

**Johann Lauer**

## **Overcoming eurosclerosis 2.0 through evolution of existing EU structures**

Over the course of several generations, the European Union (EU) underwent a period of significant growth and development, reaching its political and economic peak at the turn of the century. But for the last two decades, a generation spoiled by prosperity has been driving the EU into the ground. The result is the *second Eurosclerosis* since the Union was founded. Everything has both positive and negative effects, including peace and prosperity. The collateral damage of European prosperity can best be explained in the words of Juvenal (around 60–127), the specialist in Roman decadence:

“Now we bear the evils of long peace:

We are oppressed by what is harder than war, by luxury.”

The left-wing populists (hurray Europeans) are striving to overcome Eurosclerosis 2.0 through a progressive revolution, while the right-wing populists (hurray nationalists) are calling for a conservative turn. I consider both narratives to be infantile aberrations. In my view, the more promising way forward is to promote evolution, i.e. the further development of existing EU structures. Reinventing the wheel is a common mistake. The EU's multi-level system of local, regional, national and supranational political decision-making must be preserved in all its complexity and further developed through continuous incremental improvement (kaizen) and innovation. Furthermore, the complementarity of market and state is important; without it, neither prosperity nor technological innovation are possible.



**Johann Lauer**, E-Mail: [johann@lauer.biz](mailto:johann@lauer.biz), Homepage: [lauer.biz](http://lauer.biz).

**Overcoming Eurosclerosis 2.0.**

**Source:** [lauer.biz/eurosclerosis-2.pdf](http://lauer.biz/eurosclerosis-2.pdf).

## **The EU, a complex and efficient confederation of states, is to be revolutionized with infantile plans for the future**

The EU is the most complex and powerful supranational association of states (*Staatenverbund*). Now revolutionaries and counterrevolutionaries have brought about since 2008 Eurosclerosis 2.0 through bigoted and selfish actions. They are about to drive the EU completely into the ground with infantile plans for the future. Hurrah nationalists talk and act like Donald Trump, while hurrah Europeans talk like Mother Theresa but act like Donald Trump.

The polarization of political discourse, especially in two important policy areas, has caused Eurosclerosis 2.0: disputes over the distribution of legal competences, monetary resources and political responsibilities between the European and national levels, and between the market and the state. These are exactly the same disputes between federalists and nationalists and between neoliberals and neostatists that were essentially responsible for the first Eurosclerosis (1966-1985). Both disputes also contributed decisively to Brexit.

In the following, first the terminology and the central political controversies are explained. Second, the ups and downs of European integration are described. Third, some ways to overcome Eurosclerosis 2.0 are presented.

### **Market versus state: neoliberals versus neostatists (neoetatism)**

The market stands for strategies from the perspective of the individual, e.g. of people (natural persons), companies and associations (legal entities). The focus is on the autonomy and freedom of the individual.

The state stands for strategies from the perspective of a collective, e.g. of communities, countries or regions, nations, supranational (EU) as well as international (UN) organizations. In this context, the sovereignty of a collective comes to the fore. The political aspect of these collectives is to determine binding laws and values for all citizens or members. More importantly, the political claims the competence-competence. Firstly, the legislative, executive and judicial branches demand that they also determine which topics can and cannot be placed on the political agenda, i.e. what



**Johann Lauer**, E-Mail: [johann@lauer.biz](mailto:johann@lauer.biz), Homepage: [lauer.biz](http://lauer.biz).

**Overcoming Eurosklerosis 2.0.**

**Source:** [lauer.biz/eurosclerosis-2.pdf](http://lauer.biz/eurosclerosis-2.pdf).

is public and what is private is negotiated here. Secondly, the question of the level to which the competence-competence belongs is a matter of dispute.

Which competencies should fall to the market, which to the state? Five ideal strategies can be identified or have been practiced over the centuries:

1. *State of nature*: the market regulates everything; the state does not exist.
2. *Neoliberalism or Manchester capitalism*: as much market as possible, as little state as necessary.
3. *Pluralistic liberalism or Rhine capitalism*: complementarity between market, state and civil society, a pluralism of market economy, state and civil society strategies as well as a multitude of individual instruments for solving existential problems.
4. *Neostatism, socialism or French étatism*: as much state as possible, as little market as necessary.
5. *Communism*: the state regulates everything; the market is completely displaced.

These ideal-typical considerations make it possible to better understand many of the past and present conflicts at the European level. When the EU was founded, it was clearly inspired by French statism, which was tempered slightly by Germany and the Netherlands, who not only wanted more markets but also a pluralistic approach. The 1985 Single Market program bore the British signature. Margaret Thatcher was able to push through positions at the European level that corresponded to neoliberalism. In the meantime, neostatism has returned to the EU for almost two decades.

## **European federal state versus nation states: federalists versus nationalists**

Since the emergence of the nation states, the competence-competence mentioned above was clearly at the nation state level, here it was not only determined what was public and what was private, but also at which level (nation, region or municipality) or to which political institutions (ECB, CEN, CENELEC) public tasks and competences were transferred.



**Johann Lauer**, E-Mail: [johann@lauer.biz](mailto:johann@lauer.biz), Homepage: [lauer.biz](http://lauer.biz).

**Overcoming Eurosklerosis 2.0.**

**Source:** [lauer.biz/eurosklerosis-2.pdf](http://lauer.biz/eurosklerosis-2.pdf).

In Europe, several supranational organizations emerged after the Second World War, the main purpose of which was to prevent a renewed European war between nation states and, if possible, to enable intensive exchange between all member states. The following ideal models of supranational organization can be identified:

1. *Centralistic, supranational federal state*: here the supranational level dominates, while all other levels and political institutions are hierarchically controlled from above.
2. *Federal, supranational federal state*: there is a division of tasks, especially between the supranational and the national level, although the federal level has priority. The focus is on supranational integration. In the course of a spill-over effect, the national level should ultimately transfer its sovereignty to the supranational level.
3. *Staatenverbund* (association of states – there is no appropriate term in English, so I use the German term): is used in Germany to describe the European Union but has no direct equivalent in other languages. This is a complex political multi-level system in which states work more closely together than in a confederation but, unlike in a federal state, retain their sovereignty. The competence-competence lies at the national level of the member states, and the sovereignty of the municipal, regional, national and supranational levels is guaranteed by the subsidiarity principle.
4. *Confederation of states or Europe of the Fatherlands*: this model is based on intergovernmental cooperation rather than supranational integration. Sovereignty clearly lies with the nation states. These conclude contracts with each other.

The first model, the centralized federal state, was implemented by the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia and ended in disaster. In Western Europe, this model never had a realistic prospect. Nevertheless, there are left-wing populists, especially in Germany, who want to abolish the nation state and are pursuing precisely this model. In this model, only solutions at the European level would be viable for the future.



**Johann Lauer**, E-Mail: [johann@lauer.biz](mailto:johann@lauer.biz), Homepage: [lauer.biz](http://lauer.biz).

**Overcoming Eurosklerosis 2.0.**

**Source:** [lauer.biz/eurosklerosis-2.pdf](http://lauer.biz/eurosklerosis-2.pdf).

The Europe enthusiasts, e.g. in the Europa Union, a non-partisan organization, as well as the political elites in the individual member states, but above all the elites working at the European level and in its institutions, have for decades been striving for the second model: a supranational federal state. In this, they are oriented above all on the USA.

The fourth model, a *confederation of states*, has been implemented by the European Free Trade Association (EFTA). EFTA was founded in 1960 primarily at the instigation of Great Britain in response to the EC. Today there it still has four members: Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway and Switzerland. With his veto and the Luxembourg Compromise (1966), Charles de Gaulle temporarily enforced this model in the EC. It was only overcome with the Single European Act (SEA), which came into force in 1987.

The EC (European Communities) consisted of the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) from 1952, the European Economic Community (EEC) and the European Atomic Energy Community (EAEC or Euratom), both from 1957. Since 1993, when the Maastricht Treaty came into force, the official name has been the European Union (EU).

Since the SEA, the EU has been an association of states (*Staatenverbund*) with a complex multi-level system that not only enables autonomous political decisions at the municipal, regional, national and supranational levels, but must also guarantee them on a mandatory basis due to the principle of subsidiarity.

The legal competences of the EU have been expanded and, above all, the EU Parliament has been given more rights. Furthermore, majority decisions at the EU level have become possible. However, the EU's monetary resources are very small compared to those of the nation states. The total amount of own resources may not exceed 1.2% of the gross national income (GNI) of the EU.

Nonetheless, the power of the nation states was restricted by these legal competencies. In addition, the regional level was strengthened from above. In Germany and some other European states, the regional level was very powerful, while



**Johann Lauer**, E-Mail: [johann@lauer.biz](mailto:johann@lauer.biz), Homepage: [lauer.biz](http://lauer.biz).

**Overcoming Eurosklerosis 2.0.**

**Source:** [lauer.biz/eurosklerosis-2.pdf](http://lauer.biz/eurosklerosis-2.pdf).

in most other countries the regional level was only of subordinate importance. By introducing the principle of subsidiarity, great importance was attached to the fact that the autonomy of the lower levels should also be preserved.

The competence-competence lies with the nation states; they are the "masters" of the treaties. In addition to executive tasks, the EU Commission also has judicial tasks; it is the "guardian of the treaties". The judiciary in the EU lies with the European Court of Justice (ECJ) and the national courts. In addition, the ECJ even interprets legislative tasks from the preamble to the EU treaties, which states the aim of the "creation of an ever closer union of the peoples of Europe". The ECJ sees itself as empowered to always judge in favor of the EU level in disputes about legal competence between nation states and the EU. Therefore, all decisions of the ECJ have an federalist bias.

In a democracy, it would be the task of the legislature to determine what a closer union of peoples should look like. There therefore is no real separation of powers in the EU, as these explanations make clear.

## **The main goals of European integration: peace in Europe and international competitiveness**

European integration was intended to overcome centuries of war between European nation states. The second major goal was to secure Europe's international competitiveness and thus its prosperity. Europe was to become an important and independent international major player and assert itself alongside the USA and the Soviet Union. The former was a prerequisite for the latter to succeed. Furthermore, the unity of Europe was to be achieved without national diversity falling by the wayside.

The rapid establishment of a European federal state on the American model failed in 1954 because the French National Assembly rejected a European Defense Community (EDC). Thereafter, a functionalist strategy was pursued. The inclusion of more and more policy areas into the supranational sphere through European harmonization was intended to create a spill-over effect and thus eventually overcome the nation state and create a European federal state.



**Johann Lauer**, E-Mail: [johann@lauer.biz](mailto:johann@lauer.biz), Homepage: [lauer.biz](http://lauer.biz).

**Overcoming Eurosklerosis 2.0.**

**Source:** [lauer.biz/eurosklerosis-2.pdf](http://lauer.biz/eurosklerosis-2.pdf).

After the Second World War, two strategies were implemented in Western Europe to establish a European community. The EC established *supranational integration*, while EFTA (European Free Trade Association, 1960), established *intergovernmental cooperation*. The first strategy achieved better progress and success; Great Britain asked to join the EC as early as 1962. But De Gaulle prevented accession, and it was not until 1973 that Britain was admitted to the EC.

The first goal of creating peace between the member states was achieved: disputes were no longer played out on the battlefield in Western Europe, but always in (interminably long) meetings in Brussels as well as at regular summit meetings in all member states.

On the military level, there have been very modest successes despite some attempts; without the USA, Europe cannot guarantee its own security. To date a European defense could only be realized in rudimentary form; the EU is still a ward of the USA in this respect.

There was more success in economic matters, although there have been two major setbacks in this area as well: the first Eurosclerosis from 1966 to 1987, and the second Eurosclerosis since 2008. The two most important reasons for both the first and the second Eurosclerosis are: blockage of the political system, and lack of international competitiveness. At its core, this sclerosis is a state failure. It reflects the incapacity of the political system, which prevents timely change and thus successful adaptation to new developments.

### **First Eurosclerosis (1966-1985): blockade of the political system, lack of international competitiveness**

The term “Eurosclerosis” was coined in 1985 by the German economist Herbert Giersch. It is an artificial word made up of the terms “Euro” and “sclerosis” (hardening, calcification or blockage). Giersch focused primarily on economic parameters. In my analysis, I focus primarily on political-institutional as well as technological factors.



**Johann Lauer**, E-Mail: [johann@lauer.biz](mailto:johann@lauer.biz), Homepage: [lauer.biz](http://lauer.biz).

**Overcoming Eurosklerosis 2.0.**

**Source:** [lauer.biz/eurosclerosis-2.pdf](http://lauer.biz/eurosclerosis-2.pdf).

The unilateral preference for the European level was one of the main reasons for the first Eurosclerosis. De Gaulle brought supranational integration to a halt by reversing the very few majority decisions at the European level. The Luxembourg Compromise (1966) secured a veto right for each member state, so that decisions had to be unanimous at the European level. The dream of a European federal state was over for the time being; de Gaulle's "Europe of fatherlands" was the system of intergovernmental cooperation. This led to a serious blockade of the EC's political system, which would not be overcome until 1987.

Veto rights very often lead to the blocking of political decisions, and institutional changes become almost impossible. Since the EC was a multi-level system in which the nation state had by far the greatest number of competencies and resources, various interlinked structures emerged that prevented optimal control. In other words, there were political entanglement traps (*Politikverflechtungsfalle*), as Fritz Wilhelm Scharpf aptly put it. There was an urgent need to improve the decision-making system.

The second main reason was the decline in international competitiveness or the inability to adapt to the economic changes of the time. The importance of coal and steel declined rapidly, and this led to enormous distortions. Worse, however, was the inability to cope with Asian competition, just as is the case today. The Japanese took over entire economic sectors in the entertainment industry (photographic and television equipment). In the 1980s, even the German automotive industry was on Japan's shopping list, a fact hardly anyone remembers today. It was only the fear of being relegated to the second league economically that created the necessary pressure to advance European integration (militarily and politically, the EU had already been in the second league since the Second World War, since it could not stand against the two superpowers, the USA and the Soviet Union, in these areas).



**Johann Lauer**, E-Mail: [johann@lauer.biz](mailto:johann@lauer.biz), Homepage: [lauer.biz](http://lauer.biz).

**Overcoming Eurosklerosis 2.0.**

**Source:** [lauer.biz/eurosclerosis-2.pdf](http://lauer.biz/eurosclerosis-2.pdf).

## **Further development of the European Communities (EC) into the European Union (EU).**

The deadlock in the political system was overcome by introducing a complex multi-level system through the Single European Act (SEA, adopted in 1985 and entered into force in 1987). New decision-making procedures, especially the introduction of majority voting at the EU level, made it possible to realize substantial efficiency gains. The introduction of the subsidiarity principle as another structural principle of the EC has helped overcome political decision-making blockades. The importance of all levels of government (European level, nation states and regions, as well as municipalities) was explicitly emphasized. Only problems that could not be solved at the lower levels were to be transferred to the EU level.

In addition, there was an important strategic reorientation: instead of relying solely on European harmonization, from then on the focus shifted to also include the *mutual recognition of national rules*.

The *single market project* and *monetary union* led to the restoration of international competitiveness, from which the EU continues to benefit today. Of decisive importance for the practical implementation of the project were the detailed programs, the most effective of which was certainly the White Paper for the Completion of the Single Market of 1985, which envisaged the completion of the European single market by 1992.

It is important to note at this point that the national and regional levels, and not just the EU level, were greatly strengthened by these reforms. The strength of the EU is rooted in the fact that it can rely on strong nation states. At the same time, the nation states would be nowhere near as powerful if they were not part of the EU.

The single market program, and later the introduction of a common currency, the euro, as well as the enlargement policy to the east, set in motion an economic dynamic which today's prosperity is largely based on. The EU has been able to overtake not only Japan but also the USA in some areas.



**Johann Lauer**, E-Mail: [johann@lauer.biz](mailto:johann@lauer.biz), Homepage: [lauer.biz](http://lauer.biz).

**Overcoming Eurosklerosis 2.0.**

**Source:** [lauer.biz/eurosklerosis-2.pdf](http://lauer.biz/eurosklerosis-2.pdf).

The economic success was enormous. Today, the German automotive industry is on par with the Japanese and can easily compete with them, and is even often superior. Not least because of the three rounds of enlargement in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the EU did very well economically; even more importantly, its appeal still survives. In the EU, however, primarily economically weak candidates are pushing forward, while a strong country like Great Britain is leaving the EU.

## **EU generation**

The second powerful generation in Europe after the founding fathers included the following personalities: Jaques Delors, the most successful president of the EU Commission, Valéry Giscard d'Estaing, François Mitterrand, Helmut Schmidt, Helmut Kohl, Margaret Thatcher, Giulio Andreotti and, as the youngest member, the young Jean-Claude Juncker. They overcame the first Eurosclerosis and laid the foundations that allow us to still be doing so well (!) in the EU today. I call them the EU generation that developed the EC into the EU.

## **Eurosclerosis 2.0**

However, the lack of international competitiveness has been impossible to ignore for years. Developing countries like China and South Korea have overtaken not only Germany but the entire EU in digitization and education policy. Above all, government failure at the European and national level is responsible for this misery.

Bigoted hurrah Europeans and hurrah nationalists have contributed to an infantilization and polarization of the political culture. Instead of further developing and adapting the existing complex distribution of competences to the new realities through both steady incremental improvements (kaizen) and innovations, infantile, either revolutionary or counterrevolutionary, innovations are pursued, thus further reinforcing Eurosclerosis 2.0. This has not only caused a paralysis of state institutions at both the European and national levels, but has also caused a split in the EU and resulted in Brexit.



**Johann Lauer**, E-Mail: [johann@lauer.biz](mailto:johann@lauer.biz), Homepage: [lauer.biz](http://lauer.biz).

**Overcoming Eurosklerosis 2.0.**

**Source:** [lauer.biz/eurosclerosis-2.pdf](http://lauer.biz/eurosclerosis-2.pdf).

## **Lack of international competitiveness: state failure at the European and national levels**

At the beginning of the 21st century, a lack of international competitiveness is once again becoming apparent. The EU simply lacks international competitiveness in a digital knowledge society. Politicians both in Germany and at the EU level have been asleep at the wheel for this necessary change in both education and digital infrastructure policy. It is a paradox: although neostatism dominates both at the EU level and in most EU countries, international competitiveness has come about through state failure.

The 1985 Single Market program and the EU enlargement rounds led to enormous economic growth. Furthermore, the unleashing of market forces led to technological advances, with tremendous developments in many fields, not just the automotive industry.

The EU became the leader in cell phone production in the 1990s, with Nokia, Ericsson and Siemens accounting for well over 50 percent, and in some cases two-thirds, of global cell phone production at the beginning of the century. These companies supplied both the hardware and the software. Furthermore, the standards for the the first two generations of mobile communications networks were also set by these European companies.

In the meantime, Europe has become insignificant in both cell phone production and networks and has been overtaken by two former developing countries, China and South Korea. The expansion of communication networks in the EU cannot keep up with the network expansion in East Asia. In Germany in particular, it is catastrophic: Germany ranks second to last in the EU in terms of expansion of fiber optic networks. Furthermore, the hardware needed to run the networks is built primarily in Asia, while the software for the cell phones comes from the USA.

The state can perform a wide variety of tasks that have an impact on the economy. One such task is as a *regulator*, formulating rules for the economy. Ordoliberalism



**Johann Lauer**, E-Mail: [johann@lauer.biz](mailto:johann@lauer.biz), Homepage: [lauer.biz](http://lauer.biz).

**Overcoming Eurosklerosis 2.0.**

**Source:** [lauer.biz/eurosklerosis-2.pdf](http://lauer.biz/eurosklerosis-2.pdf).

believes that this should be the only task in this regard. But the state can also act as a *provider* of economic services through state-owned enterprises. The state also acts as a *customer* of economic services. It is primarily in this role that it has failed in the transition to the knowledge society.

The European states and the EU have not invested enough in the digital infrastructure or in the digitization of public administration. On top of that, the states have behaved like highwaymen. In Germany alone, in two decades private companies have had to pay the state billions for each network generation for the use of radio frequencies.

Education policy reflects a similar picture. The PISA studies since the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century have shown that the education system in Germany and many other EU countries cannot keep up with the East Asian systems (China, Japan, Singapore, South Korea or Taiwan). This is especially true for the MINT subjects, which are crucial for technological development. This disadvantage, which is central to the knowledge society, has barely been reduced to this day, although politicians have been promising to address it for over a decade. Even worse: a very complex and efficient education system is being destroyed in Germany for ideological reasons. The aim is to enforce equality through inclusion, but the result is equalization to the lowest common and the destruction of the efficiency of the German education system. In addition, while spending on education, like all government spending, has risen steadily, state services to citizens, especially in terms of education, have deteriorated.

## **European bigotry: European rhetoric and nationalist action**

Hooray nationalists are easily identified: they talk and act like Donald Trump. Hurrah Europeans are wolves in sheep's clothing, always hiding behind a humanist mask. They invoke European or humanist values while acting with extreme selfishness: they talk like Mother Theresa but act like Donald Trump.

Bigotry is a discipline that has been successfully practiced by Christian churches, especially in continental Europe, for two millennia. "Preach water and drink wine" and "Do what the pastor says, not what he does" are examples of popular wisdom in



**Johann Lauer**, E-Mail: [johann@lauer.biz](mailto:johann@lauer.biz), Homepage: [lauer.biz](http://lauer.biz).

**Overcoming Eurosklerosis 2.0.**

**Source:** [lauer.biz/eurosklerosis-2.pdf](http://lauer.biz/eurosklerosis-2.pdf).

Europe. Common sense enables everyone to distinguish between bigoted Pharisees, who crowd the bishops' palaces in particular, and practicing Christians who take the Gospel and the actions of Jesus Christ seriously. The fish stinks from the head, as can be seen especially in the big churches of Europe. It is not the millions leaving these lying churches who are the problem, but the Christian establishment itself.

Left-wing populists (socialists, communists) also have over a century of experience with bigotry. Left-wing populists hide behind a humanist mask and invoke human rights, while trampling them underfoot in their daily actions.

Both bishops and left-wing populists speak of paradise in the hereafter, or in this world in the distant future. But actions speak louder than words, as the Bible also says. Bishops have no inhibitions about preaching on children's rights from the pulpit, at the same time abusing children themselves or protecting criminal pedophile brothers and thus consciously accepting the suffering of children in the future. Religious wars caused millions of deaths. In the short 20<sup>th</sup> century (1917-1991) alone, the left-wing populists have about 100 million deaths on their conscience, the National Socialists 25 million.

Christian and socialist politicians dominate all European institutions, including the European Parliament. While pragmatists dominated Christian parties until the turn of the millennium and reformers dominated socialist and social democratic parties, these two popular parties have been led by bigoted and unworldly moralists for two decades. Even among hurrah Europeans, Christian as well as socialist politicians, aspiration and reality are miles apart.

The fact that the British, the Poles and the Hungarians have been overplaying the nationalist card for years is discussed publicly extensively and has become "common knowledge". The bigoted behavior of hurrah Europeans, who exist in all EU countries, often flies under the public radar and will be illustrated below with two examples. The most bigoted hurrah Europeans are found in Berlin, Luxembourg and Paris. Here, European rhetoric is preached at the highest level while nationalistic behavior is practiced.



**Johann Lauer**, E-Mail: [johann@lauer.biz](mailto:johann@lauer.biz), Homepage: [lauer.biz](http://lauer.biz).

**Overcoming Eurosklerosis 2.0.**

**Source:** [lauer.biz/eurosklerosis-2.pdf](http://lauer.biz/eurosklerosis-2.pdf).

## Germany first

The double standard of German politics is illustrated very clearly by the example of energy policy. Claims and reality have been extremely divergent in this policy area for two decades. In Berlin, quite a few people talk like Mother Theresa and act like Donald Trump. Germany always presents itself as a model student when it comes to European and international cooperation. But in gas supply, Germany has been pursuing a Germany-first policy for two decades, long before Trump invented the slogan "America first", without regard for the interests of EU or NATO partners.

At the beginning of the century, the EU's plans were to diversify the EU's gas supply. Two new pipelines were to be built, the Nord Stream pipeline from Russia through the Baltic Sea to Germany, and the Nabucco pipeline. The latter was to bring natural gas from the Caspian Sea via Turkey to Italy and Austria. The first project was realized as Nord Stream 1 and inaugurated in 2011, while the second project was abandoned.

Later two more projects were launched, Nord Stream 2, again from Russia to Germany, and South Stream. South Stream was to deliver gas from Russia through the Black Sea to the Bulgarian coast, and from there one pipeline was to go to Austria and the other to Italy, supplying gas to all southeastern European states. But Russia's annexation of Crimea in March 2014 upset these plans. The EU imposed several sanctions on Russia in March as a result.

The German proponents of the Nord Stream 2 project claim, contrary to the truth, that it is a European project. The EU's main institutions, the Commission, Parliament and Council, have not only repeatedly spoken out against this project, but have also adopted concrete measures to prevent it. Germany, however, has selfishly asserted its interests against the EU and its European partner countries.

The countries of southern and southeastern Europe were unable to do so, although one of the largest EU countries, Italy, was also affected, along with Bulgaria, Greece, Hungary and Austria. In June 2014, the Commission initiated infringement procedures over South Stream against Bulgaria, which subsequently halted work. The EU



**Johann Lauer**, E-Mail: [johann@lauer.biz](mailto:johann@lauer.biz), Homepage: [lauer.biz](http://lauer.biz).

**Overcoming Eurosklerosis 2.0.**

**Source:** [lauer.biz/eurosklerosis-2.pdf](http://lauer.biz/eurosklerosis-2.pdf).

Commissioner for Energy from 2010 to September 2014 was the German Günther Oettinger. No infringement procedure was opened against Germany. In December 2014, Putin buried the project. Now the gas is pumped through the Black Sea to Turkey through a pipeline named Turkstream. There are plans for a pipeline from Turkey to Greece that will eventually pump gas to Italy and Austria, if it is ever completed. The European part of this pipeline is now called Tesla. It has made Europe dependent on the whims of Turkey. Thus the goal of an independent supply for the EU was deliberately made more difficult by Germany. It is not Germany but its EU partners in southeastern Europe that are paying the price.

Germany and France are the only large countries in the EU that can ruthlessly assert their interests. Former EU Commission President Juncker responded to the question of why France was not charged with violating the Stability Pact, after all an important European treaty right, as follows: because it is France, France as it always has been (*“Parce que c’est la France, la France de toujours”*). Not only was the UK not given preferential treatment, it was simply isolated on important issues, which is certainly a significant reason for Brexit.

## **Luxembourg first**

In addition to Germany and France, Luxembourg is the only country that can pursue an extreme nationalist strategy in the EU without being constantly criticized or sanctioned, as Hungary or Poland are. Together with Germany, Luxembourg is a moral superpower. Luxembourg’s major exports are tax-saving models and moral lessons for EU countries that do not fall in line.

One of the most important problems of the EU was how to adjust the two elephants of the EU (France and Germany) so that the Franco-German engine of the EU could get started and going on. Luxembourg played a very useful role in this and was rewarded handsomely. A significant part of Luxembourg’s prosperity is based on its tax-saving models for the rich and international corporations. Furthermore, together with Ireland and the Netherlands, Luxembourg has prevented tax harmonization in the EU for decades. As a result, tax policy is the only policy area in which the European single



**Johann Lauer**, E-Mail: [johann@lauer.biz](mailto:johann@lauer.biz), Homepage: [lauer.biz](http://lauer.biz).

**Overcoming Eurosklerosis 2.0.**

**Source:** [lauer.biz/eurosklerosis-2.pdf](http://lauer.biz/eurosklerosis-2.pdf).

market has not been implemented. The other EU states lose billions in taxes every year due to this selfish approach.

In addition to the tax loopholes, it is also of note that Luxembourg hosts more major EU institutions than any other country: ECJ, European Investment Bank and the EU Parliament. Luxembourg benefits from the traveling circus of the EU Parliament, whose official seat is in Strasbourg, while committee and group meetings are held in Brussels and the Parliament's General Secretariat is in Luxembourg.

## **Brexit or advanced Anglophobia**

In continental Europe, the British are wrongly branded as nationalists and neoliberals. As a rule, the British do not take an ideological approach, but rather a pragmatists, even with regard to solving state problems. Thus, even under Margaret Thatcher, who is considered the very incarnation of a nationalist and neoliberal, they supported an expansion of the supranational level (see SEA). Furthermore, the English health care system (NHS) is purely state-run, something Germany is still miles away from.

The British have been marginalized and ignored by the federalist hurrah Europeans in negotiations on the future development of the EU. Since the resignation of Margaret Thatcher, they have been unable to get their ideas accepted, either in the distribution of competencies between the national and European levels or in the choice of free-market or state strategies. Hence the frustration with the EU among the majority of British politicians.

The infantilism of the hurrah Europeans is striking. They do not realize that the EU Commission, or Barnier, the negotiator in charge, is angering the British, and that this is also driving the EU into the ground – firstly because the divisions in Europe have reached a new dimension, and secondly because without the British and EFTA, the EU cannot establish itself as an independent player alongside China and the USA.



**Johann Lauer**, E-Mail: [johann@lauer.biz](mailto:johann@lauer.biz), Homepage: [lauer.biz](http://lauer.biz).

**Overcoming Eurosklerosis 2.0.**

**Source:** [lauer.biz/eurosklerosis-2.pdf](http://lauer.biz/eurosklerosis-2.pdf).

## **Decadent (bigoted as well as nationalistic) incompetents in government offices**

“Incompetents in Pin-Striped Suits: Germany’s Managers in the Twilight” (“*Nieten In Nadelstreifen. Deutschlands Manager Im Zwielficht*”) was the title of a book published in 1992 by Günter Ogger. Ogger criticized the “self-serving” pussyfooters of the “carpeted storeys” in business. With his book, he drew attention to the charlatans who, through stupidity, ignorance, hubris or incompetence, have destroyed gigantic fortunes to the detriment of shareholders, employees and the German economy. But incompetents also exist in government. Two important differences can be noted between private managers and politicians, firstly that in business the length of time that incompetents stay in office is much shorter, and secondly that the damage caused by politicians is much greater.

The EU generation discussed above stands for the further development of the EC into the EU. The bigoted hurrah Europeans as well as the hurrah nationalists are responsible for both the technological decline and the division of the EU since the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. The state failure led to the EU falling behind in relation to the East Asians and the USA; worse, due to the poor education systems compared to the main competitors, the chances of catching up are very low. In addition, because of the coronavirus crisis, there are now trillions in national debt that future generations will have to shoulder with extremely unfavorable demographics.

The decadence and incompetence of the European elites that Europeans have endured for two decades is unprecedented. No EU generation has had such a bad record since the Second World War. Here are a few names, although the list is far from complete: Jean-Claude Juncker, the worst EU Commission President, Gerhard Schröder, Angela Merkel, Frank-Walter Steinmeier, Günther Oettinger, Ursula von der Leyen, Nicolas Sarkozy, François Hollande, Silvio Berlusconi, Tony Blair, Gordon Brown, David Cameron, Viktor Orbán.



**Johann Lauer**, E-Mail: [johann@lauer.biz](mailto:johann@lauer.biz), Homepage: [lauer.biz](http://lauer.biz).

**Overcoming Eurosklerosis 2.0.**

**Source:** [lauer.biz/eurosklerosis-2.pdf](http://lauer.biz/eurosklerosis-2.pdf).

The peak of mendacity is achieved by two former heads of government: Schröder and Cameron. Although both are generously paid by their countries, they act as lobbyists for foreign countries hostile to the EU, one for Russia, the other for China. And just when you think it could not get any worse, someone comes along and tops it. The fact that a current German president, Frank-Walter Steinmeier, is advertising a Russian project and instrumentalizing 20 million dead from the Second World War in the process would be unimaginable in one's worst nightmares. It is downright breathtaking how the infernal trio of Schröder, Steinmeier and Gabriel, all former SPD chairmen and holders of the highest state offices, promote disenchantment with politics and were actively supported by at least two Christian Democrats, Merkel and Oettinger, in the gas conflict.

The state failure is primarily due to poor policy strategies. However, personnel is at least as important. In the following, a comparison is made between the political-administrative personnel of China and Germany. At the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, Germany was technologically far superior to China; since then, China has long since achieved the digital knowledge society. It has an extremely powerful digital infrastructure of its own making, while Germany and Europe is dependent on China to build its digital infrastructure. Furthermore, China's education system is much more effective than Germany's.

During the Maoist Cultural Revolution (1966-1976), ownership and performance were frowned upon. The Red Guards, consisting of vulgar Marxist semi-literates, wiped out the Chinese elite, killing about 20 million people and catapulting the country back to the Stone Age. This mass murder was preceded by an even greater one: in the so-called Great Leap Forward, some 15 to 45 million people died in the Great Famine of 1959 to 1961.

The Chinese Communists have learned from this experience and have recognized the importance of property and performance, on which Western prosperity is essentially based. Today, millionaires and billionaires sit in the Chinese parliament. Vulgar Marxist semi-illiterates can at most look forward to careers in re-education camps; at the crucial



**Johann Lauer**, E-Mail: [johann@lauer.biz](mailto:johann@lauer.biz), Homepage: [lauer.biz](http://lauer.biz).

**Overcoming Eurosklerosis 2.0.**

**Source:** [lauer.biz/eurosklerosis-2.pdf](http://lauer.biz/eurosklerosis-2.pdf).

political levers sit people who were often educated at two universities of excellence, one Chinese and usually a top American or other foreign university.

The most represented group in the Bundestag during the Bonn Republic (1949-1990) was civil servants. This fact was always criticized, but the benefits associated with it were overlooked. The Bonn Republic was not a capitalist system, as vulgar Marxists still claim today, but a pluralist system, including a very efficient state and political institutions. The most represented group in the Bundestag in the Berlin Republic (1990 to today) is college dropouts and plagiarists. Angela Merkel's favorite ministers are two plagiarists (Schavan and zu Guttenberg), who for years led very important ministries, education and defense. Even now there is another plagiarist (Giffey) in the cabinet.

Anyone who thinks that it cannot get any worse in Germany is wrong. The SPD, the oldest and most deserving party in Germany, is now predominantly led at the federal level by vulgar Marxists and Maoist apparatchiks. Kevin Kühnert, a 30-year-old college dropout, was elected deputy party chairman and even played a prominent role in the election of his two party leaders. His greatest achievement was putting the nationalization socialization of BMW on the agenda. BMW is one of the most successful and popular companies in Germany. Such Maoist concepts have been filtered out in China, but unfortunately not in Germany.

Kühnert and his comrades are not the first to drop out of university. The phenomenon is also seen in the USA. Quite a few dropouts are revered there too. However, there is one crucial difference to Germany. In the US, dropouts have to build something themselves, preferably a globally successful company, before they are revered, such as Bill Gates, Elon Musk or Mark Zuckerberg. In so-called capitalist systems, building achievement counts; socialist fun revolutionaries, meanwhile, can only destroy what others, capitalists and kulaks (rich peasants), have built.

A comparison of the achievements made under the Kohl government in foreign and European policy with the achievements of the Schröder and Merkel governments also reveals a clear picture. When the liberal-conservative government came to power in 1982, Germany was a frontline state in the Cold War, and the whole EC was in a



**Johann Lauer**, E-Mail: [johann@lauer.biz](mailto:johann@lauer.biz), Homepage: [lauer.biz](http://lauer.biz).

**Overcoming Eurosklerosis 2.0.**

**Source:** [lauer.biz/eurosklerosis-2.pdf](http://lauer.biz/eurosklerosis-2.pdf).

technological and economic crisis. Relations with the most important ally, the US, were excellent under both Republican (Reagan, Bush) and Democratic administrations (Clinton). The same was true of relations with the second and third most important allies, France and Great Britain. Relations with all other EU states were also intact. In addition, from 1990 onward, relations were very good with the Soviet Union and later with Russia as well as Hungary and Poland. Relations with Turkey were just as good. In short: in 1998, at the end of the liberal-conservative Kohl governments, Germany was surrounded by friends.

In the meantime, the picture has changed completely. Relations with the US are very bad; anti-Americanism has been present in the German government for years. There is an extremely hostile relationship with Russia, despite Nord Stream. The relation with Turkey is not quite as bad, but it is far from the halcyon days. Most problematic, however, is the division in the EU, with Brexit and the very poor relations with Hungary, Poland, Greece and Italy. This is starkly illustrated by the fact that in the latter countries, even members of the government have been playing the Nazi card. This shows how dysfunctional the EU has become. With the example of the EU gas supply, I have shown how recklessly Germany has behaved. Unfortunately, this approach can also be seen in other important policy areas, leading other countries to feel that they can only force Germany to the negotiating table by using the Nazi card.

The Corona crisis clearly shows that Germany and the EU have been overtaken by the East Asian countries. Although German politicians declared themselves the Corona World Champion after the first Corona wave, it was at most a Corona European Champion. In the meantime, Germany is not even that. Regardless of which criteria are applied, infected people, corona deaths, psychological, economic damage, the East Asians not only in totalitarian China, but also the democratic countries of Japan, South Korea and Taiwan are miles ahead of the EU.



**Johann Lauer**, E-Mail: [johann@lauer.biz](mailto:johann@lauer.biz), Homepage: [lauer.biz](http://lauer.biz).

**Overcoming Eurosklerosis 2.0.**

**Source:** [lauer.biz/eurosklerosis-2.pdf](http://lauer.biz/eurosklerosis-2.pdf).

## European panic orchestra

The decadent, bigoted and nationalist EU generation has not only caused Eurosclerosis 2.0, but is in the process of driving the EU into the ground and selling the result as a world salvation.

Several generations worked hard for over 50 years for the EU to flourish politically and economically. But for the last two decades, a generation spoiled by prosperity has been driving the EU into the ground.

The generation of Honecker the leader of the German Democratic Republic and his socialist Eastern European colleagues in particular has succeeded in creating rubble during peacetime. But there is a difference: Honecker first built what he then ruined. The decadent present EU generation is destroying what other generations have built. Incidentally, Merkel and von der Leyen, two bigoted and destructive, i.e. not modern, but postmodern rubble women, prove that women can easily compete with men in the bad as in the good.

The current European panic orchestra is destroying what other generations have built. It took charge of an EU that was the world leader in economic terms, that could keep up with technological developments and even set the tone for cell phone hardware and software and network technology, and that was politically decisive alongside the USA.

The economic situation today is not bad by international standards, but the EU is left behind when it comes to digitization and educational policy. Politically, it is just a figurehead. Great Britain has left the EU. The remaining EU is divided in many ways. On one side the hurrah Europeans, on the other the hurrah nationalists, on one side the elephants and hegemons (Germany, France, Luxembourg), on the other the powerless (starting with Italy and another 23 countries). In the EU, the following obviously applies: *Quod licet Jovi, non licet bovi* ("What Jupiter is permitted, the ox is not"). In the EU today, there are three hurrah gods and twenty-four oxen. In short: within twenty years, the EU will only be a shadow of its former self. This is the balance sheet that bigoted, incompetent and postmodern fun revolutionaries will leave behind.



**Johann Lauer**, E-Mail: [johann@lauer.biz](mailto:johann@lauer.biz), Homepage: [lauer.biz](http://lauer.biz).

**Overcoming Eurosklerosis 2.0.**

**Source:** [lauer.biz/eurosclerosis-2.pdf](http://lauer.biz/eurosclerosis-2.pdf).

It is a decadent EU generation that is capable of anything, but is of no use: “But you can’t put a crown on a clown and expect a king.”

Apparently, quite a few politicians strive for one thing above all: *studio credibility*. The most important attribute is to look good in the media. On Sundays and on public holidays, wonderful slogans are presented in a tone of deep conviction, such as Merkel’s “We can do it”. In contrast, there is no action on working days, which primarily documents a lack of commitment and incompetence. This generation especially in Germany distinguishes between primary and secondary virtues. The most important primary or cardinal virtues are prudence, justice, bravery, temperance. The secondary virtues include, in particular, hard work, loyalty, obedience, discipline, sense of duty, punctuality, reliability, orderliness, politeness, cleanliness. The East Asians have not sorted out the secondary virtues; as a result, they were able to outclass the EU.

If you compare the political claims that the German and European elites have formulated in the last two decades with the results achieved, the result is not only a political analysis, but also a satire, or, in the words of Juvenal: *difficile est, saturam non scribere* (“It is difficult not to write satire”).

## **Overcoming Eurosclerosis 2.0 and state failure**

The first Eurosclerosis (1966-1985) was successfully overcome, which is encouraging but is no guarantee that the second will also be. A “remake” or “reboot” of the EU that would strengthen the EU and weaken the nation states, as populist hurrah Europeans desire, would undoubtedly be an own goal. Just as bad would be if the nation state were strengthened at the expense of the EU, as the hurrah nationalists demand.

European integration promises to realize unity and diversity at the same time. This can only succeed if two basic problems are adequately solved: the distribution of tasks between the market and the state, and between the EU level and the nation states. First, the revolutionary vocabulary should be shelved and replaced by an incremental and innovative approach. Only then can the polarization decrease. A different motto is



**Johann Lauer**, E-Mail: [johann@lauer.biz](mailto:johann@lauer.biz), Homepage: [lauer.biz](http://lauer.biz).

**Overcoming Eurosklerosis 2.0.**

**Source:** [lauer.biz/eurosclerosis-2.pdf](http://lauer.biz/eurosclerosis-2.pdf).

necessary for the optimal further development of political systems in the EU. But first and foremost, polarization must end.

## **Polarization of the discourse: moralization of politics, politicization of science**

As a rule, those who make apodictic judgments try to legitimize them through the authority of science and morality: politicization of science and moralization of politics is the result. The idea that one can determine “the truth” or “the good” beyond doubt is a pre-modern chimera. However, we are not quite ready to give up the dream of determining truth and rightness beyond doubt. Thus, Jürgen Habermas presented a pragmatic model of political consultation, according to which all dilemmas of legitimacy can be overcome. If all those involved, citizens, scientists as well as politicians, are of good will and proceed rationally, then a decision can be reached at the end of the day that meets the demands of science and morality as well as democratic procedures. Therefore, decisions legitimized in this way can and must be accepted by all (see my article in The European: [Relationship between politics and science](#)).

This briefly summarizes the philosophical principles of Critical Theory that form the basis of the 1968 revolutionaries. They always believe that they are in possession of the truth, know the morally right thing to do, and could win a consensus of the reasonable in a democratic, free discourse, i.e. convince the others of the correctness of their opinions. The fundamental limits of reason, which have already been noted many times in antiquity, by Kant and especially in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, are simply ignored by them.

In his groundbreaking work, Thomas Samuel Kuhn showed that it is not only rational reasons, but also political, psychological and sociological ones, that influence the adoption of new theories. In *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* in particular, he analyzed the development of physics, more precisely the (Copernican) Revolution from the Ptolemaic to the Copernican worldview. He used a new terminology (paradigm, incommensurability, (Copernican) revolution, normal science) to describe and explain



**Johann Lauer**, E-Mail: [johann@lauer.biz](mailto:johann@lauer.biz), Homepage: [lauer.biz](http://lauer.biz).

**Overcoming Eurosklerosis 2.0.**

**Source:** [lauer.biz/eurosklerosis-2.pdf](http://lauer.biz/eurosklerosis-2.pdf).

this revolution. For decades, these terms have shaped not only the scientific debates in all subjects, but also the public discussion, albeit unfortunately in a very undifferentiated manner. Thus the term “paradigm” today is used in a very inflationary manner, with very different meanings and often misleadingly. This is not least due to the vagueness of the term, which Kuhn openly admits: “Part of its success, I have to say to myself with regret, stems from the fact that almost anyone can read out anything they want. Nothing about the book is more responsible for this excessive malleability than the introduction of the term ‘paradigm’.” Margaret Mastermann, a student of Wittgenstein, has identified at least 22 different meanings of this expression in Kuhn’s book.

The abuse of Kuhn’s concepts is very widespread; Kuhn’s book is likely to be one of the most cited and least read books. The most infantile meaning of all, that the old is bad and must be replaced by the new, has established itself very strongly and is used to support even the most insipid demand for renewal, reset, etc. Thus, in all areas, a campaign of the supposedly “new” against the “old” is being waged in place of objective, careful development: ethos beats reflection. Both revolutionaries and counter-revolutionaries like to use Kuhn’s vocabulary. They are like Manichaeans religious warriors who can precisely distinguish between light and darkness, good and evil: *tertium non datur*. This effectively prevents a discourse between those who think differently from the outset, since those who think differently are only presented as uneducated, morally neglected cardboard pseudo-comrades: Carl Schmitt’s friend-foe scheme, perfectly illustrated. The common ground of Left and Right Hegelians becomes visible.

The common basis of revolutionary left-wing populists (hurrah Europeans) and counter-revolutionary right-wing populists (hurrah nationalists) is thus revealed: both are Hegelians, left-wing or right-wing Hegelians; both have a pure ethos and a direct line to the world spirit. The result is arrogance and hubris. According to Karl Popper, Hegel, along with Marx and Plato, is an enemy of the open society.



**Johann Lauer**, E-Mail: [johann@lauer.biz](mailto:johann@lauer.biz), Homepage: [lauer.biz](http://lauer.biz).

**Overcoming Eurosklerosis 2.0.**

**Source:** [lauer.biz/eurosklerosis-2.pdf](http://lauer.biz/eurosklerosis-2.pdf).

This way of thinking favors a *political and utopian romanticism*. The Hegelians really believe that political structures that have grown over decades and centuries can simply be replaced with new structures that have been designed on the drawing board. And should the political structures end in a collapse, then the fault lies not with these new structures, but with the people. Therefore, a new, noble or socialist person must be created, also designed on the drawing board.

In addition, there is an *infantile messianism* that does not tolerate any shades of grey or nuance and, from the Hegelians point of view, necessarily requires the friend-foe scheme: one is either for peace or for war, for world salvation or for world doom. The result is an authoritarian (hurrah nationalists) or totalitarian (hurrah Europeans) attitude that prevents rational debate from the outset. Hurrah Europeans and Hurrah nationalists are Manichaean religious warriors and postmodern Jacobins with whom a civilized dialogue and a democratic search for consensus is hardly possible.

Kuhn's terminology is misused both by revolutionaries, who always want to abolish the old and replace it with a new, future utopia, and by counter-revolutionaries, who want a political turn to restore a past paradise. Therefore, both left-wing and right-wing populists, through the moralization of politics and the politicization of science, create a polarization of public discourse, about which they then weep crocodile tears.

The ideological-political differences between left and right Hegelians have already been discussed in the field of European politics: some are hurrah Europeans, the others hurrah nationalists.

## **Ending polarization: democratic and rational discourse on an equal footing**

Overcoming Eurosclerosis 2.0 requires, first, overcoming the polarization of political discourse, i.e., one should not spout European rhetoric and pay lip service to liberalism while following egoistic policies and authoritarian habits. The Manichaean revolutionary habitus outlined above stands in fundamental contrast to the Socratic



**Johann Lauer**, E-Mail: [johann@lauer.biz](mailto:johann@lauer.biz), Homepage: [lauer.biz](http://lauer.biz).

**Overcoming Eurosklerosis 2.0.**

**Source:** [lauer.biz/eurosclerosis-2.pdf](http://lauer.biz/eurosclerosis-2.pdf).

habitus developed in Western philosophy and science, in which doubt and not certainty is central.

“What you have inherited from your fathers, acquire it in order to possess it” (Goethe in Faust). Neither revolutionaries nor counterrevolutionaries have adequately addressed the EU. An infantile view of the EU prevails on both sides.

In the current polarizing political debate, the EU can only lose. Both left-wing populists (hurray Europeans) and right-wing populists (hurray nationalists) represent political visions of the future that are significantly worse than the EU's current constitution. Instead of further developing and adapting the existing complex distribution of competences to the new conditions through both steady incremental improvements (kaizen) and innovations, infantile innovations, either revolutionary or counter-revolutionary, are being pursued, thus further reinforcing Eurosclerosis 2.0.

The politicization of science leads to a monocausal and reductionist approach. Such a view is inadequate because the reality is much more complex. Different effects can have a common cause (equifinality) and, conversely, a cause in combination with other conditions can produce different effects (multicollinearity, see my article in Springer Nature Social Science [Methodology and political science: the discipline needs three fundamentally different methodological traditions](#)). Furthermore, what applies to every drug also applies to political regulations. There is not only one desired effect, but several other side effects.

The moralization of politics leads to the situation where all scientists who accept causalities other than those identified by the governments are defamed. Both the politicization of science and the moralization of politics, taken together, only lead to ruin and must be ended. Common sense should come to the fore again. Hegel, Marx, Frankfurt School, French Deconstructivism and Structuralism should be put aside. Aristotle, John Locke, Immanuel Kant, Adam Smith, John Stuart Mill, Max Weber and Karl Popper provide the better political and philosophical foundations.



**Johann Lauer**, E-Mail: [johann@lauer.biz](mailto:johann@lauer.biz), Homepage: [lauer.biz](http://lauer.biz).

**Overcoming Eurosklerosis 2.0.**

**Source:** [lauer.biz/eurosclerosis-2.pdf](http://lauer.biz/eurosclerosis-2.pdf).

The destructive confrontation between left-wing populists (hurray Europeans) and right-wing populists (hurray nationalists) must be brought to an end as soon as possible. An open and transparent confrontation of different interests is necessary. Above all, bigoted behavior must be overcome.

### **Future motto of the EU: unity and diversity (*unitas et diversitas*)**

In the creation of a European federal state after the Second World War, the USA in particular was taken as a model, whose motto is “out of many, one” (*e pluribus unum*). Although the French rejected a European federal state in 1954, the preamble to the European treaties has been striving for an “ever closer union of the peoples of Europe” since 1957. In 2000, a new motto for Europe was chosen: “United in diversity” (*in varietate concordia*). The motto does not bring a new accent, but holds on to the goal of a future federal state comparable to the USA.

Why should this goal be abandoned? Why rather further develop the current *sui generis* association of states (*Staatvenverbund*)? The 20<sup>th</sup> century, the century of extremes, offers two important lessons that should definitely be taken into account in the further development of the EU.

The fascist experience shows that nation states can (not must, see the counter-example of EFTA!) degenerate into nationalism, with brutal consequences (Holocaust, war). This suggests that some form of supranational integration (EU level) and global cooperation that neutralize the dangers of nationalism and meet the needs of a complex world are necessary.

Socialist experience teaches that supranational integration with massive centralization and a planned economy, as in the Soviet Union or Yugoslavia, does not do justice to the complexity of modern society and eventually collapses. Therefore, criticism of an exaggerated claim to control by the European institutions is more than justified, especially with regard to the EU Commission, but also to the European Court of Justice (ECJ), both of which interpret all norms in favor of the European level when in doubt.



**Johann Lauer**, E-Mail: [johann@lauer.biz](mailto:johann@lauer.biz), Homepage: [lauer.biz](http://lauer.biz).

**Overcoming Eurosklerosis 2.0.**

**Source:** [lauer.biz/eurosklerosis-2.pdf](http://lauer.biz/eurosklerosis-2.pdf).

Furthermore, caution is required when some want to enforce utopias with all their might.

The first, nationalist, lesson is invoked *ad nauseam* on a daily basis; the second, centralist-statist, lesson is successfully suppressed. The hurrah Europeans need to understand that the nation state will remain the most important level of political control for a long time to come. The stigmatization of people who emphasize the importance of the national and regional levels and point out the collateral damage of globalization is not only morally reprehensible, but also counterproductive.

Nationalists must recognize that without supranational integration at the European level and global supranational cooperation, the complexity of the modern world cannot be adequately managed. No European state can stand alone on an equal footing with China and the United States in a globalized world.

Therefore, my proposal for the motto of the EU is: *unity and diversity (unitas et diversitas)*. A complementarity between European unity and nation state diversity, and between market, state and civil society, is best suited to guarantee prosperity for all in the EU, as well as to building the EU as an international player that can compete with the USA and China.

## **Evolution nor revolution, further development of the existing multi-level system**

Despite its many shortcomings, the EU has the most complex and efficient supranational political system anywhere. This *sui generis Staatenverbund* (association of states) can only falter if left-wing populists (hurray Europeans) and right-wing populists (hurray nationalists) prevail. The main challenge is to develop this complex system adequately.

Eurosclerosis 2.0 can be overcome if the legal competencies, monetary resources and political responsibilities can be optimally distributed in the EU multi-level system. The main challenge is to adequately develop this complex system. This is only possible if



**Johann Lauer**, E-Mail: [johann@lauer.biz](mailto:johann@lauer.biz), Homepage: [lauer.biz](http://lauer.biz).

**Overcoming Eurosklerosis 2.0.**

**Source:** [lauer.biz/eurosclerosis-2.pdf](http://lauer.biz/eurosclerosis-2.pdf).

complementarity between different political levels as well as complementarity between the market, the state and civil society is further developed.

## **Complementarity between the European and national levels**

The four existing decision-making levels (municipal, regional, national and European) would also have to be constantly developed. It is necessary both to strengthen the performance of all levels and to shift competencies in all directions, not only toward the EU headquarters. Both shifts to the EU level and shifts back to the national level are necessary.

The political systems, both at the EU level and at the national level, are much more advanced. As shown above, there is an interlocking between the European and the national level, which has led to an increase in performance on both levels and enormously expanded the performance possibilities of each.

The most important and efficient collective and social security systems are at the national level. If one is interested in good social policy, one cannot play off the different levels against each other. Poverty, like many other problems, can only be effectively remedied if appropriate strategies and instruments are developed at all levels, local, regional, national and European, but above all if existing systems are further developed. This also includes further developing established systems at the national level. The nation state is still the most powerful political level. The national level, which guarantees diversity in the EU, must be preserved. European unity serves to preserve and further develop national diversity.

The major problems can only be overcome if several strategies and instruments are available at the European, national, regional and municipal level to tackle a problem. There is no “one” solution, no single road that leads to Rome. What is important is coordination, so that these complementary, supplementary solutions do not hinder each other. For this to happen, all the mentioned levels must have their autonomy. Hierarchization is counterproductive.



**Johann Lauer**, E-Mail: [johann@lauer.biz](mailto:johann@lauer.biz), Homepage: [lauer.biz](http://lauer.biz).

**Overcoming Eurosklerosis 2.0.**

**Source:** [lauer.biz/eurosklerosis-2.pdf](http://lauer.biz/eurosklerosis-2.pdf).

## **Complementarity between market, state and civil society**

Which competencies should the market and the state possess? Of the five ideal-typical strategies that I listed, the state of nature and communism can be disregarded because they each represent one extreme (market or state) and thus leave the many possibilities of the other strategy unused. The same is true of neoliberalism and neostatism, each of which also favors only one strategy – the former the market, the latter the state.

“Many roads lead to Rome” is a strategy that is very appropriately attributed to common sense. A pluralism of market, state and civil society strategies, as well as a variety of individual instruments for solving existential problems, offer the best guarantee that solutions will be adequate, sustainable and resilient. Complementarity between market, state and civil society is as important as complementarity between different levels of government.

### **Pluralism required: complementarity as a structural principle of the EU**

The EU multi-level system must be maintained in its complexity and further developed through constant incremental improvements (kaizen) as well as through innovations. The distribution of competencies, resources and responsibilities between the European and national levels and between the market and the state, as discussed above, is crucial in this context. For the two approaches mentioned above to succeed, complementarity should be introduced as a further structural principle of the EU. Complementarity is called for between the various political levels as well as between the market, the state and civil society. Complementarity would enable a further increase in the complexity of the political system, in which performance can be enhanced at both the European and national levels.

The greatest danger in complex systems is that responsibilities become blurred, i.e., in the worst case, there is organized irresponsibility: everyone is responsible for the successes, no one is responsible for the failures. The advantage of democratic



**Johann Lauer**, E-Mail: [johann@lauer.biz](mailto:johann@lauer.biz), Homepage: [lauer.biz](http://lauer.biz).

**Overcoming Eurosklerosis 2.0.**

**Source:** [lauer.biz/eurosklerosis-2.pdf](http://lauer.biz/eurosklerosis-2.pdf).

systems is that there is more frequent turnover of politicians and senior officials. In short: complex systems can promote the formation of shunting yards and lead to organized irresponsibility. Therefore, not only is the allocation of legal competencies, monetary resources and political responsibilities important, but it is also necessary that these correspond or are brought into harmony with one another.

## **Restoring international competitiveness**

Eurosclerosis 2.0 can be overcome if international competitiveness is restored. When tackling problems, one should always work with a pluralistic approach, i.e. both statist and market-based strategies should be applied to each problem. Monocultures are not just harmful in agriculture; they can lead entire states to ruin if, for example, only state solutions are relied on, as exemplified by the collapse of state socialism in the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

International competitiveness can only be restored if a similarly complex approach to the implementation of the single market is followed. However, the EU would also have to act as a provider of services as quickly as possible and build a high-performance 5G network virtually at every corner within the EU and EFTA. Furthermore, all levels of government, from the municipal to the European, would have to promote digitization and, as consumers of private services, enable comprehensive digitization of all government services. In short, one has to make up for the state investments that have been neglected over the last two decades. The state is needed not only as a *regulator*, but above all as a *provider* and *customer* of public services. As a regulator, the EU is finally on the right track.

It is still necessary to carry out a second educational offensive following the education offensive of the 1960s and 1970s. The first was simply about mass: everyone should be able to benefit from education, not just the better-off. This still needs to be expanded. The new offensive should focus on targeted support from kindergarten to master craftsman diploma or doctorate. But this should not be at the expense of quality. The strongest competitors from East Asia show that both, mass and quality are feasible.



**Johann Lauer**, E-Mail: [johann@lauer.biz](mailto:johann@lauer.biz), Homepage: [lauer.biz](http://lauer.biz).

**Overcoming Eurosklerosis 2.0.**

**Source:** [lauer.biz/eurosclerosis-2.pdf](http://lauer.biz/eurosclerosis-2.pdf).

## **The EU is at least as dependent on the UK and EFTA as the other way around**

While the EU's economic output was almost on a par with the US in 2010, the Americans now generate around 50 per cent more value added than the Europeans. This certainly has something to do with Brexit. But America's output is still produced with a smaller population than in the EU. So, it is not only the British and the EFTA states (Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway and Switzerland) that are dependent on the EU, but also the reverse.

The EU depends on the British first and foremost because of their political culture. While Germany and France, in particular, cultivate a rationalistic-utopian political culture, the UK, like all Anglo-Saxon countries, has an empirical-pragmatic political culture. The Anglo-Saxons always do the right thing after trying all the other options. The Germans and French always do the same thing, no matter how often they fail. Hence the tendency to statism (centralism and planned economy).at EU level.

The British made as shown above a significant contribution to overcoming the first Eurosclerosis, contrary to what many say. Without the UK and the other EFTA states, overcoming Eurosclerosis 2.0 will hardly be feasible either. The UK is vital for any serious internal and external security policy at the European level; but they are also important for developing the knowledge society. The only European universities that sit at the top of global rankings are not in the EU but in Great Britain and Switzerland.

If the EU wants to establish itself as an independent actor alongside the USA, China, Japan and Russia, this will require more than the internal development described above. It will also necessitate the inclusion of all EFTA states and Great Britain. At present, the EU treats Britain and Switzerland worse than its own provinces. They have to accept the entirety of EU law, the *acquis communautaire*, without objection, although they are not involved in its development. This will have to change if we are to overcome Eurosclerosis 2.0.



**Johann Lauer**, E-Mail: [johann@lauer.biz](mailto:johann@lauer.biz), Homepage: [lauer.biz](http://lauer.biz).

**Overcoming Eurosklerosis 2.0.**

**Source:** [lauer.biz/eurosclerosis-2.pdf](http://lauer.biz/eurosclerosis-2.pdf).