European leaders finally remember the EU isn't a country

One voice for Europe at the Ukraine peace deal table isn't very democratic

Published 17 Nov, 2026 17:42 | Updated 17 Nov, 2026 18:45



*By **Rachel Marsden**, a columnist, political strategist, and host of independently produced talk-shows in French and English.*

rachelmarsden.com



European Commission Vice-President and High Representative for Foreign Affairs Kaja Kallas with ministers at a meeting of the Foreign Affairs Council in Brussels,

Five countries want to represent Europe at Ukraine peace negotiations with Russia and the US. For once, their teenage-girl bathroom-break format is actually a good thing. At least for democracy. But also for any eventual treaty, however counterintuitively.

Every interested party gets a delegation. Europe has decided that France, the UK, Italy, Poland, and Germany will comprise its own – along with a couple of representatives from

Top stories



Handshakes and familiar faces: Putin's diplomacy at APEC (PHOTOS)

'An absolutely unprecedented event': Russian experts react to Putin-Trump-Xi meeting ANALYSIS

Russian general tells EU's Kallas to 'sort out her sh*t'

US rebukes Ukraine for 'spectacle' strikes

ICE agents pepper-spray pregnant woman in California (VIDEO)

Belgium, on November 16, 2026 © Daniel Gnap / NurPhoto via Getty Images

EU institutions. So what's the problem?

Other negotiating parties – notably Russia and the US – have called for the appointment of a single European representative. This would be convenient for negotiating purposes, but hardly a substitute for democratic and constitutional authority. We're talking about 27 EU member states, plus a wider circle of non-EU European countries. They're already issued a formal declaration detailing their common position in black and white, but a single position shouldn't be conflated with the need for a single representative empowered to commit them all.

Negotiations with a single representative might go more smoothly than with a delegation – right up until ratification. At which point an EU representative would discover that negotiating a draft and securing the consent of individual sovereign countries are two completely different challenges. Any agreement involving national competences would still have to clear the relevant constitutional ratification processes. Brussels can't just hand national parliaments a fait accompli and expect them to rubber-stamp it. Good luck with that.

European leaders have suddenly remembered that the EU isn't a country. Nor does it have an exclusive mandate over every aspect of foreign affairs. The treaties give the EU a substantial foreign-policy role, but member states retain important powers over their own foreign relations, including national military deployments, bilateral security guarantees with Ukraine, weapons supplies, intelligence cooperation, and bilateral diplomacy.

For instance, it just emerged that France has had military personnel in Ukraine since at least the summer. Ostensibly *"training"* Ukrainians and maintaining equipment. The reporting also describes French intelligence personnel conducting observation missions closer to the front lines. Meaning that not everyone was over there to just lead CrossFit classes.



Read more: Putin aide reveals Moscow's stance on Europe at peace talks

The French parliament reportedly wasn't even formally informed about the mission. So what good would an agreement with some appointed EU bureaucrat do to rein in such activities under any eventual peace treaty?

That's the goal of all this drama, right? An actual binding treaty? Something that can be registered with the United Nations Secretariat under Article 102 of the

Subscribe to RT newsletter to get news highlights of the day right in your mailbox

E-mail

We offer you the possibility to receive RT's news highlights every Monday, Wednesday and Friday by email.

Subscribe

RT Features



The Indus: A river older than borders FEATURE

UN Charter and potentially invoked before UN organs if things go sideways?

If that's the ultimate objective, then we're potentially looking at a mixed agreement covering commitments within EU competence, alongside commitments from individual European member states in areas of their own retained competence. That means both the EU and the relevant member states would be parties, each undertaking obligations within their respective areas of authority. Not everything can be signed away by some Brussels bureaucrat.

Europe is entitled to seek a delegation, like everyone else involved. Whether Moscow actually accepts its participation is another matter. But the advantage of having seven European representatives at the table is that they can speak up in real time instead of having a single Brussels-appointed flunky pretending to carry around a blank cheque from 27 national governments – including authority to promise troop deployments and bilateral security guarantees that they haven't been given. The odds of that cheque bouncing are high and only growing higher.



Read more: French troops secretly operating in Ukraine – media

It is hardly surprising that the loudest voices within the EU calling for a single appointed representative are those who seem most interested in federalizing the EU to the detriment of European citizens and the elected member-state voices accountable to them.

EU chief diplomat Kaja Kallas has argued that the treaties give her a mandate to represent the EU on foreign policy. Article 27(2) of the Treaty on European Union indeed gives her that role in matters relating to the Common Foreign and Security Policy. But representing the EU is not the same as representing 27 national governments – plus a handful more non-EU European ones – on every matter of foreign policy. The treaties also expressly preserve member states' existing powers.

Kallas has previously called for building a *"European Defense Union,"* further shifting defense policy and capabilities into the EU framework, with obvious implications for national sovereignty.

Former EU Internal Markets Commissioner Thierry Breton has also recently said that Europe *"must speak in a single voice"* at these negotiations, as though it were already the federation that he seems to want it to become.



The EU's poorest state is done taking orders. Can it make Brussels listen? FEATURE



'Let them play': Fans push back against Russia's hockey ban FEATURE

Podcasts All podcasts

'The Russians are now taking out targets that will collapse public support for the Ukrainian government'

0:00 59:9

Yalta 2.0?

0:00 24:58

Europeans didn't vote for a federal state, and they seem even less keen on Brussels acquiring even more authority. But those seeking to shovel more power into the hands of a largely unelected caste never fail to exploit these opportunities to argue that the EU should start behaving like an authoritarian dictatorship, well beyond what its own treaties currently permit. Dissent, debate and consultation – the cornerstones of democracy – are just too much of a hassle, apparently.

There's another reason that everyone should be thankful for more European behinds in seats at the table, if any treaty ever comes of all this.

While the US may seem like a main player now, what actual authority do Trump's son-in-law Jared Kushner and his real-estate buddy Steve Witkoff actually have? Both are quite likely to have their kimonos ripped open and all their dealings splayed out in the street once the newly elected congressional Democrats start their hearings.

Under Article 7 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, heads of state, heads of government and foreign ministers are the only ones who have automatic authority to perform acts relating to the conclusion of treaties. The two real estate guys are none of these things.



Read more: What could Putin, Xi, and Trump discuss at their meeting in China? (VIDEO)

Other representatives need another recognized basis for their authority. The US tends to follow this practice. But what authority will they ultimately attribute to these two Trump pals? The US Constitution also requires Senate advice and consent by a two-thirds vote for the ratification of treaties, and even a presidential executive agreement that bypasses Congress would at least need its consent for any funding.

So what would be left of the deal if American participation proved invalid? Potentially, one among the remaining parties. Meaning Europe left to babysit Ukraine and uphold promises to Russia for the collective West.

Granted, the EU's habit of following Zelensky around in a posse, helicopter-parenting him, is annoying. Like the European leaders who turned up to hold his hand after Trump dressed him down in the White House over not having any *"cards."* But in this case, it's actually a welcome development for the average European citizen that – for once – their countries aren't going to let some Brussels bureaucrat

call the shots.

If only they could make that more of a habit.

The statements, views and opinions expressed in this column are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of RT.

OPINION

You can share this story on social media:

Follow RT on Telegram

Please check our commenting policy. If you have questions or suggestions feel free to send them to feedback@rttv.ru.

Your comment here

Sign In

Sort by **Recently updated**

TS **TS Ng** 11/19/2026 at 1:27 AM **0**

Why would anyone who wants to see Russia defeated be interested to be a party in a peace talk? You don't defeat through peace.

Reply

b **bandiere venete** 11/18/2026 at 7:33 PM **0**

We subjects of European states, want to know exactly for who and what we will have to die for during next war against Russia:
-For the future of our kids or family? Do Kallas and band, send us to die for gender ideology?
-For Europe? What about our respective countries and nations? What sacred borders this time?
-For Democracy? It looks like that outside Europa there is more freedom. Democracy is just a slogan.
Imagine that scenario Von der Leyen is scared of: «Russia invading Europe». We will pay less taxes and we will have warm winters in our homes, e very likely a boost to our economy, a bigger market and plenty of raw materials to transform and exchange!
I forgot: we will also have nicer women much better than Merkel and Lagarde!

Reply

 **Bee Somsak** 11/18/2026 at 6:24 PM **0**

No sense in listening/meeting the EU with idiotic Kallas in charge. Russia will decide by force of arms the outcome of this war.

Reply

 **E Kaos** 11/18/2026 at 4:31 PM **0**

Oompah oompah oompah oom, tappety tap, oompah oompah oompah oom, tappety tap, and the war

goes on...! To the last youcranian.)'L'(heeheehee

Reply

Lacey Morton 11/17/2026 at 7:12 PM 10

🤦As John Mearsheimer has said this will be determined on the battlefield by Russia. None of those EU entities are interested in peace much less the war hawks in the US. And the Baltic states may be the most belligerent of all.

Reply

John Sciabarrasi 11/18/2026 at 3:20 PM 0

And the 1st to go down when the 💩 hits the fan.

Reply

JT13 England 11/18/2026 at 1:05 AM -3

I completely disagree with this article. «EU chief diplomat Kaja Kallas has argued that the treaties give her a mandate to represent the EU on foreign policy. Article 27(2) of the Treaty on European Union indeed gives her that role in matters relating to the Common Foreign and Security Policy.»
Kallas is the EU Foreign Policy Chief: She serves as the top diplomat and head of the foreign and security policy for the European Union, COORDINATING COMMON POSITIONS among member states. This is the whole point of having a unified foreign policy and therefore Kallas has every right to represent the whole of the EU (all 27 national governments) on the EU foreign policy, In other words, that is her flipping job.
France etc should not be doing its own thing. It needs to be told to follow EU foreign policy, or get out of the EU. Britain didn't like these blanket rules and that's why it left. But yes, Trumps two real-estate buddies have no authority to be arranging treatises and in fact the US itself should not be arranging the get-together anyway, as they are active participants in the Ukraine war. The lazy Chinese should be doing it.

Reply

Anna Peel 11/18/2026 at 3:34 AM 6

Callous Kallas is no diplomat due her being a universally-recognized «idiot».

As for her leadership re «security policy», Kaja's ancestor was a boss of secret police, while her daddy, a former soviet apparatchik, is a consummate opportunist.

Only an unusually stupid and narcissistic person like Kaja would not recognize her obvious intellectual limitations and her spectacular ignorance of history. She was selected by bankers for a reason...

Reply

JT13 England 11/18/2026 at 11:38 AM -1

Good point, but she got the job and therefore should in theory be representing the entire 27 country bloc. Frankly, I think she would be better suited to working as a checkout girl in a Lidl store, as she is low IQ but chatty and presentable.

Reply

Sandy 11/18/2026 at 1:41 PM 2

Kallas' position within the EU doesnt really matter. Russia will not accept her as a participant in the talks. End of.

Reply

JT13 England 11/18/2026 at 2:49 PM 0

Why wouldn't Russia accept her? They accept Trumps property salesmen to represent the US. By the way, what do you think Kallas has her job for. It's not a flipping sinecure, is it! Explain yourself

Reply

John Sciabarrasi 11/18/2026 at 3:10 PM 0

China has no say in this quagmire and they are far from being lazy..

Reply

steve drake 11/17/2026 at 7:23 PM 10

Finally someone who recognise the EU Commission is not a Sovereign Independent Country. It is a trading block acting like they alone rule every country in Europe and they alone hold all the cards and can tell the European Nations citizens what they can and can not do. We in the UK recognised this even before we Joined the shower of Excrement and that is also the reason we left. The EU Commission does not offer freedom or Democracy. It is giving you Slavery and Authoritarianism.

Reply

Carlo Caporaso 11/17/2026 at 8:33 PM 4

Absolutely correct. The corrupt psychopaths in Brussels have to be eliminated.
Every sovereign country has to have a representative at a European Union meeting.
To have only a few politicians representing the European Union is a recipe for corrupt criminality disasters.