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GRAND ALLIANCE OF EUROPEAN POWERS
May 10, 1956

On Receiving the Charlemagne Prize,
Aachen, West Germany

It is for me a high honour to receive today the Charlemagne Prize in this famous German and European city of Aachen, which some call Aix-la-Chapelle.

I am proud too that my name should be added to the distinguished list of the recipients of the prize who have all contributed so notably to the inspiring theme of European unity and brotherhood. I find it particularly pleasing that my immediate predecessor should be the Federal Chancellor himself. No individual has conscientiously done more than Dr. Adenauer to bring Germany back into the circle of free nations who look out hopefully upon the future. I recall my first meeting with him at The Hague eight years ago, and I have followed with attention the great work which he has done for his country, and rejoiced in his success.

It was indeed a remarkable conception of Dr. Pfeiffer and his fellow-citizens of Aachen to have created this prize and to have shaped the terms of its award. The name of Charlemagne would occur naturally to you. Here is where Charles the Great was laid to rest. Before his sway, for hundreds of years after the Roman Empire had been broken into fragments, a far-reaching substratum of Europe's population had refused to accept as normal a world consisting of warring tribes, whose quarrels dominated their lives. Just as there was a universal church, people were then dimly aware that there should be some accepted authority to keep order within and prevent incursions from without. Thus the resurrection of the Roman Empire under Charles the Great on that Christmas Day at the turn of the eighth century was welcomed by almost all with a sigh of relief, in the hope that it heralded a return to the peace and prosperity and to the larger unity which had once existed.

The idea was too good to be true. Unity was preserved for less than fifty years. Wars rent Europe for more than a thousand years. Indeed it was exactly eleven hundred years after Charlemagne's death, that in 1914 a war fiercer and more devastating than any which had gone before broke out between the states whose frontiers lie so close to this city. I do not need to trace the succeeding quarter century of fitful peace and flickering hopes which came to an end in 1939. Nor is it necessary to-day further to lament the six years which followed. You in this city know them well—but not in such a way, I am glad to think, as to prevent you from receiving me as you have done.

I have not been in Germany since I came to attend the meeting at Potsdam eleven years ago. I had to leave before it was concluded because of a General Election at home, and I did not return. Much has happened in those eleven years. In fact, in the first two years Russia pursued a policy which divided her from her allies. We have now been told on high authority all-powerful, is now dead. During the Stalin policy a new United States on the one hand. This was indeed a historic achievement, which includes no less than fifteen and from Iceland to Italy a solemn affirmation of the union come back across the Atlantic part in maintaining it.

In these considerations our thoughts. I have always regarded the duties and privileges of France by the hand back into the unity is very large, and the former Charlemagne Prize by N.A.T.O. is a striking determination to build its own peace herejeforward. The hands together and are there a question has been raised by have a new Russia to deal with. Russia should not join in a deep and sincere peace. In a true Unity of Poland was already not yet recently come to pass. It is not time to recover her freedom. Above all, we should be rasing an European unity, of which we must avoid violence. To and death.

Equally, it would be what has been achieved by years. I have spoken much about it as the sole and ex unity. No one can doubt that the Committee, the Coal and Steel with all of which many of our main theme of salvation linked with Canada and the should not exclude Russia...
A Time of Triumph: 1956

been told on high authority that it was 'the Stalin policy'—and Stalin, who was then all-powerful, is now dead. But meanwhile events moved. There followed very speedily during the Stalin policy a reconciliation between the British Commonwealth and the United States on the one hand, and the great mass of Western Germany on the other. This was indeed an historic event. It led also to the formation of N.A.T.O. which now includes no less than fifteen countries, from Canada and the United States to Turkey, and from Iceland to Italy and Portugal. This Treaty in which Germany is a partner is a solemn affirmation of the unity of Europe, and of the resolve of the United States to come back across the Atlantic Ocean and take what cannot be less than the leading part in maintaining it.

In these considerations France and the valiant French people must be much in our thoughts. I have always felt—and I said at Zürich in 1946—that one of the supreme duties and privileges of France after 1945 was to bury all bitterness and lead Germany by the hand back into the European family. The French contribution to European unity is very large, and the German reception has been invaluable. The conceptions of a former Charlemagne Prize winner, M. Monnet, have played no small part therein. Now France is faced in North Africa with the gravest difficulties, and her allies should give her their full support in her efforts to reach a just settlement.

N.A.T.O. is a striking product and expression of a world wearied of war determined to build its own organization in such strength and power that there will be peace henceforward. The principle of the Treaty is simple and majestic. We all join hands together and are sworn to fight the aggressor, whoever he may be. A new question has been raised by the recent Russian repudiation of Stalin. If it is sincere we have a new Russia to deal with, and I do not see myself, why, if this be so, the new Russia should not join in the spirit of this solemn agreement. We must realize how deep and sincere are Russian anxieties about the safety of her homeland from foreign invasion. In a true Unity of Europe Russia must have her part. I was glad to see that Poland was already not unaffected by the changes in Russian outlook that have recently come to pass. It may be that other changes will follow. Czechoslovakia will recover her freedom. Above all, Germany will be reunited.

We should be rash and blameworthy were we to attempt to solve the problem of European unity, of which German reunification is a vital part, by any violent stroke. We must avoid violence. The only unity there might be then might be a unity of ashes and death.

Equally, it would be fatal for N.A.T.O. now to relax and let apathy overtake what has been achieved by the planning and financial sacrifices made in the last eight years. I have spoken much of N.A.T.O. and I do not wish to leave the impression that I regard it as the sole and exclusive effective expression of the moves towards European unity. No one can doubt the usefulness of the Western European Union, the Economic Committee, the Coal and Steel Community and the Council of Europe at Strasbourg, with all of which many of you here have been so closely concerned. But I believe that our main theme of salvation should be the Grand Alliance of the European powers, linked with Canada and the United States. I repeat that the spirit of this arrangement should not exclude Russia and the Eastern European states. It may well be that the
great issues which perplex us, of which one of the gravest is the reunification of Germany, could then be solved more easily than they can by rival blocks confronting each other with suspicion and hostility. That is for the future. Let us go forward to it by reinforcing patiently and surely the arrangements which we have so far achieved. I thank you for your welcome.
demography of the war

Demography, Table 1: Approximate war-related deaths of major combatant nations in the Second World War

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Military losses (000s)</th>
<th>Civilian losses (000s)</th>
<th>Total losses (000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Axis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7,674</td>
<td>3,080</td>
<td>10,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Allies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>7,400</td>
<td>9,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>14,201</td>
<td>24,042</td>
<td>38,343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approximate total war-related deaths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Military</th>
<th>Civilian</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>died in concentration camps</td>
<td>22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>died through bombing</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>died in Europe from other war-related causes</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>died in China from other war-related causes</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>28,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL LOSSES** 50,000

Notes: Casualty statistics are notoriously unreliable. Frumkin provides substantially lower estimates for Germany, Austria, Czechoslovakia, and higher estimates for Poland. Urtains estimates for the USSR are higher than those of the other two scholars, and the Americans, Singer and Small, produce higher estimates for American war deaths. It may be a rule that the nationality of the scholar tends to yield higher estimates of war casualties for his or her own nation.

Soviet losses are especially problematical. In 1946 Stalin produced a figure of 7 million which, it was supposed, covered military and civilian losses; in the 1960s, under Khrushchev, it became 'in excess of 20 millions'; by the early 1990s some estimates had increased this to 25-27 million; and the most recent estimate for indirect losses—which includes those urban—is some 48 million (see J. Erickson & D. Bills (eds.), Bearanssces: The Axis and the Allies, London, 1994, p. 258).

If battle casualties are uncertain, civilian casualties are impossible to verify. Concentration camp mortality, or the human costs of resistance or insurrectionary warfare in Europe, must remain conjectural, and the figures provided reflect those conjectures.

Estimates for Asian casualties are ever more uncertain. Chinese data are very sketchy and, given the magnitude of the disaster, likely to remain so. The reported estimate of 350,000 Japanese civilian war-related deaths is almost certainly too low. What is left out is the long-term effects of nuclear bombardment, and the deaths due to it which occurred ten or twenty years after the war.

States and Great Britain made substantial loans to their allies, as shown in Tables 7 and 8. In addition, France advanced $1,547,200,000 to Russia, of which Belguim received $434,125,000 and Japan loaned $324,000,000 to Russia.

### Table 7: ADVANCES TO ALLIES BY THE UNITED STATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Total forces mobilized</th>
<th>Forces in $3,330,000,000</th>
<th>To Russia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>$4,316,000,000</td>
<td>$1,547,200,000</td>
<td>$434,125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>$2,810,000,000</td>
<td>$777,000,000</td>
<td>$239,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>$2,640,000,000</td>
<td>$814,000,000</td>
<td>$245,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>$540,000,000</td>
<td>$174,000,000</td>
<td>$52,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Allied countries</td>
<td>$13,583,000,000</td>
<td>$4,316,000,000</td>
<td>$1,251,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $19,493,000,000, of which $5,333,000,000 was to Russia.

### Table 8: ADVANCES TO ALLIES BY GREAT BRITAIN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Total forces mobilized</th>
<th>Forces in $3,330,000,000</th>
<th>To Russia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>$2,789,000,000</td>
<td>$1,757,000,000</td>
<td>$527,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>$2,040,000,000</td>
<td>$660,000,000</td>
<td>$187,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>$2,500,000,000</td>
<td>$717,000,000</td>
<td>$211,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>$450,000,000</td>
<td>$143,000,000</td>
<td>$43,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Allied countries</td>
<td>$9,079,000,000</td>
<td>$2,640,000,000</td>
<td>$757,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $13,349,000,000, of which $4,377,000,000 was to Russia.

### Table 9: AMERICAN WAR CASUALTIES BY STATES AND TERRITORIES

| States and Territories | Total casualties killed or died | Total numbers of American military
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>13,200</td>
<td>3,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New western</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New midwest</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>3,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New south</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New area</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>3,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New total</td>
<td>65,830</td>
<td>15,921,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10: AMERICAN ARMY CASUALTIES IN WORLD WAR I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cause of death</th>
<th>Overseas</th>
<th>Domestic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Killed in action</td>
<td>36,976</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Died of wounds</td>
<td>23,850</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Died of disease</td>
<td>26,850</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Died of accident</td>
<td>2,540</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drown</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed suicide</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murdered</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executed</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Died of other causes</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36,976</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The rare distinction you have bestowed is a tribute to the role the American people have played in promoting peace, freedom and security in Europe over the last fifty years. The honor is greater still because of the contributions made by previous recipients of the prize toward realizing the ancient dream of European union.

Just as the Charlemagne Prize is special, so too is Aachen, an ancient shrine that remains at the center of what it means to be European. The seat of one empire, and for centuries, a volatile boundary between others. A place of healing waters, peace treaties, and the scene of furious fighting. With its liberation at the end of World War Two, Aachen became in a sense the first German city to join the post-war democratic order. Today, Aachen is both a sanctuary for sacred relics dating to the dawn of Christianity – and a crucible of Europe’s new information economy.

Here, Charlemagne’s name summons the memory not only of empire, but of something glimpsed for the first time during his life – a sense that the disparate peoples of earth’s smallest continent could live together as participants in a single civilization.

In its quest for unity, even at the point of a sword, and its devotion to the new idea that there was something called Europe, the Carolingian idea surpassed what came before, and to an extent guides us still. Twelve centuries ago, out of the long dark night of endless tribal wars, there emerged a light that somehow survived all the ravages of time, always burning brighter, always illuminating Europe’s way to the future.

Today, the bright and shining light of European union is a matter of the utmost importance not just to Europeans, but to everyone on this planet. Europe has shown the world humanity at its best and worst.

Some of the worst violence in Europe’s history was caused by men claiming the mantle of Charlemagne, who sought to impose European union for their own ends, without the consent of European people. History teaches that European union – not to mention transatlantic unity – must come from the considered judgment of free people, and must be for worthy purposes that, when threatened, must be defended.

The creators of this prize and its first winners understood that. We often say that theirs was the generation that rebuilt Europe after World War II. But they did far more. They build the foundation of something entirely new: a Europe united in common commitment to democracy, free markets and law. That achievement endured for half a century – but only for half a
continent. Then, eleven years ago, the Berlin Wall fell, and the Iron Curtain parted, opening at last the prospect of a Europe whole and free.

We will always remember 1989 for the Wall crumbling, to the powerful strains of Schiller’s Ode to Joy. It was a great moment of liberation, another 1789, or 1848. It was a particular triumph for the German people, whose unification defied adversity, and set the stage for the larger unification of Europe to follow.

But we too often forget that it was also a time of grave uncertainty. Soon, there were doubts about NATO’s future, accentuated by its slowness to confront evil in Bosnia and Croatia. There were fears that the EU’s efforts to come closer together would either fail, or fatally divide Europe from America. The countries of central and eastern Europe feared becoming a "gray zone" of poverty and insecurity. Many wondered if Russia was headed for a communist backlash or nationalist coup.

In January of 1994, I came to Europe for the first time as President, both to celebrate Europe’s new birth of freedom, and to build upon it. I spoke of a new conception of European security, based not on divided defense blocs, but on political, military and cultural integration. This new security idea required the transatlantic alliance to do for Europe’s east what we did for Europe’s west after World War Two.

Together, we lowered trade barriers. We supported young democracies. We adapted NATO to new challenges, expanded our alliance across Europe’s old divide, and kept the door open to more new members. We made clear, and I repeat today, that NATO enlargement will continue. The EU took in three new members, opened negotiations with others, and created a single market with one currency. We stood by Russians struggling to build democracy, and opened the way to a partnership between Russia and NATO, and between Ukraine and NATO. We defended the values at the heart of our vision of an undivided Europe, acting to stop the ethnic cleansing in Bosnia and forging what I believe will be an enduring peace. We acted decisively in Kosovo, in one of our alliance’s finest moments. We are standing with crusaders for tolerance and freedom from Croatia to Slovakia to Serbia. A year ago in Germany, we launched a Stability Pact for Southeast Europe. We are encouraging reconciliation between Turkey and Greece.

Yes, there have been setbacks. But Europe today is unquestionably more united, more democratic, more peaceful than ever before. Both Europe and America should be proud.

Think about how much has changed. All across the continent, borders built to stop tanks now manage invasions of tourists and trucks. Europe’s fastest growing economies are now on the other side of the old Iron Curtain. And Vaclav Havel finally has spent more years being president than he spent in prison! At NATO headquarters, the flags of 19 allies and 27 partners fly. In central and eastern Europe, the realistic dream of membership in the EU and NATO has sparked the resolution of almost every old ethnic and border dispute. We are close to our goal of a Europe in which every nation is free, and every free nation is our partner.

In southeast Europe, Bosnians are still fighting -- but at the ballot box. Croatia is a democracy. Soldiers from almost every European country, including bitter former adversaries, are keeping
the peace in Kosovo. Last year, as German troops marched through the Balkan countryside, they were hailed as liberators. What a wonderful way to end the century!

In the meantime, Russia has stayed on the path of democracy, though its people have suffered bitter hardships and tragedies like the cruel war in Chechnya, which may well prove self-defeating because of civilian casualties. It has withdrawn its troops from the Baltic States, accepted the independence of its neighbors, and completed the first democratic transition in its thousand year history.

European unity is producing something really new under the sun. Common institutions that are bigger than the nation-state, at the same time, a devolution of democratic authority downward. Scotland and Wales have their own parliaments. This week, Northern Ireland’s new government was restored. Europe is alive with the sound of ancient place names being spoken again – Catalonia, Piedmont, Lombardy, Silesia, Transylvania, Ruthenia – not in the name of separatism, but in the spirit of healthy pride and heritage. National sovereignty is being enriched by local voices making Europe safe for diversity, reaffirming our common humanity, reducing the chance that European disunity will embroil Europe and America in another large conflict. Europe’s security remains tied to America’s security. When it is threatened, as it was in Bosnia and Kosovo, we will always respond. When it is being built, we will always take part.

Europe’s peace also sets a powerful example to other parts of the world that remain divided along ethnic, religious, and national lines. Even today, Europe has internal disputes over fundamental questions of sovereignty, political power, and economic policy. These matters are really no less consequential than the disputes over which people fight and die in many parts of the world. Today, instead of fighting and dying over them, Europeans argue about them in Brussels, in a spirit of cooperation and mutual respect.

But the whole world should take notice: if western Europe could come together following the carnage of World War II, if central Europe could do it following 50 years of communism, it can be done anywhere.

Of course, the job of building a united Europe is certainly not finished. It is important not to take self-congratulation too far. Instead, we should focus on two big pieces of unfinished business, and one enduring challenge.

The first piece of unfinished business is to make southeast Europe fully, finally, and forever part of the rest of Europe. That is the only way to make peace last in that bitterly divided region. It cannot be done by forcing people to live together – there is no bringing back the old Yugoslavia. It cannot be done by giving every community its own country, army and flag – shifting so many borders in the Balkans will only shake the peace. Our goal must be to de-Balkanize the Balkans, to create a magnet to bring people together that is more powerful than the polarizing pull of old hatreds.

That’s what the Stability Pact that Germany helped establish is designed to do, challenging the nations of southeast Europe to reform their economies and strengthen their democracies, and pledging more than $6 billion to support their efforts. Now we must quickly turn those pledges
into positive changes in ordinary people’s lives, as we steadily bring those nations into western institutions.

We also must remain unrelenting in our support for a democratic transition in Serbia. For if there is to be a future for democracy and tolerance in this region, there can be no future for Mr. Milosevic and his policy of ethnic hatred and cleansing.

If southeast Europe is to be fully integrated into the continent, Turkey must also be included. I applaud the EU’s decision to treat Turkey as a real candidate for membership. I hope both Turkey and the EU will take the next steps. It will be good for Turkey, good for southeast Europe, good for more rapid reconciliation between Turkey and Greece, and good for the entire world, still too divided by faith.

Our second piece of unfinished business concerns Russia. We must work to build a partnership with a Russia that encourages stability, democracy, and cooperative engagement with the west, and full integration with global institutions.

Only time will tell what Russia’s ultimate role in Europe will be. We do not yet know if Russia’s hard won democratic freedoms will endure. We don’t know whether it will define its greatness in yesterday’s terms, or tomorrow’s. The Russian people will make those decisions. Though Russia’s transformation is incomplete, there is reason for hope in Russia’s great journey from dictatorship to democracy, from communism to the market, from empire to nation-state, from adversary to partner in reducing the nuclear threat. Because the stakes are so high, we must do everything we can to encourage a Russia that is full democratic, and united in diversity, a Russia that defines its greatness not by dominance of its neighbors but by the dominant achievements of its people and its partnerships. That Russia should be, indeed must be, fully part of Europe.

That means no doors can be sealed shut to Russia: not NATO’s, not the EU’s. The alternative would be a future of harmful competition between Russia and the west, and the end of our vision of an undivided continent. As Winston Churchill said when he received the Charlemagne Prize in the far darker days of 1956, “in a true Unity of Europe, Russia must have her part.”

Of course, Russia may very well decide it has no interest in formally joining European or transatlantic institutions. In that case, we must make sure that as the EU and NATO expand, their eastern borders become gateways to Russia, instead of barriers to travel, trade and security cooperation. We will need to build real institutional links with Russia, as NATO has begun to do. It won’t be easy. There is mistrust to be overcome – on both sides. But it is possible – and absolutely necessary.

The steps necessary to bring southeast Europe and Russia into the embrace of European unity illustrate the continued importance of the transatlantic alliance to Europe and to America. The enduring challenge we face is to preserve and strengthen our alliance as Europe continues its coming together. We’ve agreed on the principles and laid the foundations. But the future we are building will look very different from anything we’ve ever known. In a generation, the EU may have as many as 30 members, from the Baltics, to the Balkans, to Turkey – a community of unprecedented cultural, political and economic diversity and vitality.
It will be a bigger Europe than Charlemagne ever dared dream of, a reflection of our recognition
that ultimately, Europe is a unifying idea as much as a particular place. An expansive continent
of different peoples who embrace a common destiny, play by the same rules, and affirm the same
truths: that ethnic and religious and racial hatred is unacceptable ... that human rights are
inalienable and universal ... that our differences are a source of strength, not weakness ... that
conflicts must be resolved by arguments, not arms.

I believe America must continue to support Europe's most ambitious unification efforts. And I
believe Europe should want to strengthen our alliance even as its grows stronger. The alliance
has been the bedrock of our security for a half-century. It can be the foundation on which all our
common future is built.

It is easy to point out our differences. Many do. But we must keep a healthy perspective.
Consider these headlines about US-European disputes: "Allies complain of Washington's heavy
Rally Against American Arms Plan." Well, the first is from the Suez crisis in 1956.
The second is from 1966, when France left NATO's military command. The third is from the
1981 Siberian pipeline crisis. The fourth is from 1986, during the debate about deploying
intermediate nuclear missiles in Europe.

We have always had our differences. We always will. But the simple fact is that, as Europe is
an idea as much as a place, America is a part of Europe, bound by ties of family, history and
values. More than ever, we are actually connected. Underwater cables allow us to send
staggering amounts of email and e-commerce to each other, instantaneously. A billion
dollars in trade and investment goes back and forth every day, employing more than 14 million people on
both sides of the Atlantic. And there is the enduring connection: the 104,000 Americans who lie
in military cemeteries across Europe. Today’s Europe would not be possible without them.
Whatever work I have done to merit your prize was built on their sacrifice.

Beyond our real disagreements, there will always be misperceptions on both sides of the Atlantic
that we must work to overcome. There is a perception right now in America, for example, that
Europe doesn't always carry its weight for our mutual responsibilities. Yet Europeans are
providing more than 80 percent of the troops keeping the peace in Kosovo and of the funds for
economic reconstruction. And few Americans know that Europeans paid for more than 60% of
all aid to Central America when it was ravaged by Hurricane Mitch, or that Europe provided a
third of all support for peace in Guatemala, in America’s back yard.

At the same time, there is a perception in Europe that America's power -- military, economic,
cultural -- is at times too overwhelming. Perhaps our role in NATO's air campaign in Kosovo
accentuated the fears. But in Kosovo, America exercised its power in alliance with Europe, in
pursuit of our shared interest in European peace and stability, in defense of values central to the
goal of European integration.
If, after Kosovo, European countries strengthen their born ability to act with greater authority and responsibility in times of crisis, while maintaining the transatlantic link, that is a good thing. There is no contradiction between a strong Europe and a strong transatlantic partnership.

That partnership remains profoundly important. Together, we account for more than half the world’s economy, and 90 percent of its humanitarian aid. If we are going to win the fight against terrorism, crime, and the spread of weapons of mass destruction; if we want to promote ethnic, religious, and racial tolerance; if we want to combat global warming, fight infectious disease, ease poverty, close the digital divide, we must do so together. Europe and America should draw strength from the transatlantic alliance. Europe should not be threatened by it. And America must not listen to those who say we should “go it alone.”

America must remain a good partner and a good ally to Europe. Lord Palmerston's rule that countries have no permanent alliances, only permanent interests, does not apply to our relationship. America has a permanent interest in a permanent alliance with Europe, a shared future rooted in a shared history.

The American Revolution stemmed in part from the Seven Years War, which in turn stemmed from a treaty signed in this city in 1748. A few days ago I stood at the mouth of the Targus river in Lisbon. From that spot, over five centuries ago, European explorers began to explore the far reaches of our planet, crossing unimaginable distances and conquering indescribable adversity on their way to Asia, Africa and the Americas. In their wake, the sons and daughters of this continent came across the Atlantic to populate places they called New Spain, New England, New France, New Netherlands, Nova Scotia, New Sweden ... in short, a New Europe. Without the longing for a New Europe – the same longing that motivates us still – there never would have been an America in the first place.

We should never let a sense of history's inevitability cloud our wonder that one continent changed the rest of the world through its enterprise and imagination, its capacity to change and grow -- qualities that will always define Europe's identity more truthfully than any mapmaker ever can.

In the years ahead, as pilgrims of peace come to Aachen, I hope they reflect on the similarity of two monumental ideas enshrined here. First, the architectural magnificence of the cathedral holding Charlemagne’s mortal remains, begun in his lifetime, added to throughout the Middle Ages, and repaired in the 20th century when our failure to keep the peace required it. And second, the peace and unity that three generations have now been building across the span of five decades, a work far from complete, perhaps never to be completed, but completely worthy of our labors and dreams. Let us keep building the cathedral of European unity and our alliance for freedom. Because I have laid a stone or two, I am honored and humbled to accept your prize.
You have bestowed a great privilege upon me today. To receive the Charlemagne Prize is a rare distinction. It is all the more humbling to receive it as an American, and I accept it as a tribute to the role the American people have played in promoting peace in Europe over the last fifty years. I am honored to stand in the presence of previous recipients, here today in both body and spirit. Each in their way advanced a process larger than any of them: the translation of the ancient dream of European union into an everyday reality.

Just as the Charlemagne Prize is special, so too is Aachen. This ancient shrine has known two names, and countless rulers, but it has always had a single destiny. To this day, Aachen remains at the center of the broad circumference of what it means to be European. The seat of one empire, and for centuries, a volatile boundary between others. A place of healing waters and peace treaties, and the scene of furious fighting, including its liberation at the end of World War Two, when, in a sense, Aachen became the first German city to join the post-war democratic order. A sanctuary for sacred relics dating to the dawn of Christianity – and a crucible of the new information economy already writing the future for a new generation of Europeans.

Aachen is a fitting place to reflect on tomorrow’s Europe because here we are forced to reckon with all of Europe’s past, from the glorious to the unspeakable.

The name Charlemagne summons the memory not only of empire, but of something glimpsed for the first time during his life – a sense that the disparate peoples of our smallest continent could live together, with all their differences, as participants in a single civilization.
To be sure, it was a civilization that defined itself at the point of a sword. But in its quest for unity, and its devotion to the new idea that there was something called Europe, the Carolingian idea surpassed what came before, and to an extent guides us still. Twelve centuries ago, out of the long night of darkness that enveloped the endlessly warring tribes of this region, there emerged a light, dim at first, but steadily brighter, that has never stopped illuminating Europe’s future. So powerful was the idea that hundreds of years after his death, Charlemagne was remembered as a giant, eight feet tall, simply for thinking it at all.

My purpose today is to say, on behalf of those who do not inhabit Europe, that the deepening and broadening of European union is a matter of the utmost importance to everyone on this planet. Because of what Europe has done and still does to enlighten humanity ... and because it also has suffered terrible cruelty and carnage.

The facts do not lie: 20 million dead in the first World War. 50 million dead in the second. Even after the fall of the Berlin Wall, a quarter million killed in the Balkans.

Some of the worst violence in Europe’s history was caused by people claiming the mantle of Charlemagne: specifically, Napoleon and Hitler, who sought to impose European union without the consent of European people. History teaches that European union – not to mention transatlantic unity – cannot be an end in itself. If we come together, it must be for a worthy purpose. And when that purpose is threatened, we must be willing to defend it together, or our unity means nothing.

The creators of this prize and its first winners understood that. We often say that theirs was the generation that rebuilt Europe after World War II. But that is not right. Their achievement was not to rebuild the old Europe, but to build here something entirely new: a Europe united around principles of democracy, free markets and law.
That achievement endured for half a century – but only for half a continent. Then, eleven years ago, the Berlin Wall fell, the Iron Curtain parted, and we witnessed the flowering of a thousand visions of a Europe whole and free.

In our memory, we see the Wall crumbling, and hear Schiller's Ode to Joy, and remember it as a moment of great liberation for the human spirit; another 1789, or 1848. It was a particular triumph for the German people, whose unification defied adversity from within and without, and set the stage for the larger unification of Europe to follow.

But we too often forget that it was also a time of grave uncertainty. Soon, there were doubts about NATO's future, accentuated by its slowness to confront evil in Bosnia and Croatia. There were fears that the EU's efforts to come closer together would either fail, or fatally divide Europe from America. NATO continued to maintain the Iron Curtain as its eastern frontier. The countries of central and eastern Europe feared becoming a "gray zone" of poverty and insecurity. Many wondered if Russia was headed for a communist backlash or nationalist coup. Vaclav Havel warned us then that "just as it is impossible for one half of a room to be forever warm and the other cold, it is equally unthinkable that two different Europes could forever exist next to each other without detriment to both."

In January of 1994, I came to Europe for the first time as President, both to celebrate Europe's new birth of freedom, and to build upon it. I spoke of a new conception of security in Europe, based not on the defense of one bloc against another, but on integration -- politically, militarily, and economically. With our allies, we set out to do for Europe's east what we did for Europe's west after World War Two.

Together, we lowered barriers to trade. We supported young democracies. We adapted NATO to new challenges, and expanded our alliance across Europe's old divide. We made clear, and I
repeat today, that NATO enlargement will continue. The EU took in three new members, opened negotiations with others, and created a single market with one currency. We stood by Russians struggling to build democracy, and opened the way to a partnership between Russia and NATO. We defended the values at the heart of our vision of an undivided Europe, acting to stop the ethnic cleansing in Bosnia and forging what I believe will be an enduring peace. We acted decisively in Kosovo, with unshakable unity, in one of our alliance's finest moments. We stood with crusaders for tolerance and freedom from Croatia to Slovakia to Serbia. A year ago in Germany, we launched a Stability Pact for Southeast Europe. We encouraged reconciliation between Turkey and Greece.

There have been setbacks, some small, some great. But I am very proud of what Europe and America have achieved together. For Europe today is unquestionably more united, more democratic, more peaceful than at any time in its history.

Think about how much has changed. All across the continent, borders built to stop tanks now manage invasions of tourists and trucks. Europe's fastest growing economies are now on the other side of the old Iron Curtain. And Vaclav Havel finally has spent more years being president than he spent in prison! At NATO headquarters, the flags of 19 allies and 27 partners fly. In central and eastern Europe, the realistic dream of membership in NATO and EU has sparked the resolution of almost every old ethnic and border dispute. We are close to our goal of a Europe in which every nation is free, and every free nation is our partner.

Look to southeast Europe. Bosnians are still fighting -- but at the ballot box. Croatia is a democracy. Soldiers from almost every European country, the most bitter former adversaries among them, are keeping the peace in Kosovo. Last year, we were moved by the image of German troops marching through the Balkan countryside, hailed as liberators by a people longing to be free. That was a wonderful way to end the century.
In the meantime, Russia has not wandered from the path of democracy, though its people have suffered bitter hardships and tragedies like the cruel and self-defeating war in Chechnya. It has withdrawn its troops from the Baltic States, accepted the independence of its neighbors, and completed the first democratic transition in its thousand year history.

And if we look even more closely, we can see something really new under the sun. As Europeans in Brussels evolve common institutions that are bigger than the nation-state, at the same time, democratic authority is devolving downward. Scotland and Wales have their own parliaments. This week, Northern Ireland’s new government was restored. Sovereignty is still crucial; borders still matter. Across the continent, local authorities are forging new links and new structures. Europe is alive with the sound of ancient place names being spoken again — Catalonia, Piedmont, Lombardy, Silesia, Transylvania, Ruthenia — not in the name of separatism, but in the spirit of healthy pride and heritage. Together, we are making Europe safe for diversity.

This is obviously good for Europe. It is good for America, too, because it reduces the chance we will again be called on to fight as a result of European disunity. Europe’s security is America’s security. When that security is threatened, as it was in Bosnia and Kosovo, we will always respond. When it is being built, we will always take part.

Europe’s peace also sets a powerful example to other parts of the world that are divided, as most of Europe once was, along ethnic, religious, and national lines. Think about it. Even today, Europe has internal disputes over fundamental questions of sovereignty, political power, and economic policy. The matters Europeans argue about every day in Brussels are really no less consequential than, say, the dispute over which Ethiopians and Eritreans are killing one another in a senseless war. That would be unthinkable today in the part of Europe where borders unite...
rather than divide, where nations cooperate, not compete to protect their security and build their prosperity.

I want the whole world to know: if western Europe could do it following the carnage of World War II, if central Europe could do it following 50 years of communism, it can be done anywhere.

But the job certainly is not finished in Europe. I believe we are faced with two big pieces of unfinished business, and one enduring challenge.

The first piece of unfinished business is to work for the day when southeast Europe is fully, finally, and forever part of the rest of Europe. That is the only way to make peace last in that bitterly divided region. It cannot be done by forcing people to live together -- the old Yugoslavia tried that and failed. It cannot be done by giving every community its own country, army and flag -- for there is no way to shift borders in the Balkans without shaking the peace. Our goal must be to de-Balkanize the Balkans.

That's what the Stability Pact that Germany helped establish is designed to do. Through it, we have made clear we expect the nations of southeast Europe to reform their economies and strengthen their democracies -- and together we have pledged more than $6 billion to support their efforts. Now we must urgently translate those commitments into the reality of people's lives in the region. We have pledged to bring those nations steadily into western institutions so they feel a unifying magnet more powerful than the pull of old hatreds that once tore them apart.

We also must unrelentingly support a democratic transition in Serbia. For if there is to be a future for democracy and tolerance in this region, there can be no future for Mr. Milosevic and his policy of manipulating human differences for inhuman ends.
Another critical part of southeast Europe is Turkey. It also is inextricably a part of Europe, by its geography, and by its aspiration to form common cause with the rest of the continent. I have long urged the EU to treat Turkey as a real candidate for membership. I applaud the EU for doing just that. I hope both Turkey and the EU will take the next steps. It will be good for Turkey. It will be good for southeast Europe, and speed reconciliation between Turkey and Greece. It will be good for the entire world, far too divided by faith.

Our second piece of unfinished business concerns Russia. In the short run, we must work to build the right kind of partnership with a Russia that is stable, democratic, and cooperatively engaged with the west, fully integrated with global institutions. In the long run, we and Russia must decide together what that great country's ultimate role in Europe will be.

We do not yet know if Russia's hard won democratic freedoms will endure. That will be decided by the people of Russia. We don't know whether it will define its strength in yesterday's terms, or tomorrow's. But we must be open to either possibility. We know how much Russia has overcome in its journey from dictatorship to democracy, from communism to the market, from empire to nation-state. And we ought to have some humility before the future. Though Russia's journey is incomplete, we must not foreclose the best possible outcome – a Russia that realizes the dream of reformers past and present to be fully part of Europe.

That means no doors can be sealed shut to Russia: not NATO's, not the EU's. The alternative would be to guarantee a future of harmful competition between Russia and the west ... to give up our vision of an undivided continent ... to give in to the prejudice that Russia's destiny lies outside of Europe. As Winston Churchill said when he received the Charlemagne Prize in the far darker days of 1956, "in a true Unity of Europe, Russia must have her part."
Of course, Russia may very well decide it has no interest in formally joining European or transatlantic institutions. In that case, we must make sure that as the EU and NATO expand, their eastern borders become gateways to Russia, instead of barriers to travel, trade and security cooperation. We will need to build real institutional links with Russia, as NATO has begun to do. It won't be easy. There is mistrust to be overcome – on both sides. But I believe it is possible. I also believe it is necessary.

Today, I believe we have to start thinking creatively about the final destination of our journey to an undivided, democratic, peaceful transatlantic community. We've agreed on the principles and laid the foundations. But the structure we are building will look very different from anything we've ever known. In a generation, for example, the EU may have as many as 30 members, from the Baltics, to the Balkans, to Turkey – a community of unprecedented cultural, political and economic vitality.

It will be a bigger Europe than Charlemagne ever dared dream. And it will be based on our recognition that ultimately, Europe is an idea as much as a place. An expansive continent of different peoples who embrace a common destiny, play by the same rules, and affirm the same truths: that ethnic and religious and racial hatred is unacceptable ... that human rights are inalienable and universal ... that our differences are a source of strength, not weakness.

Of course, Europe's future is Europe's choice. But I believe America must continue to support Europe's most ambitious efforts to forge deeper unity. It is very much in our interest.

The enduring challenge we will face, as Europe grows wider and deeper, is to preserve and strengthen the transatlantic alliance, the bedrock of our security for a half-century, and the foundation on which all our other dreams will be built. It is easy to point out our differences. Many do. But we must keep a healthy perspective. Consider these headlines about US-European disputes, and see if you find them familiar: "Allies complain of Washington's heavy
"Protestors Rally Against American Arms Plan." Well, the first is from the Suez crisis in 1956. The second is from 1966, when France left NATO's military command. The third is from the 1981 Siberian pipeline crisis. The fourth is from 1986, during the debate about deploying intermediate nuclear missiles in Europe.

The truth is, I believe our partnership is stronger today than it's ever been before.

The simple fact is that America is a part of Europe; if not the landmass proper, then certainly the set of ideas emanating from it. And more than that. We are connected. Underwater cables allow us to send staggering amounts of email and e-commerce to each other, instantaneously. A billion dollars in trade and investment goes back and forth every day, employing more than 14 million people on both sides of the Atlantic. And there is this enduring connection, which outweighs all the rest: there are 104,000 Americans lying in military cemeteries across Europe. Today would not be possible without them. I proudly accept this prize on their behalf as well.

There will always be perceptions on both sides of the Atlantic that we must work to overcome. There is a perception right now in America, for example, that Europe doesn't always carry its weight in our division of responsibility. But right now, Europeans are providing more than 85 percent of the troops keeping the peace in Kosovo and have pledged more than 87% of the funds for economic reconstruction. And few Americans know that Europeans paid for more than 60% of all aid to Central America and the Caribbean when they were ravaged by Hurricanes Mitch and Georges, and a third of all support for peace in Guatemala and El Salvador.

At the same time, there is a perception in Europe that America's power -- military, economic, cultural -- is at times too overwhelming. I know that our role in NATO's air campaign in Kosovo accentuated these fears, and I can understand that. But in Kosovo, America exercised its power
in alliance with Europe, in pursuit of our shared interest in European peace and stability, in defense of values central to the goal of European integration.

If one result of Kosovo is that European countries strengthen their ability to act in times of crisis, if Europeans take on greater authority and responsibility while maintaining the transatlantic link, that is a good thing. I have always believed that here is no contradiction between a strong Europe and a strong transatlantic partnership. A stronger Europe is stronger partner for America.

There has never been a time in history when that partnership has been more important. Together, we account for more than half the economy of the world, and 90 percent of its humanitarian aid. If we are going to win the fight against terrorism, crime, and the spread of weapons of mass destruction; if we want to promote ethnic, religious, and racial tolerance; if we want to protect the environment, fight infectious disease, ease poverty, close the digital divide, we must do so together. Europe should draw strength from the transatlantic alliance. Europe should not be threatened by the transatlantic alliance. And America must not listen to those who say in the face of what are clearly common challenges: "go it alone, or don't go at all."

America is determined to remain a good partner and a good ally to Europe. Our relationship may be the one exception to Lord Palmerston's rule that countries have no permanent alliances, only permanent interests. America has a permanent interest in a permanent alliance with Europe.

I would like to end these remarks by restating a truth that I see as central to American and European history. We share both a common origin and a common future. The American Revolution stemmed in part from the Seven Years War, which in turn stemmed from a treaty signed in this city in 1748. A few days ago I stood at the mouth of the Targus river in Lisbon. From that spot, over five centuries ago, European explorers began to explore the far reaches of our planet, crossing unimaginable distances and conquering indescribable adversity on their way
to Asia, Africa and the Americas. From thousands of cities and villages, the sons and daughters of this continent came across the Atlantic to populate places they called New Spain, New England, New France, New Netherlands, Nova Scotia, New Sweden... in short, a New Europe. Without the longing for a New Europe – the same longing that motivates us still – there never would have been an America in the first place.

We should never let a sense of history’s inevitability cloud our wonder that one continent changed the rest of the world through its enterprise, imagination, and capacity to grow -- qualities that will always define Europe’s identity more truthfully than any mapmaker ever can.

In the years ahead, as pilgrims of peace come to Aachen, I hope they reflect on the similarity of two monumental ideas enshrined here. The architectural magnificence of the cathedral holding Charlemagne’s mortal remains, begun in his lifetime, added to throughout the Middle Ages, and repaired in the 20th century when our failure to keep the peace required it. And the peace and unity that three generations have now been building across the span of five decades, though far from complete, and perhaps never to be completed. It requires a certain dedication to devote your life to a task that you will not live to see finished. Here, in the very cradle of Europe, I feel confident that we possess that dedication.
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You have bestowed a great privilege upon me today. To receive the Charlemagne Prize is a rare distinction. It is all the more humbling to receive it as an American, and I accept it as a tribute to the role the American people have played in promoting peace in Europe over the last fifty years. I am honored to stand in the presence of previous recipients, here today in both body and spirit. Each in their way advanced a process larger than any of them: the translation of the ancient dream of European union into an everyday reality.

Just as the Charlemagne Prize is special, so too is Aachen. This ancient shrine has known two names, and countless rulers, but it has always had a single destiny. To this day, Aachen remains at the center of the broad circumference of what it means to be European. The seat of one empire, and for centuries, a volatile border between others. A place of peacemaking, and the scene of furious fighting, including its liberation at the end of World War Two, when, in a sense, Aachen became the first German city to join the post-war democratic order. A sanctuary for sacred relics dating to the dawn of Christianity – and a crucible of the new information economy already writing the future for a new generation of Europeans.

Aachen is a fitting place to reflect on tomorrow’s Europe because here we are forced to reckon with all of Europe’s past, from the glorious to the unspeakable. The name Charlemagne summons the memory not only of empire, but of something glimpsed for the first time during his life – a sense that the disparate peoples of our smallest continent could live together, with all their differences, as participants in a single civilization.
To be sure, it was a civilization that defined itself at the point of a sword. But in its quest for unity, and its devotion to the new idea that there was something called Europe, the Carolingian idea surpassed what came before, and to an extent guides us still. Twelve centuries ago, out of the long night of darkness that enveloped the endlessly warring tribes of this region, there emerged a light, dim at first, but steadily brighter, that has never stopped illuminating Europe’s future. So powerful was the idea that hundreds of years after his death, Charlemagne was remembered as a giant, eight feet tall, simply for thinking it at all.

My purpose today is to say, on behalf of those who do not inhabit Europe, that the deepening and broadening of European union is a matter of the utmost importance to everyone on this planet. Because of what Europe has done and still does to enlighten humanity ... because it has also been a place of terrible cruelty and carnage.

The facts do not lie: 20 million dead in the first World War. 50 million dead in the second. Even after the fall of the Berlin Wall, a quarter million killed in the Balkans.

And we must candidly observe that some of the worst violence in Europe’s history was caused by people claiming the mantle of Charlemagne: specifically, Napoleon and Hitler, who sought to impose European union without the consent of European people. History teaches that European union – not to mention transatlantic unity – cannot be an end in itself. If we come together, it must be for a worthy purpose. And when that purpose is threatened, we must be willing to defend it together, or our unity means nothing.

The creators of this prize and its first beneficiaries understood that. We often say that theirs was the generation that rebuilt Europe after World War II. But that is not right. Their achievement was not to rebuild the old Europe, but to build here something entirely new: a Europe united around principles of democracy, free markets and law.
That achievement endured for half a century – but only for half a continent. Then, eleven years ago, the Berlin Wall fell, the Iron Curtain parted, and we witnessed the flowering of a thousand visions of a Europe whole and free.

In our memory, we see the Wall crumbling, and hear Schiller’s Ode to Joy, and remember it as a moment of great liberation for the human spirit; another 1789, or 1848. It was a particular triumph for the German people, whose unification, led by Chancellor Kohl, defied adversity from within and without, and set the stage for the larger unification of Europe to follow.

But we too often forget that it was also a time of grave uncertainty. Soon, there were doubts about NATO’s future, accentuated by its slowness to confront evil in Bosnia and Croatia. There were fears that the EU’s efforts to come closer together would either fail, or fatally divide Europe from America. NATO continued to maintain the Iron Curtain as its eastern frontier. The countries of central and eastern Europe feared becoming a "gray zone" of poverty and insecurity. Many wondered if Russia was headed for a communist backlash or nationalist coup. Vaclav Havel warned us then that "just as it is impossible for one half of a room to be forever warm and the other cold, it is equally unthinkable that two different Europes could forever exist next to each other without detriment to both." But by the early years of the last decade, too little had been done to heed that warning.

In January of 1994, I came to Europe for the first time as President. With our allies, we endorsed a plan for Europe’s future that would harness the optimism of 1989, and address the instability threatening it. Specifically, I made clear that America would support deeper European integration, and in harness with our allies, undertake to do for Europe’s east what we did together for Europe’s west after World War II.
We lowered barriers to trade. We supported young democracies. We adapted NATO to new challenges, and expanded our alliance across Europe's old divide. We made clear, and I repeat today, that NATO enlargement will continue. The EU took in three new members, opened negotiations with others, and created a single market with one currency. We stood by Russians struggling to build democracy, opened the way to a partnership between Russia and NATO. We remembered the imperative of defending the values at the heart of our vision of an undivided Europe, acting to stop the ethnic cleansing in Bosnia and forging what I believe will be an enduring peace. We acted decisively in Kosovo and have stood with crusaders for tolerance and freedom from Croatia to Slovakia to Serbia. A year ago in Germany, we launched a Stability Pact for Southeast Europe. We encouraged reconciliation between Turkey and Greece.

There have been setbacks, some small, some great. But I am very proud of what Europe and America have achieved together. For Europe today is unquestionably more united, more democratic, more peaceful than at any time in its history.

Think about how much has changed. All across the continent, borders built to stop tanks now manage invasions of tourists and trucks. Europe's fastest growing economies are now on the other side of the old Iron Curtain. And Vaclav Havel finally has spent more years being president than he spent in prison! At NATO headquarters, the flags of 19 allies and 27 partners fly. In central and eastern Europe, the realistic dream of membership in NATO and EU has sparked the resolution of almost every old ethnic and border dispute. We are close to our goal of a Europe in which every nation is free, and every free nation is our partner.

Look to southeast Europe. Bosnians are still fighting -- but at the ballot box. Croatia is a democracy. Soldiers from almost every European country, the most bitter former adversaries among them, are keeping the peace in Kosovo. Last year, we were moved to the marrow by the
image of German troops marching through the Balkan countryside, hailed as liberators by a people longing to be free. That was a wonderful way to end the century.

In the meantime, Russia has not wandered from the path of democracy, though its people have endured bitter hardships and tragedies like the cruel and self-defeating war in Chechnya. It has withdrawn its troops from the Baltic States, accepted the independence of its neighbors, and completed the first democratic transition in its thousand year history.

And if we look even more closely, we will see something really new under the sun. As Europeans in Brussels evolve common institutions that are bigger than the nation-state, at the same time, democratic authority is devolving downward. Scotland and Wales have their own parliaments. This week, Northern Ireland’s new assembly and executive were restored. Sovereignty is still crucial; borders still matter. But across the continent, local governments and regions are forging links across them. Europe is alive with the sound of ancient place names being spoken again: Catalonia, Piedmont, Lombardy, Silesia, Transylvania, Ruthenia. Since they are, or will be, part of a larger whole, nations are not as threatened as they once were when smaller communities peacefully assert their uniqueness. Together, we are making Europe safe for diversity.

This is obviously good for Europe. It is good for America, too, because it reduces the chances we will again be called on to fight as a result of European disunity. Europe’s security is America’s security. When that security is threatened, as it was in Bosnia and Kosovo, we will always respond. When it is being built, we will always take part.

Europe’s peace also sets a powerful example to other parts of the world that are divided, as most of Europe once was, along ethnic, religious, and national lines. Think about it. Even today, Europe has internal disputes over fundamental questions of sovereignty, political power, and
economic policy. The matters Europeans argue about every day in Brussels are really no less consequential than, say, the dispute over which Ethiopians and Eritreans have once again started to kill one another in their senseless war. That would be unthinkable today in the part of Europe where borders unite rather than divide, where nations cooperate, not compete to protect their security and build their prosperity.

I want the whole world to know: if western Europe could do it following the carnage of World War II, if central Europe could do it following 50 years of communism, it can be done anywhere.

But the job certainly is not finished in Europe. I believe we are faced with two big pieces of unfinished business, and one enduring challenge.

The first piece of unfinished business is to work for the day when southeast Europe is fully, finally, and forever part of the rest of Europe. That is the only way to make peace last in the bitterly divided region. It cannot be done by forcing people to live together -- the old Yugoslavia tried that and failed. It cannot be done by giving every community its own country, army and flag -- for there is no way to shift borders in the Balkans without shaking the peace. Our goal must be to de-Balkanize the Balkans.

That's what the Stability Pact that Germany helped establish is designed to do. Through it, we have made clear we expect the nations of southeast Europe to reform their economies and strengthen their democracies -- and together we have pledged more than $6 billion to support their efforts. We have pledged to bring the nations of the region steadily into western institutions so they feel a unifying magnet more powerful than the pull of old hatreds that once tore them apart. We must also keep pushing for a democratic transition in Serbia. For if there is to be a future for democracy and tolerance in this region, there can be no future for Mr. Milosevic and his policy of manipulating human differences for inhuman ends.
Another critical part of southeast Europe is Turkey. It also is inextricably a part of Europe, by its geography, and by its aspiration to form common cause with the rest of the continent. I have long urged the EU to treat Turkey as a real candidate for membership. I applaud the EU for doing just that. I hope both Turkey and the EU will take the next steps. It will be good for Turkey. It will be good for southeast Europe, and speed reconciliation between Turkey and Greece. It will be good for the entire world, far too divided by faith.

Our second piece of unfinished business concerns Russia. In the short run, we must work to build the right kind of partnership with a Russia that is stable, democratic, and cooperatively engaged with the west, fully integrated with global institutions. In the long run, we and Russia must decide together what that great country’s ultimate role in Europe will be.

We do not yet know if Russia’s hard won democratic freedoms will endure. We don’t know whether it will define its strength in yesterday’s terms, or tomorrow’s. But we do know how much Russia has overcome in its journey from dictatorship to democracy, from communism to the market, from empire to nation-state. And we ought to have some humility before the future. Though Russia’s journey is incomplete, we must not foreclose the best possible outcome – a Russia that realizes the dream of past and present reformers to be fully part of Europe.

That means no doors can be shut to Russia: not NATO’s, not the EU’s. The alternative would be to guarantee a future of harmful competition between Russia and the west ... to give up our vision of an undivided continent ... to give in to the prejudice that Russia’s destiny lies outside of Europe. As Winston Churchill said when he received the Charlemagne Prize in the far darker days of 1956, “in a true Unity of Europe, Russia must have her part.”
Of course, a democratic Russia must and will make its own choices. It may very well decide it has no interest in formally joining European or transatlantic institutions. In that case, we must make sure that as the EU and NATO expand, their eastern borders become gateways to Russia, instead of barriers to travel, trade and security cooperation. We will need to build real institutional links with Russia, as NATO has begun to do. It won't be easy. There is mistrust to be overcome – on both sides. But I believe it is possible. I also believe it is necessary.

Today I believe we have to start thinking creatively about the final destination of our journey to an undivided, democratic, peaceful transatlantic community. We've agreed on the principles and laid the foundations. But the structure we are building will look very different from anything we've ever known. In a generation, for example, the EU may have as many as 30 members, from the Baltics, to the Balkans, to Turkey – a community of unprecedented cultural, political and economic vitality. [Foreign Minister Fischer has spoken thoughtfully about what that kind of Europe would look like, suggesting a true federation of the kind the first recipients of the Charlemagne Prize dreamed of.]

It will be a bigger Europe than Charlemagne ever dared to dream of. And it will be based on our recognition that ultimately Europe is an idea as much as a place. An expansive continent of different peoples who embrace a common destiny, play by the same rules, and affirm the same truths … that ethnic and religious hatred is unacceptable … that human rights are universal … that our differences are a source of strength, not weakness.

Of course, Europe's future is Europe's choice. But I believe America must continue to support Europe's most ambitious efforts to forge deeper unity. It is very much in our interest. The enduring challenge we will face as Europe grows wider and deeper, is to preserve and deepen the transatlantic alliance, the bedrock of our security for a half-century, and the foundation on which all our other dreams will be built.
It is easy to point out our differences. Many do. But we must keep a healthy perspective. Consider these headlines about US-European disputes, and see if you find them familiar: "Allies complain of Washington's heavy hand." "France to NATO: Non Merci." "US Declares Economic Warfare on Allies." "Protestors Rally Against American Arms Plan." Well, the first is from the Suez crisis in 1956. The second is from 1966, when France left NATO's military command. The third is from the 1981 Siberian pipeline crisis. The fourth is from 1986, during the debate about deploying intermediate nuclear missiles in Europe.

The truth is, I believe our partnership is stronger today than it's ever been before.

The simple fact is America a part of Europe; if not the landmass proper, then certainly the set of ideas emanating from it. And more than that, we are physically attached as well. Underwater cables allow instantaneous e-mail and e-commerce. A billion dollars in trade and investment goes back and forth every day, employing more than 14 million people on both sides of the Atlantic. And there is this personal connection, which outweighs all the rest. There are 104,000 Americans lying in military cemeteries across Europe. We are proud of their sacrifice. Today would not be possible without them. I accept this prize on their behalf as well.

There will always be perceptions on both sides of the Atlantic that we must work to overcome. There is a perception right now in America, for example, that Europe doesn't always carry its weight in our division of responsibility. But right now, Europeans are providing more than 85 percent of the troops keeping the peace in Kosovo and have pledged more than 87% of the funds for economic reconstruction. And few Americans know that Europeans also paid for more than 60% of all aid to Central America and the Caribbean when they were ravaged by Hurricanes Mitch and Georges, and a third of all support for peace in Guatemala and El Salvador.
At the same time, there is a perception in Europe that America's power -- military, economic, cultural -- is at times too overwhelming. I know that our role in NATO's air campaign in Kosovo accentuated these fears, and I can understand that. But in Kosovo, America exercised its power in alliance with Europe, in pursuit of our shared interest in European peace and stability, in defense of values central to the goal of European integration. [If we are a hyperpower, as our friends in France like to say, then we are a hyperpower you can depend on.]

If one result of Kosovo is that European countries strengthen their ability to act in times of crisis, if Europeans take on greater authority and responsibility while maintaining the transatlantic link, that is a good thing. There is no contradiction between a strong Europe and a strong transatlantic partnership. A stronger Europe is stronger partner for America.

There has never been a time in history when that partnership has been more important. Together, we account for more than half the economy of the world, and 90 percent of its humanitarian aid. If we are going to win the fight against terrorism, crime, and the spread of weapons of mass destruction; if we want to promote ethnic, religious, and racial tolerance; if we want to protect the environment, fight infectious disease, ease poverty, we must work together. Europe always believed in the transatlantic alliance. And America must not listen to those who say in the face of what are clearly common challenges: “go it alone, or don’t go at all.”

So America is determined to remain a good partner and a good ally to Europe. Our relationship may be the one exception to Lord Palmerston's rule that countries have no permanent alliances, only permanent interests. America has a permanent interest in a permanent alliance with Europe.

I would like to end these remarks by restating a truth that I see as central to American and European history. We share both a common origin and a common future. The American Revolution stemmed in part from the Seven Years War, which in turn stemmed from a treaty
signed in this city in 1748. So we, too, are affected by the words spoken here. A few days ago I stood at the mouth of the Targus river in Lisbon. From that spot, over five centuries ago, European explorers began to explore the far reaches of our planet, crossing unimaginable distances and conquering indescribable adversity on their way to Asia, Africa and the Americas. From thousands of cities and villages, the sons and daughters of this continent came across the Atlantic to populate places they called New Spain, New England, New France, New Netherlands, Nova Scotia, New Sweden... in short, New Europe. Without the longing for a New Europe – the same longing that motivates us still – there never would have been an America in the first place.

We should never let a sense of history's inevitability cloud our wonder that this tiny continent, eternally restless to reinvent itself, changed the rest of the world through its enterprise, imagination, and the broad humanistic traditions that still define its identity more than any mapmaker ever can.

In the years ahead, as pilgrims of peace come to Aachen, I hope they reflect on the similarity of two great ideas enshrined here: The peace and unity that three generations have been building for five decades, though it is far from complete. And the architectural magnificence of the cathedral holding Charlemagne's mortal remains, begun in his lifetime, added to throughout the Middle Ages, and repaired in the 20th century when our failure to keep the peace required it. It requires a certain dedication to devote your life to a task that you will not live to see completed. Here, in the cradle of Europe, I feel confident that we possess that dedication.
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You have bestowed a great privilege upon me today. To receive the Charlemagne Prize is a rare distinction. It is all the more humbling to receive it as an American, and I accept it as a tribute to the role the American people have played in promoting European peace and unity over the last fifty years. I am honored to stand in the presence of previous recipients (Havel, Kohl, TK), and the presence of recipients here in spirit: Churchill...Monnet...Adenauer...Mitterand...Marshall. Each in their way advanced a process larger than any of them: the translation of a dream of European union into an everyday reality.

The Charlemagne Prize is special, because Aachen is special. This ancient shrine has known two names, and many rulers, but it has always had a single destiny. To this day, Aachen remains at the center of the broad circumference of what it means to be European. The seat of one empire and for centuries, a volatile border between others. A place of peacemaking and treaties, and the scene of furious fighting, including its liberation at the end of World War Two, when, in a sense, Aachen became the first German city to join the post-war democratic order. A sanctuary for sacred relics dating to the dawn of Christianity – and a crucible of the new information economy already writing the future for a new generation of Europeans.

Aachen is a fitting place to reflect on tomorrow’s Europe because here we are forced to reckon with all of Europe’s past, from the glorious to the unspeakable. The name Charlemagne summons the memory not only of empire, but of something glimpsed for the first time during his life – a sense that the disparate peoples of our smallest continent could live together, with all their differences, as participants in a single civilization.
To be sure, it was a civilization that defined itself at the point of a sword. But in its quest for unity, and its devotion to the new idea that there was something called Europe, the Carolingian idea surpassed what came before, and to an extent guides us still. Twelve centuries ago, out of the long night of darkness that enveloped the warring tribes of this region, there emerged a light, dim at first, but steadily brighter, that has never stopped illuminating Europe's future. So powerful was the idea that hundreds of years after his death, Charlemagne was remembered as a giant, eight feet tall, simply for thinking it at all.

My purpose today is to say, on behalf of those who do not inhabit Europe, that the deepening and broadening of European union is a matter of the utmost urgency to everyone on this planet. Because we know that for all Europe has done to enlighten humanity, it has also been a place of terrible cruelty and carnage; in its way, the darkest continent of all. The facts do not lie: 20 million dead in the first World War. 50 million dead in the second. Even after the fall of the Berlin Wall, a quarter million killed in the Balkans.

And we must candidly observe that some of the worst violence in Europe's history was caused by people claiming the mantle of Charlemagne: specifically, Napoleon and Hitler, who sought to impose European union without the consent of European people. History teaches that European union—not to mention transatlantic unity—cannot be an end in itself. If we come together, it must be for a worthy purpose. And when that purpose is threatened, we must be willing to defend it together, or our unity means nothing.

The creators of this prize and its first beneficiaries understood that. We often say that theirs was the generation that rebuilt Europe after World War II. But that is not right. Their achievement was not to rebuild the old Europe, but to build here something entirely new: a Europe united around principles of democracy, free markets and law.
That achievement endured for half a century -- but only for half a continent. Then, eleven years ago, the Berlin Wall fell, the Iron Curtain parted, and we witnessed the flowering of a thousand visions of a Europe whole and free.

In our memory, we see the Wall crumbling, and hear the strains of Schiller's Ode to Joy. We forget it was also a time of grave uncertainty. There were doubts about NATO's future, accentuated by the face of evil in Bosnia and Croatia. There were fears that the EU's efforts to come closer together would either fail, or fatally divide Europe from America. NATO still maintained the Iron Curtain as its eastern frontier. The countries of central and eastern Europe feared becoming a "gray zone" of poverty and insecurity. Some feared Russia was headed for a communist backlash or nationalist coup. Vaclav Havel warned us then that "just as it is impossible for one half of a room to be forever warm and the other cold, it is equally unthinkable that two different Europes could forever exist next to each other without detriment to both." But by the early years of the last decade, little had been done to heed that warning.

When I first came to Europe as President, in January of 1994, I worked with our allies to turn our vision into a plan for Europe's future. I made clear that America would support deeper European integration. And together with our allies, we set out to do for Europe's east what we did together for Europe's west after World War II.

We adapted NATO to new challenges, and expanded our alliance across Europe's old divide.

We made clear, and I say today, that NATO enlargement will continue -- the question today as before is not whether, but when and how. The European Union took in three new members, opened negotiations with others, and created a single market with a unified currency. We stood by Russians struggling to build a modern democracy, opened the way to a partnership between Russia and NATO. We remembered, the imperative of defending the values at the heart here: peaceful, undivided, united...
heart of our vision of an undivided Europe, acting to stop the ethnic cleansing in Bosnia and forging what I believe will be an enduring peace. We acted more quickly and decisively in Kosovo, and stood with campaigners for tolerance and freedom from Croatia to Slovakia to Serbia. One year ago in Germany, we launched a Stability Pact for Southeast Europe. We encouraged reconciliation between Turkey and Greece.

Since then there have been setbacks, some small, some great. But I am very proud of what we have achieved. For Europe today is unquestionably more united, more democratic, more peaceful than at any time in its history.

Think about the moment we have brought. All across the continent, borders built to stop tanks now manage invasions of tour buses and trucks. Europe’s fastest growing economies are now on the other side of the old Iron Curtain. And Vaclav Havel has spent more years being president than he spent in prison! At NATO headquarters, the flags of 19 allies and 27 partners fly. The realistic dream of membership in NATO and EU has sparked the resolution of almost every old ethnic and border dispute in central and eastern Europe. We are close to our goal of a Europe in which every nation is free, and every free nation is our partner.

Look to southeast Europe. The Bosnians are still fighting — but only at the ballot box. Croatia is a democracy. Soldiers from almost every European country, the most bitter former adversaries among them, are keeping the peace in Kosovo. Last year, we were moved to the marrow by the image of German troops marching through the Balkan countryside, hailed as liberators by a people longing to be free. That was a wonderful way to end the century.

In the meantime Russia, though it has endured bitter hardships and cruel tragedies like the war in Chechnya, has not wavered from the path of democracy. It has withdrawn its troops from the
Baltic States, accepted the independence of its neighbors, and completed the first democratic transition in its thousand year history.

And if we look even more closely, we will see something really new under the sun. As Europeans in Brussels evolve common institutions that are bigger than the nation-state, democratic authority is also devolving downward. Scotland and Wales have their own parliaments. [This week, Northern Ireland's new assembly and executive were restored.] And that's not all. Across the continent, local governments and regions are forging links across borders. Europe is alive with the sound of ancient place names being spoken again: Catalonia, Piedmont, Lombardy, Silesia, Transylvania, Ruthenia. Since all are, or will be, part of a larger whole, nations are not as threatened as they once were when smaller communities assert their uniqueness. We are making Europe safe for diversity.

This is obviously good for Europe. It is good for America, too, because it reduces the chance we will ever again be called on to fight to deal with the consequences of European disunity. It also sets a powerful example to other parts of the world that are divided, as most of Europe once was, along ethnic, religious, and national lines.

Think about it. Even today, Europe has internal disputes over fundamental questions of sovereignty, political power, and economic policy. The matters Europeans argue about every day in Brussels are really no less consequential than, say, the dispute over which Ethiopians and Eritreans have once again started to kill one another in their senseless war. That would be unthinkable today in the part of Europe where borders unite rather than divide, where nations cooperate, not compete to protect their security and build their prosperity.

I want the whole world to know: if western Europe could do it following the carnage of World War II, if central Europe could do it following 50 years of communism, it can be done anywhere.
But our work is certainly not finished in Europe. And now that you have made me an honorary European, I would like to speak about my vision of the road ahead. I believe we are faced with two big pieces of unfinished business, and one enduring challenge.

The first piece of unfinished business is to work for the day when southeast Europe is fully, finally, and forever part of the rest of Europe. That is the only way to make peace last in this bitterly divided region. It cannot be done by forcing people to live together—the old Yugoslavia tried that and failed. It cannot be done by giving every community its own country, army and flag—there is no way to shift borders in the Balkans without chaos. Our goal must be to de-Balkanize the Balkans.

That's what the Stability Pact that Germany helped establish is doing. Through it, we have made clear we expect the nations of southeast Europe to reform their economies and strengthen their democracies—and we have pledged more than $6 billion to support their efforts. We have pledged to bring the nations of the region steadily into western institutions so they feel a unifying magnet more powerful than the pull of old hatreds that once tore them apart. We will also keep pushing for a democratic transition in Serbia. For if there is to be a future for democracy and tolerance in this region, there can be no future for Mr. Milosevic and his policy of manipulating human differences for inhuman ends.

Another critically important part of southeast Europe is Turkey. It is also inextricably a part of Europe, by its geography, and by its aspiration to form common cause with the rest of the continent. I have long urged the EU to treat Turkey as a real candidate for membership. I applaud the EU for doing just that. I hope both Turkey and the EU will take the next steps. It will be good for Turkey. It will speed reconciliation between Turkey and Greece. It will be good for the entire world, far too divided by faith.
Our second piece of unfinished business concerns Russia. In the short run, we must work to build the right kind of partnership with a Russia that is stable, democratic, and cooperatively engaged with the west, fully integrated with global institutions. In the long run, we and Russia must decide together what that great country's ultimate role in Europe will be.

We do not yet know if Russia's hard won democratic freedoms will endure. We don't know whether it will define its strength in yesterday's terms, or tomorrow's. But we do know how much Russia has overcome in its journey from dictatorship to democracy, from communism to the market, from empire to nation-state. And we ought to have some humility before the future. Though Russia's journey is incomplete, we must not foreclose the best possible outcome – a Russia that realizes the dream of its past and present reformers to be fully part of Europe.

That means no doors should be sealed shut to Russia: not NATO's, not the EU's. The alternative would be to give up our vision of an undivided continent . . . to give in to the prejudice that Russia's destiny lies outside of Europe ... to guarantee a future of zero-sum competition between Russia and the west. As Winston Churchill said when he received the Charlemagne Prize in the far darker days of 1956, “in a true Unity of Europe, Russia must have her part.”

Of course, a democratic Russia must and will make its own choices. It may very well decide it has no interest in formally joining European or transatlantic institutions. In that case, we must make sure that as the EU and NATO expand, their eastern borders become gateways to Russia, instead of barriers to travel, trade and security cooperation. We will need to build real institutional links with Russia, as NATO has begun to do. It won't be easy. There is mistrust still to be overcome – on both sides. But I believe it is possible. I also believe it is necessary.
I believe we have to start thinking today about the final destination of our journey to an undivided, democratic, peaceful transatlantic community. We've agreed on the principles and laid the foundations. But the structure we are building will look very different from anything we've ever known. In a generation, for example, the EU may have as many as 30 members, from the Baltics, to the Balkans, to Turkey – a community of economic, cultural, political and economic vitality. Foreign Minister Fischer has spoken thoughtfully about what that kind of Europe would look like, suggesting a true federation of the kind the first recipients of the Charlemagne Prize dreamed of, with the support of their American contemporaries. Of course, Europe's future is Europe's choice. But I believe America must continue to support Europe's most ambitious efforts to forge deeper unity. It is very much in our interest.

The enduring challenge we will face as Europe grows wider and deeper, is to preserve and deepen the transatlantic alliance, the bedrock of our security for a half-century, and the foundation on which all our other dreams will be built.

It is easy to point out our differences. Many do. But we must keep them in perspective. Consider these headlines about US-European disputes, and see if you find them familiar:

"Allies complain of Washington's heavy hand." "France to NATO: Non Merci." "US Declares Economic Warfare on Allies." "Protestors Rally Against American Arms Plan." Well, the first is from the Suez crisis in 1956. The second is from 1966, when France left NATO's military command. The third is from the 1981 Siberian pipeline crisis. The fourth is from 1986, during the debate about deploying intermediate nuclear missiles in Europe.

The truth is, I believe our partnership is stronger today than it's ever been.

The simple fact is America a part of Europe; if not the landmass proper, then certainly the set of ideas emanating from it. And more than that: we are physically attached as well. Underwater...
cables allow instantaneous e-mail and e-commerce. A billion dollars in trade and investment goes back and forth every day, employing more than 14 million people on both sides of the Atlantic. And there is this physical connection, which outweighs all the rest. There are 104,000 Americans lying in military cemeteries across Europe. We are humbled by their sacrifice. Today would not be possible without them. I accept this prize on their behalf as well.

There will always be perceptions on both sides of the Atlantic that we must work to overcome. There is a perception right now in America, for example, that Europe doesn't always carry its weight in our division of responsibility. But right now, Europeans are providing more than 85 percent of the troops keeping the peace in Kosovo and have pledged more than 87% of the funds for economic reconstruction. And I bet few Americans know that Europeans also paid for more than 60% of all aid to Central America and the Caribbean when they were ravaged by Hurricanes Mitch and Georges, and a third of all support for peace in Guatemala and El Salvador.

At the same time, there is a perception in Europe that America's power -- military, economic, cultural -- is at times too overwhelming. I know that our role in NATO's air campaign in Kosovo accentuated these fears, and I can understand that. But in Kosovo, America exercised its power in alliance with Europe, in pursuit of our shared interest in European peace and stability, in defense of values central to the goal of European integration. [If we are a hyperpower, as our friends in France like to say, then we are a hyperpower you can depend on.]

And if one result of Kosovo is that European countries will strengthen their ability to act in times of crisis, if Europeans take on greater authority and responsibility in NATO, that is a good thing. There is no contradiction between a strong Europe and a strong trans-Atlantic partnership. A strong Europe is a strong partner for America.
And there has never been a time in history when that partnership has been more important. Together, we account for 50 percent of the world's economy, we possess most of its military might, we provide 90 percent of its humanitarian aid. If we are going to win the fight against terrorism, crime, and the spread of weapons of mass destruction; if we want to promote ethnic, religious, and racial tolerance; if we want to protect the environment, halt infectious disease, ease poverty, we have to work together. We cannot listen to those who say in the face of what are clearly common challenges: "go it alone, or don't go at all."

So America is determined to remain a good partner and a good ally to Europe. Our relationship may be the one exception to Lord Palmerston's rule that countries have no permanent alliances, only permanent interests. America has a permanent interest in a permanent alliance with Europe.

I would like to end these remarks by restating a truth that I see as central to American and European history. We share both a common origin and a common future. The American Revolution stemmed from the Seven Years War, which in turn stemmed from a treaty signed in this city in 1748. A few days ago I stood at the mouth of the Tagus river in Portugal. From that spot, over five centuries ago, European explorers began to explore the far reaches of our planet, crossing unimaginable distances and conquering indescribable adversity. From a thousand cities and villages, the sons and daughters of this continent came across the Atlantic to populate places they called New Spain, New England, New France, Nova Scotia, New Sweden ... in short, a New Europe. Without the longing for a New Europe – the same longing that motivates us still – there would never have been an America in the first place.

We should never let a sense of history's inevitability cloud our wonder that this tiny continent, eternally restless to reinvent itself, changed the rest of the world through its enterprise, its imagination, and the democratic traditions that define its identity...
In the years ahead, as pilgrims of peace come to Aachen, I hope they reflect on the similarity of two great ideas enshrined here: The peace and unity three generations have been building for five decades, though it is far from complete. And the architectural magnificence of the cathedral holding Charlemagne's mortal remains, begun in his lifetime, added to throughout the Middle Ages, and renovated in the 20th century when our failure to keep the peace required it. It requires a certain dedication to devote your life to a task that you will not live to see completed. Looking at you today, I feel confident that we possess that dedication.
your life to a task that you will not live to see finished. Here, in the very cradle of Europe, I feel confident that we possess that dedication.

[It is fitting to close with a European voice. The words inscribed in the Palace Chapel of the Cathedral, written in Charlemagne’s day, still speak to us with their fragile optimism:

Since the living stones have been joined in peaceful harmony,
And all numbers are measurements are in agreement
The work of the Lord who built this hall will shine brightly.
The completed edifice crowns the pious efforts of the people
Whose work will remain forever as a monument of beauty
If the Author of all things protects and rules over it.
May God therefore watch over this temple
Which Charles the Prince has founded on a solid base.]
Aachen takes its name from the Roman spa of Aquisgranum, 'Waters of Apollo-Granus'. Its warm, healing waters explain Charlemagne's choice for the site of his favourite residence, the Kaiserpfalz. The French name, Aix-la-Chapelle, marks the famous chapel, now part of Aachen Cathedral, which Charlemagne added to his palace.

Charlemagne's chapel was completed in 805. It is a three-tiered octagon, built in the Byzantine style of San Vitale in Ravenna, which Charlemagne had seen and admired. Its proportions are said to follow the mystical numbers of the seventh vision of St John's Revelation. In its day it was the largest stone building north of the Alps. Round the interior of the octagon, above the first tier of Roman arches, there runs a dedication purportedly composed by Alcuin:

**SÆSCUM LAPIDES VIVI PACIS CONPAGE LIGANTUR**

Since the living stones have been joined in peaceful harmony,

**INQUE PARES NUMEROS OMNIA CONVENIUNT**

And all numbers and measurements are in agreement

**CLARET OPUS DOMINI, TOT QUI CONSTRUIT AU LAM**

The work of the Lord who built this hall will shine brightly.

**EFFECTUSQUE PIS DAT STUDIIS HOMINUM**

The completed edifice crowns the pious efforts of the people

**QUORUM PERPETUI DECORIS STRUCTURA MANEBIT**

Whose work will remain forever as a monument of beauty

**SI PERFECTA AUCTOR PROTEGAT ATQUE REGAT.**

If the Author of All things protects and rules over it.

**SIC DEUS HOC TUTUM STABILE FUNDAMENTE TEMPLUM**

May God therefore watch over this temple

**QUED KAROLUS PRINCESC CONDIDIT, ESSE VIET.**

Which Charles the Prince has founded on a solid base.

The decoration of the chapel is heavy with the imperial symbolism Charlemagne and his successors had revived in a new and naive setting. A mosaic inside the dome represents the Adoration of the Magi. The ambo or pulpit is encrusted with fragments of Roman pottery, and an eagle cameo. Egyptian columns in green and rose porphyry support the second tier of arches. The *pala d'oro* or altar panel portrays the Passion in classic Roman relief and in solid gold. The *Lotharkreuz* of Lothar is a magnificent Christian ornament of beaten gold and with antique gems. It is surmounted by a central portrait cameo of Emperor Augustus. The imperial throne, cut from simple slabs of marble, looks down from the first-floor gallery as it did during all the nations of 700 years. The message is clear: the Empire which Charlemagne launched thought of itself both as Holy and as Roman.

In 1165 the body of the newly

"..."
canonized saint was transferred to a casket of solid gold. It was surrounded by a collection of suitable relics—the loincloth of Christ, the Virgin's girdle, a splinter of Charlemagne's skull—all placed in precious reliquaries. Barbarossa himself donated a huge, wheel-shaped, iron chandelier, the 'Crown of Lights', which is suspended in the centre of the octagonal and which symbolizes the walls of the New Jerusalem. It bears another long inscription:

Jerusalem, celestial Zion, John, herald of salvation, saw Thee... Frederick, Catholic Emperor of the Roman Empire pledged this crown of lights as a princely gift... Now, O Holy Virgin, he dedicates it to Thee: O Stella Maris, O Star of the Sea, take the humble Frederick into Thy care... and protect the Emperor's wife, Beatrix.

Today the imperial chapel at Aachen is ranked among the foremost wonders of romanesque art. But it is more than that. It provides a history lesson more vivid than any book can offer. As visitors enter, they pass through the Wolf's Door—so called after the legend of the wolf who cheated the Devil for possession of the chapel. It is a dull mind that is not gripped by the powerful fusion of the barbarian and the classical, of the Christian and the pagan, which provided the spiritual drive of the age. Here is Western Europe's greatest memorial to a time when romanesque was a novelty, and when the centre of civilisation still lay in the East.

Charlemagne's lifeblood had been the cement of the realm. His inheritance was immediately disputed by his son and grandsons. Repeated partitions ensured early disintegration. In 817 the partition of Aachen provoked civil war; in 843, following protracted family slaughter, the Treaty of Verdun produced a three-way split between the surviving grandsons. Charles the Bald received the Western Romance sector—Neustria, Aquitaine, western Burgundy, and the Spanish March. Lothair I, King of Italy, received the title of Emperor together with the 'Middle Kingdom', consisting of Austrasia, eastern Burgundy, Provence, and Italy. Lewis the German received the bulk of the eastern, solidly Germanic sector (see Map 12). The Treaty of Verdun created the core of both the future Germany and the future France. The 'Middle Kingdom' was left a bone of eternal contention between them. Charlemagne's ultimate legacy was not just the example of fragile unity but, equally, the prospect of unending strife. [KRAL]

The feuding of the Carolingians or 'Karlings' created an opportunity which the Vikings were quick to exploit. The summer of 841 saw them sailing up the Seine to plunder Rouen. In 843-4, following the Treaty of Verdun, they wintere on the island of Noirmoutier. In 854 the new city of Hamburg was burned, and Paris was sacked while Charles the Bald took refuge on Montmartre. In 847 the ancient city of Bordeaux was taken hostage for years. In 852 an ominous precedent was set