

30 years European Movement

Chamber of Industry and Commerce for Munich and Upper Bavaria (IHK), 21.11.2011

Europe, my Home

Heribert Prantl

English translation by Christine Schuller M. A. and Wolfgang Karl Göhner

What comes to your mind when you think about Europe? Where is, ladies and gentlemen, your Europe? Where can it be found?

My Europe are three pieces of furniture. They are very old, they do not belong to me and they are not in my apartment. They are, first, a long bench, second and third, a green table and a candy-table. All three can be visited in the Old Town Hall of Regensburg in Bavaria. This old town hall is not just any old town hall, it is a European place. Here European borders were determined and debates were held of how to overcome the threat when the Turks were standing before the gates of Vienna. At this place the “Perpetual Reichstag” was held for one and a half centuries, from 1663 to 1806. The “Perpetual Reichstag” was a congress of ambassadors of the Electors, the princes and the imperial cities of the “Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation”, which included in its heyday, the entire area that is now central and southern Europe.

The long bench, the green table and the candy-table are left over from those days when Regensburg was the center of core Europe: The “Perpetual Reichstag” tried to coordinate the multitude of large, small and very small states of the Empire. Until a law was passed, debates were held from Nassau-Usingen to Kriechingen, from Cologne to Bopfingen, but only the signature of the emperor in Vienna gave the conclusa validity. The procedure was cumbersome, it was federal and participatory – it was European à la Brussels, and it anticipated somehow the slowness and laboriousness of democratic processes.

The three pieces of furniture are European symbols for better, for worse. The “green table” was the tableau of decisions, which sometimes lacked contact with reality. The “long bench” was not only the place where the ambassadors sat, but also the place where unfinished files were piled up until they fell off at the end. And finally, the little candy-table: here the ambassadors and their staff could serve themselves.

This all has something likeable, modest. This old and core Europe does not show off. And the Old Town Hall in Regensburg is so small, as the old empire was great. It is my European home. However, most people do not share these feelings of comfort when they think about Europe today. Europe – it is connected with fear and a sense of unease, because people do not know where the billion and trillion bailouts for the euro will lead to. So one is tempted to apply Heinrich Heine's "Night Thoughts" about Germany on Europe: "If I think of Europe in the night, I am deprived of sleep." It is certainly one of the quotes mostly applied wrong. Namely, it ends, but many do not know, with the lines: "Germany will last eternally, it is a very healthy country." How we would like to say this about Europe. But nowadays nobody dares to do so.

Europe is experiencing historic days. In the past historical days were initiated by cannonade and the smell of war, victory and defeat was in the air. Because this is so stored in our collective memory, the historic significance of the events in recent history has not been noted: Nothing crashes – just the euro creaks, Greece groans and Italy moans.

In order to support the euro, the German Parliament has given a guarantee of an outrageous sum, and it is not the first one. These guarantees not only serve the purpose to stabilize the European Monetary Union, but to enlarge it. The European Monetary Union will become an economic union, a social union, a transfer union - a European state in the end. Obviously, this road is paved with guarantees. But this is also a road which leaves behind the fundamental principles of the German Constitution (Grundgesetz), so that a new constitutional foundation is needed. Is this bad? No, on the contrary. It is certainly not the worst thing about Germany, if European solidarity takes precedence over national self-assertion there. The German philosopher Jürgen Habermas currently advertises almost desperately for it.

The German Constitution has, for 62 years, pointed the way to Europe; it was a guide to the European stars. The German policy has followed this path, which was not always a straight one. Contract after contract has been signed, bearing the names of various European cities – Rome, Brussels, Luxembourg, The Hague, Maastricht, Amsterdam, Nice, Lisbon – to show what already has been achieved. But now we have reached the point where the European state begins. Until now the German Constitution was sufficient. However for Germany being part of a European state, it will no longer be adequate. It refuses further abandonment of state sovereignty as guarantor of unchanged German sovereignty. Europe comes to life through its Member States. They give up sovereign rights for the sake of the EU. There is no other way – because nothing comes from nothing.

Germany now faces the end of its old constitution – literally and figuratively. Literally, because the last article of the German Constitution prescribes how to proceed. Article 146 requires a referendum for the event that occurs now: the basic guarantees and principles of the old constitution can be amended only with the adoption of a new constitution. German sovereignty can only be substantially reduced and transferred to Europe by a referendum.

More Europe – and more Europe is even necessary – can only be realized with a new constitution and the consent of the people. More Europe can only come with article 146 of the German Constitution. With all the billions of euro bailouts the final days of the German Constitution began. This, however, got lost in the mountains of guarantees; but it is the truth. And it could be seen in the recent European rulings of the Constitutional Court. These are historic days, indeed. They are not accompanied by cannonades, but by guarantees.

There was once a constitution, which bore the name of its brilliance, it was called “The Golden Bull” and dates from 1356. “Bull” is an old name for deed, and the Golden Bull was the constitution of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation. It was called the Golden Bull, because her wax seal was put in a golden capsule. No one ever called the German Constitution a “golden constitution”, although it deserves this name – because of its content. If one looks for a reference object for the black-red-gold in the German colours, then the German Constitution is “gold”. The principle of democracy, the rule of law, the welfare state principle and the federal structure are the golden bars of the German Constitution.

With these golden bars we have been working for decades. They have been rolled and hammered, very often by the Constitutional Court. One gram of gold can be processed to gold leaf of half a square meter. Nearly the same was done with the principles of the German Constitution: They gilded the entire Federal Republic of Germany. Now gold has indeed the property to be made almost infinitely thin – but, nevertheless, it will not last for all of Europe.

In these days Germany experiences the finiteness of its constitution: It is no longer enough to provide more and better guarantees for the euro and for neighbouring countries. It is no longer sufficient to secure Europe's future. The German constitution is very pro-European, but it's made for Germany, not for Europe. It constitutes the statehood of the Federal Republic of Germany, not the statehood of the European Union. It is the order of life of the Germans, not of the Europeans. It binds the German state powers, not those of Europe. It guarantees the separation of powers in the

Federal Republic of Germany, not in the EU. It is the basis for German democracy, not the basis for democracy in Europe. Because the German constitution is a wise law, however, it has shown the way to Europe. It has now done its job. As constitution for a German state, which is part of a larger European one, it is not suitable. A sign can only give the direction. However, it can not be a map of the final location to which it has guided us.

The European state does certainly not come out of nowhere, it is not a creation ex nihilo. It is the culmination of European history: "If we were to take stock of our intellectual property, it would turn out that most of it does not come from our respective country, but from the common European fund. Four-fifths of our internal European possessions are common property" according to the Spanish philosopher Ortega y Gasset. It is important to make this fund a foundation. No, this foundation can not stand on the ruins of the nation states. Who wants to crush the individual states, in order to build Europe, does not understand much about Europe. Europe smashes nothing, Europe joins together. And the euro is part of the cement. It is not entirely wrong when the German Chancellor says, "the euro is Europe." But Europe is much more than the euro. The EU is built on political, not monetary foundations.

The European operating system is not the euro, it is democracy. But how can democracy in Europe be realized in a union of 450 million citizens? The best way to find out is to begin.

Ladies and gentlemen, there is a story with which one has previously tried to explain to children how long "forever" lasts. My grandmother told me the story. She was a feisty peasant woman and had 14 children, some more than the EU had Member States in the first thirty years of its existence. The old woman had lived through a lot in her life and she kept her most important memories in a large wooden box which she called "the war box". It was full of letters written by her sons and sons-in-law from all fronts of the 2nd World War from El Alamein to Stalingrad. I always think of this box, when it I think of Europe.

Such a life-experienced woman can be trusted. The story of my grandmother about the duration of eternity goes like this: On a large rock once every hundred years a bird whets his beak. If the rock is removed in this way, finally, then just one second of eternity has passed.

This never-ending story may come to ones mind, when it comes to the question of whether and when there will be a democratic and social state of Europe. Not only national politicians, but also enlightened and cosmopolitan law professors answer this question in a way that anyone who is not thinking in eons can drive into despair. The lack of social democracy in Europe was, they say,

structurally related, it can not be countered by the reform of European institutions. And why not? Because, they say, due to language problems there is “no European public”, “no European public discourse” and “no European population”. If this is really true, then the European Parliament plays the role of the little bird in the story I just told.

However, the situation is not so hopeless. At least once every five years we can see that maybe the “language barrier” is no valid argument. Despite of all language problems a “European public” and a “European discourse”, perhaps even a “European people” (albeit for understandable reasons a rather unwilling one) exists.

This day of short-term insight is the day after the election of the European Parliament. And the hope for Europe manifests itself precisely in the great lament, which is sung throughout Europe: From Helsinki to Palermo the low turnout is complained. To sum up the paradox: the bigger, and yes indeed, the more powerful the European Union and the Parliament are, the less people go to the polls. The turnout is so low that one has to ask, whether the idea of Europe will fail because people in Europe can no longer understand the sense of what is going on in Strasbourg and Brussels. But I am not so pessimistic: The influence of the European Parliament is growing, albeit not quickly and radically enough. And to the question of the existence of a European public, I think not as negatively as constitutional law experts do: Protests against financial capitalism in the streets and squares of Berlin, Rome and Paris erupted – isn't this a sign that there is a European public coming to life? In my view this is already the second act: The first took place in 2003 during the mass demonstrations against the Iraq war of the United States. Back then it was about basic issues of foreign policy in Europe. Now it's about the fundamental issues of economic, financial and social politics.

((((The European election is a mirror: It gives insight into the European consciousness, as it is – not as we would like it to be. If you don't like what you see in the mirror, do not blame the mirror. The mirror isn't faulty, if it reflects errors. However, it would be a mistake not to take note of these obvious errors. The adequate reaction would be to correct them. The poor turnout at the polls makes it clear: This Europe is not yet the Europe of its citizens. It is a Europe of elites. A European citizenship is still legal fiction far away from a perceived reality in Germany and elsewhere. The awareness of the EU elites in Brussels and Strasbourg exceeds those of the ordinary EU citizens. The elite is “euroglott”, the average European is not. The current form of government in the EU is determined by caring elitism in Brussels. Its popularity is measured at the polls.)))))

Ladies and gentlemen, when the new Munich airport was inaugurated, the then Bavarian Prime Minister Max Streibl walked proudly and inspired through the large halls accompanied by lots of journalists. Everything was spotlessly clean, spacious, urbane and sophisticated. The polished granite floor gleamed, the walls were decorated with modern art, from the speakers sounded the world's languages. When the tour was to end after two hours, a reporter asked the Bavarian Prime Minister, whether he is missing something in all this pomp and glory. The Prime Minister paused for a moment and said: "It's all wonderful, but if you arrive here, you do not realize that you are in Munich. It could be the new airport in Paris or Melbourne as well. How does a passenger know that he just landed in Munich?" A colleague suggested the next runway could be built in "pretzel shape". The laughter was great.

If one listens to this story, then behind the sounds of mirth and the alleged provinciality of the politician something very serious, important and basic can be heard. This story leads to a question that is much more important for a liberal, social and democratic state than for an airport. What special characteristics must this Europe have that it gets accepted by its citizens? What must be the hallmark, the absolutely unique of this union – which already brought together so many European constitutional and social welfare states? Are the hallmarks of this Europe, the huge rescue packages for banks, for national economies and for the euro? Will the twelve golden stars in the European flag be replaced by twelve beautiful golden rescue umbrellas or thick billion rescue levers?

Size alone is not enough. Everybody knows what a good umbrella needs to function in bad weather: It needs a solid cane to hold it and spokes that give stability. The more strokes it has, the more weather-resistant it is. The European Financial Stability Facility (EFSF) - an umbrella of enormous size - can barely be spanned by German Chancellor Angela Merkel, French President Nicolas Sarkozy and some other political leaders, who created it. However, if they want to hold it alone, they will end up like The Flying Robert in the German fairytale Struwwelpeter: Flying Robert runs with the umbrella into the storm and then it happens: "Look! The umbrella is caught up in the stormy wind and Robert flies swiftly through the air so high, so far, nobody hears him, when he cries." Then the umbrella along with Robert flies through the clouds and the story ends with the bitter sentence: "nobody knows where the wind has carried him."

Exactly this will happen to the EU and the EU Commission in Brussels, if they think they can hold the umbrella alone. They need the population of their countries and they need the trust of the citizens, because this trust will provide the spokes of the umbrella. The European Union needs the confidence of its citizens, and this trust will not simply drop down from bailouts. Without this trust

the umbrella remains fragile: it flutters, tears down and breaks. How much the confidence of the people is damaged, can be heard in any discussion on any topic: Whether it's the mouldy walls in the toilets of the kindergarden or the question why there are so few teachers and so many cancelled lessons– always and everywhere there was wild (sarcastic) applause, if anybody then mentioned “500 billions”: “500 billions for banks, but only little social benefit per month for children of the long-term unemployed.”

Europe is the best thing that ever happens to the Germans, Frenchmen and Italians, Czechs and Danes, Poles and Spanish, the Dutch, British and Greeks, the Bavarians and the Balts, Walloons and Württembergers, the Scots and the Sicilians, the Basques, the Badeners and the Thuringians in their long history. Europe is the achievement of so many old peace treaties that could not bring peace in the end. The European Union is the end of a nearly thousand-year war, that nearly all have fought against all. It is an undeserved paradise for the people of an entire continent. EU is the abbreviation for the golden age of European history (*my emphasis*).

That sounds emphatic, but it is so - even if we nearly don't dare to say so. It's true. And yet, such solemn phrases will turn to empty words, if and as long as the people hold the view that the European Union only cares for the economy and not for the social security of its citizens. Social policy is not and may not be an annex of economic policy. Social policy is the key to create a homeland. Only social policy can turn a state entity, a union, into a home for the people who live in it.

Anyone who has seen his nation state as a home does not want to be expelled from it. If his nation state is too weak, however, he wants to have Europe as a second home. So when protesters all over Europe call on to their governments to provide a certain amount of economic decency in a globalized world, then it is not unreasonable. Rules for a socially equitable economy are part of the internal peace of a state. To take care of internal peace - this is one of the basic tasks of the European Union.

45 years ago Europe stood for a limitless future. It may not be that Europe stands for endless uncertainty now. Many citizens share the uneasy feeling that the EU stands for classical external and internal security, it is beneficial for trade and commerce, but social concerns are not in good hands. Yes, fear arises that in the wake of encouraged free cross-border competition, social aspects will get lost, because different social levels in individual Member States will first open the door for

social dumping in a Europe without borders and second will lead to the lowering of national social securities. If this feeling exists – and it does – then it is not enough to demand gratitude from the citizens for the existence of the European Union. Contracts are not enough. Europe needs the confidence of its citizens.

The European nation states are losing their shape, but the European Union has not yet found hers. The EU is gaining in size, but not in strength. The welfare systems crumble and break, and the EU is doing too little to stabilize them. Despite of all speeches the EU is not based on three strong pillars, but only on one: the Economic and Monetary Union. Or, to use a different picture: Europe's social leg is stunted and dragged behind. If there would be a European state, it would be the third largest country in the world with a population of 453 million people. Most people in Europe do not feel the potential strength of Europe: they want a union, which helps them and dispels their fears of unemployment and cheap-labour competition. They want a union, which protects them. The people in Europe want to feel that this European Union cares about them and not primarily for banks and international trade. They want to understand security not only as internal security but as social security as well.

If such demands come up in the political debate the usual answer is: The EU stands for freedom and competition, social policy is the responsibility of the nation states. According to the principle of subsidiarity social policy has its place at the membership level. This seems reasonable. But such a division can not work, if the EU in particular promotes economic freedom and freedom of competition – then the social policies of the Member States, the national social policies are seen as obstacles, which have to be eliminated by the motto: green light for the freedom of movement, the freedom to provide services, free movement of goods and capital – get rid of everything which stands in its way.

In particular, the European Court of Justice in Luxembourg seems to be stuck in this thinking: The Court and its judges often act as if the Court of the European Economic Community still exists, as if they have not yet noticed, that the EEC had become the EU.

The recognition of the importance of the social system still has to grow at the European Court in Luxembourg. In Luxembourg even the right to strike, which is enshrined as a fundamental right in the constitutions of many Member States, must give way to economic freedoms. I believe: The European Union and its Court of Justice in Luxembourg may not be allowed to transform Europe into an anti-social European Union.

That would be disastrous, that would be destructive. Why? Because the social welfare states in Europe share a history of success. This success story has different milestones in different EU states. In Germany, the welfare state was established to ensure the disabled and war refugees a fairly normal life. Then it ensured that children with lower class background could study at the university and could even become Chancellor. Without the social welfare state social tensions would have erupted, however, it proved able to defuse the extremes. Without this welfare state, the German reunification would probably not have been achieved. And without a good continuation of this success story, there will be no European unity.

When we think about reform of the social welfare states it is important to continue this success story, not to quit it. It is necessary to determine the essential features of the so-called “social progress”, as described in the Lisbon Treaty. These essential features will be an expression of social justice. **The social welfare state is home - and it must remain that way. It can be insulted only by those, who need no home. And its demolition will only be demanded by those, who live in their private estates. It is very doubtful, however, whether they still can feel comfortable there, when the home of others gets destroyed** (*my emphasis*).

The European Court of Justice in Luxembourg may not be and remain a court just favouring competition, it needs to be the guardian of social matters and the common good as well. Perhaps the Court indeed overslept the creation of the EU. On paper at least, the EU already became a bit social: Article 3 of the Lisbon Treaty is not just about a Europe which relies on balanced economic growth and price stability, it also states, that a competitive social market economy should be achieved – and here it comes – with the aim to reach full employment and social progress. In the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU even basic social rights are listed that are not mentioned in the German Constitution.

It is still not quite sure whether we can trust the social commitment of the EU. Some clues can be found that confirm a social commitment – but many others rebut it. Lets have a look at the Lisbon Treaty: On the one hand full employment and social progress are mentioned, on the other hand there remain blind spots when it comes to the values of the EU. Democracy and the rule of law are directly stated – but the welfare state and social justice are sought in vain.

The privatization of social responsibility is not a good way for Europe. The EU should not continue to follow this way. Still almost everything is seen through the lens of freedom of competition.

Therefore, social issues and the common good are pushed aside. Therefore, the impetus for the privatization of the postal services, telecommunications and rail systems came from Brussels. Therefore, Brussels is proud of this privatization, but the consumers are not. Therefore, the EU regards the public service broadcasters, the public utility facilities or health systems with scepticism – in contrast to the citizens. Europe has yet to learn that not all public goods can be sacrificed to private competition. And legislative harmonisation in Europe can not be conducted according to the motto: people should be more exchangeable for the sake of business and competitiveness. However, the human being is not just a homo economicus, not even in Europe.

At this point I like to tell you my favourite story. One of the strangest episodes of my life is the time I spent in Alfred Wunsiedels factory. I went to the employment agency and was sent with seven other fellow sufferers to Wunsiedels factory, where we had to pass an aptitude test. I had to enter the examination room first, where nice questionnaires laid out ready on a desk. First question: “Do you think it is right that men have only two arms, two legs, eyes and ears?” Here I reaped the fruits of my own reflection and I wrote without hesitation: “Even four arms, legs and ears would not satisfy my thirst. The endowment of men is just puny.” Second question: “How many phones can you handle at the same time?” Again, the answer was as easy as solving a linear equation: “If there are only seven telephones”, I wrote, “I will get impatient. Until I do not have nine, I am not fully working”. Third question: “What are you doing after work?” My answer: “After-work hours. What’s that? I removed this word from my vocabulary at the age of fifteen, because in the beginning was the deed!” I got the job.

It is, ladies and gentlemen, of course, not an episode from my CV, but a story that has been written decades ago by Heinrich Böll (“*Es wird etwas geschehen*”, “*Something will happen*” [*my emphasis*]). However, it could be the description of a test at a social and employment agency in 2015. Employees have to be completely flexible, able to cope under any circumstances, incredibly healthy, tough and effective. The question is: Do we want such a society? Do we want a Europe, which it like Wunsiedels factory – a Europe in which only limitless efficiency is important and nothing else matters, where market value is everything, in which the value of people is measured only by the rules of economy?

In reality, there are indeed certain limits to this vision: In contrast to snails a man does not carry around his house on his back. And he has – as he is no hermaphrodite – other social needs. So he is looking for a mate, wants to start a family, is active in sports and choral societies, has children, who go to school, and has friends. This imposes certain limits to mobility and unlimited availability. The

“Wunsiedel-Man”, or you may call him the “Agenda-2010-Man” is obviously different: He is a man with no children, no family and no social relations.

This can not and should not be the ideal type of the European citizen. This vision of humanity must not prevail in Europe.

Europe needs other people, Europe needs citizens. Citizens - these are people who build their future together. The social welfare state plays a certain role in this process: it works against exclusion. The shaping of a common future and the social exclusion of more and more people – like the unemployed, the socially disadvantaged, people with disabilities, foreigners, refugees, immigrants, ex-prisoners – can not go together: A “two-third-democracy” is not a good one – not in Germany and not in Europe. A democracy with a poverty problem, a democracy with an exclusion problem, is a democracy with a democracy problem. This applies to Germany and to the European Union as well. Again, we need the social welfare state: It’s the precondition that people can meet on equal footing - in spite of differences in rank, talents and money bags. The European model of democracy and the European social model are connected to each other.

A European social model: It does not mean the amount of minimum wages, unemployment benefits or pensions should be similar throughout Europe and we should all have the same school systems.

A European social model: It does not mean the health care system has to be financed in the same way throughout Europe. A pan-European smooth thin social welfare state with streamlined requirements from Brussels - this is not a European social model, but rather a nightmare.

A European social model: This is something entirely different. This is the common idea that social inequality is not God-given.

A European social model: This is good protection and wise help against all the big risks in life, sickness, unemployment and dependency.

Europe – I just said – is in the light of its bloody history a paradise for the citizens of this continent. But even in this paradise, there are injustices – even in paradise, life starts and ends unfair and in between it is not much better. One is born with a silver spoon in his mouth, the other one in the gutters. One is blessed by nature, the other one isn’t. One inherits talent and perseverance, the other

disease and lack of drive. One gets an intelligent head, the other a weak heart. One is healthy all his life, the other is born with a severe disability. Nature is an equity risk.

For one a sheltered childhood leads to a successful career. Another one starts in the gutters and ends in jail. One grows up with books, another one with drugs. One attends a school, that makes him strong, the other one gets mentally crushed. One is clever but gets no support, the other has little intelligence, but all chances to acquire knowledge. Better genes or family can not be earned. They are given by fate. One gets a job, which makes him rich, the other one ends broken down. The next one will remain unemployed. Not always this is due to personal power, not always to personal fault.

Fate hits unfairly and injustices are not always compensated. This is the task of the social welfare state. It ensures that people have real chances, not only formal opportunities. In a social welfare state it is not enough that the state provides kindergartens, schools and universities with formally equal access opportunities for the wealthy and not wealthy. The social welfare state has to provide the practical conditions that enable the non-wealthy to use their formal opportunities. The social welfare state is, therefore, within bounds, a fate corrector.

A European social model: This is a common coordinate system, in which the axes are called solidarity and justice – and in which the individual states have to find their respective coordinates. They should not be hindered but supported by Brussels, Strasbourg and Luxembourg to find their place in this system (*my emphasis*).

Europe will not function, just when the machinery in Brussels works like clockwork. Europe does not function just because an elite in Brussels and Strasbourg feels at home there. Europe needs not only commissioners and EU officials, Europe needs more than regulations. **Europe needs the confidence of its citizens (*my emphasis*)**. The Europeans also need a Court they can trust in the same way, the Germans trust their Federal Constitutional Court in Karlsruhe.

“I was Europe’s last chance” - Adolf Hitler said in his final days in the bunker. It was a demonic “chance”. Adolf Hitler smashed and destroyed everything that was left over of the old Europe after the First World War. He squandered the international standing of Europe and its political and cultural demands in a horrible way. In 1945 not only Germany, but Europe was down on its knees. What happened in Europe then is poorly described with the recently often propagated word “miracle”.

The “European small states junk”, as Hitler called it contemptuously, did come together, it overcame nationalism and ancient enmities. The European Community, then the European Union was created. The EU's history is a history of squaring the destroyed circle. It is the “story that gives meaning to the meaningless”, like the title of the work of the unjustly forgotten German philosopher Theodor Lessing, who was shot in 1933 by Nazi assassins. **This EU is the ultimate goal of a tangled European history, in which the offspring of a belligerent past established itself as “force of peace”** (*my emphasis*). Unfortunately, it is hard to feel greatness in our small political life.

A Europe without Europeans would be doomed to fail. So we have to fight for a social and just Europe. Only a social and just Europe will be a democratic one. A democratic Europe is a Europe that represents the interests of all its citizens, poor and rich, weak and strong.

The Preamble to the Constitution of the Swiss Confederation in 1999 says:

“(...) conscious of their common achievements and their responsibility towards future generations, and in the knowledge that only those who use their freedom remain free, and that the strength of a people is measured by the well-being of its weakest members (...).”

The strength of a nation is measured by the welfare of the weak. This is a good, an important and future-oriented attitude. It does not apply to Switzerland – it applies to all of Europe.

Prof. Dr. jur. Heribert Prantl is a member of the Editorial Board of the *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, where he is also head of the editorial domestic policy.