

Speech Humboldt University – EM

Ladies and Gentlemen,

A little more than 15 days ago, Berlin was hit by a tragic attack. It hit a place of celebration, a popular place, in front of the *Gedächtniskirche* [Eglise du souvenir], which symbolises better than any place the necessary remembering of our tragic confrontations, and our duty to surmount them, as Europeans. A few days later, it was Istanbul, in a place of celebration once again, that paid a heavy price for its search of freedom.

A little more than 15 years ago, in May 2000, in this very place, dear Joschka Fischer, you pronounced a major speech that did not receive the echo or the answer that it deserved in France. With the same commitment to Europe and like some of my glorious predecessors here – Giorgio Napolitano for instance – I want to speak in your inspiring tradition.

With nuances and differences, in a context that has profoundly changed, but with that same conviction that acting together is our best opportunity and our duty.

Between these two events, less than two decades have passed, but the world has profoundly changed. It underwent three major disruptions.

A crisis of security in the first place. We rediscovered that the “End of History” was a myth. The Yugoslav wars had warned us. September 11 opened our eyes. And the recent Ukrainian, Syrian or Libyan conflicts showed us that violent conflicts are at our doorstep. More than everything, terrorism, on our soil, made us understand that security and defence were neither a luxury nor somebody else’s concern.

An economic crisis then. The burst of the internet bubble had warned us at the turn of the century. The 2008 crisis, triggered in the United States but spread and deep-rooted in Europe, left a mark that is still visible on our

economies and weakened millions of Europeans, in particular the younger generation in Southern Europe.

A migration crisis finally, that affected Germany in the first place. *Ich habe das schon gesagt aber ich wiederhole es hier : die deutsche Gesellschaft hat dem massiven Eintritt von Flüchtlingen mit bewundernswerte Klarheit, Mut und Menschlichkeit gegenübergeliegt. Diese Migrationsherausforderung ist nicht anekdotisch. Sie ist auch nicht momentan. Die Demografie und die politische Spannungen auf die Türe Europas und die Attraktion unseres Kontinent machen davon eine langfristige Herausforderung, die wir nur zusammen handeln können. Es ist nutzlos, sie zu ignorieren ; es ist auch sinnlos zu glauben, dass ihre Lösung in einer Mauer oder in den Abfällen unserer Solidarität und Empfangswerten liegt.* (J'ai eu l'occasion de le dire, je le répète ici : oui, la société allemande a fait face avec une lucidité, un courage et une humanité admirables à l'arrivée massive de réfugiés et de migrants. Ce défi migratoire n'est ni anecdotique ni temporaire. La démographie et les tensions politiques aux portes de l'Europe, l'attrait de notre continent en font un défi durable, que nous ne pouvons gérer qu'ensemble. Il ne sert à rien de l'ignorer, ni de croire que la réponse se trouve dans le ciment d'un mur ou dans la mise au rebut de nos valeurs d'accueil et de solidarité.)

To these three shocks, and in part under their effect, we can add a crisis of Europe itself. After the rejection of the European Constitution by France and the Netherlands, we have thought that it would be better to leave the field. We have set aside the ambitious reflections of the previous decade, from the ideas of Karl Lamers and Wolfgang Schäuble to the project of Joschka Fischer and the thoughts of Alain Juppé. The financial crisis, that has become a Euro crisis, precipitated us in emergency management. The migrant crisis and the Brexit added another lot of last-chance summits to the monthly schedule of European leaders. As Jacques Delors said, for Europe we need a vision and a screwdriver. Unfortunately, we currently have a lot of screwdrivers but we are still lacking a vision.

I do not want to draw too bleak a picture of this last decade: it was also the decade of the European enlargement that has reconciled the two sides of our continent, of digital revolution and climate change awareness.

For the European project nevertheless, it was a lost decade. Distrust has spread. The European Council has become a scene where each head of state stages its so-called victory over the other members.

To the extent that, today, the end of Europe – the “exit”, the return of nationalism, is the new magical thinking. Wouldn't France be better off without German obsessions or Brussels' “diktats”? We could spend more! Wouldn't Germany be better off without Gallic frenzy or Greek muddle? You could spend less!

I could also have a more demagogic message nowadays and tell you in turn that Europe is out of date. It would be easier to say that Germany and France have moved apart so much that it is time to work on new alliances.

How can we not see that our challenges are the same? How can we not see that terrorism is not only a French or German problem? That the Paris agreement on climate change is not an issue for Berlin too? That in a globalised world, necessary protections will not come from merely national policies but from European firmness carried by our two countries?

I have been promoting in the past months a “revolution” of our system, a change of the political and economic software inherited from post-war growth. And yet, I do speak of Europe, I do defend the European project, I do pay tribute to these enlightened men who had the crazy idea to reconcile our continent and unite its people, for the first time in history without submission or violence. Being European so a few years ago was a boring commonplace. Today, it almost sounds as a provocation.

This project could however only be a parenthesis of our History if, by weakness or unawareness, we do not defend it anymore and we do not rebuild it, to overcome its exhaustion and to adapt it to the world as it really is.

Building a Europe of sovereignty

This reconstruction, it is the ambition that I carry and that I want to present here.

The European construction started in the early 1950s sheltered from the American bloc. In Berlin, we know more than anywhere else that this period was also a time of fractures and tensions. Here in Berlin, we also know how much the European construction has contributed in terms of for our continent and the international community.

But the European project was not conceived for Europe to assert itself in global politics. It was aimed at stitching back together a ripped continent. At bringing back together the enemies of yesterday. At giving back peace and economic prosperity to a territory in ruin.

Europe has moved forward this way, being mostly inward-looking. From treaty to treaty, developing themselves by lawful relations rather than power relations, the European communities have become a European Union which deserved its name. But Europe was somehow obsessed by internal competition, by its single market and the convergence between its members.

The three disruptions that I mentioned have weakened this progression and revealed the necessity for Europe to carry a proper vision of the world.

Faced with temptation of retrenchment, we must build today a stronger Europe. We have often spoken in France of "l'Europe de la puissance", not always knowing what we wanted to do with it. I defend today a "Europe of sovereignty".

Because sovereignty means the capacity of acting in concrete terms to protect ourselves and defend our values. Because I cannot accept leaving the idea of “sovereignty” to far-right or far-left populists and their lies. No, security will not be better ensured by closing our national borders. No, controlling immigration will not be better achieved at the national scale.

This sovereignty must be complete. It must encompass all the common interests and challenges that we can better address together, at the European level. It must rely on a true democratic revival. And it must not be exhausted with the accessory, the petty norms, the clueless reports and the dubious conclusions of lengthy summits.

This sovereignty rests upon 5 pillars.

I will start with the security challenge, both internal and external, because it is the first tool of sovereignty and yet the we still lack the most at the European level.

“Sicherheit nach aussen zugewährleisten, sich selbst verteidigen zu können, ist aber Voraussetzung und innerster Kern jeglicher Souveränität von Staaten. Dies gilt demnach für die EU als Gemeinschaft von Staaten in dem Sinne, dass sie überhaupt nur noch so, durch die Gemeinschaft Souveränität erhalten können.“ (Assurer la sécurité vis-à-vis de l’extérieur, pouvoir se défendre, est la condition et le cœur même de la souveraineté de chaque Etat. Cela vaut aussi pour l’Union européenne en tant que communauté d’Etats en ce sens qu’ils ne pourront encore conserver leur souveraineté que dans ce cadre.)

These words, perfectly accurate, are not mine, but those of Karl Lamers and Wolfgang Schäuble in their famous publication on European policy in 1994.

Security is, in the first place, understanding that our true borders are the EU borders. It means preserving the Schengen agreements, that are a fundamental achievement, in the first place for the millions of everyday cross-border commuters. For this, we must in the meantime strengthen the

monitoring and the common administration of our external borders. The recent creation of the European Border and Coast Guard Agency, with increased resources and extended missions, is a major progress. We must go further, set an objective of 5,000 men that can be mobilised, increase the resources of this agency and enable it to intervene lastingly in a Member State in order to protect our borders.

We must, at the European level, develop cooperation agreements with the major emigration and transit countries, based on development and financial assistance, support for borders control and agreements on the return of migrants unauthorised to enter or to remain in the EU. An annual conference should bring at the same table the EU and these countries, in order to follow up on these agreements and make further European support conditional upon their actual implementation. This is the only way to set up a genuine European migration policy, both fair and effective.

We must also create a common intelligence system, overcoming national reluctance, that enables an effective tracking of criminals and terrorists, and, in the longer run, a common police force against organised crime and terrorism. We must face together, without being naive, the actual threats of the virtual world, cyberterrorism as well as any type of cyberattack.

Security also relies on a defence policy up to the threats we are facing. I want to escape the stereotype of a France in charge of international affairs but stuck in its internal problems, and of a Germany economically powerful but naïve in front of global threats.

Russia is not a German problem or a French passion – as some of my competitors may lead you to believe; interventions in Africa are not the sole responsibility of France: I notice incidentally that there are more German than French soldiers involved in Mali. Germany has become fully aware of the necessity of a strong defence and a European defence. The White Book presented this year by Ursula von der Leyen testifies to this.

We have a unique opportunity to move forward together. The European Union spends half as much as the United States on defence – even less if we take Brexit into account. European cooperation on military equipment programmes is weaker than 10 years ago. We must swiftly create a European Defence Fund, financing research programmes as well as common defence capacities. In this respect, we need to encourage joint defence spending through funding via the EU budget and a common debt capacity based on “European defence bonds”.

Yet, with more resources but without the willpower to act together, we remain powerless. Hence we must develop a true capability for political action: a permanent European Headquarter in charge of operation planning and monitoring, working hand in hand with national command centres and NATO is essential. I propose the establishment of a European Security Council gathering the military, diplomats, intelligence experts to advise European decision takers, especially in case of threats or attacks.

The time of choices has come. If the ambition of taking action together is not shared in the whole union, we must find ways to move forward faster in a smaller group. The treaties offer the possibility of doing so, a possibility that we should examine in the coming months. Without this will of moving forward, the best tools in the world will be useless. I am referring for example to the “Battle Groups” put in place nearly 10 years ago, and that we must finally be able to activate.

This defence endowed with resources and ambition, it means Europe opening its eyes and taking its responsibilities. It is the best way to resist the fantasy of national retrenchment as well as to the uncertainties from our American partner. It is a capability of common action, in our own way, but it is not calling into question NATO: a strong Europe can only strengthen this Alliance.

The other key element of sovereignty is our currency. Europe needs a stronger economic and monetary union. We must here again avoid the half-pregnancy attitude and give up unfounded accusations.

It is today in fashion to blame the Euro, often on the exact opposite grounds in France and Germany. It is a good indication of the unfairness of this trial...

The truth that we must collectively recognise is that the Euro is incomplete and cannot last without major reforms. It has not provided Europe with a full international sovereignty against the dollar and its rules. The truth we need to face is that France did breach the rules and thus undermined trust. The truth is also that the euro did benefit the German economy a lot, thanks to its central position in the European single market.

I want to be the President of a responsible France that respects the rules of the game and holds on to its commitments. We can and we must debate on the joint ownership rules, in particular to foster investment, but once the rule is set, it applies to all.

And just as much, we need deeper solidarity – I say so in Paris exactly like in Berlin: that is why my first battle is to put in place a budget for the Eurozone. This budget will have to be backed by a borrowing capacity and by its own resources, and will have 3 objectives: (i) financing key investments for the future, (ii) provide an emergency financial assistance (from the actual European Stability Mechanism) and (iii) helping Eurozone members in case of a large economic shock. It will have to be placed under the scrutiny of the members of European Parliament from concerned countries. The establishment of this budget will have to come with a convergence agenda for the Eurozone, an anti-dumping agenda that will set common rules for fiscal and social matters. Because no country can benefit from collective solidarity and play against its partners.

A common currency is a major political project, linking our destinies. The European Central Bank has done a lot to make this project work; its independence and its action must be respected. But we cannot rely on its action alone. In a monetary union, a country's success cannot be sustainably achieved to the detriment of another; the difficulties of one are always the

problem of all. The economic and monetary union involves a strict responsibility and a deep solidarity; clear rules, loyal cooperation, strong mutual assistance. This is the “New Deal” I am promoting, the only deal which can rebuild trust and generate growth.

A sovereign Europe must also know how to project itself as a world leader, to defend its interests as well as its values. As Pascal Lamy rightly puts it, the task of Europe is to “civilise globalisation”. It is the reason why I have long committed myself to the reform of trade policy. With a simple principle: openness must come with protections, to avoid the bigger dangers of retrenchment.

Many reforms are necessary; with Sigmar Gabriel, I have led the battle to reinforce anti-dumping protections that were met with some success. I want to mention today another action that we must lead together: to protect our strategic sectors and ensure the fairness of competition conditions, we must put in place a European scheme for the control of foreign investments. Fair competition should not only be guaranteed among European companies but also, and above all, between them and their competitors outside the Union. From 2017, a Franco-German initiative could be set up to propose such a scheme to our partners.

This Europe defending a unique identity distinguishes itself in the domain of sustainable development. We have the collective responsibility to lead our continent’s ecological transition, by creating an effective carbon market, with predictable and sufficiently high prices, and by strengthening our energy markets’ interconnections. Europe has above all a commitment and a duty: ensure the fair and complete implementation of the historic agreement reached in Paris last year.

A sovereign Europe is finally a Europe that understands and accepts the digital revolution: it is only at this level that we will be able to innovate and make our continent an attractive digital power. It is only at this level that we will be able to regulate the big platforms so that competition and innovation remain strong, and to guarantee a protection of personal data in line with our values. France and Germany share in this regard a particular sensitivity, an attachment to the protection of individual freedoms that we must defend. I wish that our two countries suggest together the creation of a European Agency for digital trust, in charge of verifying at a European level the respect by big digital companies of their transparency duty and of the access to their services without discrimination.

Unite people

These 5 key domains delineate a Europe that protects us and promotes our values.

Moving together is a necessity, as we are more efficient collectively. But moving together because we share an identity is the true reason for our project. No one said it better than Jean Monnet: “we are not forming coalitions of states, we are uniting men”.

A new democratic breath

This project implies thinking about democracy at the European scale.

The tune of the European “democratic deficit” conveys in the first place a lack of understanding of what is the European Union and a too easy rejection of our responsibilities. *Bruxelles c’est nous*. We must start by adapting our national practices and accept that a collective decision implies compromises. Trade policy provides the best example: it is because this policy is shared that Europe is strong. We must then accept that a single country, a single parliament cannot hinder a common agreement. However, our parliaments

should be informed ahead, contribute to the definition of the national position; our governments should not hide that they accept some compromises, as long as mutual concessions are accepted, debated and transparent. The subsidiarity principle requires to ensure that decisions are taken where appropriate. Be it at the local, national or European level. With the necessary democratic checks.

At a time when we need to strengthen Europe, in the face of the great challenges that I mentioned, we must also renovate our democratic practices, not to leave the monopoly of the people to the populists.

It is the reason why I suggested the organisation of democratic conventions after the French and German elections. I suggest – I will suggest as President of the French Republic during the European Council of December 2017 – to launch democratic conventions in the whole Union during 6 to 10 months in each country. It will be a debate on the content of the Union's action, on the policies it carries, on the priorities it should have. This debate will rebuild trust, beyond partisan games and beyond national strains. It will enable to propose a common answer where binary referendums, "for or against", only adds up contradictory refusals and concentrates rejections without a project.

We will draw from this exercise a "roadmap for Europe". Not a vast treaty so unreadable that it does enable all interpretations and feed all fantasies. A clear list of actions that countries willing to move forward can put in place as quickly as possible – in terms of defence, security or fiscal convergence for example. It will be possible for all countries to participate to this move, but not to obstruct everything; there will be no pre-established circle. And the progress of some will draw the others in, because it is never by waiting for each other that we arouse the desire to build together. It is by demonstrating success in a tangible way.

This does not mean giving up all institutional reforms. I think back again at Joschka Fischer's striking remark, 16 years ago: "How can we conceive a European Council with 30 heads of state and government?". This is where we

are. Institutional reforms will be necessary, treaty changes will come; they should be no taboo. Some reforms can go faster, to give room to a proper European democratic debate: in this regard, I fully support Daniel Cohn-Bendit's idea of using the quota of 73 British members of the European Parliament to create a truly European list for the next Parliament election in 2019.

But patching up our institutions, which is always the sign of a weak democracy, is not urgent. The priority is to recreate debate and trust, to forge a project and to move forward. Let Europe act and deliver, because our fellow citizens do expect it.

A European ethic

A revamped democratic method, renewed policies, then renovated institutions. There still lacks an ingredient, the one that treaties do not give, the one that actually "unites people". It is a European ethic – a desire to live together, an awareness of our shared identity, a loyalty to our values. It relies on each and everyone of us.

It is the reason why I paid tribute to Chancellor Merkel's remarkable action in the refugee crisis – and through her, to the German society – despite our political differences.

It is the reason why I am here today in front of you. Because this European ethic cannot exist without France and Germany. The European project is based on the Franco-German reconciliation. There is a cultural dimension in the broadest sense, that we should never forget: countries and people who killed each other now work together. It is because we do not think in the same way, because our immediate interests sometimes differ, because we share a history made of bloody conflicts, that we need each other and that Europe needs us together.

Deshalb das deutsch-französische Paar nie altmodisch sein wird, wenn wir wollen, dass Europa lebt. Unseres Paar hat kein anderes Recht gegenüber den anderen europäischen Ländern. Es hat eigentlich Verantwortungen ausserdem. Es trägt die Essenz des europäischen Projekt, das Versprechen von Frieden, Freiheit and Wohlstand, das wir nie verraten sollen. Ich wage es, hier die schöne Formel von Willy Brandt zu wiederholen, um sie nach Frankreich und Deutschland zu erweitern : "Es wächst zusammen, was zusammen gehört". (C'est la raison pour laquelle le couple franco-allemand ne sera jamais démodé si l'on veut que l'Europe vive. Notre couple n'a pas de droit supplémentaire par rapport aux autres Européens. Il a des responsabilités en plus. Il porte l'essence du projet européen, sa triple promesse de paix, de liberté et de prospérité que nous ne devons jamais trahir. J'ose reprendre ici la superbe invitation de Willy Brandt, pour l'étendre à la France et l'Allemagne, et à l'Europe : « ce qui va ensemble doit grandir ensemble ».)

It is especially the reason why, here, in front of students, I want to conclude by talking about youth. Our European ethic, so deep-rooted among the generation of the Founding Fathers traumatised by the war, got lost at a time of day-to-day business; it can only be regenerated thanks to you, your generation, with your concrete experience of Europe.

There are today two categories of young people in Europe. In the Eurozone, 1 out of 5 young person is unemployed. What can we say about Europe to a young Spaniard whose only professional opportunity would be to leave Madrid for Munich? What can we say to a young Greek who only lives thanks to his parents' and grand-parents' savings? What can I say to the young people of my country who are stuck in their neighbourhoods?

And there are young people who travel, who make the most of the Euro and the low-cost companies, an "Erasmus" generation which does not need to be convinced that Europe is a necessity, since it is an evidence every day.

These two youths cross paths, know each other; they are sometimes one and the same. Berlin is one of their crossroads.

It is to reconcile these two youths that I committed myself in France and that I believe in Europe. It is for this young generation that I want reforms in my country, a Eurozone that does not hold back its growth and a Europe that knows how to protect itself without giving up its welcoming tradition.

It is because Europe should not be a luxury or a gadget that I defend an “Erasmus” programme generalised to all young people; in France, I set an ambition of enabling, by 2022, 200,000 young people per year to study or do an apprenticeship at least 6 months in another country of the Union. It is to forge this identity and this ethic, grounded in the knowledge of the other rather than the fear of the neighbour, that I want to re-establish bilingual and European classes in France, revive school-twinning in Europe and strengthen the action of the Franco-German Youth Office.

Maximum diversity in minimum space: this is what Europe is about. From its languages, its cultures, let us make a unique treasure and a decisive asset in a globalized world.

I was recently reading a story narrated by a Flemish author, David von Reybrouck. The story of a child born in the early 20th century in a Belgian district that had long been a neutral zone, ruled by French law and German administration. During his lifetime, this child changed nationalities 5 times, he did his military service in Belgium and fought in the German army. As he was himself saying, “I did not cross borders, borders crossed me”.

It is to avoid that borders cross people and that people are torn by wars that some enlighten men decided to change the whole system after the war.

The European construction was initiated by men of experience, instructed by the tragedy of the European civil war. It now relies on young people like you, a

generation that knows what a crisis is, that discovers the turmoil of the world and the violence of history.

A generation that must ensure, together, that Europe tips over the right side at this moment in History when the continent trembles.