

INTERNATIONAL ITALIAN LAW OFFICE
ITALIAN LAWYER DR. ALFONSO MARRA
LAWYER LINGUIST

QUALIFIED FOR THE BILINGUALISM GERMAN - ITALIAN LANGUAGE

BY THE AUTONOMOUS PROVINCE OF BOLZANO, ITALY

QUALIFIED AT THE STATE EXAM HSK OF CHINESE LANGUAGE PROCIENCY HSK OF PEKING

QUALIFIED AT THE STATE EXAM OF FRENCH LANGUAGE PROCIENCY

AT THE FRENCH INSTITUTE OF NAPLES "LE GRENOBLE"

PARTECIPANT IN THE COURSE OF DUTCH LANGUAGE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF UTRECHT

IN POSSESSION OF THE CERTIFICATE OF DEPTH STUDIES IN APPLIED EUROPEAN UNION LAW

AT THE UNIVERSITY OF SALERNO

SPECIALIST IN CIVIL LAW AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMERINO

SPECIALIZED IN LEGAL PROFESSIONS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF SALERNO

INTERPRETER AND TRANSLATOR AT THE NAPLES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

INTERPRETER AND TRANSLATOR AT THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR' S OFFICE AND THE COURT OF NAPLES

LEGAL ADVICE AND AID IN ITALIAN – ENGLISH – GERMAN – CHINESE – GREEK – FRENCH LANGUAGE

TELEPHONE: 0039 335 69 48 594

e-mail: avvalfonsomarra@yahoo.it

INTERNET WEB SITE: www.studiolegaleinternazionaleavvocatoalfonsomarra.it

The European Treaty of Lisbon: lights and shadows from the political – diplomatic point of view

*of the Lawyer Dr. Alfonso Marra
belonging to the Naples Bar Association*

On principle, the Treaty of Lisbon would have had to “constitutionalize” the European Union nearly completely, after all the way since 2002 to 2009.

In the year 2002 in Laeken, part of the big belgian city of Bruxelles, were outlined **two important guide-lines: 1) the European Union’s widening to other States; 2) deepening as an istitutional reform.**

It was necessary to have, beside the various governments’ negotiations, also an opening to the citizens to build up a bigger representation, so as, for example, the social parties.

However, the “Constitution for Europe” had a limit: the word “constitution” was one of the words, that cannot be used in Europa for political-diplomatic reasons,

so as the word “federal”, because they refer to concepts not understood and shared by everyone in the same way.

In fact, in the political – diplomatic environment the terminology used is very important.

For example, we can say a diplomat will never say “it rains”, but he will prefer to say “there is a strong humidity”.

Therefore the terminologic agreement: “Constitutional Treaty”.

The “failure” of this Treaty by some States after popular referendum caused a “reflection pause” (always for diplomatic courtesy, because it wasn’t possible to speak about “paralysis”).

The purpose was to save the essential, so some modifications: elimination of words as “constitution”, “constitutional”, the reference to the Greek civilization (Demosthenes: according to him democracy is government of people), the reference to the hymn and the Union’s flag (even though hymn and flag has become of common use).

Moreover, how could it be possible to speak about constitution, if there are Countries that have no own constitution, as the United Kingdom?

In every case, there are still the doubts of the “Euro-sceptics” against the “Euro-convinced”.

Countries entered between 2004 and 2007 are ex communist Countries and therefore they have a fund of international conventions, that are incompatible with the other Countries’ one already member of the Union and, besides, they are wary of the Russia, that instead is a very important trade partner for Europe.

The Treaty of Lisbon was born to be “conclusive” (at least it was the ambition), but it is not so, we speak about a “mini-reform”.

Actually this reform isn’t “mini”: it is necessary to introduce financial mechanisms, to limit and check the “spendthrift” Countries, that cause heavy consequences on Euro’s stability.

Therefore the necessity to prevent it.

The Treaty of Lisbon was born in a “populistic” point of view: it has to be “readable”, easily understandable by the citizens.

The Treaty has two aspects: 1) Treaty on European Union, TEU (big),
2) Treaty “fotocopy” with riders “Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union” TFEU (less strict).

It is decided the institutionalization of the High Representative for Foreign Affairs and the Safety who, paradoxically, accumulates the offices of Foreign Minister and Minister of Defense, thing this one that doesn’t happen in anyone of the member States.

Also here there can be a political-diplomatic explanation of expediency: the term “defense” is “unsuitable”, it presupposes an army, that exists, but it hasn’t to be said.

The High Representative for Foreign Affairs and the Safety has made to the European Parliament a “**political accountability**” declaration, that is she declares to take decisions in a politically responsible way, consulting the European Parliament.

These decisions concern the financial aspect, the expenses, therefore the Parliament’s power is increased.

The High Representative for Foreign Affairs and the Safety has a diplomatic corps “European Service for the External Action” (SEAE) that is paid by the European Union: so the European Parliament can discuss about its composition.

So, there is an european foreign politics (PESC) plus a national foreign politics (mixité).

Considering that two of the member States of the European Union are also permanent members of the UNO (France and United Kingdom), there is also the **coordination obligation** because, obviously, these permanent members support the European Union’s politics.

Furthermore, referring to the member States, there is no coincidence between N.A.T.O. and European Union.

In conclusion:

the Treaty of Lisbon had to be “conclusive” and it isn’t so,

it redraws the institutional range for the future,

it puts emphasis on methods and tools that make Europe effective on the international stage.