

## The values of the European Union

### “Monistic” vs. “Pluralistic” foreign policy

<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>“Monistic” society</u></b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Based on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ a specific ideological content</li> <li>➤ or pure preservation of power</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>“Pluralistic” society</u></b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Based on</p> <p style="text-align: center;">the inviolable dignity of each human person</p>
<p><b><u>Terminology:</u></b> Sometimes also called “Geo-political” or „Westphalian“ approach, although these concepts have other connotations</p>	<p><b><u>Terminology:</u></b> Sometimes also called “value based” or “human dignity based” approach.</p>
<p><b>Conceptual basis</b></p>	<p><b>Conceptual basis</b></p>
<p><b>Sociologically</b></p>	<p><b>Sociologically</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A society characterized by a <b><u>closed conception of the world based on a specific ideological content, e.g.:</u></b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A society characterized mainly by a <b><u>procedural framework designed to permit the free development of each individual person</u></b></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Ideological (e.g. Marxist)</li> <li>➤ Religious</li> <li>➤ Nationalistic/ethnic</li> <li>➤ Collectivist (Predominance of the collective over the individual – „Asian values“)</li> <li>➤ Machiavellian power seeking by a sociological group or an</li> </ul>	<p>Based on the <b><u>equality</u></b> of all human beings, each individual should be able to live <b>according to its personal convictions</b> (ideological, religious, etc.) – <b>limited only by the freedoms of the other individuals.</b></p>

<p>individual (autocracy), which dominates all aspects of political life (<b>Monism</b>).</p>	<p>Conflicts are being resolved through “<b>practical concordance</b>”, a balancing of the interests of each party so that both liberties can be realized in an optimal way.</p> <p>⇒ The society provides <b>only a procedural framework</b>, leaving it to the individual to fill it with content.</p> <p>⇒ As different people have different views on their life, this leads necessarily to a <b>pluralistic</b> society.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tendency to <b>restrict human rights</b> – or even deny them.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Human rights</b> being the <b>basis</b> of all exercise of public authority.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Democracy seen as a threat</b> to the power position of the ruler.</li> <li>• Tendency towards “more efficient” decision making mechanisms.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Democracy</b> being the <b>basis</b> of all exercise of public authority.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Rule of Power</b> „<b>Might makes right</b>“: Resolution of conflicts by (military, police, social pressure) <u>force</u> With the aim to <u>subdue or destroy the adversary</u></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Rule of Law</b> Resolution of conflicts by <u>rule based mechanism</u>, through negotiations. With the aim to reach a <u>compromise</u>, that gives both sides room to breathe.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Concentration of power</b> The assumption to be in the possession of absolute ideological truth justifies the concentration of power in one power-</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Separation of powers</b> Distribution of power on different power-centres, so that they can mutually control each other („<u>checks and balances</u>“).</li> </ul>

centre („The Party [Religion] is always right!“).	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Tendency to <u>isolate</u> the society</b> against external influences, which are seen as threat to the power position of the ruler. ⇒ Emphasis on <b><u>sovereignty</u></b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Tendency to <u>open</u> the society</b> to external influences, seen as opportunities for further development and exchange. ⇒ Emphasis on <b><u>cooperation</u></b></li> </ul>

<b>In foreign policy terms</b>	<b>In foreign policy terms</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>Main goal: securing its own power position</u></b> internally by <b>shielding the society</b> against influences from abroad.</li> <li>• <b><u>Imperial rule:</u></b> Dominance of the centre over the periphery without democratic feedback.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>Transposition of the above mentioned value-program in foreign policy</u></b> Also because of the conviction, that this is in our own long term interest (security, stability, wealth) („The West cannot do well if the East were doing badly.“)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>Confrontational understanding of security</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Security by trying to <b>dominate</b> the surrounding countries: creation of a <b>cordon sanitaire</b>; dividing the world up into <b>zones of influence</b></li> <li>➤ Security as a „<b>zero sum game</b>“</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>Cooperative understanding of security</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Security by ensuring <b>cooperation</b> and <b>exchange</b></li> <li>➤ Security as a „<b>win-win-situation</b>“</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Advantages	Problems
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Modest requirements on administrative and societal organization of the acting state</b> Even simply structured societies and rather dysfunctional states may be able to fulfill the requirements for some time.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>High requirements on administrative and societal organization of the acting state</b> Necessitates highly developed societies and state structures to function satisfactorily.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>Destabilization operations</u></b> can, in the short term, be conducted with <b>limited military effort</b> and costs.</li> <li>• The <b>long term political costs</b> depend on the reaction of the adversary.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Necessitates a <u>long term approach</u></b> (up to several generations), <b>high political energy</b> and important <b><u>financial resources</u></b> in order to transform the political system and the society of the partner country. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>Lasting successes</b> could <b>only</b> be achieved where the EU was able to apply its most powerful foreign policy instrument: the <b>accession perspective</b></li> <li>➤ For all other cases: Necessity to define <b>realistic intermediary goals</b> (not „Westminster-democracy“, but stability and “essential” human rights).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Problems	Advantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Based on <u>compulsion</u> and <u>force</u>:</b> Those who think differently and follow different values are excluded from the political system. Their apathy or even opposition undermines in the long term the political system (e.g. implosion of the Eastern block in 1990).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Based on <u>voluntary participation</u> and <u>conviction</u>:</b> Those who think differently and follow different values are invited to contribute to the political system.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>Instable</u> in the long term</b> Short term: appearance of stability But the deficit in political and social controversy leads to structural rigidities and thus builds up tensions: ⇒ <b>Big adjustment crises</b> (e.g. Syria, Libya, etc.)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>Relative stability</u> in the long term</b> Intense political debate permits a trial and error approach, thus allows timely corrections of possible aberrations  ⇒ <b>Regular adjustments prevent a big conflagration</b></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>Aggressive</u> in tendency</b> Creation of (<b>frozen</b>) <b>conflicts</b> in the vicinity („<b>divide and rule</b>“) Tendency to <b>deflect internal tensions towards the external world</b> to stir up nationalistic sentiments (Shakespeare, Henry IV Part 2: “Be it thy course to busy giddy minds / With foreign quarrels”)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>Cooperative</u> in tendency</b> Efforts to <b>defuse tension</b> as early as possible (e.g. development aid)  <b>Compromise</b> as main instrument</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>Facilitates</u> the accession of autocratic rule by an individual, a class or caste</b> Whoever succeeds to gain con-</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>Incompatible</u> with long term autocratic rule by an individual, a class or caste</b> Successful transformation is the</li> </ul>

<p>trol of the leviens of power can accede to absolute power.</p>	<p>best guarantee against dictatorship. But that's also <b>why all adepts</b> of a closed, <b>ideological determined world order adamantly oppose</b> this approach</p>
	<p><b><u>Conclusion:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Avoid the trap of <b>missonary exaggeration.</b></li> <li>➤ But remains an <b>essential reference point</b> for a foreign policy truly aiming at promoting <b>peace, stability and prosperity for all</b></li> </ul>