

# Only the Paranoid Survive

As the Intel and CEO founder of Hungarian origin, Andrew S. Grove (Gróf András István) put it in a very appropriate manner, the crucial thing is how to *exploit the crisis points*. His analysis focuses on how companies should survive, and even more, how they should turn into their advantages crises or, if you want, a change of paradigm, a paradigm shift *à la* Thomas Kuhn. In a nutshell, there is always a turning point in every business that needs to be recognised and handled in order to avoid collapse and go on with your business in a different way. Nevertheless, his thesis does not concern only companies, it can also be transposed to every segment of life: your personal life, your career involvement, cinema industry or even politics. Paradigm shifts can therefore be of huge significance, such as the Second World War or of much less magnitude, such as the release of an album by Elvis Presley which changed the face of music industry. What matters is that you realise the occurring of the radical change and the direction the world is taking. But for Grove a radical change is even more complex, he calls it Strategic Inflection Point (SIP). He spotted for the future the appearance of Internet as a point inducing extremely fast changes that cannot be undone. Who can contradict when one looks back at the past? Data protection, retail distribution, media, music or cinema industry experts, among many others, will certainly not. When these segments have still not entirely recovered from the radical change, Intel successfully outrode competition with Japanese better-quality lower-cost chipmakers in the 90's. His advice is thus worth being seriously taken into account.

European Union does not make exception to this rule. Milestone events were numerous during the last twenty years: the digital revolution at the end of the 90's; in 2001 the collapse of the North and South Towers of the WTC; between 2004 and 2012 EU15 has become EU28; in 2005 the French and Dutch voters said no to the European Constitution; in September 2008 the world discovered how markets left alone cannot resolve anything; in 2015 migration shook the EU at its very foundations; the UK voted Brexit in 2016 and the same year Donald Trump was elected president in the US. Many events with multiple consequences, but which one is SIP and which one is the consequence of SIP? At the risk of disappointing the readers of the first English edition of the European Mirror, we have to admit that we do not have the answer. However, by reading our contributors very often turning to the different crises (and even to the questions related to their management – Szegeði), the 2008 economic crisis seems to be the event with the biggest underlying multiple way consequences (Elekes and Halmai, Kovács, Orosz and Nyikos). Professor de Mestral has a critical approach to the Achmea judgement of the ECJ in March 2018, which is one of the logical consequences of the 2004–2012 enlargement process while, on the same path of accession of the EU, Professor

Hettyey underlines the shift of the German bilateral approach to the Central Eastern European Member States to a multilateral one often manifesting in a “hiding behind the EU institutions” attitude. Commissioner Vestager underlines that the political role of the European Commission is to be limited to the prioritisation of the tasks of the institution and advocates a Commission “one Member State one Commissioner” approach notwithstanding Emmanuel Macron’s proposal to reduce the number of Commissioners to 15. Many opinions, many views, many angles; this is the strength of the European Mirror.

Nevertheless, while the European Mirror has not found the philosopher’s stone, it does however permit to understand the very complex processes the European Union is going through. So, don’t shoot the messenger, just keep in mind: *Only the Paranoid Survive*.

*Krisztián Kecsmár*

