Доктор Вальтер Швиммер
президент Международного института социальных и экономических исследований (IISES) (Вена, Австрия), Генеральный секретарь Совета Европы (1999—2004)

ЕВРОПА И РОССИЯ НА ГОРИЗОНТЕ 2030 г. (доклад на весенней сессии Международного научного конгресса «Глобалистика-2020: Глобальные проблемы и будущее человечества»)

Dr. Walter Schwimmer
President, International Institute for Socia and Economic Studies (IISES) (Vienna, Austria), Secretary General, Council of Europe (1999—2004)

EUROPE AND RUSSIA AT A HORIZON OF 2030 (report at the spring session of the International Scientific Congress “Globalistics-2020: Global Problems and the Future of Humanity”)

Best greetings from Vienna to Moscow. It’s my pleasure to speak today to the students of Lomonosov University on EUROPE AND RUSSIA AT A HORIZON OF 2030.

Talking about Europe and Russia we have first to define what is Europe? At school we learned that Europe is one of the five continents of our globe. But is it really a continent compared for example with Africa, America or Australia? Looking to the map, if Europe is a continent it is a strange continent. Strictly speaking indeed, it is not a continent at all, but a mere peninsula tacked onto Asia. The Ural River is just an arbitrary line between two continents. Russia west of the Ural Mountains is either the basis or the beginning of this peninsula, in any way a part of what we call Europe. But — for Europe’s unmistakable cultural identity this peninsula has become an own continent, and Russia is without any doubt an indispensable part of it. Russia belongs to the family of the Slavic peoples that is one of the largest linguistic groups in Europe, settling in the main areas of Central, South Eastern and Eastern Europe. Russian Orthodoxy forms an important part of European Christianity. Russian poets, composers, musicians, actors, painters, dancers have contributed to European arts and culture. And for example, St. Petersburg’s Hermitage is one of the largest treasures of European arts I do not miss to visit whenever I come to St. Petersburg.

Europe is not so much a geographical entity but a cultural and political one. At least since the days of Kievan Rus Russia had her share of this cultural and political identity. Even during the rule of the Golden Horde that moved the political power to the East Russia did not lose her links to the other parts of Europe, mainly due to the Russian Orthodox Church. Tsar Peter the Great established Russia as one of the main European Powers and since then Russia was a significant player in European politics and history. Russia suffered more than others from the Napoleonic wars, contributes substantially to the defeat of Napoleon and was a reliable partner at the Vienna Congress establishing a new order of Europe. Throughout the 19th and the beginning of the 20th Russia remained an important player in the European political concert.

Throughout its history Europe has been a continent of contradictions, of tremendous economic, scientific and cultural achievements on the one hand and many tragic conflicts and wars on the other. The last century brought the culmination of the tragic history, adding two world wars, unspeakable atrocities, the wholesale slaughter of Europe's Jews, the liquidation of entire social classes and the expulsion of millions of people from their homes. Estimates for the total casualties of the war suggest that some 60 to 65 million people died in the war, including about 20 million soldiers, that means 40 to 45 million civilians. Many civilians died because of disease, starvation, massacres, bombing and deliberate genocide.

Only the Soviet Union lost around 30 million people during the war, almost half of all World War II deaths. So one can say this was the most dramatic lesson given by history to Europeans, about the consequences of war, and in particular of inhumane ideologies, dictatorship, racism, militarism, violation of human rights. But did history this time find anyone to learn this lesson, as a compatriot of mine, the poet Ingeborg Bachmann, complained that history is teaching all the time but it does not find students to listen.

The second and hopefully last World War ended 75 years ago. Three months before the end of the fighting in World War II the leaders of the Anti-Hitler-coalition signed in Yalta the "Declaration of Liberated Europe" aimed at establishing "conditions of internal peace" and "**governmental authorities representative of all democratic elements**". The fighting ended in May 1945 and the war left a devastated Europe where only the territorial decisions **but not the principles of Yalta** were implemented. The Eastern part of the continent had to wait more than 4 decades for democracy. Europe could breathe with one lung only, as Pope John Paul II pointed out. The post-war period in Europe was marked by the political and material division of Europe with the emergence of the iron curtain. The division, which has had a deep and traumatic impact on Europe, was characterized by an ideological confrontation between two political systems.

The main concern in Europe after the tragedy of the WWII was how to avoid armed conflicts between European countries and to ensure that human rights will be observed. That led to the emergence of two institutions, the Council of Europe created in 1949 by 10 western European democracies and the European Community for Coal and Steel that should become germ cell of today's European Union. The Council of Europe should ensure lasting peaceful co-operation between all European nations based on common values, fostering pluralist de-

mocracy, rule of law and human rights. The Community for Coal and Steel put the main resources for conventional war fare under a common administration. Its success led to the creation of the European Economic Community and finally the European Union. Above all, the idea of a united Europe is a peace project. But both organisations were for around four decades restricted to Western Europe. The Anti-Hitler-coalition that created the UN organization had disappeared and instead of it Europe was divided along an ideological rift and saw the confrontation of two military alliances in the so-called Cold War. But already in 1964 an Austrian chancellor, Josef Klaus when addressing the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe warned the audience "**not to forget the Eastern wing of the common house of Europe**". We should hear this word again after 25 years.

In the 70ties representatives of both sides of Europe, of the neutral countries and the non-European NATO states US and Canada met in Helsinki, capital of the neutral Finland to overcome the mutual military threat, to avoid the danger of a 3rd world war. The Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe was an important step to overcome the rift in the common home of Europe. The Helsinki accord of 1975 signed by 35 countries including the U.S. and the Soviet Union, promotes human rights as well as cooperation in economic, social, and cultural progress. The Helsinki accord proved that Europe had still much more in common than what could divide the continent. Nevertheless Europe and in particular the countries east of the Iron Curtain had to wait about one and a half decade for the change. 1989/1990 became the years of the big change in Europe. It started slowly but significantly and with emphasis. Months before the fall of the Berlin Wall some events demonstrated that Europe was ready for this change and the people in East and West supported the development. Finland that stayed outside the Council of Europe due to its closer relations to the Soviet Union joined the organisation in spring 1989 to become its 23rd member state. On June 27 the foreign ministers of still communist Hungary, Gyula Horn, and of Austria, Alois Mock, cut through fencing that represented the communist Iron Curtain separating the two countries.

A few days later the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe received in Strasbourg a prominent guest.

Mikhail Gorbatchev who had proclaimed "glasnost" and "perestroika" principles of his policy came to Strasbourg to address the Assembly and **called for the construction of a "common European home"**.

In November the Berlin Wall fell and simultaneously a peaceful upheaval of the people in Central and Eastern Europe replaced communist dictatorship by new democracy. The collapse of the Soviet Union — officially in 1991 — was anticipated by a process of disintegration. Former communist countries and republics of the dissolved Soviet Union turned to democracy and showed their interest in being a part of the European project. First they applied for membership in the Council of Europe that was seen as a kind of seal of approval of democratic standards. Within one decade the organization admitted 19 new member states. Russia applied for membership in 1992.

The American political scientist Francis Fukoyama called the new political situation "the end of history" believing that liberal democracy (American style) eventually prevailed and many politicians considered the fall of the Berlin Wall as the final victory of the capitalist system over communism. But they all were wrong. It was the people's victory over dictatorship, of freedom over suppression, the success of the desire to go its own way, its own way of democracy and of economic system. It was also the moment of the European way of life.

What is the European way of life?

Europe consists of 49 sovereign states, large and small, 47 of them are members of the Council of Europe, 27 decided already for deeper integration within the European Union. There are peoples of Baltic, Germanic, Celtic, Latin, Slavic, central Asian and other origins, People with different beliefs — Catholic, Orthodox and Protestant Christians, Jews, Muslims and others, including agnostics and atheists. There are some 200 language communities in Europe; all of them entitled to equal rights, to preserve their identities, their cultural heritage and traditions. No one superior, no one inferior! The diversity of Europe is **an asset not an obstacle**.

Let me again refer to our cultural identity. Russians are proud of their famous composer like Tchaikovsky who is European like Chopin and Mozart. Germans are proud of their famous poet Goethe who is European like Shakespeare or Tolstoy. Spanish are proud of their famous painter Picasso who is European like Van Gogh or Kandinsky. What I want to tell you with these examples is we all have our national but at the same time our European identity.

The European way of life is based on equality and mutual respect. The forms of life in Europe are diverse for historical and cultural reasons. **That is not a weakness, it is Europe's strength!**

Unity in diversity, external unity — internal diversity, common values, common responsibility can make Europe strong, the entire Europe I want to emphasize, The post-WW II European way of life is pluralist democracy, rule of law and human rights.

These principles guide the Council of Europe as well as the European Union.

The European Union, emerging from the European Community for coal and steel and the European Economic Community, was established by the Treaty of Maastricht in 1992 and enlarged in 1995 with three "neutral" members, Austria, Finland and Sweden from 12 to 15. The Maastricht Treaty aimed at "an ever closer union among the peoples of Europe" and laid the foundations for the single currency, the Euro. The discussions before and after the Treaty demonstrated that there were still different imaginations about the character of the newly established "Union". To apply a word spoken by President Juncker much later, already in Maastricht there was not enough union in the Union... Real problems arose when a constitution should be adopted. The people of two member countries rejected the project in referendums. So progress in integration should be achieved by adapted treaties (Amsterdam, Nice and Lisbon), all of them of course compromises between those who were in favour of deeper integration and those who were mainly interested in the single market (but for some even without single currency).

However, very soon after 1989/1990 several of the new democracies in Central and Eastern Europe showed their interest to become also part of the Union. Through the Council of Europe they had their seal of approval of democratic standards and they had introduced market economy rules. In 2004 the Union admitted 10 new members in the famous "big bang", three of them former Soviet republics and five former communist countries, one of them a former Yugoslav republic. Three other countries followed soon making the Union one of 28 European states. The Council of Europe unites in the meantime 47 members, all states of Europe except Belarus, the Vatican State and the not by all recognized Kosovo.

Jean-Claude Juncker suggested in his 2006 report on request of the Warsaw Summit of the Council of Europe that the European Union should become a member of the Council of Europe. That would enhance the cooperation of both institutions and strengthen the role of the Council of Europe ensuring the participation of all European countries in the project of peace and common values.

The European project of peace and prosperity seemed to be on a very good way as the European institutions as well as the public were shocked by several facts.

The financial and economic crisis of 2008 seems to be over but there are still repercussions of the crisis; the worst repercussion is the loss of confidence in financial institutions as well as in governments.

Although there was some improvement the crisis of the single currency and the budgetary problems of certain Euro countries are not over; the policy of the European Central Bank is not uncontested and considered by many critics as illegal; the discussion will be repeated again as a consequence of the corona crisis. What we can say already now is that there are again the dividing lines of the financial crisis 2008 — north versus south.

In addition the European economy is suffering from the sanctions imposed by the EU and USA on Russia and by Russia on the EU; both sanction regimes cost the EU countries billions of Euro. And the same applies to Russia.

What happened before 2014 with regard to Russia and the European institutions? As already mentioned Russia applied in 1992 for membership in the Council of Europe.

The process of admission took about four years, for some months in 1995 the process was suspended because of critics regarding the 1st Chechen war. But in early 1996 Russia was admitted to the Council of Europe, after a heavy debate in the Parliamentary Assembly. At the beginning of the Session in which the Assembly should adopt its opinion on the Russian application I was elected leader of the political group of the European People's Party, the European political group of Christian Democrats and center parties.

We had an intensive debate and at the end an indicative vote with a difficult result — 50% of the group members were in favour of the admission of the Russian Federation, the other half of the delegates against. I asked for the authority to discuss their position with the opponents. At the end a clear majority voted in favour, a few abstained. The main argument of mine was that it is certainly better to have Russia in and not out, for the Council of Europe, its member states

as well as for the citizens of Russia who will enjoy certain rights like the European Convention on Human Right with the right of application to the European Court of Human Rights and the benefits of several other conventions of the Council of Europe. Certainly the process of transmission from the bolshevist Soviet Union to a democratic federal democracy and the necessary reforms were not yet completed but various reform processes had started with the help of the Council of Europe. So the Parliamentary Assembly as well as the Committee of Ministers considered Russia to be in the right direction. I do not hide that there have been tensions between the Council of Russia, even depriving voting rights of the Russian delegation, once in 2000 because of the Chechen war, once after 2014 because of the Crimean crisis. With good will from both sides the voting rights were returned to the Russian delegations.

As I pointed out in my address at the opening of Globalistics 2020 also countries outside the European Union are part of Europe.

They have the right to be considered as equal partners in the European political concert. In particular regarding Russia the Union has to find the right policy. I would say it is high time after nearly a quarter of a century since the collapse of the Soviet Union. In the 90ies, when Russia was in economic troubles, the Union had a tendency to patronize Russia, and some decision makers, old suspicions alive, where not unhappy with the situation. After the economic revival of Russia, in particular on the energy sector, old suspicions still alive, they have difficulties to tackle with the new reality.

There is no alternative to close cooperation between the European Union and Russia. I dare to say this being fully aware of the obstacles for closer cooperation because of the Ukrainian crisis.

But what was neglected has been a vision or at least a strategy for the relationship between the largest European state, the Russian Federation, and this entity "sui generis", as lawyers use to define the Union, which is neither an organization nor a state. This failure is due to both partners, the Union as well as Russia. The European Neighborhood Policy (ENP) encompasses all other Eastern European non-member countries, but not Russia (that would not like to be included). For Russia the EU proclaimed a strategic partnership that was never really implemented. As I pointed out before there has been no strategy. The most promising approach was at the St. Petersburg Summit in May 2003.

The EU and Russia agreed to reinforce co-operation with a view to creating four EU/Russia Common Spaces, in the long term and within the framework of the existing Partnership and Co-operation Agreement (PCA), on the basis of common values and shared interests. These Common Spaces cover economic issues and the environment; issues of freedom, security and justice; external security, including crisis management and non-proliferation; and research and education, including cultural aspects. But very few aims were realized.

But usually the EU-Russia summits were too determined by day-to-day politics to contribute to a common vision or strategy. The last summit took place on January 28, 2014, at the very beginning of the Ukraine crisis and was obviously overshadowed by it.

Regardless of whose fault or neglect, the fact is that this most important tool for discussing relationships was then no longer used when it was most urgently needed. The same is true of the NATO-Russia Council (which has clearly been suspended by NATO).

The "common European house" therefore obviously only exists in the Council of Europe, which — unfortunately — was used too little as a pan-European political platform in the Ukraine crisis, but so far not in EU-Russia relations. It is high time to open the doors between the wings of the Union and Russia in the House of Europe and talk openly about the problems to be solved.

The declaration in Minsk on February 12, 2015 contains a glimmer of hope. It was signed by Hollande, Merkel, Poroshenko and Putin: "Leaders remain committed to the vision of a joint humanitarian and economic space from the Atlantic to the Pacific based upon full respect for international law and the OSCE principles." This is a commitment to common ground and contains something like a reconciliation of the European and Eurasian Union integration models. Last but not least, the negative consequences of the sanctions for both sides demonstrate that economic cooperation and harmonization would be mutually beneficial and would help alleviate conflicts such as the Ukraine crisis. But action must follow the words of Minsk. Ukraine has two neighbors, the EU and Russia. And both neighbors have a common responsibility for peace and security.

But the Ukraine is not the only common interest of Russia and the EU. In my view it is worth to remember and revive the four common spaces. Above all I want to emphasize joint actions against climate change. The CoVid crisis has it repercussion on the economy elsewhere and close cooperation for recovery of EU, Russia but also all other European countries lies in mutual interest.

The international order since 1989 has changed fundamentally. New forces are gaining significantly in influence, and since then others have relatively less importance. How can Europe's voice be brought to the fore in this process of change?

How can we maintain our position in the world — besides the US, China, India and an emerging Africa with their different systems of values? This is not a theoretical question. This means protecting, defending and promoting Europe's values, Europe's interests. In this competition EU, Russia and all other European states are natural partners. It is the own interest of Europe to defend multilateralism, as expressed above all in international cooperation within the framework of the UN — especially the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Multilateral institutions ought to be strengthened against the "law of the strongest".

Security is not any more provided by military force. The contrary is the case. Therefore we need autonomous security architecture for Europe, a European Security Forum or Council, of course with Russia on board, for open and constructive dialogue.

The 17 Sustainable Development Goals adopted by the UN General Assembly in January 2017 look for me like a catalogue of intensive cooperation in Europe. I will take one example, SDG no. 4 education. One should not only enhance the Erasmus program one should also consider mutual visa freedom for students. (That should of course be followed for visa free travel for anyone. Ano-

ther goal no. 13 is to take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts. In that context I would emphasize the importance of the arctic for the climate as well of the need to protect the Siberian woods that have the same relevance for the world climate as the Amazon rain forests.

The founding fathers of the European project developed their vision of a peaceful and lawful Europe during the WW II despite of devastation of a whole continent. And to a large extent their vision came true against all obstacles. Fortunately we don't live in war and devastation. So we have the chance to develop our vision under much better conditions. But we need a vision in particular for the young people of Europe. When I wrote my book "The European Dream" I dedicated the book to my grandchildren who were at that time two years old in the hope that the Europe they live in will be broader, peaceful and free of dividing lines. In two months they are getting 18. There is still a lot to be done to fulfil my hope. I would like to see at the horizon of 2030 many of the goals becoming reality thanks to an EU-Russia Alliance for SDGs. That could be the vision we missed so far. A European vision for still maintaining the peace project this alliance could be **another end of history**, peace prevailing over war, democracy prevailing over dictatorship, rule of law prevailing over the law of the strongest, human rights prevailing over inhumanity, sustainability prevailing over waste of our natural recourses, responsibility prevailing over thoughtless destruction of our planet.

The world population will grow to 8,5 billion in 2030. The population in Europe including Russia will be less than 10% of this figure. We will not be the strongest military power. Possibly we will not anymore be the strongest economy.

But we can be the model for peace, stability and prosperity, the frontrunner for sustainable development and demonstrating the best practice with the European way of life. To achieve these aims there is no alternative to a closer cooperation **within** Europe. Europe needs Russia, Russia needs Europe, there is no Europe without Russia, no Russia without Europe.