EUROPE IN THE WORLD OF TOMORROW

Je crois que l'esprit humain semble voyager d'un pays à l'autre" said the great writer Madame de Stael, born in the Republic of Geneva. This probably applies to entire continents. In the 20th century, many admired the "American way of life". In recent decades, the economic boom in East Asia has moved and changed the world. When one speaks of Africa, one thinks first, rightly or wrongly, of catastrophes, wars and civil wars.

Where does Europe stand today? Which continent will win the future? One can hear again and again that "Europe is no longer of relevance in the world" because its military strength has become too small, because the European states have not armed themselves enough¹. This is often paraphrased with "the Europeans must take on more responsibility", as if the problems of our time could be solved with tanks and fighter planes. The French writer Michel Houellebecq predicts in his novel "Submission" that Muslims will seize power in France in 2022; and the British author Douglas Murray has written a bestseller about the "Suicide of Europe".

In fact, the idea that a country is only worth something if it is militarily strong corresponds to a way of thinking that has been developed over centuries, even millennia. Going back to the Enlightenment and Humanism, but above all to historical experience, this way of thinking was overcome in Europe after the Second World War. Starting with the Council of Europe, reinforced by the European Economic Community (EEC), the members of these organizations have replaced a centuries-old policy of confrontation with a policy of cooperation based on common values.

I. Essential elements of the European identity of today.

Already with Homer we learned that the one who killed the most enemies is a great hero. In the course of time, those who won battles, conquered countries and thus increased their fame went down in history as "Greats", think of Alexander the Great, Charlemagne or Frederick the Great. But when Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic

¹ In this sense: Editorial in "Die WELT" of Nov. 24, 2018 "Dwarves on the world stage"

attacked his neighbors in the 1990s, no one said "Milosevic the Great" anymore, but rather "this man belongs before a court martial.

The essence of European politics today is that we live on a continent of peace, where the welfare of the citizens has become more important than the power of the state; on a continent that respects human rights and tries to protect the environment.

1. A Continent of Peace.....

Indeed, a "revolution in European diplomacy" took place in Europe with the founding of the Council of Europe in 1949. The goals and means of foreign policy have changed fundamentally. The traditional power politics were first replaced in Western Europe by a policy of cooperation for the benefit of the citizens. This policy was based on shared values such as democracy, human rights and the rule of law. Promoting the welfare of citizens became the legitimation of foreign policy action as well; the welfare state took on an international dimension. Wars to enforce national and power-political interests became unthinkable for these countries.

For centuries, foreign policy was conducted in the sense of the "reason of state", as Realpolitik, in the power-political interests of the country or its ruler. Wars were regarded as "the continuation of politics by other means" and peace treaties divided territories and people at will. Today, only the USA pursues this foreign policy worldwide, other great powers in the regional areas. The USA can still wage wars all over the world as it pleases, and the eastward expansion of NATO has brought back power-political thinking and new tensions to Europe.

After the Second World War, a peace zone was created by the foundation of the Council of Europe, later deepened by the European Union. Europe no longer conducts military operations to strengthen national foreign policy, but as international peace missions. 75 years of peace in Europe were possible because the "balance of power thinking" based on power politics was replaced by a policy of common values, compliance with which was also monitored internationally.

2. and welfare

Europe now accounts for 7% of the world's population; EU countries and the UK produce 20% of world GDP, but consume half of the world's social services. Undoubtedly, there is still a strong social divide between Western and Eastern Europe, but the principle of promoting the welfare of citizens as a maxim of political action has fundamentally established itself on our continent and has led to social rights and achievements being much more developed in Europe than in other regions of the world².

Certainly, the foundations of any social policy must be earned in every state. But social awareness and social responsibility are also essential as the basis of this policy. The Council of Europe has already made a significant contribution to this, having drawn up appropriate norms and established standards for all members.

Thus, in 1961, the European Social Charter was adopted, which laid down social rights and freedoms, compliance with which is monitored in a control procedure. The rights enshrined in the charter govern various aspects of daily life such as housing; health; education; working conditions and non-discrimination.

Art. 1 of the Charter already emphasizes the "right to work". The Contracting States undertake to strive for the goal of the highest and strongest possible level of employment. It establishes workers' rights and working conditions; a framework for weekly working hours and for paid annual leave. Particular emphasis is placed on equal rights for men and women; there are special protection conditions for children and young people and maternity protection is provided for female workers. The European Social Charter also contains directives in the field of education; a right to protection of health and special measures to support families, which are granted a right to social, legal and economic protection³.

² Kenneth Clark; "Civilisation"; London 1962

³ Alain Decaux; "C'était le XXe Siécle; Paris 1996

Undoubtedly, the implementation of social rights depends as much on economic opportunities as on the political will of governments. But it is unique in the history of international relations that an organization has succeeded in establishing rules whose observance is monitored and allows for appropriate complaints. This approach can only serve as a model for other continents and governments.

3. A continent of human rights.

If the USA is the country of military strength and China has experienced the greatest economic upswing in recent decades, then Europe today is the continent of human rights. The European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) is one of the greatest achievements of the Council of Europe. The ECHR proved to be a treaty of unprecedented scope, which was opened for signature in 1950 and entered into force in 1953. The rights and freedoms of citizens are protected and the member states undertake to guarantee these rights. Violations of these rights can be brought before a supranational institution, the European Court of Human Rights, in addition to the national courts.

Among other things, the Convention guarantees the right to life; protection from torture and inhuman treatment; the right to liberty and security; the right to a fair trial; the protection of privacy, family life and correspondence; the right to freedom of expression, including freedom of the press, etc. Protocols have added other rights, such as the abolition of the death penalty or the protection of property.

The European Court of Human Rights can be seen as a part of the Austrian legal system: every year about 400 complaints are filed from Austria. Some of them even took on the character of precedents, such as the case "Lingens v. Austria": Editor-in-Chief Michel Lingens was proved right against the then Federal Chancellor Bruno Kreisky, who was suing for libel. The Court of Justice ruled that politicians in the public interest must accept more criticism than private individuals.

Law and human rights became part of the European self-image. Whereas in the past each state had sole sovereignty in the area of jurisdiction, Europe has

developed a supranational legal system on which every citizen can rely. This became one of the foundations for a "Europe of the citizens". The legal system created by the Council of Europe created a political reality that was characterized by the fact that European values became the basis of national legal systems as well.

4. Setting an example in environmental protection.

On no other continent has so much been or is done to protect the environment as in Europe. In combating climate change, the European Union has demonstrated that sustainable development and economic progress can go hand in hand. CO2 emissions have been reduced by 22% between 1990 and 2015, and economic growth of 50% has been achieved over the same period⁴.

The Treaty of Maastricht (1992) made "sustainable development" a binding objective; the Treaty of Amsterdam (1997) introduced co-decision by the EU Parliament for environmental issues, which is now equally involved with the Council. The European Environment Agency, based in Copenhagen, has been collecting relevant information and making it available to European decision-makers and the public since 1994.

Between 2010 and 2015, the EU has invested more in the development of renewable energy sources than in any other energy source. For energy from renewable sources, the energy produced per person is three times the global average. Ever since the first steps towards a European environmental policy were taken in 1972, the EU has been committed to tackling the problems of acid rain and the destruction of the ozone layer. European cities today have the lowest levels of air pollution in the world. This is largely the result of the early ban on lead and other pollutants in petrol.

The recycling of waste is also playing an increasingly important role in the cities and communities of our continent. The recycling rate alone rose from 30% in 2004 to 43% only ten years later; 96% of the beaches are clean enough to allow

⁴ Success Story Europe - 60 Years of Joint Progress"; Publication of the European Political Strategy Centre

for carefree bathing. Today, the EU has a target that at least 30% of the expenditure should contribute to achieving climate targets. The EU's climate and environmental policy is aimed at preserving biodiversity and supporting the transition to a clean, low-carbon society. The goal is to achieve "climate neutrality" by 2050. A fund has been created for this purpose, which has € 7500 million at its disposal for the period 2021 to 2027.

The plans for a "European Green Deal" presented by the EU Commission at the end of 2019 offer new opportunities to strengthen European environmental and climate policy.

5. Leading in development aid.

The EU is the largest donor of development aid. With an amount of € 75.2 billion in 2019, 55.2% of the worldwide development aid came from the EU and its member states. This amount represents 0,46 % of the GDP of the European Union⁵. Three member states achieved the official target of 0.7%, namely Luxembourg, Sweden and Denmark; 17 member states increased their contributions in 2018, including Austria.

Beyond official development assistance, the European Union is committed to helping partner countries achieve environmental goals. Official aid should be coordinated with private sector investment, trade and the opportunities available in each country in order to achieve maximum impact. In addition, the intention is to increase official development assistance to 0.7% of GDP by 2030.

Unfortunately, it has to be said that the goals of development aid, as originally declared by the United Nations and which should have been implemented within the framework of development decades, have not been achieved by far. The whole development cooperation project was based on the model of the Marshall Plan, which was very successful in Europe, in countries but where the framework conditions did not correspond to those of post-war Europe, the

⁵ Press release of the European Commission of 16 April 2020

desired successes did not materialize either. But this goes far beyond the possibilities of the EU⁶.

All in all, it can be said that a political model has been created in Europe that is characterized by peace, prosperity, human rights, environmental protection and help for others. This has never existed in this form in history. Europe has found a new identity with a model that was first developed in Western Europe. In the communist countries of Central and Eastern Europe, not only economic but also socio-political development was brutally suppressed until the fall of the "Iron Curtain". This had the effect of preserving traditional thinking in these countries regarding nationalism, the rule of law, or conflict resolution in a form that was overcome in Western Europe after the Second World War.

When the then US Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld spoke of the "new Europe", he actually meant those countries where thinking was often still done in old categories. The integration of those states that had been oppressed for two generations into a pan-European community was undoubtedly appropriate and necessary. But this integration not only changed these countries, it also created new differences of opinion, which affected questions of sovereignty as well as security. For example, some of the former communist countries believe that in order to belong to the West, one must be aggressive toward Russia. After 1955, Austria showed very clearly that belonging to the West is perfectly compatible with constructive relations with Moscow.

Europe, i.e. the members of the Council of Europe and the European Union, today stands for a political model that no longer focuses on the power of the state but on the well-being of the people. The welfare of the citizens became more important than demonstrating power through wars and military interventions. It would therefore be a decisive step for the future towards a new quality of international relations if other countries and continents were to orient themselves according to this European model and not push Europe to fall back into the power politics of past centuries.

 $^{^6}$ "The Marshall Plan in Austria"; Volume 8; Contemporary Austrian Studies, Transaction Publishers 2002.

II. The worldwide superiority of the USA

1. The will to exercise power.

The "revolution in diplomacy" has not taken place in the USA- quite the contrary. After the collapse of the Soviet Union and after the victory in the First Gulf War, the American President George Bush (father) declared that a "new world order" had been created. What was really new? In the new situation the USA recognized the unique chance to lead the world on its own; to decide alone when and where military force can be used; if possible with the approval of the United Nations, if necessary, even without it.

Francis Fukuyama spoke of the "end of history", that is, the final victory of the American ideas of democracy and capitalism. But there was another essential innovation: if the treatment of one's own citizens, as still stated in the Charter of the United Nations, used to be an "internal affair" of each state, the UN has now for the first time stated that the mistreatment of even one's own citizens can constitute "a threat to peace". The USA interpreted this as its right to control security zones, for example in Iraq, a sovereign state, with Operation "Provide Comfort", i.e. to intervene at will.

In his book of the same name, Henry Kissinger raised the question of whether America needs its own foreign policy⁷. The basic answer to this question is "NO"; and this is because the USA is so powerful that it can do whatever it wants.

In 1992, under Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney, a "Defense Planning Guidance" stipulated that it is the "political and military mission of the United States to prevent the emergence of a military power anywhere in the world that could challenge the American claim to leadership. Then, under President Bill Clinton, military interventions were further expanded under the slogan "liberal interventionism" or "humanitarian action" in Bosnia, Kosovo and Haiti. In addition, it was thus possible to find a new task for NATO. Under

⁷ Henry Kissinger: "Does America need a Foreign Policy? -Toward a Diplomacy for the ^{21st} Century". New York 2001

the motto of defending "American values", it was possible to intervene wherever American interests were at stake. In the process, agreement was also reached between the political camps in the United States, i.e. between "liberal internationalism" and the neo-conservatives. Democratic institutions and liberal values were to be anchored throughout the world. For, according to the official representation, democracies would not wage wars against each other. Whatever the case may be, this gave the U.S. the opportunity to intervene worldwide; if possible to create governments in its own image through "regime change"

2. Wars always and everywhere.

The attacks of September 11, 2001, led to a further militarization of American foreign policy. In the following seven years alone, the US defense budget increased by 80 %. Of the 1.6 million American soldiers, 500,000 are stationed abroad at 800 military bases in 172 countries. The U.S. has 50 formal allies on all continents; while in comparison, China may have one, North Korea.

In 2001, Afghanistan was invaded in order to punish the country for giving shelter to al-Qaeda terrorists. This was followed by the invasion of Iraq in 2003; in the following years, participation in the fighting in Libya, Syria and Yemen. U.S. special forces have also been deployed in Niger and Somalia, as well as in Mali, Thailand, Jordan and other parts of the world. In 2017, 37,813 U.S. soldiers served on secret missions⁹; 40,000 U.S. troops were stationed in Japan; 24,000 in South Korea; 36,000 in Germany; 8300 in the United Kingdom; 1400 in Turkey; 6500 in Bahrain and 3000 in Qatar.

One thing is also significant: President Donald Trump decided to withdraw the US forces from only one of these theaters of war, namely Syria. As a result, he was criticized by large parts of the media as an "irresponsible isolationist". In September 2002, the "National Security Strategy" was

⁸ William Shawcross; "Diliver us from Evil"; New York 2000

 $^{^{9}}$ Michael Mandelbaum; "The Ideas that conquered the World"; New York 2002

adopted, which served as the basis for worldwide commitment to the "fight against terrorism". It states that the USA does not hesitate to act alone and preventively in the fight against terror. Preventive wars thus became an official part of the American military strategy

The theory of the "Revolution in Military Affairs" also helped to strengthen the belief in the insurmountable time of the US forces. According to it, technical progress has increased the destructive power of weapons so decisively that neither on earth nor in space could anyone resist the military power of the USA. In fact, under President Bush (son), the USA still established a military command "CYBERCOM", which carried out more than 200 cyber attacks already in 2011.

Generally speaking, it can be assumed that in a time when information systems are a decisive factor in peace and war, all states will devote a great deal of energy to being able to destroy them in an emergency. Years ago Russia was blamed for the cyber attacks against targets in Estonia and Georgia. Books have been written about Putin's new "Cyber-Armies". China is repeatedly accused of industrial espionage via cyber attacks. But also in this area the USA is leading. Already under President Obama the United States massively expanded military deployments of drones. As early as 2013, the U.S. armed forces had 11,000 drones at their disposal, killing 8,000 people, including, however, a considerable number of civilians despite their alleged accuracy. So if the goal of a drone mission is to take out enemies covertly and remotely, then it has undoubtedly been achieved. How far a terrorist mentality can be pushed back by this, if there are always innocent victims, is a completely different question.

In any case, it can be assumed that, as far as military strength is concerned, the United States has no equal opponent on the ground, in the air, on the oceans and in space, either in terms of classical weapons or modern robots. If the U.S. uses other means in addition to armed power to enforce its will, it is probably because wars are expensive and become less popular the longer they last; and despite the enormous military superiority, they are obviously

difficult to win. America has therefore developed various forms of "substitute wars," such as propaganda wars or even economic wars, in each of which "law as weapon" is also used.

III. The world of tomorrow.

As far as the development of individual regions, countries and entire continents is concerned, there are some areas - such as demographic or economic development - which can be calculated to a certain degree. Other events, often very decisive, occur suddenly and to everyone's surprise, such as the current Covid 19 pandemic. Suddenly, familiar ways of life are changed, whole branches of the economy collapse, life is no longer as it used to be. Here, we will first use a few examples to illustrate the forces that have shaped international relations in recent decades and that may also be relevant for the future, such as the power of the courageous or the power of the markets. But it will also be shown which changes are already emerging in such a way that they can be taken for granted for a foreseeable future.

1. The power of the brave and the power of the markets.

Why is the world changing? During the last decades, for example since the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, the world has changed dramatically, both politically and socio-politically. Looking at the creative forces that have brought about these changes, it can be seen that traditional power factors have played only a minor or no role, while the power of destiny and chance; the power of the courageous; the markets and even myths have been very decisive in this process¹⁰.

• The fall of the Berlin Wall is a prime example of how the "power of the brave" can triumph over the "powerlessness of the powerful". With 170,000 Stasi employees and informants, the GDR probably had one of the best-organized repressive apparatuses in the world. Nevertheless, courageous opposition members dared to resist at great personal risk. The cry "We want change" eventually became a slogan of the demonstrating masses. The economic

٠

 $^{^{10}}$ Le Monde diplomatique- Music and Politics; June/July 2020

crisis in the GDR, the creeping disintegration of the state and power apparatus there, probably played just as much a role in this as the attractiveness of the life deal in West Germany; from the general standard of living to pop music and blue jeans among young people.

- The Soviet Union, a superpower, also collapsed, although the state apparatus had millions of soldiers; over 60,000 tanks; nuclear warheads and long-range missiles. Certainly, here too, it played a role that the reality of everyday life was only a mirage of the official ideology; that the planned economy was not capable of even remotely matching the standard of living in the West; and that nationalist thinking could not be overcome in the multi-ethnic empire. Civil rights activists such as Andrei Sakharov and Alexander Ginsburg retained the upper hand, although the influence of Alexander Solzhenitsyn must also be mentioned in this context. The trade union movement Solidarnosc in Poland; Nelson Mandela and Aung Sann Suu Kyi are further examples of how whole systems can be brought down by the "power of the brave".
- The power of the markets, in combination with technology and communication, has led to the creation of a new world economic order through globalization. Initially it was political decisions that led to the privatization and deregulation of large parts of the economy in the 1980s. However, it was then market forces that led to worldwide competition in essential areas. State monopolies protected until then were smashed; in China alone, steel production rose from 46 million tons in 1985 to 738 million tons only 30 years later. The winners in this development were all those who could assert themselves worldwide; the losers were those who could not keep up with this dynamic, for example in the traditional industries. Donald Trump's efforts to turn the wheel back show how difficult it is for politicians to influence globalization¹¹. Even during the economic and financial crisis of 2008, it became clear that events were primarily determined by the markets and that politicians had the greatest difficulty in reacting, in some cases just barely able to mitigate the crisis.
- Another phenomenon that has a decisive influence on international relations and also has an impact on domestic politics in many countries are migration movements. There are now numerous studies on why millions of people leave their homes to find a better future in North America or in Europe. The wars in the Middle East, political and social conflicts, high crime rates and

¹¹ Useful saving for difficult times; Abhijet V. Banerjee; Paris 2020

corrupt governments are just as much reasons for this as a lack of educational opportunities; high unemployment, strong population growth or already noticeable effects of climate change.

Now our theme is "Europe in the world of tomorrow" and the concrete question is "Why is the world changing?". The very decisive changes of the last decades described above were not based on the will of those in power to shape the future; forces were set in motion that could no longer be controlled by traditional means of power. In the future, too, one can probably expect that it will hardly be possible to stop social, technological and economic developments with traditional means of power, i.e., primarily military strength.

- The rise of Islamic fundamentalism in recent decades also raises the question of how far this development was planned or at least made possible by political decisions. To what extent were religious and political groups proactive? The main goals of Islamic fundamentalism are a return to the original Islam and the fight against Western foreign infiltration. The goal is to remove the separation between secular and spiritual authority. In addition, this movement has an expansionist component: the Islamic legal order, the Islamic world order, is to rule the whole world. Ideologies such as nationalism, socialism or pan-Arabism, which were at times taken over from the West, have disappointed, which is why people rediscovered their own roots, Islam. It was then this combination of religious conviction and political will that gave Islamic fundamentalism its special power. If then the US tried to religious dynamic by supporting exploit this fundamentalists in Afghanistan in the fight against the Soviet Union, then it must be seen as a "ruse of history" when America declared the global "war on terror" only a few years later.
- Which forces and which powers have brought about the social and cultural change that has led to the fact that we today see the role of state and society, of faith and church, very differently than just a few years ago. The role models of men and women have changed; the acceptance of different interpersonal relationships or professional profiles has changed decisively. The power of minorities, initiatives of the cultural avant-garde have probably played just as much a role in this as the willingness of young people to bring about social change, even if this has been associated with risks. Political power has often confined itself

precisely to not preventing this change or, in retrospect, to setting the framework for it¹².

On the other hand, global information systems have made a significant contribution to a worldwide commitment to new ideas and new ideals. Standards have been set worldwide, and non-compliance with them can be shown; or their violation is internationally denounced. In this context it is interesting to note that the term "modernity" first became established in art and culture, which means new contents and new

forms of expression were found before mass production in industry and modern warfare. Later, art prevailed in "post-modernism"; subsequently, society became the information society.

If the "Project Europe" is characterized by the fact that it is based on a system of values, then this model is probably more suitable for shaping future developments, as shown above, than traditional power apparatuses. "Europe" should thus be in a position to shape policies in such a way that they are accepted by the overall system as well as by the expectations of the citizens concerned.

2. Demography and economic development.

"Demography determines the fate of a country," said Auguste Comte. In fact, the development of the population of a country or continent can be assessed as well as economic changes.

As far as Europe is concerned, the death rate has been higher than the number of births since 2012. Without an influx from outside, the number of inhabitants in the European Union would therefore decline. At present, 447 million people live in the EU; if the current trend continues, the figure will be only 424 million in 2070 (6). This development is linked to another

_

¹² Brian White; "Issues in World Politics"; UK 2001

trend: the proportion of people over 65, which is currently 20%, will rise to 30% by 2070.

At the same time, the world population is expected to increase from the current 7.8 billion people to 10.5 billion over the next 50 years. This would mean that the share of the countries of the European Union in the world population, which in 1950 was still 13% and is now 5.7%, would fall to 3.7%. The United States' share of the world population would then be 3.9%; that of China, according to these calculations, would fall from 18.5% to 12%. India would then have 250 million more people than today and the subcontinent's share of the world population would be 15.6%. The development in Africa is particularly dramatic: in 1950 only 7.1% of the world population lived on this continent; today it is 14% and in 50 years it will be 27.4%¹³

It is obvious that these demographic developments can have significant geopolitical implications. The internal stability of the countries is affected as much as their economic strength; migration movements can take on unprecedented proportions.

The economic balance of power will also change dramatically in the coming decades, and it is also important to note that the proportion of working people in overaged societies is declining. The trends are clear: the share of Chinese GDP in world production, measured in terms of purchasing power parity, was 18 % in 2016 and is expected to rise to 20 % by 2050¹⁴. In contrast, the share of the US economy will fall from 16% to 12% over the same period, and that of the EU countries from 15% to 9%.

The "ranking" of the economies of the individual countries will change accordingly. If, again measured in terms of purchasing power parity, this was led by China in 2016, followed by the USA, India, Japan and Germany; for 2050 the following forecasts are available: China, followed

¹³ Scientific Service of the European Parliament; PE 628 271 of June 2019

¹⁴ Journal "Diplomacy" of Sept/Oct. 2019

by India, the USA, Indonesia and Brazil. Germany would then barely make it to ninth place; Great Britain would be in tenth place.

Now we are seeing just how enormous an impact a small virus can have on economic development: entire industries collapse; people suffer huge losses of income; international trade in goods is paralyzed. Whatever the development, the trend is clear: Europe's share in the world economy is shrinking. The motto can therefore only be: together we are stronger.

3. New dimensions of security and power

As much as the economy and society determine the development of a country and a continent, it is precisely in the area of international relations that the convictions and attitudes that shape the actions of the individual actors are important. Already today, new dimensions of security and power are emerging in this regard: the "welfare thinking" has, at least in Europe, pushed "warfare thinking" into the background.

For 1000 years, international security was a militarily anchored security. A strong army should ensure that one country could not be invaded or oppressed by another. In this sense, power was above all military power: the one who had the strongest troops or who was better able to deploy them was able to impose his will on the other. Thus, for the longest time, international security was 90% military security. Today, only 10 % of international security is military security, and accordingly, power today is only 10 % military power.

What has changed? Whereas in the past, interstate security was based on a single decisive question: "Who is the stronger", international security today encompasses many aspects, practically all areas that affect citizens in the welfare state: from the security of living conditions to the security of currency; from health security to a secure environment; from the guarantee of human rights to education and training. Today, the

focus is on "human security", i.e. making people feel comfortable and secure in the most diverse areas of life¹⁵.

It is not possible to solve all these areas of "human security" through armed conflict. These challenges require much more international cooperation and mutual trust, which has become the norm in European organizations. Even those developments that are determined by markets and technologies, even if they pose a threat, can hardly be solved militarily.

Similarly, the structure of those who exercise power has also changed today: there are a multitude of players, far beyond the state actors. Countless NGOs, corporations, media, and even private actors have appeared on the scene, which has led to a fragmentation of old power structures.

4. Die Revolution in NON-Military Affairs".

The attitude towards war has changed decisively in the European countries. Libraries were written about the "Revolution in Military Affairs", that is, about the fact that modern technology has revolutionized warfare. According to this, modern weapons have reached a precision and power never seen before, which should enable especially the US forces to conquer the whole world and beyond. All this may be true. But at the same time the environment in which wars are fought has changed dramatically:

For centuries, wars and the use of force were part of the normality
of international relations and were accepted. Wars were simply
the "extension of politics by other means". This is no longer the
case today. International law prohibits the use of force. There are
numerous treaties prohibiting wars and the Charter of the United
Nations prohibits the use of force. Only self-defense and military

¹⁵ Christopher A. Preble 'The Power Problem'; Cornelle University 2009

operations that have been approved by the UN Security Council are allowed.

- Waging wars means killing and destroying. This has not changed. What is new, however, is that the world is now watching. The influence of the mass media, which report directly on fighting, can hardly be overestimated. If people can watch in their living rooms how people are killed on the battlefield and whole areas of land are destroyed, then it becomes more difficult for any army leadership to deploy troops at will.
- On 1 July 2002, the International Criminal Court began its work. This court has been recognized by 123 states of the world and punishes crimes against humanity, war crimes and genocide. International criminal tribunals for the former Yugoslavia and for Rwanda were already established to punish crimes committed during the conflicts in these countries. Even if some powers such as the USA, China or Russia have not recognized the International Criminal Court, its creation has made it clear to a large part of the international community that wars and war crimes are no longer a normal part of international relations.
- Not insignificant is also that the attitude towards heroism has changed. Since time immemorial it was considered "beautiful and glorious to die on the field of honor". As late as the First World War, the commanding British general spoke of a "glorious day" when, in the first 12 hours of the offensive on the Somme, his country had to mourn 60,000 victims. Today, even professional armies must do everything possible to avoid casualties in their own ranks. And the "field of honor" has largely shifted from the battlefield to the soccer field.

In any case, it has become much more difficult to wage wars and win battles. This is not only shown by the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, which

have been going on for decades now. Also the "war on terror" can hardly be called a great success, since there are four times more Islamic terrorists today than in September 2001. How can one really disenchant utopias that are oriented towards the hereafter? How can one give confidence and a home to someone who is uprooted?

Obviously it is hardly possible to achieve these goals by military means. It is therefore incomprehensible that at a time when most threats are non-military in nature, armed force is still seen as the solution to the problems, that a continent is only considered to be a force in the world if it is rearmed.

These considerations are in line with the expectations of EU citizens. According to a survey from 2018, they expect more commitment from the European Union in the fight against unemployment, environmental protection, stronger measures against tax evasion and a stronger promotion of democracy.

IV. Key questions for the future

1. Which Union: Confederation or Supranational State?

Europe's future in the world depends crucially on how far our continent's integration progresses, and in particular on how far the European Union will emerge stronger from the various crises.

The Council of Europe was founded in 1949 as an association of sovereign states. Some countries wanted greater integration and decided in 1957 in the Treaty of Rome to strive for an "ever closer union" in Europe. Since then it is still unclear how close this union is to become. Some are striving, in the style of the United States of America, for the United States of Europe, that is, for a federal state.

The current problems of the EU are directly linked to the question of how much sovereignty the individual nation states should give up and transfer to the Union. In fact, we are living in a period of "shared sovereignty": national sovereignty has been given up, but no European sovereignty has been created. We have given up national currencies, there is a European monetary union with the euro. But there is no European economic union, which should be a prerequisite for a common currency. We have given up national border controls, but the "Dublin decisions", which should have been the basis of a common refugee policy, have proved obsolete in times of crisis. One speaks of a Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), but in the end it was precisely the large countries of the EU that were not prepared to give up their foreign policy to assert their own interests.

Long before the Corona crisis, French President Emmanuel Macron presented proposals to strengthen a common European sovereignty: a common budget should strengthen the euro; a European refugee agency should manage migration; and a common European army should be created. But would France itself be willing to give up its own army?

Then came the Corona pandemic. Now, in July 2020, the EU heads of state and government agreed a € 750 billion aid package to overcome it. As in the past, countries with lower national debt have initially hesitated to pay for those who have not yet distinguished themselves by thriftiness. In addition, these countries were often hit harder by the virus, such as Italy or Spain. However: it was finally agreed to raise the considerable sum of almost 5% of the EU's GDP in the form of bonds and direct aid

For the first time in history, the EU as a whole will raise the stipulated sum, be jointly liable and use it to supplement the measures of the European Central Bank. This is not what the United States of America decided a few years after its founding under then Secretary of the Treasury Alexander Hamilton, namely joint liability for all national debts, but it is a decisive step towards a possible new, supranational policy.

Europe's position in tomorrow's world will depend decisively on how sovereign the EU can act as such and whether there is a willingness to "dare to do more Europe".

2. Europe with or without Russia?

Russia became a member of the Council of Europe in 1996 and, like the other members, has thus assumed the corresponding obligations regarding the European Convention on Human Rights, the suspension of the death penalty or the protection of national minorities. Washington chose a different strategy: as soon as it became clear after the presidency of Boris Yeltsin that Russia was not prepared to assume a vassal role, the various American governments did everything they could to expand NATO to Russia's borders¹⁶.

Countless sanctions were imposed on Russia and with the help of numerous NGOs and even the American ambassador in Moscow, a "regime change" was to be achieved. But Russia is not Albania. As soon as Vladimir Putin, as Russian president, made it clear that his country also wanted to pursue its own national interests, Washington did not hesitate to start a new Cold War. Putin, who was elected president in May 2000, was not only politically opposed, but demonized and accused of wanting to establish a "new world order". America simply needs an enemy. If one considers oneself to be "the chosen nation", called to lead humanity, then one needs an enemy. For "the good" can show his virtues accordingly only when there is also "the evil".

Europe, on the other hand, should try to establish or expand a partnership with Russia in view of the given interests: politically within the framework of the Council of Europe; economically and in the security sector. The foundations of an economic partnership are also clear: Russia is rich in oil and natural gas, which Europe needs; and the

¹⁶ Stephen F. Cohen; "Who Putin is not"; September ^{20th}, 2018

countries of Europe are in a position to help Russia build the economic structures that a modern economy needs.

With regard to a security partnership between Russia and Europe, one must probably assume the dangers to which a country or government is exposed. If one is confronted with common threats, then it is probably appropriate to work together to avert these threats. In this sense, the aim should be to continue along the path that the Council of Europe took with the admission of Russia and not to create new dividing lines in Europe.

3. Do we go the European or the American way?

For the future of the world, it is of crucial importance whether international relations continue to be seen as power politics in the traditional sense, as is the case in Washington's view; or whether the European model with its exemplary function prevails.

Officials repeatedly emphasize that Europe and the United States form a community of values. This is fundamentally correct. However, the implementation of these values in practical politics takes different forms on both sides of the Atlantic, especially in terms of international relations. The "revolution in diplomacy" has not taken place in the United States. American foreign policy is still power politics based on military strength, according to the motto "Foreign Policy without the backing of the military is like a base-ball game without a base-ball bat". In contrast, as shown above, in the relations between European countries, law has replaced power as the basis for action. In US foreign policy, on the other hand, the principle of "Might is Right" still prevails.

It is incomprehensible that there are still voices that propagate the American way of armament and wars, even for Europe, when one considers the devastating results of US policy in recent decades: the war in Iraq alone has claimed 600,000 civilian lives; an entire region has been destabilized; waves of refugees have been triggered and terrorist groups have been strengthened. NATO's eastward expansion has led to new

tensions in Europe and the policy of "regime change" as practiced in

various countries has led to new wars.

The United States holds on to its national sovereignty unconditionally.

Foreign policy must serve only national interests; there are no equal

allies, only vassals. Washington sets the rules for its own actions and

also for how other countries must behave. In this sense, the U.S. secret

services see themselves as entitled to spy on security establishments,

commercial enterprises and also private individuals, enemies and

friends. Contracts such as the Iran Agreement are terminated, regardless

of the European partners, and Germany is prescribed from whom the

country may or may not obtain its energy.

The USA sees itself as a chosen nation. International organizations

consider it an encroachment on their sovereignty and freedom. If

convenient, they choose to go it alone in wars, in environmental

protection or in the rejection of the International Criminal Court. In view

of these fundamental differences, the question must be allowed whether

a genuine partnership is even possible under these circumstances. In

any case, the Europeans are well advised to defend their own interests

with the same intensity and determination as the Americans defend

theirs. And if Europe today stands for peace and prosperity in the world,

then in the world of tomorrow this European model should be seen as a

model for international relations.

Dr. Wendelin Ettmayer

born 1943; grew up in Neukirchen am Walde

1977-1993: Member of the National Council

1994-2008: Ambassador to Finland, Canada and the Council of Europe

Author of various publications, see website: www.wendelinettmayer.at

e-mail: wendelin.ettmayer@gmail.com

24 / 24