

At the Origin of the European Union Youth Forum: The Difficult Emergence of European Youth Organisations

Joël Kotek

Université Libre de Bruxelles

Introduction

Organisations are born out of crises usually in a hurry, if not in a panic. One thinks especially of the construction of Europe. Despite the butchery of World War I (9 million dead), World War II (40 million dead) and even the discovery of Auschwitz, the Europe we cherish would never have come into being. It took the Soviet threat - the Prague coup (February 1948), the Berlin crisis (June 1948) and the Korean War (June 1950), to force Europeans to unite. One of my University teachers in the Institut d'Etudes Politiques de Paris, Alfred Grosser, used to joke that we should put up a statue of Stalin in each of the largest public squares in our capitals to thank him for scaring us so much. If today the world of youth is relatively well structured, at least on a European scale, we also owe it to the Cold War, to three events linked to it.

1. The Soviet time: *Back to the past.* Before the 1940s, there was little or no youth policy at national, European or international level. In democratic countries, of course. On the other hand, as one can imagine, dictatorial or even more totalitarian regimes have always favoured the recruitment of youth. One thinks of Mussolini's *Babilla*, the Nazi *Hitlerjugend* or the youth recruitment under Franco. Nevertheless the fact remains that the first to have thought of



enrolling their young people in unique movements, depending on their age, were the Soviets. They were the first to think of using young people, both nationally (Pioneers, Komsomols) and internationally (KIM), to recruit young people. The Communist Youth International (KIM) was created in 1919 under the aegis of the Communist International (Komintern). Its objective: to enrol the youth of the world. The means: by deception. From the 1920s, the KIM, under the direction of the Komintern, set up a strategy to conquer the world's youth by systematically infiltrating non-communist political organisations in the West. The main instruments of this methodical enterprise were "front organisations" and "submarines". Front organisations were those which officially professed ideas not identifiable with communist ideology. Those NGOs, supposedly independent in fact under the control of communist agents or submarines who received their order from the International youth international (KIM) which coordinates everything from Moscow. Allegedly, representative of all the trends in civilian democratic society, they were created and were only meaningful to the extent that they served the foreign policy of the Soviet Union. They were conceived as so many "communication channels" for the Communist parties, which were anxious to acquire a greater audience and a wider area of recruitment. From the twenties, there were many hundreds of these types of organisations which, the better to seduce and attract idealistic and romantic youth, proclaimed goals always worthy of praise and sympathy: peace, anti-imperialist struggle, disarmament, and economic, scientific and cultural progress for humanity. What is a submarine? A submarine is an underground Communist Party activist who is charged with infiltrating a rival political (socialist, liberal) or a front organisation. In *Hieroglyphics*, Arthur Koestler tells how, in Berlin in 1931, once having decided to join the KPD, he was

persuaded that he would be more useful to the party by keeping his opinion to himself. How to forget that the president of the Spanish Socialist Youth, Santiago Carrillo, was in reality one of these submarines, that is to say a clandestine member of the Communist Party of Spain. The same was true of Ted Willis, the general secretary of the Young Socialists before assuming the presidency of the... Young Communists, a little before the signing of the Soviet-German Pact. Submarines were agents of influence. Their mission? Pushing the front organisation they control to adopt pro-Soviet positions, by any means possible. In 1939, for example, this meant supporting the USSR's attack on Finland. The front organisations were those which officially professed ideas not identifiable with communist ideology. Those NGOs, supposedly independent, were in fact under the control of communist agents or submarines who received their order from the Communist Youth International (KIM), which coordinated everything from Moscow. Allegedly, representative of all the trends in civilian democratic society, they were created and were only meaningful to the extent that they served the foreign policy of the Soviet Union. They were conceived as so many "communication channels" for the communist parties, which were anxious to acquire a greater audience and a wider area of recruitment. From the twenties, there were many hundreds of these types of organisations which, the better to seduce and attract idealistic and romantic youth, proclaimed goals always worthy of praise and sympathy: peace, anti-imperialist struggle, disarmament, and economic, scientific and cultural progress for humanity.

This tactical choice paid off. Goaded by the anti-fascist wave, front organisations multiplied during the thirties, each consisting of a secretariat and an executive committee firmly entrenched by militant communists, seen as neutrals, not communists. Thus, the Czech Erwin Pollack, alias Marcel Godard, a typical example of these Jewish gladiators converted to Stalinism, controlled the Universal Community of Youth for Peace, Liberty and Progress, while Andre Victor, a Jew from Romania, led the "World Gathering of Students"¹. One can see that a priority for KIM was to get its different organisations to infiltrate, colonise or even create mass organisations which were progressive and anti-fascist. The most remarkable example of infiltration is that of Great Britain. There, in a country where the Communist Party has only a few militants, not a single youth organisation that is even slightly left-wing seems to have escaped the communist grip. In 1940, in the midst of the Blitz, the youth section of the Labour Party and the prestigious National Union of Students of Britain supported the policy of neutrality defended by Moscow. The slogan: no more imperialist England than fascist Germany. Their goal: convincing the British youth to refuse to engage in the imperialist war against Nazi Germany! How to forget that since August 1939 the USSR was a close ally

1 Eppe, Heinrich. (1970). *Die Kraft der Solidarität: 80 Jahre Sozialistische Jugendinternationale*. Vienne, Internationale Union der Sozialistische Jugend, p. 64, and Luza, Radomir. (1970). *History of the international socialist youth movement*. Sijthoff, Leyden, p. 53.

of Nazi Germany after the so-called Stalin-Ribbentrop Pact. The shock was harsh. The Labour Party youth section was immediately dissolved.

These manoeuvres were soon forgotten when the USSR entered the war on the side of the Allies because of Nazi treason on 22 June 1941. The urgency of the resistance will favour the undermining work of the KIM agents. Through a complex process, which is the subject of my doctoral thesis², the result was stunning. In November 1945, around 25 submarine agents succeeded in imposing on the British government the creation of the World Federation of Democratic Youth (WFDY). This officially non-political international was supposed to be the youth equivalent of the United Nations (UN). The manoeuvre was genius: eight ministers of His Gracious Majesty and the King vouch for it. Officially, the communists represent only 3.2% of the delegates against 4% for the Catholics. The World Federation of Democratic Youth was nonetheless a front organisation³. With its mostly clandestine membership, the communist group, which controlled at least thirteen western delegations, including those of Italy, Great Britain and the United States, dominated all the power structures. Two of the three general secretaries were communist subs, including a Spaniard in exile (Ignacio Gallego). It is notable that Alexandre Shelepine, the future director of the KGB and, at one time, the number two Soviet leader, was appointed in November 1945, to the Council of WFDY. Finally, it was a young French deputy, a Communist Party fellow traveller, Guy de Boysson, who was elected president by an overwhelming majority. This former Pétainist who had joined the resistance would later manage an important Franco-Soviet bank. The scenario was repeated in Prague the following year, 1946, with the creation of the International Union of Students (IUS)⁴. Here again, the apparently pluralist character of the meeting did not prevent the election of two communist submariners to the presidency and the general secretariat, the British Tom Madden and the Czech Joseph Grohmann. In Prague, as in London, the work of infiltration served its purpose perfectly: to enable the Soviets to control the international relations of the only two mass youth and student organisations of the post-war period. Controlling a non-governmental organisation such as

2 Kotek, Joël. (1998). *La jeune garde: entre KGB et CIA, la jeunesse mondiale, enjeu des relations internationales, 1917-1989*. Paris, Seuil.

3 The communists held four of the five positions: the presidency, in the person of Guy de Boysson (France), the treasurer by Frances Damon (USA), and the secretariat by Herbert Williams and Kutty Hookham. The only non-communist in the secretariat was the fellow traveller, the Dane, Lieutenant Svend Beyer-Pederson. Three non-communists were elected to the vice-presidency, the American Elsa Graves, the Chinese C.Z. Chen, the Brit Perry Jones, “against” the Soviet Nikolai Mikhailov to the Executive Committee and to the Council, but otherwise matters were taken very seriously. These two entities were totally locked up: in the Executive Committee at least six of the seven members –including the “Socialist” Hajek– were under communist influence. Ignacio Gallego (Spain), K. Boomla (India), C.K. Chen (Free China Territories), Slavko Komar (Yugoslavia), Jiri Hajek (Czechoslovakia), and Manuel Popoca (Mexico). Also in the Council, the communists had succeeded in gaining a majority.

4 Kotek, Joël. (1996). *Students and The Cold War*. Macmillan/St Martin Press.

the International Union of Students was not insignificant in the context of the mainly oblique confrontations of the Cold War. Especially towards the colonial elites. How can we prove that the WFDY and IUS were under communist control? Apart from my interviews with a dozen communist submariners, mostly British and Czech, one can verify this fact through the position that the youth and student organisations took on the first crises of the Cold War. To the great surprise of Westerners, especially British, both WDFY and IUS supported all the positions of the USSR: support for the Czechoslovak Coup d'état (1948), for the Berlin blockade (1948), for Tito in the Trieste crisis (1946) and then for the condemnation of Titoism (1948), support for the Greek communists, for North Korea (1950) and, of course, opposition to the Marshall Plan (1947) and to the first stages of the European construction (1950)⁵. In 1949, WFDY naturally joined in the celebrations of Stalin's 70th birthday:

To General Stalin:

On the occasion of your 70th birthday, WFDY sends you expressions of affection, admiration and respect that the democratic youth of the whole world feel for the first combatant for Peace and Freedom of all people.

Thanks to your grandiose work as leader of the Soviet State, a new society has been built where man knows no more the exploitation of man, in which all the natural as well as scientific resources have been made available, a society in which magnificent perspectives have been opened up to all and particularly, to the young generation which, by its enthusiastic work, marches resolutely towards ever more radiant tomorrows.

This is why it is not only the 60 million young people who comprise our federation, but all the youth, enamoured of freedom in all the countries, who wish today to show you their gratitude, because they see you as the most valiant defender of democracy and national independence for the people.

Inspired by the great example of Soviet youth, young democrats throughout the entire world will continue to serve the cause of peace relentlessly, to intensify the struggle against the warmongers, to unmask unceasingly their agents, the dividers of youth, and to reinforce ever more world unity among youth with action against the warmongers, who want to sacrifice millions of human lives in a new massacre to safeguard their sordid interests.

We wish you once more a long life for the good of all the workers and particularly, for the youth of the whole world.

⁵ Another proof: in December 1958, when Alexander Shelepine became head of the KGB, he was still vice-president of the IUS.

On behalf of the WFDY Secretariat: the president, Guy de Boysson, and the secretary general, Enrico Boccara⁶. It is easy to understand why the Soviets spared no effort to develop these two international organisations, which benefited from unlimited funds. Two magazines in seven languages, a world youth and student festival with tens of thousands of participants, etc. In August 1951, the Third World Youth and Student Festival in Berlin attracted more than a million participants, including 24,000 foreigners, especially from Europe but also from Africa and Asia. According to the CIA, the festival cost a whopping \$50 million dollar. Nothing was too good to seduce European youth but also the rising elites of the Third World in the context of decolonisation.

2. The time of the Western response. Under these conditions, one can understand the panic that gradually invaded Western chancelleries. Could the Soviets be allowed to monopolise the international representation of youth and students any longer? As early as 1946, the main European powers, most of them colonial powers, decided to react. Under the impetus of Great Britain, the main European states, but not the United States, decided to create a counterforce. In 1949, the World Youth Assembly (WAY) was created in London, and a year later, the International Students' Conference (ISC) was created in Holland to respond to the student challenge posed by the USSR. As one can see, it took four years to create a rival organisation to the WFDY and five years to create a counter IUS. Why this delay?

1. The European states were ruined in a context where the United States was losing interest in young people.
2. Above all, youth policies were in their infancy in both Europe and the United States. Apart from the Scandinavian countries, there was no National Youth Council in Belgium, France, Britain, Germany nor in the United States that was representative of all political and non-political currents in the country. In order to create a representative international and not a univocal one like WFDY, it was therefore up to the different governments concerned to create first representative national councils. The French Council of Youth (CFJ), the British Youth Council, or in the United States, the Young Adult Council (YAC) were thus created. In the same concern for representativeness, European governments, which, as we have said, remain colonialist, will be obliged to create, in a second phase, colonial youth councils, obviously under control. Driven by the Cold War, the West finally became interested in colonial youth. While France created a "Conseil de la Jeunesse de l'Union française" (French Union Youth Council, CJUF) to control the young colonists, the British set up a "Commonwealth Youth Council" (CYC). The most bizarre case was the

6 Information Service of WFDY, No. 78, 8th December 1949.

Youth Council of the Belgian Congo. It was composed entirely of white colonials. It was all these national youth councils (NYC), originally mostly European, that created WAY in 1949.

First conclusion: it was in reaction to the Soviet threat that the NYC of Europe was created, the ones that were at the origin of WAY, the CENYC and nowadays the European Youth Forum. Would everything be better in the best of worlds? No. The ambition may be there, but the means were not. Both the British and the French governments will not be able to cover the costs of their creation. An international organisation is expensive in terms of personnel and travel costs. A delegate from the colonies is a complete liability. Where to find the money? Logically, in 1950, both WAY and ISC were on the verge of bankruptcy. Salaries were no longer paid. The letters found in the archives of the British and French governments are astonishing. These are distress calls that will be heard from 1951, by the United States, which will (finally) engage in the great game of cultural war. How did they do this? In 1951, private American foundations decided to support not only WAY and IUE but also most of the European youth and European cultural organisations. Not so private foundations: in reality, all these supposedly private foundations were CIA creations. Why are they so? If the American government was eager to take up the communist challenge, the climate of McCarthyite hysteria forbids the American government to get closer to progressive or even liberal organisations. The Young Adult Council (YAC) and the National Union of American Students (USNSA) were actually the *bête noire* of many American conservative circles. Its anti-colonialist stance, its action in favour of black civil rights, the personality of its main leader (the Jewish radical Lowenstein, linked to Martin Luther King), its ethnic composition (black and Jewish leaders), are all causes of its political isolation. The poisonous climate of the 1950s thus condemned even anti-communist progressive organisations to destitution or to secret funds. There was only one way: to build a parallel system of secret funding, via private foundations, i.e., beyond the reach and control of Congress. Only the CIA could fulfil this function. A department of international organisations was therefore created within the CIA, specifically responsible for financing Western counter-fronts. The objective: to avoid seeing the youth elites of the future Asian and African states, obviously courted by the Soviets, switch to the communist side. From this point of view, acting in an occult manner was all the more advantageous as the American government was determined to support anti-colonialist movements, such as the FNL in Algeria, which was nationalist but not communist. Covert funding made it possible to avoid offending the colonial powers head-on, especially France, which was more eager than ever to keep its African colonies. For the CIA, the fact that many of the YAC and USNSA cadres came from the radical left was not a problem. On the contrary. It was these American or Scandinavian cadres like Olof Palme, the overwhelming majority of whom were aware of the CIA links who transformed the good old paternalistic, apolitical and Eurocentric WAY into an anti-colonial

war machine. The young Americans, quite quickly (because of the American funding), the leaders of reference for both WAY and ISC are remarkable. For example, the American neo-Marxist historian Immanuel Wallerstein, the father of the concept of world economy, worked for a few years for the World Assembly of Youth (WAY), between Oxford and Accra, in Ghana. He was one of the advisors to the Pan-African and Third World leader N'Krumah. The 8th Council in Accra confirmed, if there was any need, the definitive metamorphosis of WAY. Completely dedicated as it always was to counter communist influence in the Third World, it was going to tackle first and foremost the wrongs of its own camp. The simple fact that the Council was held in Accra, the capital of the first African state to have won its independence, Nkrumah's country, who was one of the fathers of the Pan-African movement, testifies to this. It is obvious that Immanuel Wallerstein, the former but still very influential vice-president of WAY, was not uninvolved in this choice. A fervent admirer of Nkrumah, it is in Accra that he had chosen to live to finish his doctoral research (Oxford, 1959), which will lead to two major works, the first devoted to the general study of African independence (1961) and the second to the particular case of Ghana and the Ivory Coast (1965). Who better than Wallerstein could testify to the birth (finally) of Africa to the world. Given that, the idea of organising the 8th Council on African territory smacked of genius. WAY had come into step with Africa the very year of all the emancipation. It will only be the more respected, from North to South, as shown by the quality and diversity of the heads of State who accepted to send a message of support: let us mention Kwame Nkrumah, Sékou Toure, Jawaharlal Nehru, Ferhat Abbas, Tom J. Mboya, Mohamed Ayub Khan, Indira Gandhi, J. Kozonguizi, David Ben Gurion, Dwight Eisenhower, Chester Bowles, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Salvador de Madariaga, Harold MacMillan, Heinrich Lubke, Richard Nixon, John Kennedy, Hugh Gaitskell, Adlai Stevenson, and P. Modinos. Thus, you had, in addition to the presidents of the German Federal Republic and of the United States, the two candidates for his succession, the imposing Nehru, the charismatic Nkrumah, the unsubdued Sékou Touré and the "rebel" Ferhat Abbas. In his message, the president of the provisional government of Algeria (and future first president) took a strong line: "The role of youth is to fight the imperialist systems which in the past have delivered half of humanity into domination by the other half".

Over the years, both WAY and ISC changed in nature, not least because of the growing impetus of their new African and Asian members. In 1958, an Indian became the head of the WAY Secretariat. Everything changed. WAY became increasingly political, and, of course, anti-colonial. Thus, WAY organised seminars with young nationalist leaders from Morocco, Tunisia and Algeria to the great anger and impotence of the French. The rupture was consummated. In 1958, the French youth council, one of the four founding members of WAY, left it definitively following a motion stressing the legitimate aspirations of the

Algerian people. In 1959, WAY and ISC congratulated (temporarily, it is true) Fidel Castro's seizure of power in Cuba.

That WAY was a creation of the Cold War (but no more so than the European Union) is obvious; that it progressively succeeded to disengage itself from it, is nonetheless also evident. WAY in 1948, conceived by Ernest Bevin and soon taken over by France, does not resemble at all the WAY of 1958, let alone that of 1966. Whereas one was European, paternalistic, educational and in fact quasi-governmental, the other became dynamic, political and militant. This was in contrast to WFDY, which never deviated from its Russian sponsorship – its leaders had hidden behind Soviet lines during the Hungarian revolution in 1956, but not without previously having placed its archives in the closest communist embassy, China, - WAY criticised the colonial politics of France, Great Britain and then, American imperialism. In August 1966, during the 6th General Assembly of WAY, meeting in Tokyo, in the presence of delegates from the ANC and the Algerian FNL, WAY logically came to deplore the Vietnamese policy of Lyndon Johnson.

VIETNAM

The 6th General Assembly of WAY:

AWARE of the specific responsibility of the younger generation with regard to the future of the people of the world, their inalienable right to liberty, progress and democracy.

CONVINCED of the indivisibility of peace, the first and main factor of which is the achievement of liberty for all peoples, including freedom of choice in the nature of their regime and of equality between all nations;

CONSIDERING that the war of aggression waged for more than five years in Vietnam, in open violation of the Geneva agreements of 1954, is the deep-seated origin and the immediate cause of the (54) extremely dangerous situation in this country, seriously menacing peace in Southeast Asia and the world;

CALLS FOR an immediate halt and withdrawal of military activities in Vietnam so that a favourable atmosphere is created for a negotiated settlement by Vietnamese factions in the spirit of genuine concern for the welfare of the Vietnamese people and in order that their aspirations for national independence and self-determination can be realised.

The last phrase of the resolution was menacing: the General Assembly noted that "if the American Government desires to contribute towards peace, it must, as a prerequisite, refrain from committing acts tantamount to a denial of what it purports to champion".

WAY appears to be more in tune with the aspirations of the world's youth. In 1966, WAY did not resemble the WAY of 1958 at all, let alone that of 1949, which was conceived by Ernest Bevin. Right up to 1967, indeed, the World Assembly of Youth was going to receive considerable funding (conferences, seminars, diverse meetings, grants, information campaigns, etc.) from the CIA, covering almost 60% of its working budget; most of its activities being themselves financed, case by case, to 80% by one or other of the foundations, of which the principal was most certainly FYSA.

The organisation became a true United Nations of Youth. This mutation was not without consequences. It explains the formal creation of a European secretariat within WAY in 1959; a secretariat that would become an independent youth organisation in 1963. Faced with the rise of the Third World, the European committees of WAY, with France, finally created CENYC in 1963, a European Committee of National Youth Councils. With Europe no longer dominating WAY de facto, the need for regrouping within an independent entity made as much sense as other horizons opened to the Europeans. CENYC was thought of as the reinforced arm of Europeans within WAY and the young people vis-a-vis the budding European institutions. To link up with them, the chief youth movements and organisations decided to create an ad hoc platform, the CNAJEP. The first CENYC Assembly was held in Brussels in May 1964.

Second conclusion. CENYC, the main European youth organisation, the forerunner, with the ECB⁷ (1971-1996) of the Youth Forum, was created as a reaction to the increasing marginalisation of the European youth councils and INGYOs.

3. The time of withdrawal into Europe. Until 1966, the CIA financed mostly progressive and third-world organisations, but obviously non-communist ones, without interfering in their work. Why until 1966? Not because of criticism of US policy in Vietnam, but simply because of an article in a progressive Californian magazine which revealed the secret financing of youth (YAC) and student (USNSA) organisations by the CIA. The article snowballed. A snowball that will sweep away everything in its path. It soon became clear that the CIA was financing not only these two most representative American youth organisations, but also their International, i.e., ISC and WAY. The CIA did not

7 The European Coordination Bureau of International Youth Organizations. The ECB was founded in 1971 in Brussels as the successor to the European Liaison Secretariat for Youth Organizations —Secrétariat européen de liaison des organisations de jeunesse— set up 1969. The ECB's aim was to promote consultation, concertation and cooperation between international non-governmental youth organisations (INGYOs), like the socialist IUSY or Jewish EUJS, especially vis-à-vis institutions of the Council of Europe and the European Union; to contribute to European information and training activities of youth organisations; to promote European work with respect to other institutions; to encourage youth organisations with no international links to develop their international work; to defend and improve material conditions of INGYOs.

limit itself to supporting only WAY and ISC. There does not seem to have been any non-communist youth organisations which escaped its generosity, including the socialist youth international:

- CENYC (European Council of the National Youth Committees)
- EYC (European Youth Campaign)
- UIJDC (International Union of Young Christian Democrats)
- IUSY (International Union of Socialist Youth)
- IYC (Indian Youth Council)
- YCW (Young Christian Workers)
- NFCUS (National Federation of Canadian University Students)
- Pax Romana
- WUS (World University Services)
- YWCA (Young Women's Christian Association)
- Etc.

It was later discovered that this system of hidden funding extended far beyond the youth movement. The scandal soon spread to organisations as powerful as the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions and as prestigious as the Congress for Cultural Freedom. Tom Braden, the inventor of the secret financial system, admits to having distributed, for instance, \$1,300,000 to the European Youth Campaign⁸ between 1951 and 1959. The storm became an earthquake. Anathemas rained down, heads were called, organisations disappeared overnight. The International Student Conference (ISC) disappeared for good within the year. WAY took a few years to die of asphyxiation, firstly because of the departure of many of its national sections, but also and above all because of a lack of funding. What Western state could replace the United States? A youth international requires huge budgets. No state, of course, while the USSR obviously continues to finance WFDY and IUS massively.

The solution will be regional, European: it will be up to the Council of Europe, then the European Union, to become aware of the need for a European youth policy. In 1972, while WAY was a shadow of its former self, the Council of Europe simultaneously created the European Youth Centre and the European Youth Foundation. The EYC was conceived as an international training and meeting centre with accommodation facilities. The European Youth Foundation (EYF) was a fund created to provide financial and educational support to young people and European youth activities around the core values of the organisation. It was necessary to find an alternative to US funding, via the CIA, at least at European level. In 1979, the Council of European National Youth Committees (CENYC)

8 Interview by Joël Kotek of Tom Braden, former CIA official, Washington, June 1993.



and the European Co-ordination Bureau of International Youth Organizations (ECB) created the Youth Forum of the European Communities (YFEU). Its goal: to work vis-à-vis the European Union (then called the European Community). In 1996, those three organisations merged to create the European Youth Forum. The establishment of a single structure replacing all three was a major rationalisation. The EYF acted as the platform of national youth councils and international youth organisations with the institutions of the European Union. Its aim: to speak on behalf of organised youth in Europe and to defend and promote the rights and interests of young people and their organisations. A kind of WAY but at the sole European level.

It goes without saying that WFDY and IUS have almost disappeared following the collapse of the Soviet bloc. If there is still a WFDY, as well as a WAY, owned by a Malaysian oligarch who bought the brand, they are only a shadow of their former selves. Third observation. It was the failure of the CIA's hidden system that prompted Europeans to finally take an interest in ensuring sustainable funding for European youth organisations. First through the Council of Europe, then through the European Union. Great things are born out of crises. This is the case now with the enlargement of NATO thanks to Putin. Necessity makes the law. ■