICATION” note in smaller font below. Above the title, separated by a line, there were the following elements, from right to left: number, e.g. “Number Two”, type of periodisation, e.g. “Monthly”,

---

month and year, e.g. “May 1951”. Below the title, between the two lines, there was information about the publisher. From right to left: “EDITOR: GEORGE POP”, address: “adm: 26 Melody Road, LONDON, S.W.18”.

After changing the layout and issuing the magazine in copies produced on a duplicating machine, the masthead was printed in purple (blue?). On the right, there was the CEFYM logo: a globe showing only the general outline of Central Europe without borders (sometimes with the names of nations), surrounded by the organisation’s name in capitals: “CENTRAL EUROPEAN FEDERAL YOUTH MOVEMENT” and the slogan idea: “UNITAS ET LIBERTAS” (united and free). On the right, there was the title of the magazine: “EUROPEAN PRESS” and below, in smaller font, the subtitle: “Bulletin of the Central European Federal Youth Movement”. Below, on the right, the address in a smaller font: “4. Newton Grove/Bedford Park./LONDON, W4/Chiswick 6068”. The masthead appearance given here was not always precisely adhered to. The layout remained the same, but sometimes, on the left, there would be the publisher name, the address data was also reduced, and at the end, information about the CEFYM affiliation to other European organisations was also provided, e.g. “Affiliated to the Federal Union”. The form of address notation changed – reduced only to the masthead, it was not the only one in the version produced on a duplicating machine. There were issues with a masthead in green, which consisted of a large page title: “EUROPEAN PRESS”, with the addition of “Bulletin of the Central European Federal Youth Movement” in a much smaller font. It is unknown if these were only preparatory versions or official issues. It is highly probable that they were finished, and the organisation experimented with the layout of the masthead. In the issue from March 1959, the masthead was black. The layout was kept similar, with more information about affiliation and membership of CEFYM, and the publisher’s date and address were given in the bar between two double lines. In the issue from May 1959, the subtitle changed to “BULLETIN OF CEF & CEFYM”, which was related to the fact that in that year, the organisation was reorganised and the new CEF developed from it (as it has been mentioned above). This masthead remained unchanged until 1963.

After returning to publishing in the form of a magazine, a new look of the masthead and first page of the magazine was established. The masthead was black. The first part of the

---

12 European Press, 1953.
14 European Press, March, 1959. It was given that CEFYM was affiliated with: Federal Union, Young European Federation, Young World Federation, that it was affiliated with Union of International Associations, and that it was a member of the Council of the Free Central European Youth in Paris.
title: “EUROPEAN” was written in large font across the entire page, below, on the right side, there was the second part: “PRESS”, and on the left, in a smaller font: “BULLETIN”; below, on the left, there was the month and year: “APRIL – MAY – JUNE 1964”. In the next issue, instead of the word “Bulletin”, there were the words “REUVE TRIMESTRIELLE” and in the following one: “BULLETIN & REUVE TRIMESTRIELLE”.

Initially, therefore, European Press was published every month. It is not known what the periodisation was when the magazine was published using the duplication method and when the name “Bulletin of CEFYM” was added as a subtitle. What is known, is that from May 1959, it was subtitled: CEFYM and CEF. Was the monthly periodisation kept? The exact date of the issue was not provided on the masthead. After returning in 1964 [?], the journal was published at quarterly (three-month) intervals in the form of a magazine. It lasted several years, however, some issues were published every four months instead of every three months. In the seventies, it was not issued regularly. Quarterly periodisation was attempted, as evidenced by combined editions, e.g. for the second and third quarters of 1972. But from 1973, the periodisation for the seasons – summer and winter – appears, so the magazine was published as a semi-annual.

It is difficult to state clearly what the cause of these publishing perturbations was because no sources are available on the subject. Using the comparative method and comparing this problem to similar ones in other subjects of political emigration after 1945 (political parties and organisations), with a very large probability, bordering on certainty, it can be said that the main reason was the lack of sufficient financial resources for publishing a monthly. Taking into account the fact that in the 1960s and 1970s, European Press contains quite a lot of materials reprinted from other magazines, one can conclude that at that time the editorial office did not have enough original materials for publication.

European Press stood out among the emigration press titles from 1964 with its colourful design of the first page. It contained photos of persons important to the Central European nations, religious symbols or references to historical events (shown in the table in the annex). An analysis of the data contained in the table in the annex shows that most of them referred to the Polish state, and mainly to the Jagiellonian idea of the federation of Poland and Lithuania, and the idea of federation in Central Europe. This operation was evidence of a logical reference to the tried and tested example of the political union of two countries. One can also ask whether such a large number of “Polish” examples in the magazine was to attract the Polish emigration, or whether it resulted from the fact that from 1964, it was Poles that were responsible for the publishing house – first, W. Nowak and then, A.J. Cydzik?

It should also be noted that the illustrations were meant to serve a specific idea that they wanted to propagate. And in this context, sometimes the descriptions were not entirely consistent with history. For example, in the issue from the summer of 1977, the
The presented illustration of the Polish and Lithuanian parliament from 1505 was described as the beginning of the federation of Poland, Lithuania and Ukraine. This was not the case, because, at that time, a three-part state was not yet in the minds of the rulers. The issue of Ukraine as the third part of the Commonwealth did not appear until the turn of the 16th and 17th centuries – it was considered as an idea in the first half of the 17th century, but it was not implemented and the Commonwealth remained a two-part construct. In this case, it seems that there was the intention to convince readers that it had been once the right idea, and it should have been implemented then, especially since the Ukrainians were members of CEFYM/CEF. Such perception of the Jagiellonian Union was not deprived of historical grounds either. The government of the January Uprising used the coat of arms of a state composed of three symbols: the Polish White Eagle, the Lithuanian Pahonia and the Ukrainian Archangel Michael. This combination of symbolism was later propagated in Polish educational and patriotic activities, including reproductions on postcards, window stickers, etc.\textsuperscript{16} The idea of making the Ukrainian nation equal to the Polish and Lithuanian nations was part of most of the ideas and projects of reconstructing the Commonwealth as a union or federation put forward by Poles in the 19th and early 20th centuries.\textsuperscript{17}

Similarly, in the issue from the summer of 1978, information on Poland’s relations with other states was provided on the background of the gallery of Polish kings and princes, on the basis of a royal union or federation.

Poland in Royal Union with:

1) Moravia and Czechs (Bohemia) 863–960, 1003–1025, 1300–1305 and 1434–1526
2) Hungary 1370–1399, 1434–1526 and 1576–1586
3) Sweden 1587–1668
4) Saxony 1697–1763
5) Austro–Hungary 1772–1918

Poland in Federation with:

1) Lithuania 1386–1795
2) Ukraine 1386–1772
3) Prussia 1466–1701
4) Latvia 1561–1772
5) Byelorussia 1386–1795

\textsuperscript{16} These postcards, stickers and other similar materials can be found, for example, at the Museum of the History of the Polish People’s Movement in Warsaw. Examples of signatures: MHPRL–8178, MHPRL–1098, MHPRL–9810, MHPRL–13502, MHPRL–13509.

6) Moldavia (Roumania) 1595–1620
Federation of Poland, Lithuania and Ukraine 1386–1795
Was the First to Pass Habeeas Corpus in 1430
Sovereign Parliament 1505
Federal Constitution 1569
Act of Religious Toleration 1572.\(^\text{18}\)

Although these associations, apart from the federation with Latvia, Belarus and Ukraine, did take place, only the Polish–Lithuanian union can be counted as a relationship between two integrating states. The remaining ones were firstly acts of ad hoc policy of the then rulers/states, and, secondly, they would fall apart very quickly. They were formal and only the Polish–Lithuanian union turned into reality. Pointing to the existence of a Polish federation with Latvia, Belarus and Ukraine within the framework of the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth was an apologia of the “Jagiellonian idea” (unification of Central Europe). It was already in the 19\(^{th}\) century when it was commonly realised that in order to be able to think about the reconstruction of the Republic of Poland, there was a need to convince the nations inhabiting its territories of this idea. The problem, however, was that the 19\(^{th}\) century saw a national renaissance of the Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians and the formation of the Belarusian nation, and one of its symptoms was a great sense of separateness and independence from the Poles. This was aptly described by Stanisław A. Thugutt, a popular Polish politician, one of the founders of the idea of integrating Poland and the Central European states and the Baltic republics, who wrote in 1929: “[...] in relation to smaller and weaker nations, we [Poles – AI] sometimes had such a high opinion of ourselves that it did not allow us to see that these have their own forms of life, no one knows – worse or better than ours, but certainly closer and nicer to them”.\(^\text{19}\)

**Discussion on the subject matter of the magazine**

As it has been already mentioned, the leading themes of the magazine that were repeated in most issues included the issue of European integration, in particular, the federalisation of Central Europe; history and events from the states dependent on the USSR; information about the organisation, and other similar subjects.


The most important topic included, of course, the issue for whose promotion the organisation was founded – the integration of Central Europe. In an article discussing the magazine, there is no place for a detailed presentation of this subject, which is why it will be addressed very synthetically.\[^{20}\] As indicated by the name of the organisation, CEFYM advocated the federalisation of Europe as its future. Europe was to be federated as a whole, although the greatest amount of space was devoted to the problems of federalisation of Central Europe, which was understood not so much in geographical as in political terms. It consisted of countries lying between the Soviet Union and Germany in the east–west direction and between the Baltic, Adriatic and Black Seas, in the north–south direction. It was emphasised that the western borders of the USSR should be withdrawn and the socialist republics of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Belarus and Ukraine should become separate, independent and, of course, democratic states.\[^{21}\] Interestingly, in the early 1950s, it was still believed that the Central European federation should be established first, followed by a federation of Western European states, which would then cooperate with each other and lead to establishing the Federal Europe States.\[^{22}\] However, these dreams were quickly verified by reality, and in later years, it was thought that the unity of Western Europe would be the best way to unity and freedom in Central Europe. And a united Europe was seen as a necessary guarantee of lasting and universal peace in the world.\[^{23}\]

While a lot was written about the need to federate Central Europe and the entire old continent, the form of political organisation of these federations was not mentioned. It was said that all members of the federation should be equal, and the constitutional order of the community should be based on the rules of a federation. This approach to the problem was a conscious escape from a troublesome issue. Federation as a political form assumes far-reaching integration with the establishment of governing bodies over the organs of federal states’ authorities. This always undermines the spirit, so there was no point in going on about it if the federation could only start to develop in the future when the Central European states would be liberated from the communists and their dependence on the USSR.

In European Press, European (including Central European) integration initiatives were followed and analysed in terms of their suitability for the idea of a federation of either Central Europe or the whole of the continent. Understandably, the birth and

development of the European Communities were welcomed and seen as the beginning of the federalisation of Western Europe.24

Despite the dreams about a federalised Europe, however, orthodoxy was not preserved. Other ideas that could be convergent, similar to CEF’s idea, were noticed. This was the case with the vision of integration formulated by General Charles de Gaulle, or “Europe of Homelands” as a confederation. CEF members did not reject this idea, but they treated it as one of the stages, perhaps necessary, on the way to a federation. Through the analysis of the idea proposed by the French president, it was emphasised that the unity of Europe is the most important aspect. Confederacy undoubtedly would bring nations closer to this unity. On this occasion, the issue of reconciliation between various countries, including Great Britain (not yet in the Communities) and the USSR was raised. It was pointed out that unity based on federal principles must be achieved in time, and confederation would be a very favourable stage on this path. However, it was clearly stated that this was to be a stage, not the destination of the journey (that was supposed to be federation).25

Along the plans of de Gaulle, more space was devoted to the unification of Germany. For CEF members, it was not a simple matter, because Germany was one of the two main perpetrators of the war tragedy in post-war Central Europe. But this necessity of German unification was understood, and it would have to be achieved if European unity was to be reached anyway. A united Germany was perceived as an opportunity for the rebirth of German power, and with it – the possibility of the re-appearance of aggressive German policy towards other European countries. And this aspect was used to render the need for a federation of Central Europe more appealing, which would become one of the factors counterbalancing a united Germany.26 This issue was represented in *European Press* by publications of statements of European politicians and Central European emigrants, which was supposed to show that CEF’s thought coincides with popular views on this issue. Therefore, the following people became known as journalists writing for the magazine: Georgi M. Dimitrov – General Secretary of the International Peasants’ Union, member of the European Movement, one of the leaders

---


of the Bulgarian Agrarian National Union and the Bulgarian National Committee; Altiero Spinelli – co-founder of the Ventotene Manifesto, member and founder of the Crocodile Club, Director of the Institute of International Affairs in Rome; Anzelm J. Cydzik; Adam Romer – Polish diplomat, Catholic journalist, Director of the Office of Prime Minister General Władysław Sikorski, Honorary President of the CEF; Josef Lettrich – member of the authorities of the International Peasants’ Union, leader of the Czechoslovak Republican Party of Farmers and Peasants in exile; Eugen Hinterhoff; Karlheinz Koppe – Vice President of the European Federalist Action; Vernon Dawson – Secretary General of the Liberal International; Ernst Wistrick, one of the directors of the European Movement.

Another project that was presented in European Press columns was the so-called neutralisation of Central Europe. The authors of the journal distinguished here the following ideas: 1. English Disengagement Plan, put forward post–1945 as a way to implement the Yalta agreements, involving the simultaneous withdrawal of foreign troops from Central Europe; 2. Rapacki Plan – plan of a nuclear–free zone, presented in the 1960s, involving the withdrawal of all atomic weapons from Central Europe; 3. Neutral Belt Plan with West Germany, presented by Andrey Gromyko at the opening of the conference in Helsinki in 1972, involving the withdrawal of foreign troops and the resignation from all international agreements except the UN, countries of Central Europe and West Germany; 4. Neutral Belt Plan without West Germany. The latter was a CEF idea, presented by A.J. Cydzik and Stefan Velinsky at the conference in Helsinki in 1972. It was to rely on the establishment of a neutral zone, stretching between the ethnic lands of the Russians and West Germany. In all these plans, CEF

federalists saw the possibility of creating a Central European Federation. It was to be neutral and to cooperate primarily with the EEC.36

The series of the Conferences on Security and Cooperation in Europe also found its place in *European Press*. The attitudes of political Central European emigration towards the idea and implementation of this conference were negative. It was perceived as erasing the aspirations to integrate Europe, as it was supposed to sanction the then-current shape of Europe. CEF activists and other emigrants organised campaigns against those agreements which were seen as an opportunity for the USSR to continue its political oppression of Central European countries.37

Before and during the conference in Helsinki in 1973, CEF federalists were handing to European politicians the “Declaration of Tasks for the European Security Conference in Helsinki” and the “Appeal to the Governments and Nations of the Western World” drawn up for the occasion. In the Declaration, they expressed the opinion that considering the fact that 28 years after the war, two German states were recognised as sovereign and obtained full membership in the UN, it was time to restore normal relations in Central Europe. Therefore, peace and security in Europe could become possible only when all the reasons for the tension were removed by meeting the four minimum conditions. These were: accepting the declaration of the territorial neutrality of Central European countries located between Germany and the USSR – which was to be a sine qua non condition for future peace in Europe, signing an international treaty that would guarantee that there would be no intervention in the sovereign rights of Central European countries, the evacuation of all foreign armies and government agents from the newly formed neutral states, carrying out free elections in these states under the control of the UN and reconstructing state governments based on the Declaration of Human Rights and borders according to the pre-1939 division. Austria’s neutralisation was pointed out as an example of the feasibility of such a solution. A summary of the activities undertaken by the CEF against the agreement of Western states and the USSR was presented by Anzelm J. Cydzik.38

The year 1976 marked the 25th anniversary of the Declaration of Liberation (“Declaration of Freedom”) which was signed in Philadelphia on 11 February 1951 by about 200 representatives of Central European emigration. Its 10th clause postulated the need to establish


a federation of Central and East European nations and to take part in building a united Europe. CEF activists considered it still valid and worthy of reminding and propagating.\textsuperscript{39}

At that time, Prof. Stefan Velinsky, a Czech member of the CEF Executive Committee and an advocate of the abovementioned ideas, to prove his position, used arguments from several areas. First of all – a historical one, typical for émigré activists, propagating the traditions of this idea in the region for many centuries. Second – economic and social one. He referred to the first great socialist ideologists: Robert Owen, Claude Henri de Saint-Simon, Pierre Joseph Proudhon and Charles Fourier, who promoted building a world based on federal principles, both in politics and in the economy. Thirdly, he pointed out that the federation would protect the region against internal conflicts, and at the same time, help to remove cultural and political barriers between nations. He believed that it was worth pursuing a federation because it would allow all conflicts to be resolved peacefully while promoting cooperation, not competition.\textsuperscript{40}

In other articles from that period, Prof. Velinsky appealed for the development of ideas and goals for the unification of Europe. He recalled the initial sentences from the Tindemans Report: “The European idea has lost much of its strength and initial momentum.” Prof. Velinsky thought that it had happened because integration processes were encapsulated only within the area of the Common Market. There was no educational policy to explain and motivate integration. He stressed that the promotion of the European Union places a lot of emphasis on technical and administrative solutions, but it is insufficient in indicating the need, tasks and goal of achieving a higher level of human development. He emphasised that the goal and idea of the European Union should be to strive to provide people with a state in which they will be creators of their own destiny and will feel safe. An important part was played by tolerance, identified with democracy. It was crucial because of the specificity of the “European society” composed of multiple nationalities and cultures. Political unification should not mean the unification of culture. The multi-culturalism and multi-nationality of Europe should be preserved, and tolerance was necessary for that. Velinsky opposed the idea that the European Federation can only be a repetition and imitation of the United States of America. He disagreed as he believed that the American society is essentially a mono-nation, while Europe consists of many nations, and it should stay that way.\textsuperscript{41}


\textsuperscript{40} Stefan Velinsky, “Why Just a Federation,” ibid., 8.

In the following years, CEF, in accordance with its idea, continued to emphasise the need to establish the Central European Federation as a belt separating Germany from the USSR. At the 7th CEF Congress in September 1977, there were still warnings that Europe could not exist while being divided because it could not function properly without a free Central Europe. Nor could it be safe without the Central European Federation, and only with it, could Europeans create a security system for themselves.42

The second thematic area in European Press, as has been mentioned, was information about the activities of its authorities. This information could usually be found on the last pages. It would give the details about the composition of CEFYM (and then CEF) authorities, correspondence addresses, and current organisational information. In the issues in which CEFYM/CEF congresses and conferences were reported and discussed, this information was provided on different pages of the issue. It was then the main theme of the issue. In this context, the issues of the magazine that stand out are those that were published in duplicates, or in the years 1953–1963, and those with the subtitle “Bulletin of CEFYM” and from May 1959: “Bulletin of CEF & CEFYM”. Their topics focused primarily on information from the life of the organisation, mainly on reports from CEFYM Council meetings, general assemblies and reports of the organisation’s secretary for a particular period. They are an extremely valuable source about the history of the organisation. Information about other events or typical articles that were not a report of a paper or a presentation of CEFYM and CEF bodies were rare at that time. The issue published after July 1963 (the date determined based of the content of the issue) gives some information about conferences and meetings of European organisations promoting integration in Europe, such as the European Movement,43 the World Association of World Federalists,44 Action European Federalists.45

Authors of European Press

The articles and materials published in European Press were primarily written by members of CEFYM and CEF authorities: Georg Theodor Pop, Chairman of the Press Sub-


committee; Alfred Andoni, President of the Executive Committee, member of the Albanian Peasant Party; Anzelm Jerzy Cydzik, Secretary–General, member of the Supreme Council of the Polish People’s Party in exile; Dr V. Dara, President of the Executive Committee; Georg E. Iliescu, former Military Attaché of Romania in London; T. Sekolec, Vice–President of the Executive Committee, member of the Slovenian Christian Democratic Party; M.J. Sokolowski, Minister of Foreign Affairs in the Government of the Republic of Poland in London; Dr O. Wolicy, Chairman of the CEFYM Council, President of the Ukrainian Socialist Party; Franciszek Wilk, President of the Polish People’s Party in Great Britain and, since 1968, of the entire Polish People’s Party, a member of the authorities of the International Peasant Union in Great Britain; Prof. Stefan Ve- linsky, a Czech member of the CEF authorities. The name Anzelm J. Cydzik appeared among the names of authors the most often. This was because he was the secretary of the organisation and, for this reason, posted reports on the activities and his own reports as the Secretary.

In addition to CEFYM/CEF members, other authors, who wanted to write about the issue of federation in Central Europe or throughout Europe from a similar perspective, were published gladly in European Press as well. They included the above–mentioned ones, for example, leaders of émigré political parties. The outstanding figures of the integration movement, such as Altiero Spineli, whose articles were reprinted rather than taken as original ones, constituted the last, smallest group of authors.

**Summary and conclusions**

Undoubtedly, European Press was an outstanding magazine among those published by political emigrants from Central Europe. Its first distinguishing feature is the subordination of the journal’s content to the purpose of the issuing organisation – propagating the federalisation of Europe, primarily Central Europe. The second factor distinguishing the magazine is the lack of any feuds between various political groups of Central European emigration. The journal was supposed to unite and not divide, show the unity of emigration and not the problems that divided it.

The variable periodisation and publishing method indicate that, like most emigre press, in particular, political press, CEFYM and CEF suffered from a lack of material funds and financial security when it comes to European Press. In the first year of its publication, and then from 1964 to the mid–1970s, the magazine had good editorial quality. However, in the period of publication as a duplicated Bulletin, it was apparent that the quality of the magazine was of little importance.
The sudden cancellation of the magazine related to the unexpected death of A.J. Cydzik, the secretary of CEF and the publisher of the magazine, indicates that, at that time, CEF was already a small organisation (which was characteristic of the majority of Central–European political emigration organisations), consisting of a few enthusiasts who continued their adolescent dreams. After Cydzik’s death, it turned out that no one would be willing or able to publish the magazine.

When looking at the issues of European integration from the perspective of the second decade of the 21st century and the identity problems that the integration process is encountering in Europe, it can be concluded that European Press and similar magazines have been underestimated by major European organisations as well as the institutions of the European Communities. Support for these organisations and institutions would help to promote the essence of European integration, building a common European identity, or all those aspects that are still missing in the EU and whose absence is an obstacle to its further development. And it cannot be denied that the EU has helped considerably in the development of many, if not all, Member and Associated States.
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