

Publication Citizens' Forum on the Future of Europe



## **Citizen's Forum on the Future of Europe: What Kind of Europe Do We want?**

**Prague**

**30 March 2006**

**Socialist Group in the European Parliament**

**Working Group on Citizens' Europe**

## **Publication Citizens' Forum on the Future of Europe**

### **SOCIALIST GROUP IN THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT WORKING GROUP on CITIZENS' EUROPE**

#### **Citizens' Forum on the Future of Europe: What Kind of Europe Do We Want?**

**Prague**

**30 March 2006**

#### ***Agenda***

##### ***Opening of the Forum and Plenary Sitting with Debate***

<u>Chair:</u>	<b>Jo Leinen</b> , MEP, Chairman of the Constitutional Committee, Germany
<u>Welcome address by</u>	<b>Lubomír Zaorálek</b> Chairman of the Chamber of Deputies, Czech Parliament
<u>Keynote Speaker:</u>	<b>Martin Schulz</b> , MEP, President of the PSE Group in the European Parliament
	<b>Vladimir Špidla</b> , Commissioner for Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities

##### ***Working Group I - Europe's goals and the tasks of the European Union***

<u>Chair:</u>	<b>Carlos Carnero</b> , MEP, Spain
<u>Panel Members:</u>	<b>Petr Brod</b> , Journalist, Czech Republic <b>Jan Herzmann</b> , Director Factum Group, Czech Republic <b>Genowefa Grabowska</b> , MEP, Poland <b>Martine Roure</b> , MEP, France
<u>Conclusions:</u>	<b>Lenka Rovná</b> , Professor, Head of Monnet Centre of Excellence. Charles University Prague, Czech Republic
<u>Issues</u>	- What is the goal of the European integration? What do citizens expect from the Union? - Fundamental rights, the Union's values in general - Period of reflection; Where do we go now? - Competences and subsidiarity

##### ***Working Group II - Europe's economic and social model***

<u>Chair:</u>	<b>Richard Falbr</b> MEP, Czech Republic
<u>Panel Members:</u>	<b>Pavel Mertlík</b> , Chief economist Raiffeisen Bank, former Minister of Finance, Czech Republic <b>Eva Klvačová</b> , Professor., Head of ICRE, Economic Faculty, Czech Republic <b>Dariusz Rosati</b> , MEP, Poland <b>Miroslav Daněk</b> , Ministry for Regional Developement of the Czech Republic <b>Proinsias de Rossa</b> , MEP, Ireland
<u>Conclusions</u>	<b>Martin Potůček</b> , Director of the Center for Social and Economic Strategies, Charles University, Czech Republic
<u>Issues</u>	- In a globalised economy, what is the future for the European social and economic model? - Partnership for growth and jobs (Lisbon Strategy) as a balanced approach between the economic goals, sustainable development and a new future for Europe's social model - Structural funds, cohesion policy. What is the real added value, how do citizens perceive, Europe's impact on the daily lives? What are the problems? - Single market: Free movement of the people and services. Where are the problems?

## **Publication Citizens' Forum on the Future of Europe**

### **Working Group III - *Europe's role in the world, the borders of the European Union, Europe's new neighbours***

Chair: **Libor Rouček**, MEP, Czech Republic  
Panel Members: **Jan Kavan**, MP, former Minister for Foreign Affairs, Czech Republic  
**Jan Marinus Wiersma**, MEP, Netherlands  
**Monika Benová**, MEP, Slovakia  
**Wolfgang Kreissl-Doerfler**, MEP, Germany  
Conclusions: **Jiří Dienstbier**, Council for International Relations, former Minister for Foreign Affairs, Czech Republic  
Issues: - How do we define the boundaries of the European Union? How does it affect us?  
- The pace of enlargement  
- Within the globalised world: trade, organised crime, trafficking, terrorism  
- Neighbourhood policy: what kind of relationship should we have with partners in the East and the South?

### **Afternoon debates**

### **Working Group I - *Europe's goals and the tasks of the European Union***

(Discussion continues)

Chair: **Richard Corbett**, MEP, United Kingdom  
Panel Members: **Vladimír Müller**, Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs, Czech Republic  
**Pavel Šaradín**, Professor, University of Olomouc, Czech Republic  
**Klaus Haensch**, MEP, Germany  
**Stavros Lambrinidis**, MEP, Greece  
Conclusions: **Ivo Šlosarčík**, Institute of International Studies, Charles University, Czech Republic

### **Working Group II - *Europe's economic and social model***

(Discussion continues)

Chair: **Maria Berger**, MEP, Austria  
Panel members: **Milan Štěch**, Senator, President of Czech and Moravian Trade Unions, Czech Republic  
**Zbyněk Fiala**, Editor-in-chief EKONOM, Czech Republic  
**Petr Osvald**, Representative to the Committee of Regions, Czech Republic  
**Pervenche Berès**, MEP, France  
**Toomas Hendrik Ilves**, MEP, Estonia  
Conclusions: **Jiří Havel**, Deputy Prime Minister (economy), Czech Republic

### **Working Group III - *Europe's role in the world, the borders of the European Union and Europe's new neighbour***

(Discussion continues)

Chair: **Hannes Swoboda**, MEP, Austria  
Panel Members: **Jan Marinus Wiersma**, MEP, Netherlands  
**Ana Maria Gomes**, MEP, Portugal  
**Alena Gajdůšková**, Senator, Czech Republic  
**David Král**, Director EUROPEUM, Czech Republic  
Conclusions: **Petr Drulák**, Director of the Institute for International Relations, Czech Republic

## **Publication Citizens' Forum on the Future of Europe**

### ***Plenary conclusions and debate***

Chair and conclusions

from the Working Groups:

**Richard Corbett**, MEP, United Kingdom

**Vladimír Špidla**, Commissioner for Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities

**Magda Kósáné Kovács**, MEP, Hungary

Panel:

**Working group chairs, rapporteurs and speakers**

## **Publication Citizens' Forum on the Future of Europe**

### **Speech by Jo Leinen**

**MEP, Germany,**

**Chairman of the Constitutional Affairs Committee in the European Parliament.**

Dear friends,

A warm welcome to the first Citizens' Forum on the Future of Europe organised by the Socialist Group in the European Parliament. We are delighted that this first Forum is taking place here in Prague in the Czech Republic, a city of such a great cultural, political and economic heritage, a city and a country which have given Europe so much over the past centuries. It is very gratifying, of course, that the Socialist Group's invitation has met with such an overwhelming response. This shows that the European debate is very much alive in the Czech Republic. We all know, of course, that there is also great diversity of opinion in this country, starting at the very top of the Republic and extending into the population. And I am sure that this diversity will also be reflected in our debates here today, which will continue until late this afternoon.

We have eminent guests to speak to us right at the start of the Forum and it is a particular pleasure to welcome Mr Martin Schulz, Chairman of the Parliamentary Group of the Party of European Socialists in the European Parliament. It was our chairman's idea to hold this type of citizens' forum. This is hardly surprising, given that among other things, he was a successful mayor of a German town for many years and, as we know, links with citizens are especially strong at local level.

I am particularly pleased that Mr Lubomír Zaorálek, the Chairman of the Chamber of Deputies of the Czech Parliament, is here today. The European Parliament maintains close contacts with the national parliaments in the European Union and I believe that, as the bodies which represent the citizens, they have a particularly important role to play during this period of reflection.

I would also like to welcome our 'keynote speaker', Commissioner Vladimir Špidla. He is of course a very familiar figure in the Czech Republic and as Europe's Commissioner for Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities, he deals with a core area of the debate which we are conducting in Europe.

'What kind of Europe do we want?' This is the theme of our forum today. Do we want a weak Europe or a strong Europe which can solve the problems we face? Do we want a neoliberal Europe in which the market prevails, or do we want a social Europe in which social solidarity is guaranteed as well? Do we want a Europe of elites, governments and bureaucracies, or should it be a Europe of citizens, with enhanced forms of participation in the European political process? These and other questions have arisen, above all, since the citizens of two countries, France and the Netherlands, rejected the European Constitution in their referenda. We believe that they did not say 'no' to Europe; what they did was raise questions. They voiced their concerns. They wanted to know where the journey with Europe is heading.

There is a real lack of clarity about the European Union: what it is, what it is supposed to do, which frame of reference it provides, and which form of protection it offers. I think that we should view the crisis that is now facing us as an opportunity. Never before has there been such a great opportunity to discuss the future of Europe in all 25 countries with this level of intensity. I am optimistic that at the end of this period of reflection, a new consensus can emerge about what we are doing on our continent and in the world, how we can guarantee our values and interests, and how we can continue to safeguard a high quality of life for the 450 million people in Europe in the coming years and decades.

## **Publication Citizens' Forum on the Future of Europe**

The European Parliament has engaged in this debate for a very long time and in January this year, it adopted a resolution on this topic. There are various priority issues which should be discussed across the board and these issues feature in the programme for today's meeting. Which role should Europe play in the world? Are we simply a political player in our European continent, or does Europe also have a responsibility to solve the major problems facing humankind, of which there are many? How can we preserve Europe's economic and social model in the future in the face of globalisation and intense competition from America, Asia, China, India and other countries whose economic catch-up is meteoric? And what about a more general question: the vision of European integration? After the Second World War, there was the vision of a United States of Europe. That was a long time ago. So the question which arises now is this: does our vision of Europe today simply envisage Europe as a large market – a major economic space from the Atlantic to the Urals, – or as a political union with closer links between people and mechanisms for solidarity between the Member States and their peoples? There are many important questions. I am sure that we will find some answers today.

We have many representatives here today who are also opinion-leaders in Czech society. I would like to welcome you all very warmly once again. I would also like to thank our speakers who will be contributing their expertise to this debate later in the working groups which will be held over the course of the day. I would like to thank our secretariat for its excellent work in preparing the conference. I am sure that our discussions at this first PSE Citizens' Forum here in Prague will be interesting and exciting.

**Discours d'ouverture de Lubomir ZAORALEK**

Président de la Chambre des Députés de la République Tchèque

Je vous souhaite la bienvenue ici dans mon pays, un pays où l'Union Européenne a une très bonne réputation. Je pense que pour la majorité de nos citoyens, l'UE est quelque chose de très sympathique et nous avons de très bonnes raisons pour cela.

La Sociale Démocratie tchèque a toujours défendu l'idée de l'adhésion à l'UE, cela a toujours fait partie de notre programme socio-démocrate et le summum de notre activité politique a été l'adhésion à l'UE en 2004. Nous constatons maintenant une accélération de notre économie et du social. Pour de nombreux citoyens, l'adhésion à l'UE a signifié une accélération de tout ce qui constitue la vie de notre société. Nous considérons que l'UE n'est pas seulement un ensemble économique mais également une véritable culture, culture que nous considérons comme la nôtre et que nous voulons défendre parce qu'elle constitue un ensemble de valeurs auxquelles nous adhérons totalement. La majorité des citoyens en République Tchèque souhaiterait atteindre, grâce à l'UE, davantage de cohésion et de solidarité en utilisant bien entendu les différents fonds européens. Mais la Sociale Démocratie en République Tchèque ne veut pas seulement utiliser l'arme de la fiscalité des salaires inférieurs aux autres pays pour être compétitifs, nous voulons créer une véritable base permettant d'accroître notre productivité et notre économie, d'améliorer notre situation économique d'une façon générale. Nous croyons en l'Europe. Nous considérons également que l'UE représente une protection pour notre pays, pour nos valeurs, pour nos visions de la vie, de la société et de l'avenir de la planète.

Alors comment cela se fait-il que l'on entende parler d'une crise de l'UE, comment est-il possible qu'il y ait tant de doutes et de remises en question de l'UE ? J'ai l'impression que, dans les anciens Etats membres, le nationalisme et le populisme deviennent de plus en plus virulents, ce n'est pas sans raison, les difficultés existent, je les connais, notre monde est en transformation très rapide, l'ordre économique mondial est profondément chamboulé, le monde du travail est en pleine transformation et il est très difficile dans l'UE d'aujourd'hui de trouver sa place. La compétitivité de l'UE diminue depuis une dizaine d'années, ce qui est également une des raisons des craintes de la population européenne qui se dit que l'UE ne représente plus une protection suffisante face à la mondialisation. Mais les Nations Unies ont également du mal à se réformer, l'Organisation Mondiale du Commerce aussi a du mal à mettre au point une véritable politique vis-à-vis des pays en développement. Toutes les organisations internationales ont du mal à réagir aux transformations du monde actuel et on dirait que plus les efforts se multiplient, moins les résultats sont visibles. Nous essaierons nous aussi de tout faire pour avoir davantage de clarté et nous sommes convaincus d'une chose, nos efforts ne seront couronnés de succès que si nous sommes ensemble., en défendant ensemble nos valeurs communes.

Il est inconcevable pour moi qu'un pays puisse s'en sortir seul. Aujourd'hui on entend de plus en plus parler de nationalisme économique. Il me semble évident que nous avons besoin d'une politique commune de l'énergie, elle est prévue par la stratégie de Lisbonne, nous avons également besoin d'une politique commune en matière de sciences et de recherche. Tous ces objectifs nous les connaissons, nous les partageons, mais le problème c'est de passer ensuite à l'action.

Avant d'entreprendre quoi que ce soit ensemble, il faut se poser précisément la question de l'Europe que nous voulons. Si nous voulons rassembler nos forces, nous devons d'abord savoir pourquoi nous voulons nous battre. J'aurai souhaité pour ma part une ratification du traité constitutionnel. Je considère que ce projet de Constitution était un progrès il permettait d'aller plus loin que le traité de Nice. En tant que Président du Parlement Tchèque, ce projet de traité constitutionnel permettait d'accroître la participation des parlements nationaux, il sera

## **Publication Citizens' Forum on the Future of Europe**

peut être quand même possible d'accroître le rôle des parlements nationaux mais sans la Constitution européenne ce sera plus difficile. Pour l'UE, je suis convaincu des avantages du marché intérieur, de la libre circulation des travailleurs qui n'est pas dans l'intérêt uniquement d'un pays comme la République Tchèque mais qui est bon également pour toute l'UE. Pratiquement tout le Parlement tchèque est d'accord pour considérer que nous avons besoin de ce marché intérieur, de cette libre circulation des travailleurs, que tous ces principes sont essentiels mais ensuite il faut les traduire dans la pratique. Mais il est déjà important de se mettre d'accord quant aux objectifs, sinon, rien ne bougera, d'où la nécessité d'un Forum comme celui-ci pour poser les bonnes questions, pour nous demander ce que nous pouvons faire ensemble et ce que nous voulons faire ensemble. Vous avez dit que l'Europe traverse une crise, nous avons besoin de croissance, nous le savons mais nous ne pouvons pas nous contenter de résultats partiels : nous avons besoin d'objectifs plus ambitieux qui permettent d'aller de l'avant. Le mouvement est toujours important.

Mr BORRELL est venu me rendre visite récemment, il a parlé du sommet Euro-méditerranéen et il m'a raconté que plusieurs représentants s'étaient excusés, considérant que ce sommet n'était pas suffisamment important, parce qu'ils n'en n'attendaient rien. Je trouve ce genre d'attitude préoccupante, c'est une grande incrédulité, un grand scepticisme vis-à-vis du développement de l'UE. Or, nous savons que des pays autour de la Méditerranée se développent très rapidement en ce moment, leur rôle sur la scène internationale peut devenir de plus en plus important mais un affaiblissement de l'UE sera négatif pour tout le monde. Je pense à notre attitude en matière d'aide humanitaire, en matière culturelle, aux valeurs que représente l'UE et là, je considère que nous avons un grand potentiel de sympathie dans le reste du monde pour les valeurs que nous représentons. C'est ce combat pour les valeurs qui doit représenter la base de notre politique étrangère commune, nous devons parler d'une même voix, sinon la méfiance, la tendance à la méfiance de plus en plus perceptible se répandra, cela me fait très peur.

Lorsque la question du futur de l'Europe nous est posée, je pense que nous n'avons pas d'alternative que le choix de l'UE. A nous de la transformer en véritable communauté qui soit capable de défendre ses valeurs, sa culture, sa conception du monde dans le reste du monde en matière de droits de l'homme et pas seulement en matière économique, nous devons naturellement défendre nos activités créatrices vis-à-vis des nouveaux concurrents comme la Chine mais en plus de cette lutte économique, c'est une véritable défense de nos valeurs qui s'impose. Nous ne devons pas succomber à la tentation du nationalisme économique. Nous devons continuer notre effort de construction sur une base de confiance, d'où la nécessité de faire participer les citoyens car sans la confiance des citoyens, aucun progrès ne sera possible.

Je suis heureux de vous accueillir ici à Prague pour que vous voyiez comment fonctionne notre pays, comment nous sortons de la crise, je ne sais pas si la social-démocratie a besoin d'un nouveau "batkodersberg" mais je pense que nous avons besoin d'une Europe plus convaincante qu'elle ne l'a été jusqu'à présent et j'espère que notre réunion aujourd'hui à Prague permettra de décider de nouvelles perspectives d'avenir pour les citoyens de l'UE pour qu'en ensemble nous progressions et nous allions de l'avant.

**Welcome address by Martin Schulz  
MEP, President of the PSE Group in the European Parliament**

Ladies and gentlemen,

'The Future of Europe: What kind of Europe do we want?' In answering this question, I would like to come back to a concept mentioned by my esteemed colleague Jo Leinen in his introduction. He made reference to one of the demands put forward by European Social Democrats in the 1920s. The Heidelberg Programme, adopted by Germany's Social Democrats in 1925, was the first-ever party manifesto to embrace the vision of a United States of Europe. The question, of course, is what the men and women who wrote this document back in 1925 actually meant. They certainly did not mean abandoning national sovereignty. What they had in mind was that Europe's states – Europe's sovereign states – should integrate in those areas where such integration is possible. The United States of Europe should not be a replica of the United States of America but a European model for economic prosperity, social security and peace. The Heidelberg Programme was adopted seven years after the end of the First World War. It is really very useful to cast our minds back to the years after 1917 when we discuss the future of Europe today.

In 1989 we experienced the end of the bipolar world which, by then, had lasted for almost 40 years. My German colleague Wolfgang Thierse, President of the German Bundestag for many years, once described this time as follows: the fall of the Berlin Wall marked the end of our comfortable existence. What he meant was that the time when everything was conveniently clear-cut was over. Regardless which side of the wall you were on, everything was quite straightforward. The good guys were on your own side and the bad guys were on the other side. Thus the world was polarised to a very large extent and, as we all know, the so-called 'balance of terror' – the massive stockpiling of nuclear weapons by both superpowers, the Soviet Union on the one side and the United States on the other, dreadful though this was – brought a relatively high level of peace and security, because each side knew that a nuclear first strike would inevitably result in its own destruction. We all lived with and endured this absurdity for 40 years, but the situation was clear-cut. With the fall of the Berlin Wall, the familiar structures collapsed. For the last 16 years, all of us – whether we are citizens of the Czech Republic or Malta, whether we live in Finland or Portugal – have been living through this transformation process. This applies as much to France as it does to Poland, to Belgium as much as to Germany.

So why have I mentioned 1917? From the end of 1917 to late 1918, people were confronted with upheavals like those which faced us in 1989/90. Let's remind ourselves of what happened: in 1917, the Tsarist empire collapsed and civil war erupted in Russia, culminating in an unparalleled catastrophe: the emergence of a new and hitherto unknown form of governance, the Bolshevik regime. With the abdication of Wilhelm II, Germany descended into chaos. The Austro-Hungarian Empire – the Danube monarchy – disintegrated and the Ottoman Empire ceased to exist. The people who lived through the years from 1917 to 1919 had to deal with a shock like the one which we have experienced, but the far harsher and more brutal economic slump meant that it was much more dramatic, and the lack of prospects for the future was felt far more keenly than is the case for us today.

How did people respond? Broadly speaking, there were two kinds of reaction. There were those who advocated a United States of Europe, an integrated model of peace aimed at achieving social stability and welfare. They convened the League of Nations in Geneva with the goal of stimulating the economy and promoting peace through international dialogue.

On the other side were the ultranationalists, the opportunists who attempted to exploit people's hopelessness and garner support for their evil ideologies. They were the ones who

provided the simplistic answers in difficult times, who were quick to apportion blame and who could be relied on to instantly identify scapegoats; they were the ones who were certain that another country or nation was determined to destroy and obliterate their identity. The evil German, the evil Frenchman, the Bolshevik, the Nazi – I don't need to continue the list; you are familiar with the rhetoric. Suffice it to say that 'the other' was regarded as evil, bent on destroying our identity. This was the level at which the ultranationalists and their base ideologies operated. The battle was waged between these two poles: supranationalism – which did not mean abandoning one's culture but seeking supranational solutions – on the one hand, and destructive ultranationalism, on the other. This was what happened in the 1920s and the 1930s, and we all know what the outcome was. I don't need to dwell on it here.

When familiar structures collapse, people seek answers, and it is the task of politicians to provide them, or at least to make an attempt to find the answers and identify solutions. I would like to mention two instances which I believe are very good examples.

In 1989/90, as the blocs were dissolved in the heart of Europe and there appeared to be a realistic prospect of restoring the national unity of my home country, the Federal Republic of Germany, the then Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl (and I freely admit that I was never – and still am not – a great fan of Helmut Kohl or his domestic policies), made two decisions which, from a European policy perspective, were the right ones: the restoration of German unity, and the reunification of our 82-million-strong nation in the heart of Europe. And as one step in this process, you may remember, he merged the two second-largest armies in each of the blocs, the Warsaw Pact, on the one hand, and NATO, on the other. We have already forgotten about it, but at the time, the merger of the Federal Armed Forces – the Bundeswehr – and the GDR's National People's Army, the NVA, was an extremely important step. Helmut Kohl embedded this process in the Maastricht process, the process of European constitutionalisation. He believed that Germany should definitely not stand alone in the heart of Europe but should be embedded in a supranational framework. And in order to underpin this process and counter the risk of a deutschmark hegemony, an economic hegemony, emerging in the heart of Europe on the basis of Germany's strong currency, Kohl insisted that Germany integrate into the eurozone. This was a key element of the Maastricht process. If Helmut Kohl deserves any accolades for his contribution to history, it is here.

Which lessons must we learn from this for Europe? Responsible politicians know that at times when a new order is emerging in the world, which is what is happening now, none of us can survive on our own. Libor Rouček spoke earlier about China and India, reminding us that neither Germany nor the Czech Republic can survive on its own in the face of transcontinental economic competition. We need the stronger, united economic power of an enlarged European Union. Even with its 450 million people, the EU is not a particularly large entity compared with the 2.3 billion people who make up the total population of China and India. We must be realistic for once about our size even after enlargement. In relation to these transcontinental challengers, we need this stronger, united Europe if we want to deliver on the pledge that we have made to our citizens: that we will provide more prosperity, more jobs, more decent incomes and more social security. We cannot achieve this via a national economy; we need Europe's economic power. Responsible politicians know that in such times of transformation, we can choose between two options. It is the same choice that faced our great-grandfathers, our grandfathers and our grandmothers in the 1920s: to send out the message that there is no need to give up any of what we regard as our nation's cultural heritage – in an ancient city like Prague, it is important to underline that point – but that something else is needed as well in order to safeguard our heritage for the future. The national framework – which we need for ourselves – is no longer enough; in order to be able to assert ourselves within our own culture together with others over the long term, we need something else as well. Our task is to make it clear that Europe is not, and must not be, a substitute, but that it is the add-on which provides us with the social, economic and cultural safeguards for the future.

## **Publication Citizens' Forum on the Future of Europe**

This is the route that we envisage for the future of Europe, and that is why we need the European Constitution as the framework for this process. There are those who tell the nations of Europe that they can manage everything much better on their own; indeed, there are supposedly some of these people here in Prague, even in high positions. That, in my view, is a short-termist response which sounds good for a brief period. As it is, we are all easily tempted – even those of us who are up here on the podium – we are all politicians and we are all easily seduced by the prospect of the next headline which might give us an extra half a percent in the opinion polls, and so we sometimes say things which, in our hearts, we may not entirely believe. Any 21st century politician who claims to be immune to this temptation is not being completely truthful. Every one of us has succumbed to this temptation at some point. It is one thing to make a small amount of political capital at the expense of one's political rival when, let's say, we are discussing the national budget for the current year; but when it is a question of establishing a sound basis for the long-term future of nations, we must – in my view – apply different criteria. The criterion which we must apply is this: how does it benefit our citizens? My answer is this: nothing that we have achieved so far is guaranteed. Peace is not guaranteed. Social welfare is not guaranteed. Our generation still has to struggle for them day after day, just as previous generations did. Politics must create the framework for this process.

What do Europe's citizens want, and what do they want from us? 99% of all citizens in every country want three things: they want work so that they can bring home a decent wage, and they want to use this decent wage to build a decent life for themselves and their children. Anyone who responds to these needs will win the people over. But if we want to guarantee these things for the people in Europe, we need Europe to be united – politically, socially, economically and culturally. And, in my view, the only conceivable way forward for our Europe is to pursue this immense historically successful project for social security, economic progress and, above all, guaranteed peace by overcoming nationalism. Not by abandoning our own identities, no, but by overcoming nationalism. I cannot imagine anything better. If we Europeans look back at our past, we will see that this can, and in my view must, be the model for our future. That is why we European Socialists will continue to campaign for this Constitution. Thank you.

**Speech by Vladimír Špidla**  
**Keynote Speaker,**  
**Commissioner for Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities**

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I am very pleased to be able to take part in today's conference. I must say that the previous speakers have offered a very clear vision of the kind of Europe we should like to have. I have a high regard for these contributions. But we must also consider the kind of Europe we do not wish to have. I should therefore like to make a few observations from the other point of view.

First of all, I should like to say that we cannot wish for a Europe where everything is sacrificed on the altar of economic competitiveness and gross domestic product growth.

A short time ago, I had the opportunity to hold discussions with practically all the Latin American Ministries of Labour and Social Affairs. The discussions were about how those countries can make use of the experiences of the European Union. Among other things, I had a very interesting conversation with the Brazilian Minister for Labour and Social Affairs. He said that Brazil had been going through a period of phenomenal economic growth since the 1930s, but, in spite of this, it had missed its opportunity in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. This growth had also resulted in all the wealth being concentrated in the hands of a small elite and had been accompanied by an increase in the number of people living in absolute poverty. And I must emphasise that I do not consider it acceptable to have the kind of Europe that would sacrifice the European social state on the altar of economic growth.

We very often hear superficial statements to the effect that the European social state and the European social model do not exist. That is not true. Recent discussions clearly show that there is a universal basket of European values which we can call a European social model, which is being implemented in a multitude of different national approaches.

I should like to support this idea with some arguments.

A typical approach in Europe is to provide citizens with the right to equal access and support in certain life situations. We consider it right to offer people the opportunity to develop their talents fully in the field of education and to provide appropriate medical care in the event of illness. For example, if we compare the health care systems in the different European states, we find that they are all consistently directed towards this objective. This is European, the basis for the European social model.

An aspect of Europe which we do want is **decommodification** – an awareness that not all things are goods. Health, for example, is certainly not a commodity. And this is a fundamental component of the European social model.

The European social model is characterised by a high proportion of publicly financed public services, at around 26 per cent of GDP on average in the different states. The upper boundary stands at more than 30 per cent, the lower boundary at around 20 per cent. I am firmly convinced that an appropriate degree of redistribution, which I hope you will allow me to set rather mechanically somewhere between 30 and, let's say, 40 per cent, is the basis for the European way of life. It is an essential prerequisite and, in my view, it is also an essential prerequisite for democracy itself.

The European approach is quite distinct. It states that **it is possible to combine economic efficiency, social solidarity and ecological sustainability**, that it is possible to combine output and social justice, that they are not in conflict, that they are not opposites. And,

## Publication Citizens' Forum on the Future of Europe

therefore, I am very pleased that the Lisbon strategy, which is basically and very simply a decision by Europe to compete on quality, does not mean downward competition, but upward competition. Our aim is to compete in quality of life. A fundamental component of this strategy is the awareness that there are three apexes in the magic triangle: economic efficiency, social sensitivity and social coherence, and long-term ecological stability, which need not conflict with economic prosperity, since the former is an active component of the latter.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Europe must hold its own in a globalised world. The phenomenon of globalisation as such is very old. At least 300 years old. The Seven Year War, which left its mark on life in Europe during the 18<sup>th</sup> century, was actually the first *world war*. It started as a conflict between Prussia and Austria, but battles did not take place in Europe alone, but also in Canada and in the United States, in India and on the world's oceans. Even then, one conflict was capable of provoking a global reaction. And even the fact that the British breed of sheep gave way to the Australian is just another example of globalisation, but it was a very, very long time ago.

Ladies and Gentlemen, we are now in a modern globalised world, with civilisations in competition, in competition with super-states. Europe, although in competition with China, does not compare as regards area on the map. China is a super-state. It is an emerging power. And it is essential to be aware of this. If we Europeans are not able to integrate, if we do not manage to formulate our own foreign policy, our own security policy, and to forge our own leading position in the world as a whole, we shall not be able to stabilise and develop the European way of life in the long term. I consider this to be very important.

I should like to give another example illustrating the complexity of this discussion. We often compare American universities and European universities using various tables and we are often overcome by scepticism. But the United States actually has only one, two or, at most, three *American universities* in the true sense – the rest are rather *universities in America*. Our universities are not European universities. Most of them are universities in Europe, just like a university in Idaho or in Minnesota. We therefore need to concentrate our strengths on integrating European projects.

It is essential not only to strengthen integration from all points of view, but we must also communicate Europe's success stories in a better way. The enlargement of Europe is a success, but it is not perceived as such, certainly not in all countries. We very often encounter the phrase 'social dumping' in the new Member States. This is an argument which usually has no real substance, simply expressing fear and anxiety, but it crops up very frequently. But the fact that the new Member States have lower GDPs is not social dumping! The European legal structure, although by no means perfect, is capable of dealing with any risk of social dumping and abuse of people. If social dumping does exist, it takes the form of undeclared black labour. This is where we encounter brutal situations, often close to slavery.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is also essential to realise that the most fundamental change took place with the fall of the iron curtain and that our options, although broad, are nonetheless limited. For example, we cannot prevent globalisation. The question facing us is not how to escape globalisation, but **how to control globalisation and its consequences**.

Of no less importance, of course, is controlling the enormous pace of change, which is actually produced by our own internal dynamics, not globalisation. Computers were not invented in China and the internet is not an Indian product; they are creations of European-American civilisation. I have had the opportunity to hold discussions with trade unionists in the steel industry. Just 30% of the products manufactured by the present-day modern steel

## Publication Citizens' Forum on the Future of Europe

industry are the same as they were ten years ago. 70% of the manufacturing base – in a field as apparently stable as the steel industry – has changed. In this context of globalisation and internal dynamics, we have to balance the necessary flexibility of a dynamic society with job security and the need for dignified working careers, what is now known as 'flexicurity'.

Similarly, it may be said that we cannot choose whether or not we want a culturally diverse Europe. Europe is culturally diverse. **Europe is and will continue to be multicultural**. We can only look for an answer as to what kind of multiculturalism we want.

And finally, the same can be said of **population ageing**. It is pointless to ask whether our population is ageing or not, since it is undoubtedly going to get older. We must, however, look for ways for this demographically altered population to be able to live a high-quality life in future. We shall have to find answers for all areas, including those we consider to be the most important: health care and pensions. In other words, we cannot stand still and we cannot fail to react.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I am convinced that the fundamental feature of the social democratic movement has always been its progressiveness. Martin Schulz has referred to the planned objectives of German social democracy in the 1920s in relation to Europe. I believe that German social democracy includes many examples of real progressiveness. For example, the first programme, which was formulated in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, included the concept that homosexuality should not be a criminal offence. The courage needed to stand up for something like that in the 1870s indicates a progressiveness which runs very deep. And, in my view, this is the most fundamental task of the social democratic movement. It would be a tragedy if a progressive movement were to be transformed into a conservative movement, simply preserving the *status quo* and unable to face up to the challenges to come.

I have given an outline of the kind of Europe I should like, as a European Commissioner and as a social democrat. I also know what kind of Europe I do not want – one split into winners and losers, in any sense of the words. The future is in our own hands.

Thank you for your attention

## **Conclusions**

### **Working Group I**

#### ***Europe's goals and the tasks of the European Union***

***(rapporteurs: Prof. PhDr. Lenka Rovna, CSc., PhDr. Ivo Slosarcik, LL.M.)***

- The debate at the Citizens' Forum revealed a high level of support for the European Constitution. Whatever the outcome of the reflection period on the ratification process, the overwhelming majority of participants called for the constitutionalisation process, which is seen as a basis for fulfilling the expectations of citizens to continue.
- The period of reflection should be seen as an opportunity for, and responsibility of, all levels of society (government at local, regional and state level, political parties, parliament, interest groups, non-governmental organizations, academia, the media and citizens) to debate the aims and methods of the integration process.
- Many speak of the crisis of the European Union. In a broader historical perspective, the integration process has gone through many crises. It is important to raise citizens' awareness of the successful projects, such as the introduction of Euro and the enlargement to include ten new member states in 2004. Although the EU Constitutional process is, at present, in a serious crisis, the statement "The EU Constitution is dead" in no way solves the very essence of the problem. On the contrary, it risks triggering either a trend towards the creation of a "hard-core EU", or stimulating a rise of Euroscepticism, in particular in the old Members States.
- According to the public opinion surveys in the Czech Republic, citizens expect a politically coherent EU; they also call for a more transparent EU architecture and clearly defined borders of the EU. Czech citizens wish to see an internally and externally safe Union. The Czech citizen's perception of becoming a member of the Union reflects rather the (mostly positive) economic consequences. Awareness of the values of the European Union has so far not had such a high profile.
- This being said, the debate during the Citizens' Forum showed a relative consensus as regards the objectives of European integration (external and internal security, economic prosperity, maintenance of the European social model, decomodification of some principles) and the challenges to the European Union (globalisation, security threats). A divergence of opinions exists as regards the optimal responses and steps to be made by the EU.
- The crisis of the ratification process of the Treaty establishing the Constitution for Europe is only one symbol of this process. Further, the EU Constitutional Treaty does not adequately respond (at least not explicitly) to several other open issues related to the European Union's future, such as absorption capacity of the Union to enlarge further.
- At the end of the reflection period and, in particular, after the clarification of the positions of France and the Netherlands towards the future of the Constitutional Treaty, several options are open, including the addition of interpretative declaration to the Treaty text, repetition of the ratification process in the France and Netherlands or a modification of the Treaty. In the meantime, the ratification process should continue in those Member States, which have not yet expressed their position on ratification. In addition to that, several new instruments contained in the Constitutional Treaty (such as those in the area of Justice and Home Affairs), could be implemented within the current EU regulatory framework (by means of secondary legislation).

## **Publication Citizens' Forum on the Future of Europe**

### **Working Group II**

*Europe's economic and social model*

*(rapporteur: Professor PhDr. Martin Potůček, CSc. MSc.)*

- Social cohesion and economic efficiency are not mutually exclusive. Social cohesion is a prerequisite for long-term economic efficiency and political stability and a pre-condition for further European integration.
- The welfare state at the national level cannot cope with the pressures of globalization alone
- Within the European Union, a defensive strategy towards European social model prevails: "to preserve what could be preserved". On the contrary, the only potential successful strategy would be to adopt an offensive strategy of strengthening the European social model thus making it more effective in the face of present and future challenges. A new generation of innovative policies is needed;
- There is an urgent need to expand internal regulations (frameworks, well defined borders) of social welfare (such as harmonization of taxation, regulation of public services, quality norms).
- The Lisbon strategy II, which prioritizes economic competitiveness and employment, does not pay sufficient attention to the social and environmental pillars. The social policy agenda should be taken on board more rigorously in internal market policies.
- Due to the reluctant attitudes of some Member States, the Open Method of Coordination has proved to be a weak instrument for pursuing the European Social Model. (Member States' representatives agree on some economic and social goals at the European level, but neglect them in national decision making.). There are also signs of a reverse of the European Economic model towards "economic nationalisms".
- The European Union should promote its concepts of human rights, public health, safety, social dialogue, and environmental protection at the global level, too. It should defend them against global players (for example the WTO or some multinationals refusing to treat Trade Unions as partners) which neglect those.
- More needs to be done to touch the hearts and minds of people. Communication with citizens about European economic and social policies must not be technocratic; concrete themes which have an effect on everyday lives together with visions and values evoking emotions would have a much higher appeal as well as practical impact. Cities and regions are natural platforms for public discussions about European economic and social policies.
- There is a bitter reality of unequal access to a variety of assets among the Member States: "a competitive disadvantage" especially between the Old and the new ones, (such as restrictions on free movement of labour and services, lower agricultural subsidies, neglected infrastructure). These exceptions and barriers must be eliminated by 2013.
- The absence of a European public space endangers further integration. High quality news coverage of EU issues should be promoted by the European Commission. It was proposed that a European news service be launched by the European Commission and made available in the languages of the Member States – with specific parts devoted to local (national) issues. When the media are in hands of strong financial groups, they will distort public discourse about European integration.
- This citizens' Forum should not be the last of its kind.

**Working Group III**

***Europe's role in the world, the borders of the European Union and  
Europe's new neighbours***

***(rapporteurs: Jiří Dienstbier, Doc. Ing. Petr Drulák, Ph.D.)***

- Many people and countries worldwide envy European integration. It is the most integrated grouping of states in the world, based on democracy, solidarity and the rule of law.
- With regard to the role of the EU in the world and the threats the EU is facing, unilateralism was named as the most prominent issue. Linked to that is the question of "soft" and "hard" power and there a sound balance between the two should be sought. Europe needs a military capacity. A European model has to be found which respects European values and prevents their abuse. The 25 national budgets for military power should be more harmonised. In this process it is important to define who are the strategic partners of the EU and what are our perceptions of the global actors: USA, Russia, and China.
- Energy policy has been another important aspect of foreign policy; participants noted that the current energy crisis has paradoxically pushed energy policy a little further towards the objective of lowering the EU's dependency on the supplies from unstable regions and from outside Europe in general. A further progress in deepening energy policy was called for;
- A consensus has been reached on the re-orientation of immigration policies, whereby emphasis should lie primarily with prevention rather than cure. By an effective use of development policy the EU should help to create conditions for people to allow them to live their lives in their home countries.
- Widening and deepening of the EU are no contradictions. However, any further enlargement should go step by step and every stage should be properly explained to citizens. Also, alternatives to full membership should be thoroughly discussed;
- With regard to the borders of the Union, the participants called for a thorough-going debate. Two different positions emerged: "a Christian-value oriented one", putting the emphasis on safeguarding European ("Christian") values and a "political" one putting the emphasis on strengthening security by exporting values of democracy and the rule of law into the near neighbourhood/candidate countries. The accession of Turkey has been debated in this context and further public debates were called for.
- The obstacles to the deepening of the second pillar and achieving the strategic targets of the CFSP were seen in domestic national politics, such as election timetables and populism.

***Conclusions on the Role of Media in building  
a higher awareness of European issues.***

***(concluded by Prof. Petr Fiala, Editor-in-Chief, Ekonom.)***

Although not foreseen as an individual item in the agenda, each of the working group debated the role of the media in the EU integration process and the issue deserves a separate chapter in the conclusions;

- The information barrier on EU issues is still high in many countries, such as the Czech Republic. There, the European institutions could widen their services for journalists and opinion multipliers in general, especially for those from the new Member States;

## **Publication Citizens' Forum on the Future of Europe**

- There were calls to increase the capacity and the funding of a Brussels-based press centre which would enable journalists from national, regional, local media to undertake frequent short visits to follow important developments in Brussels at first hand, in order to improve their understanding of the working of the Union. It is still very expensive for most of the media, especially those from the new Member States to regularly send their staff to Brussels. In the Czech Republic the media that can afford this are often in Eurosceptic hands;
- To increase the capacity (and the funding) of training centres for journalists. Journalists that have a thorough understanding of European issues can thus effectively prevent the media from publishing outright nonsense on the issue, which often happens out of lack of knowledge; It was proposed that a European independent non-partisan newspaper service be launched by the European Commission and made available in the languages of the Member States – with specific parts devoted

**Concluding remarks by Richard Corbett**

**MEP, United Kingdom**

**Member of the Constitutional Affairs Committee in the European Parliament**

I have been charged with trying to make a synthesis. Now, I will not attempt the impossible, but I will, if you will allow me, focus on some key points. Let us start by casting our minds back to this morning's plenary session, where we had a powerful speech, I thought, from Martin Schultz, who reminded us of the reasons the EU was set up in the first place: the idealistic reasons, the emotional side - if you like - to secure peace. We simply had to find a better way of organising our continent after centuries of repeated warfare and in that we have largely succeeded. By contrast, what we have heard from the discussions in the working groups this afternoon has focused a little bit on the other side of the coin, the pragmatic side of why we work together in the European Union as a group of interdependent, neighbouring countries. Whether we like it or not, we are interdependent - we must find common solutions to common problems.

On the economy, we know that we sink or we swim together. Our economies are interdependent. Each one of our Member States does the most of its trade with the rest of the European Union. We are macro economically affected by each other. Many of us share the same currency. We also share the same economic challenges, the challenges of globalisation and global competition, ageing populations, the challenges of how to preserve our social models, which are diverse, but have a lot in common and certainly when it comes to the values that they represent which are particularly important to us as socialists. What we face in the economy is also true in terms of foreign policy. A colleague of mine was recently at a seminar in India, looking at the future of the world in 2050 and he was stuck that all the models they were looking were talking about a world with three superpowers; the United States, China and India. When he said "what about Europe?" they said: "Well, yes Europe is important economically, but in terms of foreign policy, we'll see if you can get your act together" - they were rather dismissive. And as Klaus Hänsch said in our working group this morning, we are an economic superpower, but a political dwarf, and that is actually irresponsible. We need to get our act together and use the fact that in trade and in overseas aid and development we are an economic superpower, but we need to use that for political effect as well. As Mr Drulák was saying, whether that needs a military capacity or not is something we can discuss further and we will see, but if at least we got the political muscle out of our economic weight then maybe we don't need to go very far down the military road, but that of course is a whole debate in itself.

So the idealistic reasons and the pragmatic reasons that drive us together are two sides of the same coin, and it applies to all of our Member States, big and small. I told my working group earlier that I had been at a conference in London, where a British academic was talking to an international audience about the role of the big countries in Europe. Then, in the middle of his talk, he was a bit embarrassed, he suddenly realised that there might be some people from the small Member States in the audience. He asked "Is there anyone here from a small Member States here?". Two hands went up straight away - the Ambassadors of Germany and France. The German Ambassador said, "We are all small countries - the only difference is those who already appreciate that and those who still think of themselves as big powers!" And he was right, of course. We are all small or medium-sized, and certainly interdependent countries.

We have also looked at the question of identity. Sometimes, in our group of neighbouring countries we have the debate; are you Czech or European? Are you French or European? Are you British or European? And the answer is, of course, both. Look at my case, which is even more complicated: I'm English, so support England in football. But when it comes to athletics, we don't have separate teams for England, Scotland and Wales, so I support Britain in the

## Publication Citizens' Forum on the Future of Europe

Olympics. And then when we play against the Americans at golf in the Ryder Cup, I support the Europeans. This is not contradictory, this is just different dimensions to life - a silly example perhaps in sport, but it applies in many aspects of our life. We have a local, a regional, a national, a European and a world dimension to our lives. You do not have to choose, they are different aspects of us as multidimensional individuals.

It's been said that Europe develops, in Professor Rovná's words, "from crisis to crisis". It's rather been from crisis to compromise and then to another crisis and then another compromise - over half a century of such developments. But our latest step forward has stalled - we are in a crisis that has not yet been resolved, and that is the issue of what to do about the European constitution. I think our debates have shown that there is no consensus yet on that. That's ok, we don't yet need a consensus, but we will, in due course, need to find a solution to this issue.

We are in the middle of a period of reflection which is ongoing and I think this needs to be longer and deeper, but we will need then to draw conclusions from it. It's interesting that the debate has been not so much about the text, but the context - the issues we have been discussing in all our working groups today. But that context will change. For instance, issues that were of concern in France during the referendum campaign like the services directive, that context is changing. It will change still further in a year or so when you will have a new President in France and new governments in some other countries. Context changes month by month in any case, but in a new context, next year perhaps, we will have to decide what to do with this text.

And we saw in our discussions that the range of options is large. At one extreme you could say to France and the Netherlands, "look, please think again because a majority has now ratified this constitution - it's now 16 of the 27 Member States, so please think again and vote again without further ado." I think it is unlikely to work quite so simply, but we'll see. The other extreme is to say "forget it, it's impossible now to change the treaties now we need 27 ratifications. We have to live with the current treaties as they are now forever more". That other extreme, I think, is equally unrealistic because the reasons which led all our governments to conclude that we need a reform of the current treaties have not gone away. They have been touched on today in every working group. The Union needs to work more effectively in the economy, in foreign affairs. We need to make it more transparent and more democratically accountable. We need to adjust the mechanics, the institutions to the enlarged (and eventually still larger) Union if we are to avoid the sclerosis of the decision making system. Those issues will not disappear - in due course, they will have to be addressed. We will come back to that next year - we do not need to decide now, - but we do need to start thinking what solution can we find on the constitution: could we have the same text with declarations to interpret it? That worked when Denmark rejected the Treaty of Maastricht - without changing one word of the treaty, they had a new referendum and approved it having had reassurances through declarations interpreting it. Would that work now? Looks a bit difficult at this stage - we'll see in a year's time. Or perhaps an extra protocol, which would itself need ratifying in every country, adding to it? Maybe that's insufficient, maybe we need to renegotiate part of the text, maybe we need to renegotiate the whole text, maybe you do it by lots of little treaties, issue by issue, or by putting things into enlargement treaties which also change the original treaties. We will see. But I naturally tend to hope that the text is kept as intact as possible - it was a compromise that was worked on for a long time, eventually reached consensus with 25 governments, has public support in most of our states, but not all of them.

What do we do when we have a divergence like this? It is not a rejection of the constitution, it's a divergence - it's accepted strongly in some quarters and rejected in others. What we do in Europe is we talk things through to find a compromise that will work for all. Our EU history is crisis to compromise, to crisis to compromise (and perhaps the term "crisis" is

## **Publication Citizens' Forum on the Future of Europe**

overdone, if you look at our history these are minor crises!). But that process will continue and will have to continue because we need our Union, we need it to work and we need it to work effectively.

That leaves the question that Mr Potůček raised about how to deal with the media, how to communicate with citizens, how to get information and indeed emotion across. It's a huge challenge in my country, I can tell you, with the media that we have, and I know that it's a huge challenge in many Member States, even where you have a media that is sympathetic to the European Union. Our institutions are inevitably more distant from people than national or local institutions. That is a reason why you do not act at European level if you can perfectly well act at national or local level. Sometimes, as we know, we need to act at European level to make sure that we do so in as an effective a way, as transparent a way and as democratic a way as possible. All of us, media, academics, politicians and ordinary citizens, which we all are of course, keep on getting that message across and explaining and persuading people of the merits of our Union that we have worked so long to build up.

I hope that that provides a general summary of where I think there might be consensus in this room, and I will now give the floor to our Commissioner, Mr Spidla. I deliberately say our Commissioner because Commissioners belong to all of us. They are drawn from one per country, but it is a college that belongs to the European Union as a whole and is, of course, accountable to the European Parliament for its actions.

**Concluding address by Vladimír Špidla**  
**Commissioner for Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities**

I shall try to comment very briefly and, in some cases, perhaps a little harshly on the concluding discussions at the Citizens' Forum. Only in this way can we clarify certain concepts and define a few developments for the future.

First of all, we must realise that the *European Union* is *our Union*. This is a fundamental distinction. At this Forum, we have continued to talk about the European Union as if it were something external to us and as if our participation, the participation of anyone, of any state and any group of citizens in the construction of the European project, did not exist. But it is still **our Union!**

Another clear conclusion from these discussions concerns what we must emphasise in public debate: that it is the European Union which is, in its way, a **universal protective force**, a protective principle, allowing this part of the world to develop its own civilisational mission and its own dynamics. The blue flag of the European Union and its 12 stars may be compared with the blue cloak of the Virgin Mary – with the way in which Europeans, together with Christianity, embraced the principle of universal protection and gradually turned away from their tribal gods. We occasionally hear today the assertion that, in times of anxiety, people return to their roots, going back to the nation-state as if to the power which is able to provide the appropriate protection, but this power in reality no longer exists.

Another important aspect, which has been mentioned several times, is **internationalisation**. Economics is being internationalised, science is being internationalised, so it is essential for democracy to be internationalised too. The European Union – our Union – is an answer to how to influence development which is international but which, without it, would remain oligarchic in nature. This is why the internationalisation of democracy is so important. Without this process, democracy will lose its power in an internationalised and global world.

Discussion of the borders and influence of the European Union calls for a different metaphor, the metaphor of **island ecology**. Briefly, if an island society is to develop internal dynamics, it must be either very remote or sufficiently large. This means that Europe, without a certain scale, bringing internal and geographic power, would not be able to control its own internal dynamics in the long term. It would not be able to hold its own against external dynamics and it would not be able to make its own mark on globalisation.

It has been said that the open method of coordination is weak. And it often is weak, but it nevertheless often achieves surprisingly good results. The European method of gradual and voluntary integration is the original feature of the European Union project. Throughout European history, a single question has been asked: **where is 'Rome'**? i.e. where is the centre of economic and political power. The traditional answer after the first world war was to create several 'Romes' and to strike a balance between them. But the European Union's answer is different in that there will be no 'Rome' in Europe. European integration is based on the concept that integration will ensure that **there will never be a centre of economic, political or other power which might destabilise the whole balance of Europe**.

An excellent example of the practical application of this concept was given by Martin Schulz this morning. Germany gave up its Mark because, if the reunified Germany had retained the Mark, it would have gone against the basic principle that there should be no Rome in Europe. This was a great example of a practical statesmanlike decision, the scope of which has not yet been fully appreciated. Why am I talking about this? Deepening of integration is based on the Monnet method of consensus, i.e. the process of integration cannot be enforced. **Of course, there is a need to continue to be pro-active, to have sufficient courage to try new things – but there is also a need to be able to step back when it is found that a step would on**

**balance be more disintegrating than integrating.** Of course, we must also always have sufficient courage when further integrating steps are feasible. It is then essential to move forward and take every opportunity which presents itself. As the Czech steelworkers say, softly softly.

There has also been talk here of the usefulness of a unified European magazine or newspaper. I do not wish to go into too much detail since it is extremely complex. I am aware of the relatively successful project known as Euronews – it has 8 million listeners or viewers every day, while CNN has only 1.2 million viewers in Europe! When I heard about this, it seemed at first to be rather surprising, but the explanation is very simple: Euronews broadcasts in nine languages, CNN only in English. This shows that it is really very important to look for ways to reach national listeners and national viewers and readers and it is clear that it is essential to use a multilingual approach.

I should like to mention one more aspect of European integration, which has not really been raised at this forum but which I consider to be absolutely fundamental for the world and for Europe as such. Europe is the only real – albeit not entirely consistent – advocate of **sustainable development as a strategic, political and social concept.** It is not China, it is not the United States, and it is not any other centre of civilisation in the world. I believe that this is our originality, of which you can be justly proud.

There has also been talk here of a common security policy. The theory of weak and stronger forces, or soft and hard forces, may be described by a whole series of abstract concepts. I am personally convinced that there is a certain need to build an effective force, which Europe should be capable of using. The first step is clear: we must **formulate a common border and security policy.** Because, Ladies and Gentlemen, there are plenty of supersonic fighters, but there is not the will to think of them as a tool to be used if necessary. I believe that Europe would find it very difficult to manage in the long term without an appropriate capacity in this respect.

With regard to the enlargement of Europe and its influence in different parts of the world, I should like once more to finish with a rather provocative thought. I believe that it is extremely important for us to realise that the borders of the European space are expanding. In my view, they are basically the border between trans-Saharan and sub-Saharan Africa and the border in the Middle East – all areas inside this space have a direct influence on us and it is in our interests to influence them. Impressions left by recent discussions with Latin America have convinced me that there is a need to develop the transatlantic dimension very significantly so that it is not limited just to relations with North America.

Europe has enough room for heretical and bold ideas. But I consider it to be absolutely fundamental that Europe needs to stabilise and deepen its integration. It needs to push through or develop further types of policies, in the field of both internal policies, such as social and energy policies, and also policies enabling Europe to emerge as a significant player in an international context, so as to put an end to what has been said today: that Europe is simply an economic giant – and I am willing, very stubbornly and resolutely, to uphold the idea that it is also a giant of civilisation and culture – but a dwarf when it comes to foreign policy.

How can this situation be changed? As to how it might unfold, we can take the example of the Italian renaissance. Renaissance Italy was undoubtedly unusually advanced from an economic point of view. It was the giant of its time in terms of its economy, culture and civilisation. But it did not manage to achieve internal integration, which resulted in its destabilisation from within and its glorious era came to an end. I should not like to allow modern-day Europe to suffer a similar fate.

Thank you for your attention.