

REVUE DE PRESSE



Rapport « Think Global Act European III »



15 juin 2011

Contact Presse :

Mme. Stéphanie Baz, sbaz@notre-europe.eu, 00 33 1 44 58 97 84

SOMMAIRE

Presse écrite

- La Lettre de l'Expansion.....04
- La Lettre A.....05
- Rzeczpospolita.....06

Presse en ligne

- Euractiv (versions anglaise et française).....09
- Public Service Europe.....13
- Europolitics.....15
- Offnews.....16
- Bureau de presse de la République de Chypre.....21
- Fondation Robert Schuman.....21
- Euclid Network News.....21
- Global Europe News.....22
- Boulevard extérieur.....22
- Fondation Jean Jaurès.....22
- Mouvement européen.....23
- Eurofunds.....23
- EuropeanVoice.....24

PRESSE ECRITE



International

DB : ses arguments à Bruxelles

Les services du commissaire à la Concurrence, Joaquín Almunia, cherchent à démontrer que la future entité Deutsche Börse-Nyse Euronext aurait un quasi-monopole sur les dérivés en Europe, ainsi qu'une position dominante sur la compensation avec Eurex (DB) et Liffe (Nyse).

Les avocats des opérateurs boursiers veulent mettre en avant que la plupart des transactions se font de gré à gré. Ce qui préservera la liberté de choix des investisseurs après la fusion. Surtout, ils veulent préserver le modèle « en silo » de Deutsche Börse, qui consiste à lier la transaction et la compensation. Or Bruxelles estime que cela limite la concurrence entre les opérateurs. DB veut démontrer que ce modèle ne pose pas de problème, puisqu'il s'agit d'une tendance du secteur à s'organiser ainsi, à l'instar de Nyse ou de la Bourse de Londres.

Des arguments qui n'ont pas convaincu la Commission. Celle-ci envisage d'exiger une cession de l'une des chambres de compensation du nouvel ensemble, Eurex ou Liffe. Les clients de ces chambres, qui seront consultés par Bruxelles après la notification, préfèrent de leur côté une solution où le choix de leur prestataire reste ouvert. ■

■ **LA COMMISSION** européenne estime que le Parlement va retarder de six mois l'adoption de la directive sur les produits dérivés, après que le texte a été mis à l'ordre du jour de la session de juin. Les eurodéputés, forts d'une unanimité des groupes politiques, veulent ainsi faire pression pour que les Vingt-Sept et la Commission rejoignent leurs positions plus radicales.

■ **LE PRÉSIDENT** de la Commission européenne travaille en parallèle avec trois entités sur le dossier du cadre budgétaire pluriannuel de l'UE : le cabinet du commissaire au budget, Janusz Lewandowski, celui du commissaire à la fiscalité, Algirdas Semeta et le Bepa, le think tank qui lui est rattaché.

■ **LA FONDATION CHIRAC** va soutenir la tenue d'une conférence ministérielle à Bamako en octobre prochain afin d'apporter des propositions concrètes pour la gestion de l'eau dans le bassin du Niger.

■ **IPIC**, le fonds souverain d'Abu Dhabi, va reprendre les négociations interrompues en février avec le constructeur allemand de camions MAN au sujet du rachat des parts restantes de ce dernier. IPIC avait acquis 70 % de MAN en 2009 pour 475 millions d'euros.

■ **NEXTER** se prépare à recevoir en juin une importante délégation du ministère de la Défense d'Arabie saoudite. L'objectif est de relancer l'acquisition de canons Caesar. L'ex-Giat espère également vendre au royaume arabe des blindés légers VBCI et Aravis.

■ **LE MAROC** va équiper son réseau routier de 1 000 radars. Ce contrôle sera concédé à une société privée qui sera désignée fin juillet 2011. Sur les 1 000 appareils, 150 contrôleraient les feux et 10 la vitesse. Le Maroc va aussi se doter d'une structure centralisée pour le traitement des PV sur le modèle français.

■ **LA CHINE ET L'INDE** ont bloqué l'adoption de normes sociales mondiales lors de la conférence réunie à Paris la semaine dernière dans le cadre du G20. Les deux pays ont malgré tout accepté que le FMI et la Banque mondiale modifient leur soutien aux pays en développement pour intégrer un volet amélioration des droits sociaux. L'avancée sera officialisée lors de la conférence ministérielle du G20 en septembre.

■ **LE PARLEMENT** européen veut privilégier une plate-forme commune de bonnes pratiques pour les opérateurs européens de jeux et paris en ligne, dans le cadre de son rapport sur le Livre vert de la Commission européenne. Le groupe PPE, représenté sur ce dossier par Damien Abad, veut en outre que le Parlement défende face à la DG Concurrence le droit d'affectation aux filières de la taxe prélevée sur le montant des paris hippiques, comme c'est le cas pour le système français.

BAVARIA YACHTBAU : IL VISE DE NOUVELLES ACQUISITIONS EN 2011

■ Le constructeur allemand de bateaux, concurrent du français Bénéteau, compte racheter un fabricant de catamarans d'ici la fin de l'année. Bavaria Yachtbau, contrôlé par Anchorage Advisors et Oaktree Capital, compte investir ce segment sur lequel il n'est pas encore présent. Plusieurs dossiers sont à l'étude. La société bavaroise, qui a réalisé en 2010 un chiffre d'affaires en hausse de 15 % à 120 millions d'euros, compte approfondir sa stratégie de croissance externe après les rachats du français Dufour et de l'italien Grand Soleil. Il veut développer sa gamme de bateaux à moteurs dans les petits modèles en reprenant un chantier. ■

UE : 16 THINK TANKS ALERTENT SUR LE MANQUE DE RÉGULATION BANCAIRE

■ Les ministres des Affaires européennes des trois pays qui assureront les futures présidences tournantes de l'UE (Pologne, Danemark, Chypre) se verront remettre un rapport réalisé par 16 think tanks emmenés par Notre Europe (Bruegel, Egmont, European Council on Foreign Relations). Ils recommandent surtout que ces trois capitales s'accordent sur un programme de renforcement de la supervision financière européenne, et notamment de la régulation bancaire. Afin d'éviter de nouvelles crises, ils appellent à plus de rigueur et de transparence pour les futurs stress tests. Ils réclameront aussi que ces trois pays soutiennent le projet d'emprunt obligataire européen pour financer les projets d'avenir de la stratégie UE 2020. ■

La Lettre de L'Expansion

La Lettre est réalisée chaque semaine sous la responsabilité de Philippe Reiller. Rédacteur en chef (41.63), preiller@lexpansion.com

Rédaction : Emmanuelle Leneuf, GRAND REPORTER (41.64), eleneuf@lexpansion.com, Marie-Jeanne Pasquette (42.01), mjpasquette@lexpansion.com (ENTREPRISES), Thierry Mestayer (42.06), tmestayer@lexpansion.com (INTERNATIONAL)

RESPONSABLE DU Centre de prévision de L'Expansion : Emmanuel Lechypre (50.78), lechypre@lexpansion.com
DIRECTEUR GÉNÉRAL ADJOINT : Eric Matton.
ÉDITEUR : Antoine Laporte.
RELATIONS PRESSE : Virginie Matrat (43.09).
RELATIONS CLIENTÈLE : Nadia Boufassa (42.99).
ONT COLLABORÉ À CE NUMÉRO : Julie Laro, Patrick Minet, David Perrault.

Prix du numéro : 25 € TTC.
Abonnement premium : 1 495 € TTC.
Société éditrice : Groupe Express-Roularta.
SA au capital de 7 150 050 €, RCS Paris : 552 018 681.
Siège social : 29, rue de Châteaudun, 75009 Paris.
PRÉSIDENT-DIRECTEUR GÉNÉRAL : Rik De Nolf.
DIRECTEURS GÉNÉRAUX DÉLÉGÉS : Corinne Pitavy, Christophe Barbier.
DIRECTEUR DE LA PUBLICATION : Christophe Barbier.

Principal actionnaire : ROULARTA MEDIA FRANCE
Imprimée par Impro.
98, rue Alexis-Pesnon, 93100 Montreuil.
Commission paritaire n° 1112 82343.
Toute reproduction non autorisée même par photocopie est interdite.
Copyright 2011.

29, rue de Châteaudun, 75308 Paris Cedex 09 | RÉDACTION : 01 75 55 50 63 (fax : 01 75 55 41 40) | ABONNEMENTS : 01 75 55 42 99 (fax : 01 75 55 41 29)

CLUBS & THINK-TANKS



La Lettre A N°1502 du 03/06/2011

Notre Europe

Notre Europe, laboratoire d'idées fondé par Jacques Delors, met la dernière main à son troisième *Think Global - Act European* (TGAE). Cette contribution, dont le premier volet a été lancé il y a trois ans (LLA n°1432), rassemble des recommandations aux trois pays qui présideront l'Union européenne d'ici fin 2012 : la Pologne, le Danemark et Chypre. Seize think-tanks, parmi lesquels les belges Egmont et DemosEuropa, l'espagnol Real Instituto Elcano et le grec Eliamep, ont participé à la rédaction de l'acte, qui balaye l'agenda politique de l'UE pour les dix-huit prochains mois. Le rapport, de nouveau coordonné cette année par la chercheuse Elvire Fabry, doit être présenté à Bruxelles le 15 juin.



rp.pl

Rzeczpospolita

Unia czeka na polskiego premiera

Anna Słojewska 01-07-2011, ostatnia aktualizacja 02-07-2011 01:30

UE spodziewa się bardzo wiele po przewodnictwie Polski. Liczy na nasz optymizm i proeuropejskość. Anna Słojewska pisze z Brukseli

– Jeśli ktoś potrafi ożywić poczucie wspólnego europejskiego celu, są to właśnie oni – napisał w piątek brytyjski dziennik "Financial Times". Dziennikarze, politycy, eksperci oczekują ze strony polskiej prezydencji dokonań graniczących z cudem, biorąc pod uwagę ograniczone kompetencje.

– Tusk i jego ministrowie są naprawdę zainteresowani, żeby pchnąć Europę naprzód. Oczekujemy silnego przywództwa od polskiej prezydencji – mówi "Rz" Hannes Swoboda, wiceszef frakcji socjalistycznej w Parlamencie Europejskim, po spotkaniach z przedstawicielami polskiego rządu.

Tuska chwala też chadecy i liberałowie. Ale wypowiedź Swobody jest znacząca: to rzadki przypadek, by lider grupy politycznej, do której należy opozycja (SLD), tak pozytywnie wypowiadał się o rządzie i to w przeddzień kampanii wyborczej. Wyraźnie przecież szkodzi w ten sposób swoim polskim kolegom. Swoboda widzi ten paradoks, ale jego wypowiedź to wyraz zmęczenia kryzysem politycznym w UE.

Okazuje się, że tak wyczekiwany przez europejskie elity polityczne traktat lizboński nie tchnął w Unię nowego ducha i europejskiej tożsamości. Mimo że na jej czele stoi przecież od 1 grudnia 2009 r. "prezydent" – przewodniczący Rady Europejskiej Herman Van Rompuy.

– Jest bardzo słaby. Jego rola sprowadza się do raportowania, co mówią poszczególne państwa członkowskie. Nie jest twarzą Europy – tłumaczy Swoboda. Jego zdaniem Europa potrzebuje przywództwa i tymczasowo należy wrócić do modelu, w którym prezydencja rotacyjna odgrywa większą rolę.

Zarówno politycy, jak i eksperci podkreślają, że nadejście Polski może zmienić atmosferę w UE. – Nie ma zaufania do przywódców politycznych, a oni też nie ufają sobie nawzajem. Stąd te oczekiwania wobec Polski. To duży kraj, a jego rola polityczna w Europie systematycznie się zwiększa – mówi Janis Emmanouilidis, ekspert European Policy Centre w Brukseli. I wylicza dodatkowe powody, dla których od Tuska oczekuje się więcej niż od Viktora Orbana: silne europejskie przekonania polskiego premiera, ogromne poparcie wśród Polaków dla UE, a wreszcie fakt, że Polska jako jedyna nie doświadczyła kryzysu. Ma więc prawo pouczać innych, jak zarządzać gospodarką.

Eksperti podkreślają bardzo dobre przygotowanie polskiej prezydencji. – Spotkałam ministra Dowgielewicza na forum gospodarczym w Krynicy we wrześniu 2008 r. Już wtedy mówił mi o prezydencji i odpowiedzialnych za nią osobach – wspomina Elvire Fabry, ekspertka paryskiego instytutu Notre Europe. Według niej ta pierwsza polska prezydencja to ogromna szansa na zwiększenie roli politycznej kraju. – A agendę macie naprawdę poważną: reforma zarządzania gospodarczego, negocjacje nad nowym wieloletnim budżetem, umowa stowarzyszeniowa z Ukrainą, wolny przepływ osób w strefie Schengen – wylicza Fabry.

Jak zauważa, ostatnio z planu polskiej prezydencji zniknął jednak jeden priorytet. – Już nie mówi się o wspólnej polityce obronnej. Bo w kontekście polskiej nieobecności w Libii byłoby to dziwne – uważa ekspertka.

Nasi rozmówcy przyznają, że wiele oczekiwań dotyczy bardziej atmosfery niż konkretnych dokonań. Ale ona też się liczy w dzisiejszych czasach, gdy Unia Europejska kojarzy się bardziej z kosztami niż zyskami. – Nie znam żadnego przywódcy z wizją europejską. W przemówieniu Orbana słowo "Europa" prawie nie padało, inni też ją wypierają – mówi Hannes Swoboda.

Polscy dyplomaci w prywatnych rozmowach robią wrażenie przejętych takimi nadziejami. Zorientował się też Tusk, który w przemówieniu programowym w Sejmie w ostatni czwartek wyraźnie podkreślał ograniczone możliwości prezydencji rotacyjnej. Te obawy są zrozumiałe, bo wygórowane nadzieje mogą nieść ryzyko dla polskiego premiera. – Trudno będzie je wypełnić. Polski rząd już chyba zdał sobie z tego sprawę i studzi nastroje w Brukseli – mówi ekspert.

PRESSE EN LIGNE



16 juin 2011

Next EU trio urged to put prime ministers in driving seat

Important political decisions, such as the EU's long-term budget and the bloc's enlargement to new countries, should be shaped up by prime ministers ahead of summit meetings of heads of state, think-tank representatives told the countries taking over the EU's next three rotating presidencies.

Senior diplomats from Poland, Denmark and Cyprus, the countries holding the next trio of EU presidencies, delivered what appears to be a well-coordinated message: the role of the General Affairs Council (GAC) should be strengthened in view of important decisions, such as the adoption of the EU budget (see 'Background').

The General Affairs Council normally meets at least six times a year. It brings together the EU's 27 foreign ministers and is the highest EU decision-making body after the European Council of heads of state and government, which meets every three months.

In order to raise the body's political profile, Poland, Denmark and Cyprus now want these meetings to be chaired by the prime minister of the country holding the six-month rotating presidency.

The statements were made at a Brussels presentation of the [contribution of 16 European think-tanks](#) to the upcoming Polish, Danish and Cypriot Trio Presidency of the European Union. The meeting was hosted by Notre Europe, a think-tank led by former European Commission President Jacques Delors.

In a policy paper made available to participants, various researchers argued in favour of boosting the GAC.

Piotr Maciej Kaczyński, a research fellow at the Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS), suggested that the meetings should be chaired by the prime ministers or presidents of the countries holding the rotating presidency. Cyprus is a presidential republic.

Putting an end to backroom deals

According to some sources, disenchantment is growing with respect to the functioning of the GAC, which is attended [very unevenly](#) by member countries. Some are represented by foreign affairs ministers, others by European affairs ministers, deputy foreign ministers, junior ministers or merely by the country's permanent representative in Brussels.

In addition, diplomats fear that the current trend - set by Council President Herman Van Rompuy - of consulting with member states in informal formats, with a small number of

participants gathering in "dark rooms" by invitation only, is setting a dangerous precedent as a substitute for official decision-making.

Jan Tombiński, ambassador and permanent representative of Poland, the country holding the next EU rotating presidency, said he didn't believe in ideas that Prime Ministers should lead the GAC council.

"It is the substance which is creating the actors," he said, mentioning that councils such as Ecofin of JHA, the Justice and Home affairs council, had been of extreme importance in the last period due to the unfolding events in those fields. Regarding GAC, he said that this was going to be the "major actor" with regard to the discussions on EU's long term budget.

The European Commission is due to present its draft budget proposal on 20 June and budget discussions will begin thereafter.

The ambassador also advocated establishing mechanisms for providing information to the European Parliament at a very early stage.

A year and a half after the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty, the EU is still struggling to fulfill its treaty obligations with regard to relations between its institutions and is still in a phase of shaping a new culture of cooperation, he said.

Claus Grube, permanent secretary of state at the Danish Foreign Ministry, also took the view that the rotating presidencies needed to streamline work done in the different ministerial formats. This work should not only be done well, but must also be done on time, he said.

Trio format to chair budget talks 'from beginning to end'

The Danish diplomat, who has held the post of permanent representative to the EU and has been involved in several of Denmark's six EU presidencies so far, spoke of the need for "administrative and political leadership" in the EU's Council of ministers, saying that his country would be happy to provide such leadership during its stint at the bloc's helm in the first half of 2012.

Grube said it was remarkable how much the next trio of presidencies had been able to agree upon, despite being very different countries – one old and two new members, one from the north, one from the south and one from the east. He singled out the EU's long-term budget and the single market as areas where the rotating presidencies' coordination of work would be "extremely important".

Compared to 2005, Grube said he expected the negotiations over the EU's long-term budget for 2014-2020 to be much more complicated because all the elements would come into play, both on the income side and on the expenditure side.

"No rotating presidency would be able to lead the negotiations from beginning to end. But within the eighteen months at our disposal, we might be able to finish the job," he said.

Nicholas Emiliou, permanent secretary in the Cypriot Foreign Ministry, also spoke in strong terms about the need to strengthen the GAC, in order to better prepare EU summit meetings and to give "added value" to the work of Council President Herman Van Rompuy.

In particular, Emiliou called for budget talks and EU enlargement to be addressed in a transparent and democratic manner.

"In a family, the way you spend the family fortune and whom you let in as a new family member matters," he argued. He made no mention of Turkey, but made clear that Cyprus would not delegate to others the right to decide on Ankara's EU bid.

The Cypriot diplomat also said that climate change was an issue to be discussed in the GAC format. Cyprus is particularly sensitive to this topic, as the country is already experiencing desertification and a lack of water resources as a result of climate change.

Georgi Gotev



16 juin 2011

Le prochain trio de présidences devra mettre les premiers ministres aux commandes

Les décisions politiques importantes, comme celles qui concernent le budget à long terme de l'UE et l'élargissement de l'Union, devraient être élaborées par les premiers ministres en amont des sommets rassemblant les chefs d'Etat. C'est ce qu'ont déclaré les représentants de groupes de réflexion aux pays qui assumeront les trois prochaines présidences tournantes de l'UE.

De hauts diplomates originaires de Pologne, du Danemark et de Chypre, les trois pays qui assumeront le prochain trio de présidences de l'UE, ont véhiculé ce qui semble être un message bien harmonisé : le rôle du Conseil Affaires générales (CAG) devrait être renforcé s'agissant de la prise de décisions importantes, comme l'adoption du budget de l'UE (voir « Contexte »).

Le Conseil Affaires générales se réunit au moins six fois par an. Il rassemble les 27 ministres européens des affaires étrangères et il s'agit du plus important organe décisionnel de l'UE après le Conseil des chefs d'Etat et de gouvernement, qui se rencontre tous les trois mois.

Afin de donner plus de poids à cet organe, la Pologne, le Danemark et Chypre souhaitent que les réunions du CAG soient désormais présidées par le premier ministre du pays qui tient la présidence tournante (chaque mandat durant six mois).

Ces déclarations ont été faites lors de la présentation à Bruxelles de la [contribution de 16 groupes de réflexion européens](#) au futur trio de présidences polonaise, danoise et chypriote. Cette réunion était organisée par Notre Europe, un groupe de réflexion dirigé par l'ancien président de la Commission, Jacques Delors. Dans un rapport distribué aux participants, de nombreux chercheurs sont favorables à l'idée de donner plus de poids au CAG.

Piotr Maciej Kaczyński, chercheur au *Centre for European Policy Studies* (CEPS), a proposé que les réunions soient présidées par le premier ministre ou le président du pays qui assure la présidence tournante.

Mettre fin aux accords de couloir

Selon certaines sources, nombreux sont ceux qui nourrissent de moins en moins d'illusions au sujet du fonctionnement du CAG, auquel les Etats membres ne participent que de manière [hétérogène](#). Certains sont représentés par leur ministre des affaires étrangères, d'autres par le ministre chargé des affaires européennes, le vice-ministre des affaires étrangères, un ministre de second rang ou même simplement un représentant permanent du pays à Bruxelles.

En outre, les diplomates craignent que la tendance actuelle mise en place par le président du Conseil, Herman Van Rompuy, ne crée un dangereux précédent et ne remplace le processus de prise de décision officiel. Cette tendance consiste à consulter les Etats membres de manière informelle en invitant un petit nombre de personnes à se rassembler dans de « petites pièces » sur invitation seulement.

Jan Tombiński, qui est ambassadeur et représentant permanent de la Pologne, le pays qui tiendra la prochaine présidence tournante de l'UE, a déclaré qu'il ne croyait pas qu'il soit nécessaire que les premiers ministres dirigent le CAG.

« C'est la substance qui crée les acteurs », a-t-il ajouté, déclarant que les conseils comme l'Ecofin-JAI avaient été très importants récemment à cause des événements qui ont eu lieu dans ces domaines. Concernant le CAG, il a précisé qu'il s'agirait de l'« acteur principal » s'agissant des discussions sur le budget à long terme de l'UE.

La Commission européenne devrait présenter son projet de proposition de budget le 20 juin.

L'ambassadeur plaide également pour la mise en place de mécanismes voués à fournir des informations au Parlement européen dès le début des discussions.

Un an et demi après l'entrée en vigueur du Traité de Lisbonne, l'UE peine encore à respecter les obligations du traité concernant les relations entre ses institutions. Elle est encore en train d'élaborer une nouvelle culture de la coopération, a-t-il affirmé.

Claus Grube, secrétaire d'Etat permanent au ministère danois des affaires étrangères, pense lui aussi que les présidences tournantes devraient rationaliser le travail effectué au sein des différentes réunions ministérielles. Ce travail doit non seulement être bien fait, mais il doit également être réalisé dans les temps, a-t-il ajouté.

Le trio mènera les discussions sur le budget « du début à la fin »

Le diplomate danois, qui occupe le poste de représentant permanent auprès de l'UE et a été impliqué dans plusieurs des six présidences danoises de l'Union, a parlé de la nécessité d'un « leadership administratif et politique » au Conseil des ministres, ajoutant que son pays serait heureux d'introduire ce genre de leadership durant le premier semestre de 2012, lors qu'il tiendra la présidence.

M. Grube a affirmé qu'il était remarquable de voir à quel point le prochain trio de présidences soit parvenu à se mettre d'accord, malgré le fait qu'il s'agisse de pays très différents : un ancien Etat membre, deux nouveaux, un venant du Nord, un du Sud et le dernier de l'Est. Il a déclaré que le budget à long terme de l'UE et le marché unique seraient des domaines pour lesquels la coordination du travail des présidences tournantes serait « extrêmement importante ».

En comparaison à 2005, M. Grube a dit qu'il s'attendait à ce que les négociations sur le budget à long terme de l'UE pour 2014-2020 soient beaucoup plus compliquées, car tous les éléments devraient être pris en compte, que ce soit du côté des recettes ou des dépenses.

« Aucune présidence tournante ne pourra mener les négociations du début à la fin. Mais dans les 18 mois dont nous disposons, nous pourrions peut-être finir le travail », a-t-il expliqué. Nicholas Emiliou, secrétaire permanent au ministère chypriote des affaires étrangères, s'est également montré ferme sur la nécessité de renforcer le CAG, afin de mieux préparer les réunions du sommet de l'UE et d'apporter une « valeur ajoutée » au travail réalisé par le président du Conseil, Herman Van Rompuy.

En particulier, M. Emiliou a demandé que les discussions sur le budget et l'élargissement soient abordées de manière transparente et démocratique.

« Dans une famille, la manière dont on dépense l'argent et l'accueil de nouveaux membres sont des choses importantes », a-t-il argué. Il n'a pas mentionné la Turquie, mais il a été clair sur le fait que Chypre ne laisserait pas les autres décider à sa place au sujet de l'adhésion d'Ankara.

Le diplomate chypriote a également déclaré que le changement climatique était une question qui devait être discutée dans le cadre du CAG. Chypre est particulièrement concernée par ce problème, dans la mesure où le pays subit déjà des problèmes de désertification et de manque d'eau à cause du réchauffement. **Georgi Gotev**



Only 'solidarity' can save Europe's economy

20 June 2011 | [Integration and enlargement](#) | [France](#)

Member states must start thinking about the future of the EU or risk international irrelevance, writes Elvire Fabry

After such momentous events as the eurozone crisis, the Fukushima nuclear catastrophe and military intervention in Libya, the arrival of "contaminated cucumbers" signals a return to everyday politics in Europe. The fact that the sanitary crisis spread fear across the continent, even among the least threatened nations, makes one wonder: are the petty diatribes currently bouncing between political leaders the product of pent-up resentment? Probably so – these cucumber accusations are most likely an indirect response to both imposed solidarity and

never-ending economic angst.

What is certain is that if member states do not start thinking about the European Union's future again, the project as a whole is bound to falter - distracted by a morass of cultural clichés and rising prejudice. The eurozone crisis has not yet ended and avoiding state bankruptcies represents a far more pressing subject for all. Rather than venting frustrations, political leaders should continue focusing on preventing new economic crises.

A recent report by 16 European think-tanks – concerning the 18-month agenda of the upcoming Polish, Danish and Cypriot Trio Presidency, which starts on July 2011, and called "Think Global Act European" – underlines the importance of this financial topic. The report puts a special emphasis on the risk of a new banking crisis. One way to avoid such new crises would be to upgrade future stress tests, notably by making them more rigorous and more transparent. Only such tests will create a foundation strong enough to sustain the necessary restructuring and recapitalisation of many European banks.

But beyond avoiding new crises, political leaders need to look further afield. Without stronger economic growth, the EU will seem paltry in comparison to more buoyant economic zones - such as those of emerging markets where companies are finding it far easier to move beyond the 2008/2009 financial crisis. In fact, for some member states – markedly those situated in the eurozone's periphery – without EU help, stagnation or even recessions are far more likely than growth.

Given recent cuts in national budgets - for many states, only union-level action retains the leverage sufficient to stimulate growth. In addition to structural reform, many states will also need EU-level investment in numerous sectors such as research and development, infrastructure and energy. Such investment will require strong state-level support – especially, concerning innovative financial instruments like European bonds – also, mentioned by the European Commission in its 2011 budget review.

Besides such bonds, for Europe to remain competitive on the international scene – notably via a transition to a low-carbon economy– the EU will require the financial means to meet its ends. The upcoming 2014-2020 European budget negotiations, which will debut under the Polish Presidency, will be crucial in this regard. It is during these negotiations that we will see if officials are mature enough to think beyond traditional national frameworks.

Although this budget, which only represents roughly 1 per cent of the Europe's total gross national product, is no panacea for the EU's economy - it can, nevertheless, still play a fundamental role in kick-starting growth in several sectors and regions. The budget should not be addressed in a strictly financial manner. Rather, negotiations should focus on obtaining new economies of scale and on increasing Europe-wide efficiency.

These two objectives could be realised by coordinating national and community-level expenditures - to avoid overlap in areas such as defence, foreign affairs and research - and by improving budgetary responses to fluctuating economic needs in specific regions and sectors. Another way to reinforce Europe's potential to create economic growth would be to give the EU its own resources - via an energy or carbon tax, for example. This "autonomous" revenue would increase the budget by diversifying its funding.

Finally, new initiatives – such as the European Semester, the Euro-Plus Pact and the reform of

the Stability and Growth Pact – will all require sustained citizen-level support across all member states. What needs to be kept in mind is that solidarity amongst Europeans is beneficial to everyone's long-term economic and political interests. Whether it is in relation to the eurozone crisis, violence in Libya, nuclear quandaries or E. coli bacteria – now, more than ever, it is crucial that we all act as Europeans.

Elvire Fabry is a senior research fellow at Notre Europe, which was one of 16 think-tanks to participate in the Think Global Act European project



Think tanks roll out recommendations to upcoming trio

By Gaspard Sebag | Wednesday 15 June 2011

The political role of the upcoming trio of rotating Presidencies of the Council of the EU has been curtailed but they still have a part to play, especially with regard to the negotiations over the next multiannual financial framework (MFF), the implementation of the internal market and, paradoxically, the external dimension, say 16 think tanks. Ahead of the Polish, Danish and Cypriot trio Presidencies, which will take over at the EU's helm at the beginning of July, French think tank Notre Europe published, on 15 June, the third edition of a report entitled 'Think global – Act European' and organised a debate with ambassadors from these three countries. The report contains an analysis of the programmes of these Presidencies and the challenges ahead with the aim of presenting concrete recommendations.

The entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty and the 'top down' approach favoured by the European Council during the financial crisis has relegated the rotating Presidency's role to one of "administrative leadership," according to the report. Presidencies' agendas are more often imposed than selected. In the next 18 months, monetary stability and economic growth are likely to remain top EU priorities. Claus Grube, the permanent secretary of state at the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, hopes that his country will be able to exercise "some political leadership".

"The single market is one of the domains where the trio Presidencies have the most opportunity to prove their value," reads the report. Both Grube and Jan Tombinski, the permanent representative of Poland to the EU, agree that there is "a lot of unfulfilled potential". Grube even argues that an efficient single market is "the precondition for a well-functioning euro and a stable euro area".

In their capacity as chair of the General Affairs Council, the trio Presidencies will have the delicate task of conducting the negotiations concerning the post-2013 MFF. The key role will fall upon the Danish Presidency. If all goes well, Grube hopes his country's Presidency will "be able to finish the job". He recognises that it will be "much more complicated" than the talks over the current financial framework as both expenditure and resources will be discussed this time round. "The financial crisis will not make it easier," he adds.

In spite of the shift of foreign affairs responsibility following the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty from the rotating Presidency to the EU's high representative, the think tanks see a coordination role for the trio with the European Council, the Commission and the Parliament. "There's room for everybody," says the Executive Secretary-General at the European External Action Service (EAS), Pierre Vimont. Cooperation between the trio and the EAS looks like a real possibility. "We should not forget that we all agreed to it," said Grube. "Therefore we are fully committed to making it a success."

Ending on a more philosophical note, the Danish secretary of state argued that the EU "should not forget what [it has] achieved and be a bit more self-confident in that".

Copyright © 2008 Europolitics. Tous droits réservés.

Offnews.info

— para el desarrollo sostenible

18/06/2011 | The Need for an Open System to Evaluate European Union CSDP Missions

Félix Arteaga

Summary: Now that the Lisbon Treaty is in force, European Presidencies no longer need to continue promoting CSDP (Common Security and Defence Policy) missions as they did in the past, but they do need to articulate new measures that will consolidate them in the future. While the missions have served as a laboratory for the gradual development of the EU's procedures and civilian and military crisis management bodies, they have not been subject to critical assessment and monitoring processes as stringent as have been established in some countries. This ARI sustains that in future the CSDP missions will not be able to rely on such a tolerant framework and that they will be subject to more criticism and more thorough evaluation. Consequently, the forthcoming Presidencies must start implementing mechanisms to strengthen the legitimacy and transparency of the CSDP missions and prevent European citizens and their representatives in the European Parliament from becoming distanced from them.

Analysis: The EU has launched 24 CSDP (Common Security and Defence Policy) missions since 2003, but very little is known about them. The information available from open sources is limited to the information provided by the Council through its website, and only in the last few years have external valuations begun to appear. Compared to the uncritical and complacent descriptions of official reports, independent evaluations coincide in pinpointing common deficiencies in the missions. Among others, they point to a lack of strategy in the mandates, their limited results when it comes to solving the underlying problems, the democratic deficit in their management, the difficulty in coordinating interventions, the difference in strategic cultures among member states and the lack of military planning capacity.

Now that the Lisbon Treaty is in force, European Presidencies no longer need to continue promoting CSDP missions as they did in the past, but they do need to articulate new measures that will consolidate them in the future. As well as improving the operating and doctrinal aspects of the missions, future Presidencies will have to turn their attention to two structural conditioning factors linked to their affordability and accountability. While the missions have

served as a laboratory for the gradual development of the EU's procedures and civilian and military crisis management bodies, they have not been subject to critical assessment and monitoring processes as stringent as have been established in some countries. This work sustains that in future the CSDP missions will not be able to rely on such a tolerant framework and that they will be subject to more criticism and more thorough evaluation. Consequently, the forthcoming presidencies must start implementing mechanisms to strengthen the legitimacy and transparency of the CSDP missions and prevent European citizens and their representatives in the European Parliament from becoming distanced from them.

Reasons for Concern about the Missions' Affordability

The number and international demand for CSDP missions have not continued to grow due to the proliferation of crises and the European aim of contributing to international governance, discharging its responsibility to protect and providing humanitarian aid as a global security player. However, the resources available to the EU do not live up to these expectations, while new needs are constantly arising and priorities must be set. As the 2008 report on the implementation of the European Security Strategy of 2003 highlighted, the EU must 'prioritise [its] commitments, in line with resources'. The concept of affordability refers to undertaking only those missions that can actually be conducted and that, furthermore, produce the expected results in terms of acceptable cost and efficiency. Affordability means earmarking expenses in accordance with the global priorities and resources of the CSDP and CFSP (Common Foreign and Security Policy).

Experience shows that the political support for CSDP missions is out of step with the contributions to launch them because the very same member states that approve the missions are not obliged to provide the necessary resources to actually implement them. Several of the missions approved in Brussels have seen their roll-out delayed because they did not have the necessary resources (Concordia, EUFOR Chad/Car, EULEX Kosovo and EUPOL Afghanistan), while others were deployed quickly due to the sponsorship of some states (Artemis Congo, EU NAVFOR Atalanta and EUMM Georgia). The practical consequence is that despite appearing to be acting collectively, the EU actually acts like a coalition of the willing in which the available means and participants define the mission.

Most of the official evaluations highlight the EU's capacity to implement missions requiring comprehensive management because it has a range of civilian and military instruments which other players do not have. However, some evaluations question this comparative advantage because many missions have experienced difficulties in assembling military, civilian and financial resources. European Defence Agency data show that the difference in military capabilities between member states continues to increase and unless future Presidencies make real efforts to introduce convergence criteria there will be increasingly fewer countries able to operate jointly. Presidencies should also keep up their efforts to achieve the civilian and military headline goals set. These goals were not achieved by the 2003 and 2010 deadlines, while resources have been launched such as the EU Battlegroups which have so far not been used in CSDP missions.

The EU has shown a greater capacity to generate civilian capabilities in technical, development and humanitarian aid missions, but not in missions like those of Kosovo and Afghanistan which required sizeable police contingents or in missions to reform the security sector in complex scenarios such as Guinea Bissau and Somalia (perhaps this explains why missions like EUJUST LEX Iraq, EUSEC DR Congo and EUTM Somalia do not even feature on the Council's website). Similarly, experience shows that peace-building and nation-

building missions require more resources, strategic patience and management capacity to achieve results than the EU can provide.

The funding of these missions is yet another source of uncertainty. Civilian missions can be funded using CFSP funds (€327 million for 2011), but this is barely 3%-4% of the total EU external affairs budget. In military operations, the States involved take up most of the expenses (costs lie where they fall), except for some common costs covered by the Athena mechanism and others to launch the operations but which only cover approximately 10% of the real expense. Despite the financing mechanisms and the budget increase applicable to CSDP missions, the funds are insufficient and their management by the Council, the Commission and the European External Action Services needs to be rendered more coherent.

The reliance on national military, civilian and financial contributions gives major European countries an extraordinary power to reject those missions or mechanisms that oblige them to make significant contributions (Germany and Sweden in EUFOR Chad) or to demand –in exchange for their contributions– the control of the decision-making process and a more prominent role and greater visibility in the missions (France contributed 53% of EUFOR Chad/CAR's troops).

Presidencies must aim for synchronisation between the political decision-making processes, operation planning and the generation of forces, so that missions are not approved unless the necessary resources are guaranteed. When synchronisation has worked, it has been possible to conduct missions as demanding as the Concordia mission in the Balkans and Atalanta in the Horn of Africa. But when common decision-making has underestimated the availability of resources, either it has not been possible to deploy the missions (Darfur), or they have been delayed (it took six months to assemble 16 helicopters and 10 transport aircraft for EUFOR Chad/CAR) or they have been deficient, as was the case of Kosovo and Afghanistan. Presidencies must also continue to support initiatives like permanent structural cooperation, the division of tasks, functional specialisation, the pooling of resources and outsourcing, which can increase collective resources and reduce the dependence on individual countries.

In a Europe where citizen welfare is being scaled down and where many are questioning their governments' decisions to intervene in international missions, Presidencies must focus on streamlining the EU's intervention criteria. The influence of an international player is not gauged by the number of missions it conducts but by the results that are achieved. Presidencies must help change the mentality of those in charge of the missions in order to shift the focus to mission quality and not quantity. The EU must take advantage of the emergence of new global and regional players to share with them the responsibilities of international security, within the complementary framework advocated by a comprehensive approach.

Reasons to Demand Accountability in Respect of the Missions
European governments are finding it increasingly difficult to justify to their own citizens their involvement in international security missions, especially those where costs do not translate into results. Because of the need to secure and maintain political and social support for these missions, many countries have established democratic supervision mechanisms to authorise involvement in international initiatives. These mechanisms apply mainly to military missions, but they have increased the influence of parliamentary debates and opinion polls in the approval of and continued involvement in missions. The general tendency of governments asking for prior approval before sending troops abroad forces them to justify the reasons for

their involvement in such missions, the goals thereof, results obtained and human, material and financial resources necessary to implement them.

It is true that not all 27 EU member states have accountability mechanisms, that these mechanisms vary from one country to another and that they are all in the test phase. But it is also true that they have become widespread and that the governments which were previously opposed to being scrutinised are now benefiting from the support and legitimacy it affords them. At EU level, there are not yet similar mechanisms in place due to the democratic shortfall of the CSDP in general, and missions are not subject to public scrutiny. However, it will not be long before societies and parliaments that are used to demanding accountability from their governments with regard to missions start insisting on the same from Brussels, so it would be a good idea if the next presidencies began preparing the institutions and changing the procedures so as to improve accountability.

A first step would be to increase the information available regarding the status, results and lessons learned from the missions. Official civilian and military evaluations do not filter down to civilian society and the constraints on open information are compounded by the lack of methodological instruments for assessing CFSP missions, hampering self-criticism and learning. Accordingly, it would be advisable for the next Presidencies to present initiatives to boost the information flow and develop more transparent evaluation mechanisms and indicators. This would enable them to increase the interaction between national parliaments and the European Parliament, Europeanising the defence commissions, in order to foster greater social involvement, as suggested by the EU Institute for Security Studies.

Until now, most CSDP missions have lacked a strategy clearly marking out the EU's vital interests and priorities at play, the strategic objectives, resources needed and how these resources will be used. European public opinion and MEPs do not have that information because the available public documents are too general and the concepts of crisis management and operation plans (OPLANS) are confidential. Without having access to these aspects, it is very difficult to know why missions are approved and what strategic effects they have. Neither are there efficient reporting mechanisms for MEPs to receive this kind of information confidentially, since governments avoid being accountable to the European Parliament by arguing that they are accountable to their own national parliaments, and they avoid being accountable to the latter by arguing that the decisions are taken in Brussels. As a result, in the EU, missions are as likely to be as out of step with societies as they already are in member states, and the way to prevent this is for those responsible for the missions to provide transparent and systematic accounts of the results of the missions.

Conclusion: The entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty and the launch of the European External Action Service are an opportunity to introduce reporting and assessment mechanisms to render CSDP missions more democratically legitimate and accountable than now. The European Parliament now has a greater capacity to supervise and interact with the High Representative and the European External Action Service, for them to provide more information on missions financed with European funds or responding to requests from the President of the Parliament or the External Affairs Committee concerning the CFSP. The European Parliament also receives periodical reports and can draft non-binding recommendations with the information received during visits, hearings and open sources. However, European institutions have little capacity to demand accountability from those responsible for CSDP missions whose financing and resources come from governmental sources.

Consequently, and although it hardly seems logical to ask Presidencies to promote transparency and supervision of the intergovernmental system, they must do exactly that, because establishing a European open evaluation system would help European citizens identify better with the CSDP missions and would nurture Europe's strategic culture. In a strategic context such as that of the next few years, in which the available resources will shrink, there will be no shortage of people questioning the wisdom of the EU continuing to expand the number and complexity of CSDP missions without those responsible for managing them being asked to provide explanations with regard to their goals and results. As well as official assessment mechanisms, a more open and transparent evaluation system must be implemented to enable governments and institutions to share the lessons learned with MEPs and civil society. Furthermore, the implementation of such a mechanism would help advance towards monitoring procedures based on the best national practices and strengthen democratic supervision by national parliaments since they would be able to verify the information they receive from their governments against the information received from Brussels.

Since this is a long-term process, the immediate steps for Presidencies should be aimed at creating evaluation, supervision and communication instruments that affect CSDP missions that do not have a significant military component. Presidencies must try to put an end to the current dilution of responsibilities throughout the institutional universe and the various decision-making levels and start defining and personalising responsibilities. In the long term, in order to do the same with military missions, presidencies must foster cooperation between the European Parliament and national parliaments in order to consolidate the principles of accountability and accessibility, regulate open or classified information systems, harmonise the evaluation procedures and methodologies and promote the strategic communication of European leaders with regard to CSDP missions. Now that Presidencies have lost much of their prominence in CSDP missions, their work must be aimed at consolidating the missions by fostering the EU's credibility and efficacy as a leading player in global security.

In summary, Presidencies must: (1) recast their role in CSDP missions towards monitoring and supervision; (2) introduce intervention criteria to synchronise political decision-making, operations planning and generation of resources (affordability); and (3) introduce transparency, evaluation and supervision mechanisms for the missions (accountability).

Félix Arteaga

Senior Analyst for Security and Defence, Elcano Royal Institute

[1] This ARI was originally written as a chapter of the book 'Think Global - Act European III' devoted to the Polish, Danish, and Cypriot Trio Presidency of the European Union. It is published by Notre Europe, Egmont, GKI and the Elcano Royal Institute.

Real Instituto Elcano (España)

The Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs will visit Brussels and The Hague

14/06/2011

The Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ambassador Nicholas Emiliou, will travel this afternoon from London to Brussels, where he will participate tomorrow Wednesday at the conference of the network of 16 european think tanks "Think Global – Act European" entitled "The contribution of 16 european think tanks to the Polish, Danish, and Cypriot Trio Presidency of the European Union". In the framework of the conference, Ambassador Emiliou will speak at a panel with theme, "Lisbon Treaty rules in a time of crisis: stress tests for European governance. The vision of the rotating presidencies".

Following his visit to Brussels, the Permanent Secretary will travel to The Hague, where on Thursday 16 June, will hold meetings with the Secretary General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of The Netherlands, Mr. Ed Kronenburg and the Director General for European Cooperation at the Foreign Ministry, Mr. Robert De Groot.

The discussions will include the Cyprus problem, EU-Turkish relations, bilateral issues and european matters of mutual interest.

Source: © 2004 - 2010 Republic of Cyprus, [Ministry of Interior](#), Press and Information Office



Présidence/UE *Le 20 juin 2011*

Notre Europe vient de publier la contribution de 16 think tanks européens au trio de présidences polonaise, danoise et chypriote, une étude coordonnée par Elvire Fabry. Comme les deux précédentes éditions de "Think Global - Act European (TGAE)", ce rapport se consacre à un scénario à moyen terme, couvrant le trio des présidences polonaise, danoise et chypriote, de juillet 2011 à décembre 2012



"Think Global Act European" report, 15 June 2011

The report presents an in-depth analysis of the Trio's role and discusses the initiatives from the previous Trio Presidency, emerging challenges and specific proposals for policy progress. The full report is available [here](#).

Mention de TGAE à l'adresse suivante : <http://www.globeurope.com/news-views/archive>



(18.06.2011)

Contributions aux présidences polonaise, danoise et chypriote

Notre Europe, le laboratoire d'idées fondé par Jacques Delors, a présenté le 15 juin à Bruxelles la 3ème édition du rapport « Think Global – Act European » (TGAE) qu'il coordonne. Synthèse du travail de 16 think tanks européens, ce rapport, rédigé sous la direction d'Elvire Fabry, se concentre sur le moyen terme, à savoir les dix-huit mois qui verront la présidence de l'Europe assurée successivement par la Pologne, le Danemark et Chypre d'ici décembre 2012. Il fait le point sur les initiatives prises sous les trois présidences précédentes, identifie les défis émergents et formule des propositions concrètes à court et moyen terme pour une amélioration rapide des politiques. Nous publions ci-dessous la synthèse en français de ce rapport dont le texte intégral en anglais est accessible avec le lien ci-après.

http://www.notre-europe.eu/uploads/tx_publication/TGAE2011-web_01.pdf



Fondation Jean Jaurès

Mention du rapport TGAE dans sa newsletter n°443 ; 20 juin 2011

<http://www.jean-jaures.org/Newsletter/Toutes-les-newsletters/Newsletter/News-443/EUROPE>



Mouvement Européen
France

Titre: Think Global Act European

Quand: 15.06.2011

Catégorie: [Débats](#)

Organisé par Notre Europe. Présentation de la contribution de 16 think tanks européens au trio de présidences polonaise, danoise et chypriote. **Lieu:** Palais d'Egmont, place du Petit Sablon 8, 1000 Bruxelles. **Plus d'infos**



(Version polonaise)

28 kwiecień 2011

Prezentacja raportu 16 europejskich think-tanków z rekomendacjami dla Prezydencji Polski, Danii i Cypru 15 czerwca 2011 Egmont Palace - Place du Petit Sablon 8 bis, Bruksela.

Źródło: [Czytaj więcej...](#)

FLEMING ON FINANCE



The mood turns apocalyptic

Saving Greece is about more than bringing that country back on track, writes [Stewart Fleming](#). It is about ensuring that the EU continues to be a global economic power

Is the European Union finally waking up to the scale of the political and economic challenges it faces? Last week, at a seminar in Brussels led by Notre Europe, a think-tank, the apocalyptic mood, even among government officials who normally let their political masters do the talking in public, was unmistakable.

With the financial crisis in Greece exploding all over the European media, Michael Claus, a director-general for European affairs at Germany's foreign ministry, spoke bluntly. For the European Union in the next 18 months, "the top priority will be to save the euro", he said.

By last weekend the chances of achieving that objective were brightening just a little. The stand-off between Germany on the one hand and the European Central Bank and France on the other, over how private-sector lenders to Greece should be cajoled into participating in the Greek bail-out was apparently resolved.

The compromise reached by Angela Merkel, Germany's chancellor, and Nicolas Sarkozy, France's president, means that the International Monetary Fund (IMF) will withhold the *coup de grâce* from Greece. Provided Greece's parliament approves a new economic austerity package, the IMF will distribute around €12 billion to Athens so that the EU/IMF bail-out can continue to wobble on. Febrile financial markets should calm down again – for a while, at least.

But all that has happened is that the participants may have bought some time.

Later this year the Greek financial crisis will be back on the front pages. Economists at Barclays Capital, an investment bank, have correctly concluded that, given the likely interest rates that Greece faces on its debts of around 150% of gross domestic product and its feeble medium-term growth prospects, Greece's "public-debt dynamics [are] unsustainable and a restructuring [of its debts] is inevitable".

If the IMF, most probably under Christine Lagarde as the new managing director, had to come to this conclusion too, then the IMF disbursements would have to stop.

Muddling through

Nouriel Roubini, a US economist renowned for his gloomy prognostications, wrote on 13 June that "the muddle-through approach to the eurozone crisis has failed to resolve the fundamental problems". If this continues, the result will be "a break-up of the monetary union itself", he warned.

This, however, is to give 'muddling through' a bad name. In 1982, Mexico defaulted on its international debts, triggering the worst international debt crisis in modern times. Over the next eight years, more than a dozen Latin American countries eventually had to be 'bailed out', with help from the IMF, the US Treasury and (mainly) US banks. Had Washington not led the rescue, then the US banking system, which was over-extended in Latin America, would itself have collapsed, according to Harold James, the official historian of the IMF. The crisis would then have gone global.

The managing director of the IMF at the time was Jacques de Larosière, a former governor of France's central bank. Jean-Claude Trichet, now president of the European Central Bank (ECB), was a senior French treasury official. Then, as now, he was actively involved in the ultimately successful 'muddling through' strategy that helped Latin America through its 'lost decade' of growth.

EU officials are well aware that the crisis now facing Europe is much more challenging. Latin America's crisis was overwhelmingly about US bank lending. It did not involve publicly traded sovereign bonds monitored by credit-rating agencies – whose venal incompetence was exposed by the 2007 sub-prime debt crisis, but who nevertheless still wield so much unaccountable power.

The Latin American countries in trouble were not part of a currency union. Greece's troubles can affect – and have already affected – the likes of Portugal, Ireland and Spain, and continue to threaten the euro itself. This gives their governments leverage in negotiations that Latin American debtors did not have, once US bankers had been bludgeoned into rolling over their loans.

Perhaps the biggest difference was that de Larosière and Paul Volcker, the then chairman of the US Federal Reserve Board, welded themselves into a formidable team. Volcker could be bold. Unlike Trichet today, he was leader of a long-established central bank, in a unitary state, blessed with incontestable political legitimacy. With de Larosière he provided visionary leadership. We have not seen much of that in Europe since the Greek crisis broke.

Early last year, when the extent of the Greek crisis started to become apparent, Germany's top priority was to avoid a financial Afghanistan – a protracted

engagement with a troubled debtor. It wanted to provide support only when all other options were exhausted, even though history and long IMF experience, teaches that it is better to tackle such crises early than wait until everybody is staring over the edge of the cliff.

Manna for speculators

More recently, Germany has lumbered into a bitter, confidence-destroying, all-too-public confrontation with the ECB and France – manna from heaven for greedy financial market speculators.

If Roubini is to be proved wrong, then this bungling has to stop. Yes, fierce pressure has to be exerted on Greece's political leaders – and their voters – to reform not just their economy, but their corrupt and anarchic country. It beggars belief that Greeks still do not seem to understand that, without reform, they are facing economic oblivion, not just a lost decade.

Another reason for maintaining the pressure on Greece is to demonstrate to Spain, Portugal and Ireland, that bail-outs are not hand-outs. Private-sector bankers with loans out to Greece, who baulk at acting like responsible lenders, need to know that regulators and supervisors can play dirty too, albeit behind the scenes.

But Claus, speaking at last week's Notre Europe seminar, was wrong in at least one respect. It is not just the survival of the euro that is at stake. If Europe fails to raise its miserable potential economic growth rate and implement the reforms needed to compete effectively with China, India, Brazil, Indonesia and other emerging economies, then it will be embarking on the journey to irrelevance that has been the fate of many great cultures in the past.

Stewart Fleming is a freelance journalist based in London.