

WHILE EUROPE'S FUTURE IS AT STAKE EYES OF EUROPE IS OFFERING IT A NEW VISION

*"Russia must be part of Europe. Otherwise,
it will push her towards China,"*

The issue of the reception of migrants is dangerously undermining European cohesion, as Professor Chantal Delsol's brilliant analysis in Le Figaro (1 June 2018) points out. More than ever, Europe is at a crossroads. The dramatic 2019 European elections will tell us if it passes or if it breaks. The stakes are terribly high: populism is growing across Europe in east and west, in north and south and not only in the Visegrad club that brings together the former Soviet republics. Also in Austria, and more recently in Italy, Flanders and even Bavaria which is stiffening in the face of AFD's nationalist tension. A new and bold vision of Europe is badly needed.

Eyes of Europe is more than ever part of the solution with its paneuropean autoactive educational platform. An EU-Commission internal circular from June 2017 means the same, see page 2 of this document: [Eyes of Europe gets taken over \(De, En\)](#)

Italy now joins Greece, the United Kingdom, Poland, Hungary, Austria, the Czech Republic and Slovakia in a very long list of countries that have announced their democratic rejection of the Brussels European model.

Should we force them to be free, thus erasing democracy, even if many of them do not wish, contrary to the United Kingdom to leave Europe?

Yet they express the firm determination to transform Europe from within. It was in this hope that the Visegrad group has met recently, under the chairmanship of Hungary to hold an important colloquium in Budapest on the theme of the future of Europe with the participation of all countries of Central Europe. It has escaped nobody that Steve Bannon was one of the guests at the symposium.

Euroscepticism, developed at this point by so many countries and so many actors, betrays a failure of Europe and its institutions on which we must reflect and which we must definitely take into account.

Europe is being castigated by many because it is felt to be far too liberal. Hence the surprise: are the peoples of Europe refusing to be free?

Hence the anguished question of the elites of our countries: will we have to bend democratically to this popular will and abandon sections of our freedom?

Are we going to have to choose between democracy and their model of freedom?

"Old Europe" is being shaken by this question.

Some of our elites no longer believe in democracy precisely because of the unacceptable preferences of the people. The so called institutional Europe is believed to defend postmodern freedom against some of the peoples of Europe. The latter use democracy (the number is on their side) to impose their "illiberal" opinions.

This ideological quarrel breaks our societies into irreconcilable clans, opening deep breaches within political families.

It's the worst pass we've been through since the fall of the wall and soviet communism.

(...) The arrival on the European scene of the peoples of Central Europe has changed the situation dramatically.

As soon as they joined the European club, they have begun to challenge postmodern liberal models-including political, economic and societal freedom.

They have resisted the deployment of our modern or postmodern vision: globalism and cosmopolitics, emancipation, liberalism at all levels. (...) In the face of our elites who tend to want absolute freedom, eastern peoples strive for freedom embedded in reality. Let us take the perilous example of immigration. We are used to considering as xenophobes and racists any country that refuses migrants or erects walls. The alternative would be to welcome the immigrant applicants to our country. But can we succeed in this enterprise? "Schaffen wir das? " Here's the drama. However, for illiberal democracies, the question of immigration is not a drama, but a tragedy. The issue is also about preserving local culture and national identity.

The peoples of Eastern Europe find moral admonitions from others repugnant.(...)

The current situation is very serious because it results in ideological struggle. Freedom of movement cannot be absolute because it clashes with the question of cultural identity. If the elites persist in denying reality, they will end up driving people crazy, thus threatening freedoms.(Chantal Delsol in Le Figaro)

After Austria, Italy is now in the eye of a typhoon. A short sentence attributed to the European Budget Commissioner, the German Günther Oettinger, assuring that the financial markets would "teach Italians how to vote", raised general outrage in the Italian peninsula. "It's crazy, in Brussels they don't know shame. (Mr. Oettinger) said the markets will teach Italians to vote well. If that's not a threat! But I'm not afraid," Matteo Salvini, league leader (far right), immediately tweeted.

After President Sergio Mattarella's decision to refuse a Eurosceptic government, the Milan Stock Exchange was falling dramatically .

Even the Democratic Party (PD, centre-left), the most European in Italy, has taken the lead: *"No one can tell Italians how to vote, the markets less than all the others. Italy must be respected,"* said Maurizio Martina, acting secretary general.

The outgoing Minister of Economic Development, Carlo Calenda, member of the DP, called for *"an apology or resignation" of the German commissioner.*

Even the European Commission has distanced itself. Its spokesman Margaritis Schinas referred to *"imprudent remarks": "It is the Italians and only the Italians who will decide the future of their country. Nobody else."*

Fair enough! The President of the European Council, Donald Tusk, also spoke: *"My call to all EU institutions: respect the voters. We are there to serve them, not to teach them. My appeal to all EU institutions: please respect the voters. We are there to serve them, not to lecture them."*

New far-right interior minister insists he will stick to his campaign determination to deport around 500,000 illegal immigrants.

Sandro Gozi, Italy's former Europe minister, said the EU had given ammunition to anti-immigration populist parties by not helping Italy deal with large numbers of arrivals. *"Europe could and should have done more, the Italians feel they have been left alone which has fuelled the populists' agenda."*

"Delays in the implementation of the relocation mechanism have been politically devastating," Gozi said. *"Not because relocation would have solved in itself the migration crisis, but because it showed the Visegrád Group did not want to pay any price."*

"We are going backwards on solidarity and responsibility," said an EU diplomat.

This shows in anticipation that the next European elections will most likely take place next year in a climate of mutual suspicion and extreme tension. The most pessimistic commentators predict a Eurosceptic tidal wave in the European Parliament.



WE, EUROPEANS, ARE ALONE. (Jacques Attali)

On the other hand , Jacques Attali is flabbergasted by President Donald Trump's volte face, who seems to have decided to definitely turn his back on his European ally. As for the champion of the European cause, Emmanuel Macron he resolutely turned to Russia and thus resumed centuries of good understanding between Russia and France within the concert of European nations.

Jacques Attali (French: born 1 November 1943) is a [French](#) economic and [social theorist](#), writer, [political adviser](#) and senior civil servant, who served as a counselor to President [François Mitterrand](#) from 1981 to 1991 and was the first head of the [European Bank for Reconstruction and Development](#) in 1991-1993. He co-founded the European program [EUREKA](#), dedicated to the development of new technologies. In 2009, [Foreign Policy](#) recognized him as one of the top 100 "global thinkers" in the world.

When will we, Europeans, understand that we are alone? When will we draw the right conclusions?

Considering what is being played out in Austria, Germany and now Italy, it should drive us to urgently search for the answers to these vital questions.

Since the twenties, Europeans have gradually become accustomed to the idea that, even if they made a thousand mistakes, there would always be someone to save them from their own turpitude. And the United States also gradually settled into the role of 'Deus ex Machina'. And indeed, they saved us (with Stalin) from Nazi monsters with their army; they saved us from our economic sclerosis with the Marshall Plan; and they saved us from the Soviet threat with their nuclear missiles.

(...) Moreover, this support has always been carefully managed and limited: the Americans had done everything so that their Allies could continue needing them. It was out of the question for the Europeans to be independent militarily, financially, culturally, industrially or technologically. There was not a single strategic industry in which the United States did not seek to either maintain control, or deprive the Europeans from doing so. Similarly, there was not an area of law where the Americans did not try to set the rules. And there was not an area in innovation where the Americans were not pulling the strings.

For a long time, Europeans remained blind to this cynicism and false altruism. They remained docile vassals and did nothing to create the conditions necessary for their autonomy, (except, partially, in monetary policy). In fact, they even approved these dynamics, most of them shamefully enjoying their servitude.

Today, everything has changed. Europeans can no longer afford not to see that they are alone; that the Americans are no longer there to defend them; that the American President makes his decisions without taking into account either the point of view or the interests of their allies.

And it's not unique to Donald Trump. Long before, since at least George W. Bush, the Americans have always done things their way. Obama had even theorized it by formulating the astonishing concept of "leading from behind": his charm was necessary to keep others from noticing the cowardice of such statement.

It is one thing to obey the Americans when it's consistent with our strategy. However, it is another thing to submit to their diktats when it is contrary to our interests.

Europeans have yet to draw conclusions from their loneliness. They have yet to realize that if they are the targets of an attack, whether it is terrorism or a strategic attack, it is no longer certain that Washington will send its soldiers, or take the risk of having a bomb dropped on its territory. As for me, I am even convinced that, in the medium term, the opposite is certain: if Europe is attacked, no American will come to die in order to save us.

Divided, European countries will not be able to do anything to combat these threats, and the populists are as suicidal as the blissful Atlanticists.

It would therefore be criminal (and I weigh my words) for European leaders to not plan and prepare together against these threats. (Jacques Attali on his blog)

French President Macron is perfectly in line with Attali's vision. Merkel's answer to Macron's bold European vision and proposals has finally been revealed nine months after her election in a long interview with the Frankfurter Allgemeine Sonntagszeitung.

Angela Merkel eventually takes a clear step towards the French president with regard to defence and finances. When it comes to asylum and border protection, both agree as well.

- Thomas Gutschker (FAZ): *In all her considerations, Merkel proceeds from her dictum that Europe can no longer fully rely on the United States as a partner in the future. "We Europeans really have to take our fate into our own hands."*

And so all the Chancellor's thoughts revolve around how Europe can prove itself capable of acting in an increasingly complicated world. This is exactly what Macron stood for in his Sorbonne speech on Europe: "The Europe we know is too weak, too slow, too inefficient, but only Europe can give us a capacity to act in the world in the face of the great challenges of our time."

The priorities that Merkel now names herself are therefore - not surprisingly - the same as Macron's: "For me it is important that, in addition to a common foreign and defence policy and a common asylum and development policy, Europe remains economically strong and innovative." The Chancellor considers the issues of border security, a common asylum policy and combating the causes of flight to be "real existential issues" for Europe.

Macron and Merkel both want a genuine EU border guard force with extended powers. Merkel said it must have the right "to act independently at the external borders"; today it can only do so in addition to and at the request of the Member States. Merkel's "Marshall Plan for Africa" is also entirely in Macron's spirit. With regard to the treatment of migrants, Macron had called for a "genuine European Asylum Office" at the Sorbonne, which would "speed up and unify our procedures". In the F.A.Z. interview, Merkel expressed similar considerations: "In the final stage of development, we need a common European refugee authority that carries out all asylum procedures at the external borders on the basis of a uniform European asylum law.

She had never gone that far before, and of course she knows how difficult the many steps on this path will be. Merkel, for example, does not yet see an agreement on a fair distribution mode for refugees on the horizon. The Visegrád states will hardly give in on their own initiative.

The Chancellor said furthermore: "We need faster economic convergence between the member states in the euro zone. To this end, we must strengthen our capacity for innovation, with the help of additional structural policy. We need to consider how we can better involve countries that are lagging behind in science, technology and innovation".

What is new is her proposal to help countries with short-term loans that get into difficulties due to external circumstances. She's meeting Macron quite a bit with it.

*Merkel mentions one main another argument for why things should now move quickly: Europe's capacity to act. She says literally: **"In today's uncertain times, Europe must be able to act at all times."***

MACRON IS TRYING TO ROOT PUTIN'S RUSSIA IN EUROPE

It seems that Attali's vision of Europe is widely shared by the young President Macron. In the wake of General de Gaulle, the young French President chose to revive historical ties with Russia while his attempt to soften Uncle Sam back to good feelings towards Europeans seems to have failed. H el ene Carr ere d'Encausse, perpetual secretary of the French Academy and historian specialising in Russia comments:

"I think that the Franco-German couple is a horse and a lark because Eastern Europe, the new Europe, is behind Germany. It is, in a way, dependent on Germany. But what will have a real impact on NATO's overall policy? These are the countries of the new Europe: Poland, the Baltic States. They are actors of an extremely profound anti-Russianism, which Europe has adopted. Europe has consistently followed them, including in the case of sanctions imposed on Russia by the European Union in response to the Ukrainian crisis. Consequently, I would say that our vision of a French and then European policy is a vision that is distorted because we underestimate this pressure factor, which for Russia is fundamental: the reconstruction of a certain whole under German influence.

The Franco-German couple, which is indeed inescapable in Europe, is somewhere paralysing French diplomacy in this exchange and dialogue with Russia. Ukraine is part of the German influential landscape, there is no doubt.

"What must be done immediately is to help Putin out of this history of Eastern Ukraine and to do so, we must show him that it is possible."

French President Emmanuel Macron reached out to Russia to "anchor it in Europe" despite the current tensions in an attempt to turn his back on 25 years of "misunderstandings". "I believe very strongly that Russia has its history and destiny in Europe," Macron said during his first official visit to Russia.

For Mr Macron, "a window of opportunity" is opening for a "new dynamic" between Paris and Moscow, where Mr Putin has just begun a fourth term, and Europe. Both statesmen are deeply shaken by the decision of American President Donald Trump to leave the Iranian nuclear agreement.

"France is our long-standing, traditional and reliable partner. It has always aspired to defend its sovereignty, which is a guarantee of stability in the relationship," Putin stressed. But he has not publicly expressed the will to strengthen relations with the countries of the European Union, while the sanctions taken during the crises in Ukraine in 2014 and the Crimea still apply.

"We will not lift sanctions if nothing is done to address the situation in the troubled Dombass region of eastern Ukraine, Macron said.

The head of state made no secret of the fact that the task of "restoring confidence" between Moscow and Western Europe after "25 years of misunderstanding" was going to be difficult. Natalia Solzhenitsyn, the writer's widow and dissident, with whom he met on Thursday evening, called on him to act to bring his country closer to Europe. ***"Russia must be part of Europe. Otherwise, it will push her towards China,"*** she said.

Despite the tensions of recent years, France has remained economically very present in Russia, with some 500 companies employing nearly 170,000 employees.

For Mr Macron, it is now necessary to *"open new avenues in a more proactive way" to strengthen the French presence, in particular of startups and SMEs, in "agri-food, space, sustainable cities, energy services and digital"*.

Emmanuel Macron said he hoped to return soon to Russia, but this time to support the French team if it qualifies for the semi-finals of the World Cup-2018 (14 June-15 July) He expressed the hope that: *"relations between Paris and Moscow are inspired by judo, valued by Vladimir Putin, which "rests on respect for the opponent", and his favorite sport, football, which is "a collective sport"*.

Eyes of Europe was always convinced that it was time to put an end to the European anchoring towards America and that the time had come, to initiate, in the wake of the German Ostpolitik (policy of opening up to the East of the 1980s), a true European Ostpolitik. And just as the famous Ostpolitik began with a rapprochement *"à la De Gaulle"* towards Moscow, the Macronian Ostpolitik was initiated by a spectacular trip by the young French president to President Putin's Russia on the occasion of his recent re-election.

'A NEW BASIS FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN RUSSIA AND EUROPE' CULTURE AS UNIFIER?

Both the EU and Moscow, signatories of the Iran deal along with China and the US, want to maintain the agreement and fear a return of destabilising, unilateralist US policies in the Middle East.

"It creates a new basis for cooperation between Russia and Europe, without ignoring the differences that still exist," a Russian diplomat told AFP on condition of anonymity. Those differences remain large and unresolved on a host of issues, including the war in [Ukraine](#), where Russia backs separatists in the east of the country, as well as the use of chemical weapons in Syria.

Macron is seeking *"a serious dialogue... to try to find common ground,"* an aide told reporters last week. *"We are doing it with our eyes open... aware of the difficulties,"* added the official, who spoke on condition of anonymity.



IT'S FAR TOO EASY TO BLAME THE EAST FOR ALL OF EUROPE'S WOES

[Natalie Nougayrede](#) senior columnist in The Guardian comments: *In western Europe, we conveniently ignore our own faults – and show little compassion for our neighbours' troubled pasts. Acknowledging the pains that our eastern neighbours have endured, and paying tribute to the people power of 1989, might help defuse some of today's disputes. There's now a growing perception within [Europe](#) that one specific category of societies or citizens deserves to be labelled with scorn or condescending regret. That category is geographically defined: it's in the east. In Brussels, Paris, Berlin, and elsewhere in the western part of the continent, it's become almost common wisdom to say the "easterners" are spoilers in the EU club. Is that fair? We must face facts. The west that won the cold war no longer exists.*

Next year will mark the 30th anniversary of the 1989 revolutions that allowed Europe's reunification. The "east" has attained a kind of pariah status. Central and eastern Europeans, goes the logic, "just don't get" the European project: they're in it only for the money, they don't cooperate with Brussels as they should, they're troublesome, they're xenophobic, and they hanker for authoritarianism – what a success the club would be without them!

But aren't we forgetting something? Look at the outcome of Italy's recent elections: [anti-immigration populists and far-right extremists](#) are now slated to form the next government in the eurozone's third biggest economy. And what about Austria, where the [far-right Freedom party holds three key ministries](#)? In Germany, not only does the far-right [AfD control 92 seats in the Bundestag](#) (a first for an extremist party since the second world war), its ideology now seems to hold sway on how Bavaria's ruling CSU party is preparing for elections in the autumn in that powerful regional state. Nor can it be said that France, [despite Marine Le Pen's defeat](#), has rid itself of xenophobic and anti-Muslim sentiment.

To ascribe all Europe's woes to its eastern part is simplistic and in no small part disingenuous. Not only that, but "reading" Europe along east-west lines risks feeding the very divisions that pro-Europeans say they want to solve or repair. Tit-for-tat rhetoric is rife and historical complexes abound, with Germany's influence being an obvious source of resentment.

East-west relations within the EU are now so fraught that it's become tempting to moan about the consequences of Europe's reunification rather than to applaud it as a major accomplishment for human dignity and the freedom of nations to choose their own destiny, at the heart of a continent devastated by war and totalitarianism in the 20th century.

Western Europeans thought the bridging of psychological gaps that derive from differences in historical experiences would be easier. But in the east, overcoming the lingering trauma of having been part of Europe's "bloodlands", where the crimes of Nazism and Stalinism converged, remains an unfulfilled task – one that westerners can't fully grasp, simply because their memory is different.

The EU must defend its principles if it is to survive. But acknowledging the burden and the pains that our eastern neighbours endured, and paying tribute to the legacy of the [people power of 1989](#), might perhaps go a long way to defusing some of today's disputes.

*In Bratislava recently I met the writer Fedor Gál, one of the heroes of the 1989 uprising in Czechoslovakia. When I asked him about east-west tensions in today's Europe, he said this about his region: "We yet have to understand that Europe is a path, not just a source of income." If we want to find a way of relating to one another, and not just squabbling over quotas or money, we need to show we are aware of history. Calling out misbehaviour when it occurs is necessary, but not enough. We westerners carry our own share of responsibility for Europe's travails. We have to acknowledge that for us too, **the European project is a path.***

EYES OF EUROPE: EUROPE'S FUTURE NOW RESTS ON WHO OWNS THE STORY OF ITS PAST

[Natalie Nougayrède](#): "We must evaluate our common past, get to grips with it, and build on it"

- Large crowds of Greek people recently [protested against](#) the use of the name Macedonia by the neighbouring former Yugoslav republic.

In Paris, there is intense debate about whether the writer [Charles Maurras](#), a leading intellectual figure of French early 20th-century ultranationalism and antisemitism and a prominent supporter of the Vichy regime, should be listed among the names to be officially "commemorated" this year (he was born in 1868). Poland's new law aimed at curtailing any discussion of the role [some Poles played in the Holocaust](#) led to a spat with Israel and the US. In Germany, where the far-right AfD holds [94 seats in the Bundestag](#), a local Berlin politician (of Palestinian family background) last month [called for newly arrived migrants to be sent on mandatory visits to concentration camp memorials](#) to assist their "integration courses".

Rows about European history are hardly new. A long-running dispute in Austria over [what to do about the house where Hitler was born](#), in Braunau, is one example.

The legacy of colonialism is a recurring theme in French, British and Dutch debates. Populist regimes in Poland and Hungary have made a staple of rewriting history, or of approaching it very selectively, to suit their own political goals. Russia's aggression in Ukraine came accompanied with a full-blown propaganda operation about fighting "fascism". The Yugoslav wars of the 1990s were full of such manipulative rekindling of second world war rhetoric. And historical hang-ups aren't an exclusively European trait, of course. Witness how the Winter Olympics in Korea highlights again the trauma of a 65-year-old cold war frontline. See how in the US, the civil war is being debated with a ferocity and a frequency unseen since the 1960s civil rights movement.

*But such debates have a particular resonance in Europe because **the European project has rested from the outset on overcoming historical hatred and forging reconciliation.** The EU as it exists today was made possible not through the domination that comes with victory in arms, nor from a frozen armistice, but through patient, deliberative rapprochement. The Germans call this *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, a word that is [hard to translate](#) but means a combination of analysing the past, coming to grips with it, drawing lessons from it, and learning to live with it.*

The European project, at its core, set itself the political aim of overcoming 20th-century continental horrors.

Reconciliation is the bedrock on which the EU exists. That's why, for instance, the Greek attacks on Germany during the eurozone crisis (Angela Merkel was portrayed with a Nazi helmet by protesters in Athens) were so worrying. It's also why the 2015 refugee crisis, as it unfolded in the Balkans, led to fears that conflict might once again flare up in the region. History certainly didn't end in 1989 – but now it's back with a bang, just as we prepare to celebrate the centenary of the first world war armistice, signed in a railroad carriage outside Compiègne, northern France. In a recent debate, the American historian Francis Fukuyama said "identity politics are in fact politics of recognition". And national memories do need recognition, but that's not the same thing as whitewashing. The president of France, Emmanuel Macron – who likes to cast himself as a leader who will "relaunch" Europe – knows this well. He likes to refer to [Paul Ricoeur](#), the philosopher he worked for as a student. Ricoeur wrote books about history, memory and forgetting.

There is no shortage of official speeches about [Europe](#) that are full of historical references. What's harder to find are events, memorials, statements, educational programmes or museums where Europe's complex tapestry of distinct national histories are brought together in ways that help to understand the lives, histories and experiences of others on the continent.

Europeans still largely see their fellow Europeans' history through the lenses of their own national past. This surely accounts for much of the growing psychological gap between east and west, but also north and south.

Diverging interpretations of history can act as triggers to confrontation. To visit national or municipal history museums across Europe is to see at first hand this experience of fragmentation. No one has worked more than the Germans to account for past crimes but elsewhere, and for many reasons, Vergangenheitsbewältigung is still a work in progress, or yet to be fully embraced. I was mindful of this when I recently visited the local history museum in Marseille, which tells the story of a city that from 1830 onwards thrived as a port as the result of France's conquest of Algeria, but says little about the suffering that conquest inflicted.

(...)Europe's present angst, drawn from multiple crises and middle-class discontent, comes with a reappraisal of historical notions that were once deemed rock-solid but which no longer seem to be so. It's not exactly amnesia – rather, it's a frenzy of fragmented and controversial readings of history. Everything is up for grabs. Consensus on basic facts is no longer guaranteed.

*Last year a hundred historians and writers from different countries attempted to bring Europe's mosaic of separate memories together in a fascinating book published in Paris, titled *Europa, Our History* (sadly, it has not been translated into English). Also last year, EU institutions [inaugurated a museum in Brussels](#) devoted to Europe's common past and how the continent has tried to overcome its darkest chapters. It is designed to be interactive and attractive to younger generations. **We need more of this.***

Well yes indeed Natalie Nougayrède (senior Guardian columnist) is perfectly right in suggesting that we need much more of this. It means that we basically need a common Paneuropean educational system as well as a virtual democratic agora to forge a European public opinion that does not exist yet and basically a European folk instead of a German Nation, a French or Italian or Polish Republic, a Dutch Kingdom etc.

Need we repeat once more that Eyes of Europe stands exactly for that and also for a deliberate political and cultural *Ostpolitik* as the one conducted by the Germans Willy Brandt and Helmut Schmidt in the wake of General De Gaulle's rapprochement towards Russia.

Establishing a joyfully revolutionary "*counter-school*" on a European scale has become a priority, a *Pan-European* scale.

While everything is falling apart against a background of ultra-individualism, exchange in respect and mutual aid is now the only viable alternative. It is indeed EoE's objective to create a joyfully revolutionary European *counter-school!* that is striving for dialogue, mutual respect and interactions in real time. time.

Emmanuel Macron, who has just won the European Charlemagne Prize, seems to be keen on a spectacular rapprochement with Moscow. It is the same Macron who pleaded again for a generalization of the Erasmus project to the attention of adolescents who attend secondary education. That's basically what EoE is standing for.

Eyes of Europe, an autoactive education platform, is nothing less than a *virtual Erasmus Program for teenagers. Teenagers, so it seems, are becoming more and more addicted to technology and less and less in line and at ease with traditional school education.*

In the United States, nearly one in two teens permanently connected. 13-17 year olds are more connected than ever. In 2018, 45% of American teens said they were connected "almost all day" according to a study by the Pew Research Center. This is twice as much as in the previous similar study conducted in 2014-15. And 44% of these young people, aged between 13 and 17, say they go several times a day. Girls are more addicted than boys: 50% of them say they are connected to a service almost all the time compared to 39% of boys.

The smartphone has established itself as an omnipresent element in the lives of adolescents: 95% are equipped with it or have access to it when the proportion was only 73% in 2014-2015. How do they experience this hyperconnexion? Pretty good for the most part according to the study. 31% see it as a very beneficial impact, with the possibility of being in contact with friends and family at the forefront. Finding information easily and meeting people with the same interests are also seen as the real pluses brought by social networks. Almost one in four adolescents (24%) believe, on the contrary, that the impact of networks on their lives is mostly negative. The study was conducted between March 7 and April 10, 2018 with 1058 parents with adolescents between 13 and 17 years of age and 783 adolescents of these ages. (Aux États-Unis, près d'un adolescent sur 2 connecté en permanence; see [Ingrid Vergara](#) in *Le Figaro*)

The auto active educational platform Eyes of Europe has been developed with love and care for the last 21 years and it is still in the pipeline. It is high time that this generous and ambitious program gets finally realized.

It is high time we save Europe, we saved its vision and saved the planet. Eyes of Europe offers two things: a teaching of European culture and history as well as a permanent debate in real time with teenagers from all over Europe on current issues that are rarely tackled by educational structures organized on a national or regional basis.

These themes are notably: global warming, the demographic explosion, immigration, the crisis of democracy but also the art of living and the crisis of ethics...

Eyes of Europe stands for Europe in progress.

MARC GUIOT

Brussels, June 2018

The following graphic got supplementary installed by : www.elcor-international.org

