

GLOBALIZATION

With Christine Lagarde, US Corporations Enter the French Government



Unknown to the French, lawyer Christine Lagarde became the Foreign Trade Minister of the government of Dominique de Villepin. Only a few years ago, she was defending the interests of US multinationals to the detriment of French companies. Her political positions perfectly match her status as a member of the CSIS, the think tank of the oil lobby in the United States.

page 2

Media clash on the European budget

INTERNATIONAL OP-ED

The French-German offensive about the British budget decrease before and during the summit of Brussels has weakened the British presidency of the European Union when it has not even started yet. Tony Blair hoped to impose his leadership but he is now on the defensive. The New Labour and its allies thus make efforts to change the main topic of the discussion from the British reduction to the Common Agricultural Policy.

page 5

JUNE 25, 1991

Croatia and Slovakia Separate from Yugoslavia

After the collapse of power in East and Central Europe, 83% of the Slovenians voted in favor of the independence of their republic during a referendum. In the meantime, 94% of the Croatians approved a more subtle resolution to strengthen their autonomy. Both republics drew their own conclusions after Serbia's rejection to hand over the temporary presidency to Yugoslavia. On June 25, 1991, both republics separated from Yugoslavia - which then saw itself divided into two parts - and later proclaimed their independence. Serbia immediately launched a lightning attack against Croatia and, two weeks later, against Slovenia. The Yugoslav air force attacked key infrastructure targets of both republics aiming at damaging their economy and thus preventing them from obtaining their independence. ■



THE PRESIDENTIAL MAJORITY PREPARES VLADIMIR PUTIN'S THIRD MANDATE

Iedinaia Rossia (United Russia), the party of the president, currently prepares a law that would allow Vladimir Putin to run for a third period of mandate. Without openly questioning the principle that opposes three consecutive mandates, the Committee of the Duma presided over by Alexander Moskalets suggests that only mandates completely fulfilled should be taken into account. Then, a resignation from the president before the end of his second mandate would be enough to enable him to run for a third term. ■

Globalization

With Christine Lagarde, US Corporations Enter the French Government

Unknown to the French, lawyer Christine Lagarde became the Foreign Trade Minister of the government of Dominique de Villepin. Only a few years ago, she was defending the interests of US multinationals to the detriment of French companies. Her political positions perfectly match her status as a member of the CSIS, the think tank of the oil lobby in the United States.



Christine Lagarde

University of Saint Gallen, Switzerland, May 20, 2005.

The composition of the new French government, announced on June 2, 2005, is amazing due to its incoherence. The Prime Minister, Dominique de Villepin, a Gaullist that won world recognition after his speech against the war in Iraq before the UN Security Council, is accompanied by a State Minister, Nicolas Sarkozy, who is a committed supporter of the United States and Israel.

The Finance Minister, a strategic element of the US penetration, becomes an Atlantist bastion. The Minister of Economy, Thierry Breton, is a member of a powerful liberal think tank: the Aspen Institute [1], and member of its French branch. Three delegate ministers back Breton. For reasons of internal balance

of the presidential majority, François Loos is in charge of Industry. Jean-François Copé is in charge of the Budget and the State Reform. It is a young leader who learned the US methods of communication under the guidance of John Negroponte [2], who currently heads the group of US intelligence agencies. Finally, Christine Lagarde is in charge of Foreign Trade.

In the political field, Mrs. Lagarde is a stranger. She is a brilliant lawyer, specialized in social law, who joined the Baker & McKenzie law firm, in Chicago, in 1981 and made a career in the United States. Not renouncing to her personal life, according to those in charge of her publicity, she went up the levels of the world's most important economy law firm (4,400 collaborators in 35 countries) until she was appointed as a member of its Executive Committee and later, in the fall of 2004, she was promoted to president of its Strategy Committee. In the meantime, in April 2005, she joined the Vigilance Committee of the Dutch multinational ING, one of the most important financial societies in the world. Christine Lagarde occupies the fifth rank in the list of European businesswomen published by the *Wall Street Journal* and the 76th rank in the **list of the world's most powerful women** of *Forbes* magazine.

Dazzled by such exceptional career, the French media abstained from investigating the new minister.

Although this element is not included in her **official biography**, Mrs. Lagarde was a member of the Center for Strategic & International Studies (CSIS) [3]. She co-presided over the **Action USA/UE/Poland commission** of this think tank along with Zbigniew Brzezinski [4] and, in particular, she was in charge of the USA-Poland Defense Industries working group (1995-2002) and issues regarding the liberalization of Polish exchanges. However, in those positions, she represented the US interests to the detriment of those of France's foreign trade, the sector that she currently heads in the French government [5]. As a lawyer of the Baker & McKenzie law firm, Christine Lagarde worked in favor of the interests of Boeing and Lockheed-Martin to the detriment of the interests of Airbus and Dassault.

In 2003, Christine Lagarde became a member, also in the CSIS, of the Commission for the Expansion of the Euro-Atlantic Community along with her friend Brzezinski and different personalities such as the former director of the World Trade Organization (WTO) Renato Ruggiero, and Stuart Eizenstat, former special ambassador for the restitution of religious assets in Central Europe. This commission was in charge of potential investments in Poland, Latvia, Romania, Czech Republic and Hungary.

A man played a key role in each of those commissions: Bruce P. Jackson, founder of the US Committee to Expand NATO, who represented the interests of the aircraft manufacturing company Lockheed-Martin, of which he was a vice-president. Thanks to the relations made in the commissions presided over by Christine Lagarde, Jackson signed the contract of the century: the sale, in April 2003, of 48 F-16 Lockheed-Martin jet fighters to Poland for 3.5 billion dollars.

The transaction caused great dismay in Europe as the Polish government was paying with the European Union's funds for the preservation of its agricultural

sector.

The deal had nothing to do with Poland's real needs. On the other hand, once integrated to the European Union, the logical thing would have been that Poland would have bought the Mirage 2000-5 MK2 of Dassault or the Jaas-39 of Saab.

However, the contract was very linked to the Poland's incorporation to the colonization of Iraq along with the United States, the United Kingdom and Australia. In addition, Jackson was the main financial backer of the Committee for the Liberation of Iraq [6].

After that transaction, the Euro-Atlantic Commission of Christine Lagarde was in charge of *"assisting Polish companies to better self-market capabilities as a subcontractor or supplier for contracts won by prime contractors (particularly U.S.) in Iraq, Afghanistan, and as part of Poland's defense modernization"* [7].

Only supposing that Christine Lagarde abandoned her former duties and that she has no intentions of going back to them, would it be possible to admit that we are not witnessing a case of conflict of interests. However, when the political positions defended by the groups she presided over are analyzed, it is impossible to ignore that they are completely against the French position defended by Dominique de Villepin before the United Nations.

To conclude, we have to say that the statements made by the minister two days after her appointment seemed shocking for the French trade unions. Christine Lagarde promised to carry out a reform of labor law because, in her opinion, *"it often represents an obstacle for employment and for a number of business decisions"*. However, in order to understand her point of view, it is important to analyze her statements, not comparing them with the MEDEF speech, but linked to the positions that she has thus far supported. Christine Lagarde made big efforts to impose the Anglo-Saxon labor law model in Central and East Europe. Her goal was to promote the interests of the US firms, not those of the Old Europe.

[1] *"The Aspen Institute Educates the Sharks of Business"*, *Voltaire*, September 2, 2004.

[2] *"John Negroponte, bientôt à Bagdad"*, by Arthur Lepic, *Voltaire*, April 20, 2004.

[3] *"CSIS, The Oil Crusaders"*, *Voltaire*, July 6, 2004.

[4] *"The outrageous strategy to destroy Russia"*, by Arthur Lepic, *Voltaire*, October 22, 2004.

[5] Another co-president, Austrian former minister Ferdinand Lacina, represented the European interests.

[6] *"Une guerre juteuse pour Lockheed Martin"*, *Voltaire*, February 7, 2003.

[7] Draft Work Plan, February 25, 2004.

Media clash on the European budget

The French-German offensive about the British budget decrease before and during the summit of Brussels has weakened the British presidency of the European Union when it has not even started yet. Tony Blair hoped to impose his leadership but he is now on the defensive. The New Labour and its allies thus make efforts to change the main topic of the discussion from the British reduction to the Common Agricultural Policy.

Analysis

The French-German offensive about the British budget decrease before and during the summit of Brussels has weakened the British presidency of the European Union when it has not even started yet. Tony Blair hoped to impose his leadership with the support of the Atlantist states but he is now on the defensive. The British Prime Minister has been described by Jean-Claude Juncker, current president of the European Union whom he will succeed on July 1st, as the one responsible for the failure of budget discussions. Thus, the *New Labour* and its allies make efforts to change the main topic of the discussion from the British reduction to the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP). In *Der Spiegel*, Tony Blair presents the German readers with the guidelines of his defense. He tries to isolate the French position denouncing the CAP and insisting on the fact that it is illogical that 40% of the budget spending is aimed at 5% of the European economic activity. He notes that the United Kingdom already gives too much money to the Union although he is willing to give more as long as it serves the interests of those who need it more. Finally, he calls for a reform of the social protection systems in Europe, an issue that would likely be at the center of the British presidency. In *The Guardian*, former Labour minister and European Trade Commissioner Peter Mandelson retakes the arguments given by the Prime Minister although he does not really assume them. He believes that it is necessary that Europe modernizes and adapts its social model to globalization. However, he denies an Americanization of the European model.

This media offensive has a favorable echo in the French press while it is somewhat mitigated by the rest of the European media. Thus, in *Le Monde*, the new French Minister of Foreign Affairs, Philippe Douste-Blazy, defends the French position and particularly the CAP. Criticizing the British arguments, he notes that this policy is not only a support for farmers but it also guarantees the agricultural self-sufficiency of the Union and contributes to the reconditioning of the territories and food security (this argument could be seen as evocation of the crisis of the mad cows from Great Britain). He urges Europe to work on the reactivation of its economy, security and common foreign policy.

Most of the other European actors deplore this conflict without saying who is right and condemning their selfishness. In *Der Standard*, the Austrian Foreign Affairs Minister, Ursula Plassnik, regrets that European leaders lost the art of commitment. However, she aligns herself with the British problems and calls for an extensive evaluation of the European social system that, she says, is no longer adapted to the new challenges of globalization. Thus, she thinks that the French and Dutch electors who voted against the European Constitutional Treaty (ECT) were chasing a chimera because it is not possible that the European social system can protect them still today.

Vaclav Havel's former advisor, Atlantist Jiri Pehe, affirms in an article circulated by *Project Syndicate* and published by the *Korea Herald* and *Le Figaro*, and we hope that maybe others too, that the new states have showed a strong European sentiment during the budget crisis of Brussels. On the contrary, the traditional countries have chosen to act favoring their national interests. Thus, he rejects the position of London and Paris and urges the founding states to pay more attention to the new members.

Interviewed by the Canadian website *Macleans.ca*, Latvia's president, Vaira Vike-Freiberga, is optimistic as to the evolution of the situation in the Union in spite of the rejection of the ECT and the failure of the summit of Brussels. She believes that crises are a natural phenomenon of European construction and that the Union will be able to overcome them. As to the relations of her country with Russia, she affirms that Moscow still refuses to admit the crimes committed by the Red Army. This argument is part of Latvia's re-writing of history that its president began. She also alleges that Moscow still tries to control its neighbors. This is one of the reasons why Washington firmly supports the European Union and NATO's expansion to the East. From the Atlantist point of view, it is necessary to take the former Soviet communist republics away from the Russian influence in order to avoid a revitalization of a rival. Unfortunately for this project, some European leaders have called for a pause in the expansion after the double "No" vote in France and the Netherlands. As a reaction to these statements, the supporters of the expansion are mobilizing themselves.

Ukraine's Prime Minister, Yuliya Tymoshenko, continues her lobbying in an article circulated by *Project Syndicate* and published, thus far, by the *Korea Herald* and the *Taipei Times*. She affirms that her country has a place in the European Union and she is working hard in that direction. However, she says Ukraine wants to have with Russia the same kind of relations that France has with Germany. Relying on this analogy, she notes that Ukraine can have strong links with Moscow, although it may belong to a different regional organization, and accuses Russia of having occupied her country during the existence of the USSR. It seems she forgot to soon that Jruschov and Brezhnev were both

Ukrainians.

Bulgaria's Finance Minister, Milen Veltchev, affirms in *Le Figaro* that it would not be fair that Sofia were penalized due to the current European crisis after all the efforts made. Affirming that his country is as Europhile as it is Francophile, he urges Paris to support a future incorporation of Bulgaria.

In *Libération*, Albania's ambassador in France, Ferit Hoxha, says that France should remember the commitments made in favor of the integration of the Balkan states and specially his. In effect, during the conference of Zagreb, Jacques Chirac had affirmed that the Balkan states belong to the European family. This call for a rapid incorporation of the Balkan states is backed in *Le Monde* by former German president Richard von Weizsäcker, and by former Prime Ministers Giuliano Amato of Italy, Carl Bildt of Sweden, and Jean-Luc Dehaene of Belgium. Addressing the European leaders, they say that the rejection of the ECT should not affect the integration of those countries. In spite of the fears of the Union's peoples about rapid expansions, the commitments made during the summit of Thessalonica should be respected.

For the European Foreign Affairs Commissioner, Austrian Benita Ferrero-Waldner, these successive expansions are evidence of the fact that the European Union is a global actor, with an important role in world affairs and able to contribute to peace and prosperity in the continent and elsewhere. In *Le Figaro*, she affirms that she will defend this image of Europe during the summit with the United States of which we already spoke in our columns. In spite of internal crises, the European Union can be a good partner of Washington in the international arena, and particularly in Iraq and Israel, thanks to its *soft power*.

However, after the double rejection of the ECT, how would it be possible to make them accept the current orientation of the European Union regarding the expansion, economic deregulation and Atlantism? European Communication Commissioner, Swede Margot Wallstrom, recommends developing a European public space. In the *International Herald Tribune*, she suggests that the European Commission should resort to political parties and journalists of the Union so that all the population approaches the big issues from the European point of view. Far from creating a new democratic instrument, it is about a propaganda program that aims at making the people accept the Union after the failure of the French and Dutch referendums.

Voltaire Network

Tony Blair



Tony Blair is the British Prime Minister from the New Labour.

“The EU money should be for employment, not for cows”

Référence : "EU-Geld für Arbeitsplätze, nicht für Kühe !", by Tony Blair, *Der Spiegel*, June 21, 2005.

"Le pire serait de continuer comme si rien ne s'était passé" , *Le Monde*, June 23, 2005.

I am a convinced European and the passionate supporters of Europe should back the reforms. We should be honest regarding the European challenges, and also listen to what the voters say. We need a Europe adapted to the conditions of the 21st century. That is why, as other four countries, the British government could not vote in favor of proposals concerning the European budget last week. We do not want a budget that continues contributing seven times more to agriculture than research, development, science, technology, training and innovation all together. 40% of the budget is for the agricultural policy that only covers 5% of the population. We should direct the economy to the future, create jobs and not favor particular interests. We should invest in education and innovation, but not paying 2 Euros everyday for a cow. This cannot be achieved overnight, but the rest of the world is not waiting for us and we cannot wait till 2014 as some people think.

Obviously we should assist the poorest members. The United Kingdom has declared that it favored the expansion and would keep its commitments. Just to clarify: Great Britain has always paid its part. Even with the reductions, we have paid twice and an a half times more than the French or Italians. We are willing to pay more if it is for the right policy, but only if it goes to the poorest and not to the richest. That money should get to what Europeans appreciate: growth, employment and wellbeing. We should adapt ourselves to the economic conditions which are not only dictated by the United States or Japan, but also India, China and others.

The EU is more than a free trade area. The people want jobs, but also safety and preservation of the environment. They want to defend the European values and a strong Europe in the world. The United Kingdom supports a social Europe, but a social Europe according to the current world. We should find out why some get to create jobs in Europe and why some others do not. Without growth, those goals cannot be achieved. These debates cannot be separated from the budget.

During the British presidency, we tried to draft a budget suitable for all the members and make Europe stronger in the next century. Some people talk about a crisis in Europe, but what I see is an opportunity to set more ambitious goals. We could bring the European citizens closer if we listen to their expectations.

Peter Mandelson

Peter Mandelson was British Minister of Commerce, representative of the Labour Party of Hartlepool and president of Policy Network - a European Think Group. He is a European commissioner for Commerce at the Commission of José Manuel Barroso.

"More than a squabble, this goes to the heart of Europe"

Référence : "More than a squabble : this goes to the heart of Europe", by Peter Mandelson, *The Guardian*, June 20, 2005.

Brussels summit evidenced the challenge faced by Europe: to continue as it was before or take into account the rejection by France and Netherlands to the European Constitutional Treaty and reset mainly the policies and priorities. Of course, the anti-Europeans want to use the current crisis to weaken Europe and turn it into a great common market. However, without Europe, we would be unable to influence on the globalize world. For those who want to improve Europe, the challenge is to achieve the adoption of the right policy. Obviously, it would have been better to reach an agreement in Brussels but such failure does not lead to an immediate crisis even though when it is not about a fact without consequences. However, it would be positive to think about the future of the reduction of the British check and the Common Agricultural Policy. Detractors of this policy claim that it is not common that 5% of the European Union business devours 40% of the European budget at the expense of areas with future such as education and research. Yet, it is not just about money. It is also at stake the course to be taken by an attacked Europe by the populist movements. Europe may chose between decadency and painful economic reforms that would enable it to continue being competitive. This policy should not allow Europe to be Americanized but adapt the European social system to the new realities. The citizens must be capable of adapting quickly to the changing world. This requires a highly specialized training that would cover all ethnic groups. We dealt with national problems that needed a European approach. To build a new European social model, discussions should take place and achieve a new consensus for Europe.

Philippe Douste-Blazy

Former French Minister of Health (1993-1995), Culture (1995-1997) and Health and Social Protection (2004-2005), Philippe Douste-Blazy is the current French Foreign Minister. In 2003, he was the coauthor of a law that redeems the colonization of Algeria by France.

"Europe: the moment of truth"

Référence : "Europe : l'heure de vérité" , by Philippe Douste-Blazy, *Le Monde*, June 21, 2005.

On May 29, the French rejected the European Constitutional Treaty and such democratic choice has to be accepted. We can not continue pretending that nothing has happened. _Europe is facing an identity crisis, and not just in France and Holland. We have witnessed a divorce between the States and the peoples. Due to the incapacity to have a clear and coherent vision towards the

future, Europe separated from the citizens. A political course has to be set for the European Union. Since long ago, we have hesitated between a Europe-market and a Europe with real political means. Today, more than ever, we should defend the choice of the political Europe since it is considered that between the nation and globalized world, Europe is still an appropriate step of regulation, cooperation, solidarity and action. This is the true debate and not the fight between the “old” and the “new ones” as some people say.

The latest version of the Luxemburg proposal included an increase of more than 30% for research costs and other areas with future, whereas the Agricultural Common Policy witnessed how part of its budget was reduced up to a third of the total amount compared to more than a half just less than 10 years ago. This evidenced that the European Union has turned into the future. The European leaders share the will to make Europe to achieve a higher growth and greater competitiveness. But we also want it to keep on being loyal to its premises since 50 years ago, something that should be preserved: cooperation, common use of resources, solidarity. This is the vision that France is trying to defend.

Faced by the risk of a “negative spiral”, the European Council decided to interrupt the ratification process of the Constitutional Treaty. This active notion should lead, however, neither to destroy the community achievements nor to question the 50 years of European constitution. For those who present the Common Agricultural Policy as something from the past, we should analyze the advantages and disadvantages of the actions and reforms undertaken. We are not just talking about assisting farmers but also the agricultural autonomy of our continent, our commercial capacity to gain segments of the foreign market. The reflection period should be used to address openly and collectively all the issues. France would have to defend its values, convictions and interests and recover itself the spirit of the founding fathers, adapted to today’s realities. However, it should not prevent us from addressing the current big issues:

- ▶ We should reactivate the policy in favor of growth and employment, thus giving new impetus to the Lisbon strategy. Research is an essential area.
- ▶ We should relieve and protect our citizens. There has to be a space for freedom within the European continent which the citizens fear no longer because they will know that this space is under clear and accepted regulations by everyone.
- ▶ The role of Europe in the world. Iraq proved *on the contrary*, Europe should be united to reaffirm a diplomacy and defense that would enable it to preserve its position in the world and speak out with a strong voice and autonomy.

Ursula Plassnik

Former chief of staff of the Austrian Foreign Minister Wolfgang Schüssel (1997-2004) and former Ambassador to Switzerland (2004), Ursula Plassnik is the Austrian Federal Minister of Foreign Affairs.

“Europe, take a deep breath please”

Référence : “Europa, bitte tief durchatmen”, by Ursula Plassnik, *Der Standard*, June 21, 2005.

We did not give a good image at the European Council. For weeks, there was the impression that it was simply an accounting period. Who could save more? At the end and after the meeting, disappointment was obvious. The summit was a failure, not only in terms of the finances of the European Union and the future of the Constitution but also the European project. We had the opportunity to consolidate the political will through mobilization, something that is possible to be technically achieved. There was neither political strength nor long term vision to achieve a commitment. This was the tough lesson of the summit. The strength of the community lies on the possibility of the commitment. Without it, the project of freedom and wellbeing could only contribute to what is possible at the national level.

What happened on Friday in Brussels is the opposition of two old European conceptions, “Europe as a market” and “Europe as a political project”. The issue of “deepening” vs. “expansion” was also weighed. However, these explanations will not satisfy those who were under a deep sense of unease, which will not disappear with the usual European slogans.

Those who said “no” to the referendum did not say “no” to the work for a united Europe. They just wanted a different Europe, more just in terms of opinions. The economic situation and dissatisfaction regarding the politicians in their countries was decisive. Comprehensively, growth is insufficient in Europe, the pie does not grow as we expected. Encouraged by the shift from an industrial society into a service and knowledge-based society, we expect from Europe what it can offer: steady jobs and more social security. We have to be more realistic. The emerging national selfishness should not lead to the loss of European solidarity. We should achieve a balance between the interests of yesterday and those of today. The citizens must understand that a Europe a la carte for 450 people is impossible. The politicians who practice the art of commitment at a European scale should not be sanctioned in their countries but rather encouraged. This is the only way that Europe preserves its peaceful way of living, which is well defined in the Constitution.

We should ask ourselves two main questions: What do we want from this European Union? And the other one, very much related to it: How much are we willing to contribute to a consolidation process and a stable future for Europe? To be able to find the solutions for the future, we have to be brave enough to question ourselves certain things and think of its feasibility.

Jiri Pehe

Former director of studies on Central Europe of Freedom House during the Cold War and political advisor to former Czech president Vaclav Havel (1997-1999), Jiri Pehe is a political analyst and director of the university of New York in Prague. He is a member of the Administrative Council of the American Fund for the Czech Republic.

“Egoism poses threat to EU unity”

Référence : “Egoism poses threat to EU unity”, by Jiri Pehe, *Korea Herald*, June 21, 2005.

“ Les nouveaux et les vrais européens ”, *Le Figaro*, June 21, 2005.

The fiasco of the EU summit brought to light the differences of attitude among the majority of the new member countries from Central and Eastern Europe and the “old” members. But the differences were not just as we expected. We did not see any of the new member countries being immature and eager for the community money but fit for the commitment and capable of sacrificing their own “national interests”. However, the big countries were incapable of reaching an agreement about the budget for the period 2007-2014, which could have a negative impact upon the Union. The leaders of the new member countries seem to worry more about that than the old member nations.

Therefore, most of the new members were willing to support the commitment proposed by Luxemburg which provided that the budget should amount to 1.06% of the global GNP of the EU and the annual “discount” of Great Britain to be frozen at 4.6 billion Euros. The Czech Republic and Slovakia had even agreed on a more radical plan which provided to top up the budget to just 1% of the GNP of the European Union.

Surprisingly the old and experienced European democracies had ignored the political risks bound to the possible renovation of a passionate nationalism in the European continent and the inexperienced new democracies of Eastern Europe had recommended caution. Maybe due to their recent accession, the new members know that in order to get their place in the Union they have to make efforts. They understand, therefore, that the European funds are less important than the plan to be part of a united Europe. The EU offers the small nations under attacked by both flanks by Germany and Russia a level of political stability and security that they ever had in the modern history. The States of Western Europe, however, feel that the political dimension of the European integration is a fact already established and they only think of its limits.

The disagreement about the budget does not mean that we are moving towards a catastrophe, but we should be careful. Obviously, we cannot eliminate totally the event of a weakening or disintegration of the common political structures of Europe. For the small countries from Eastern and Central Europe which are economically fragile, a Europe made up by nations that fight once again relentlessly to defend their own interests is a nightmare. But such nightmare could expand across all European nations. Maybe the Western countries should pay more attention to their new associates.

Vaira Vike-Freiberga

Former Psychology Professor at the Montreal University, from a family that left Latvia after the Reich's collapse, Vaira Vike-Freiberga is President of Latvia.

“We’ll Find A Way Out - Europeans Always Have”

Référence : “We'll find a way out - Europeans always have” by Vaira Vike-Freiberga, *Macleans.Ca*, June 20, 2005.

The evolution of European construction follows its course as it always has, overcoming crisis. The cliché that crisis are an opportunity seems to be true for the EU. The European Constitution Treaty (ECT) was an extremely ambitious project as it had to be approved by all European nations, which could not come to fruition. But we found a withdrawal solution. We have always done. Europe must understand the challenges of a globalized world. That French and Dutch alike had or had not accepted the text does not change in the least the fact that we are subject to India's and China's competition. Each country should adapt itself.

Vladimir Putin kindly welcomed me on May 9. Simultaneously, I received various letters supporting Latvia's position. May 9 marks freedom for half of Europe. For the Baltic States it was the beginning of a new occupation. We would like Moscow to admit it. However, Russia tries to keep its influence on the neighboring countries.

Yuliya Tymoshenko

Ukrainian multimillionaire, Yuliya Tymoshenko is Prime Minister of Ukraine. Leads the Homeland Party, next to Viktor Yushchenko and played a central role in the “Orange Revolution”.

“Ukraine Deserves EU Membership”

Référence : “Ukraine deserves EU membership”, by Yuliya Tymoshenko, *Korea Herald*, June 20, 2005.

“Ukraine still sees an EU that is worth belonging to”, *Taipei Times*, June 22, 2005.

EU long-standing members seem to doubt now the future of the Union, but we, in Ukraine, continue to see it in hope and admiration. Entering the EU is the central project of our foreign policy.

Europe is an indivisible whole. If a European nation is not free, the rest isn't completely. We would never like to see a split Europe. A Europe of peace and prosperity need be spread all over its territories. Some say that Ukraine is not a part of Europe, but you only have to go to Kiev and talk with the people there to realize that this is not true. Ukraine's future is that of Europe and Ukrainians are working hard to build it. We know that it won't be easy. It is our hope to form the same bonds with Russia that France has with Germany. The EU has proved that even when a country has occupied another, reconciliation is possible.

The **orange revolution** allowed Ukraine to put an end to a century of totalitarian regimes. Now we see our future in the person of **Viktor Yushchenko**,

Milen Veltchev

Milen Veltchev is
Bulgarian Finance
Minister.

“France-Bulgaria: Crucial Friends”

Référence : "France-Bulgarie, l'indispensable amitié", by Milen Veltchev, *Le Figaro*, June 22, 2005.

Bulgaria is very much concerned about anything that may happen to the EU, and especially about the risks that increasing the number of its members entails. Last April 25th, my country signed a joining agreement with the EU. We made huge efforts to achieve this and that is why Bulgaria is now watching the EU crisis without losing sight of its objectives and interests.

Bulgaria is a country with a long history and with a rich culture that has once and again flourished after each crisis. Today, as something exceptional in its hectic history, Bulgaria is undergoing a period of significant changes. Such changes have made us feel even more enthusiastic and determined. Within three days, particularly important and uncertain legislative elections will be held in my country. However, whatever the result, our foreign and European policies will remain the same. Additionally, we have a dynamic economy which derives from the financial policy that we have been following since 4 years ago. Obviously, this has been all due to the highly strict measures we have abided by and to the fact of having “tightened our own belt”. This has led us to even take unpopular actions, particularly because poverty is still a serious problem that we’re facing. It is difficult to think in a macroeconomic way when we can’t see any change in our own pockets. But in spite of this, my fellow countrymen and countrywomen are working without a break and better everyday.

It wouldn’t be honest on my part to ignore that Bulgaria is still facing a number of challenges such as the still unfinished reforms of the justice, health and education systems. Our victory in the struggle against corruption and crime is not complete and even less absolute. However, we keep going on thanks to the work of Simeon Saxe-Cobourg-Gotha’s government and to the assistance coming from our European and American friends.

Bulgaria is a traditionally French-speaking country. It has always been very important for us to rely on France’s support and friendship. Bulgarians know that the French ‘no’ in their referendum is not addressed against them or against their joining Europe.

Ferit Hoxha

Ferit Hoxha is Albania's
Ambassador to France.

“Europe: The Balkans’ Blues”

Référence : "Europe, le blues des Balkans", by Ferit Hoxha, *Libération*, June 20, 2005.

Since the last May 1st, 2004 expansion, everyone in the EU is still asking himself about the European borders. Everybody is giving his/her opinion in this regard. However, so far nobody has questioned the European membership of the Balkan states or the European Southeast as we'd rather call it. The European countries' action in the Balkans has always been a great one. But every time Europe has shown indifference towards those states, the result has been disastrous. There are unbreakable ties between Europe and the Balkans. Since Europe understood the importance of its role in that region, things have improved substantially. Who can rationally doubt today the effectiveness of the European action in the general and probably definitive pacification of the Balkans? All those countries feel deeply committed to Europe for that and have given priority, above all else, to their joining the EU in a certain period of time. However, since the French and Dutch refusal of the European Constitution Treaty (ECT), an atmosphere of uncertainty has risen around the EU expansion. Hinting, or even inferring that the French said deliberately “no” to this expansion, is not only simplistic but also it would be like saying that the French have lost their sense of a great nation of pro-European ideas and actions. Telling the Balkan states today that Europe wants to take a long time to think about its future is like politely telling them that they are not wanted, thus breaking the mechanism of the reform in the Balkans.

History has always recognized big nations as more responsible for themselves and for the rest. Each time that the United States, as its administrations change, shows signs of international unconcern, Europe becomes alarmed for it. What can be said then of France and its role in the European context? Is it now that it's richer that Europe has become scared? Is it now that it has become stronger that Europe starts to be afraid? Is it now that it's larger that Europe draws back in itself? Is it now that it has undergone several tests that Europe starts to doubt its future?

Since 1999, the speech on the Balkan states entrance in the EU has been clear and coherent. **Jacques Chirac**, who organized the first European Union-Balkans summit in Zagreb in 2000, recalled that the Balkan states had their place in the European family. Nobody would ever understand that this compromise were questioned. That promise, renewed and solemnly strengthened at the Thessalonica summit in 2003, is the umbilical cord that cannot be broken. One can't simply renounce it.

Giuliano Amato, Jean-Luc Dehaene, Carl Bildt, Richard von Weizsäcker

Giuliano Amato, ex president of the Italian Council (1992-1993 and 2000-2001), is an Italian senator and was vice-president of the European Convention.

Jean-Luc Dehaene, ex Primer Minister of Belgium (1992-1999), was vice-president of the European Convention.

Carl Bildt was Prime Minister of Sweden (1991-1994) and special envoy of the Secretariat of the United Nations for the Balkans (1999-2001). He is a member of the Boards of Directors of the Center for European Reform in London and the Rand Corporation in the United States.

A member of the CDU, Richard von Weizsäcker was the mayor of Berlin (1981-1984) and President of the Federal Republic (1984-1994).

“European Leaders, the Balkans are waiting!”

Référence : “Dirigeants européens, les Balkans vous attendent!”, by Richard von Weizsäcker, Giuliano Amato, Carl Bildt, Jean-Luc Dehaene, *Le Monde*, June 18, 2005.

Two years ago, when tension was at its peak due to the Iraqi war, the European leaders gathered in Thessalonica decided to keep working on the European consolidation and integration. They published a special Declaration in which they reaffirmed the European future of the Balkans.

Once again, the Union needs to be guided. In times in which the populations of two of its founders have firmly rejected the European Constitutional Treaty (ECT) we must keep in mind that 20 million Europeans expect we do our part as their guide and that of their children. They all wonder if one day they will be part of Europe or if they will live in a sort of a “nobody’s land”; a policy their neighbors are questioning. They need a solid and credible message not coming from Brussels but from the standards of the European democracies. They must be told that if they keep working on reforms, reconciliation and commitments they will certainly be members of the Union. The task these nations have is huge and this is the reason why we seriously need new policies. We know the challenge can be met.

We know that for some of you, political leaders, it is not easy to convince your countries’ public opinion about the necessity of expanding the European Union. However, you do have all arguments to do it. You know everything we have done in that region and how many soldiers we have there. You also know nothing can justify the current status quo and the adhesion to the European Union is the only way to overcome it. We are facing a critical moment in the history of the Union. We urge your Heads of States, Primer Ministers and Presidents to guide these new fragile democracies. Europe can overcome the crisis of the Constitution but it won’t survive another Srebrenica.

Benita Ferrero-Waldner

Ex federal minister of Foreign Relations of Austria (2000-2004), Benita Ferrero-Waldner is the European commissioner of Foreign Relations.

“Europe, an actor of world magnitude”

Référence : “L'Europa, un acteur de dimension mondiale”, by Benita Ferrero-Waldner, *Le Figaro*, June 20, 2005.

The turmoil in the European Union regarding the European Constitutional Treaty (ECT) and the future of its funding, has led our partners to wonder the real capacity of Europe to become an actor of world magnitude. They fear the creation of a drawn up Europe. But, the present Summit between Europe and the United States can show the opposite. This concerns the citizens of the Union and our associates for surveys reveal how interested European citizens are on seeing Europe become a global power.

The topics of the meeting indicate Europe is already an actor of world magnitude. This week, the European Union and the United States will hold in Brussels an international conference on Iraq, something unthinkable a couple of years ago. When I visited Baghdad two weeks ago, I saw how enthusiastic the Iraqi people were for our support. Therefore, the Union must take the necessary risks to support their political and economic development.

As part of the Quartet and in collaboration with the United States, the UN and Russia, we helped the Israelis and the Palestinians to find a solution to the conflict they have had for several decades and we supported the imminent withdrawal from Gaza. Our work was aimed at implementing the “route card”. The Union gives its full support to the activities of the special envoy of the Quartet, **James Wolfensohn**.

Our best success on foreign policy is, perhaps, the impact the expansion of the Union can have on peace and security in the European continent. For the United States, this undoubtedly means the consolidation of our influence. We will respect our commitments so that the European Union can go on with its expansion. Nonetheless, it is obvious that in some member States the rhythm and the range of the process affect the limits of what the public opinion is willing to accept. In times in which we take the necessary time to think, we must recognize the expansion can not be indefinite. This is one of the aspects upon which the European Neighborliness Policy is based on. It is an inspiration for our neighbors of the South and the East who can not hope to join us in the short-term. They must respect the rule of law in their respective countries and in compensation we offer them the chance of participating in the internal market of the Union and a closer cooperation regarding energy and transportation networks and their participation in programs of the Community.

Likewise, we work together to increase the prosperity of our compatriots and that of the rest of the world by increasing economic and commercial exchanges and creating new jobs in the European Union. Our citizens are being benefited. In the whole world, our foreign policy promotes peace, prosperity and security through diplomacy, development assistance programs, humanitarian aid, economic and commercial policy as well as the security and defense policy of Europe. These tools allow us to react quickly to the crisis that emerge

everywhere in the world. Through a common commitment with multilateral institutions and through the UN reform, first of all, as well as the ending of the present negotiations in the WTO we will be able to endure such achievements.

Margot Wallstrom

Ex social-democrat parliamentarian from Sweden (1979-1985), ex ministry of Civil Affairs (1988-1991), Culture (1994-1996), Social Affairs (1996-1998) and former European commissioner for Environmental Issues (1999-2004), Margot Wallstrom is the Swedish European Commissioner for Communications and vice-president of the European Commission.

“Grass-roots change for Europe”

Référence : “Grass-roots change for Europa”, by Margot Wallstrom, *International Herald Tribune*, June 21, 2005.

The European Constitution means the symbolic refounding of the European Union as a community based on democratic principles. The European Constitutional Treaty (ECT) offered more and not less democracy. Therefore, it is sad to see how such democratic text was rejected by France and Holland. But, apart from this democratic reality, the European Union is seen as a project of the elites and not of the peoples. We have not been able to present its advantages for European citizens. Nowadays, they no longer perceive the advantages of peace and prosperity Europe has provided.

However, they fear globalization.

We have always known there was no plan B in the ECT, but a plan D, D of democracy, could be needed. We have to develop a popular movement in favor of Europe, it is necessary the every-day policy be perceived in its European magnitude. We must develop a democratic European infrastructure and certain measures should be implemented to achieve it:

- ▶ To develop European political parties and the dialogue between national Parliaments and European institutions.
- ▶ To develop a European public space by increasing the translations and the interchange between journalists. The European commission can play an important role in the organization of contacts.
- ▶ These exchanges must be promoted in universities too.

Voltaire

Voltaire is the daily international affairs publication of the Voltaire Network, “Réseau Voltaire pour la liberté d’expression”, which is solely responsible for its editorial content. *Voltaire* is published in France

by the Thomas Paine Press, 8, rue Auguste-Blanqui, 93200 Saint-Denis, France (SARL de presse 448 286 203 RCS Bobigny). ISSN 1762-5157. Dépôt légal à parution.

Director of Publication: Thierry Meyssan.

Voltaire is published 200 times a year and is distributed to its subscribers in PDF via e-mail.

Free subscription:

www.voltairenetwork.net/abonnement.php3