



# EUROPE. WHERE TO NOW?



32 County Sovereignty Movement



## EUROPE: A THREAT TO DEMOCRACY

The problem is arising from the fact that Ireland and the rest of Europe, when negotiating this treaty, left itself in a very enclosed space with practically no room for political compromise and this is the endemic root of all the present problems and problems that will arise in the future. The support of the people was presumed, not given. What kind of democracy is in the midst of being formed when agreements are formed on the basis of this presumed support? And when the very citizens they claim to represent air their concerns they are ridiculed, put down, and told they are against Ireland, the EU, and progress. No alternative option was given or even considered, and now that the linear minded route that the EU has taken is being shot down from every side they figure the best way forward is to regurgitate it, effect cosmetic changes, but all the while seeking to introduce what the people have rejected.

The very ethics of the Irish government can be called into question for this treaty. A major issue which is arising is whether the government acted unconstitutionally by agreeing to terms which necessitated constitutional change in the first place to allow them negotiate in such a fashion. First and foremost they must uphold the Constitution in any negotiations and in order for them to negotiate outside of that remit they must first seek the permission of the people to do so and then submit whatever was negotiated for ratification or not. How can a government negotiate a treaty which needs Constitutional change to bring it into effect, presume the support of the people, but promise calamity if that support is not forthcoming?

These very tactics are something that can be discussed in great detail, but what is important now is to decide what viable and agreed route can be taken into the future to the satisfaction of all citizens, rather than this one minded and oppressive style that is being currently taken. What also has to be studied is the complete failings of the Lisbon Treaty, and to realise and acknowledge exactly why the people have rejected this new style EU. Three times now in three different countries it has been rejected, and rather than seeing it as a mere problem that can be sidestepped EU representatives need urgently to address the ever growing gulf between the citizens and the political elite.

*"We declare the right of the people of Ireland to the ownership of Ireland, and to the unfettered control of Irish destinies, to be sovereign and indefeasible".*

# THE EU FROM THE BEGINNING

To fully grasp where we are at present, we must remember the past. What did the EU originate as and what direction has it taken since?

## **The EU since its very inception has always been moving towards the prospect of a federal style Europe.**

The European Economic Community was originally formed as the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) in 1951 with the Treaty of Paris. The idea of the community was to foster international relations in a hope to try and prevent any further outbreaks of war, to nurture the commercial relations between countries and promote inter-national trading and exporting. The main aim of the EEC, as stated in its preamble, was to *"preserve peace and liberty and to lay the foundations of an ever closer union among the peoples of Europe"*. A closer union, but not a complete one as is being put forward now to sustain a monopoly of European voices over indigenous affairs in all of her member countries. A European Defence Community (EDC) and European Political Community (EPC) were also proposed, but the EDC was rejected by the French Parliament knowing full well the far and long reaching implications a federal Europe with an army would have for the future.

From this point forward all the steps taken were slowly moving towards this ideal federal Europe in all of its treaties, with the grasp and control of the European Community slowly moving into the hands of the political elite and spreading over its member states. Treaties were further implemented in 1957, 1967, and 1987 further harmonizing the separate entities already formed in the European arena. The watershed for the move towards the complete Europe was soundly formed in 1993 with the Maastricht Treaty. This treaty formed the basis for the introduction of the Euro further spreading the European influence, but also the 'Three Pillars' system which held the EU together.

These three pillars were :

- European Community
- Common Foreign and Security Policy
- Police and Judicial Co-operation in Criminal Matters

These pillars were the first major moves for a federal Europe that is still being put forward in the present day. This, like many treaties before and after, was fraught with difficulty in getting the people to accept it, but as always, it was forced through by the so called representatives of these people. The middle pillar mentioned, Common Foreign and Security Policy, is one of note. As a result of this treaty EU Battle Groups, Peacekeeping, a Common Defence policy, and Helsinki Headline Goal Force Catalogue were negotiated and put into place. How is one supposed to keep clearly as a separate entity the sovereignty and identity of ones country when asked to engage and partake in such activities?

Ireland may have the ability to distance itself from some of these policies, but on past and present reference to the international reaction to the 'No' vote here, it is clear to see the EU policy on many effects is 'All In or Get Out'.

The Helsinki Headline Goal Force Catalogue is also one to take particular heed of. It is a military capability target as set out by members of the WEU with deadlines to achieve. The 2003 goals were to be able to deploy *'up to 15 brigades or 50,000-60,000 persons in order to be capable of intervening in any crisis that could occur in an area where European interests are affected. The aim was to make those forces self-reliant, deployable within 60 days and over 4,000 km, and sustainable in the field for a year. This means the force would actually have to number around 180,000 troops so as to provide rotating replacements for the initial forces.'* The 2010 goals are that *'they would be capable of responding with swift and decisive action applying a fully coherent approach to the whole spectrum of crisis management operations covered by the Treaty of the EU and the 2003 EU Security Strategy (i.e. humanitarian and rescue tasks, disarmament operations, support to third countries in combating terrorism, peacekeeping tasks and tasks of combat forces in crisis management, and peacemaking).'*

As a result it is not relevant that Ireland only participates in *some* of these activities. All these actions are being taken in the name of the EU which Ireland is a part. The contents of the aims for 2010 are vague, *'disarmament operations'* and *'combating terrorism'*. Who is likely to define which factions are worthy of being 'disarmed', and which factions are deemed worthy of holding a 'terrorist' tag onto them, giving the fact that a EU member in the form of Great Britain is still holding on illegally to a part of another member state, Ireland, without repercussion, and also given the fact that states and regimes who impose terror in places such as Darfur, Zimbabwe, and Nepal, are all allowed continued with relative ease and free will because it is not convenient to intervene? Is the definition of terrorism or which groups are to be disarmed to be put before a vote in the EU, a vote which after the acceptance of a Lisbon style treaty, would make Ireland's say even smaller?

They want another army to 'defend' Europe or for whatever reasons they wish to use it for. Surely for defensive actions, interested countries can join NATO. And for peacekeeping there is the UN even though there is a general disregard for UN motions, sanctions and guidelines from some of those most vocal in its support when the time suits, countries such as America and Israel.

How can faith be put into this EU system when it systematically fails to uphold its own conditions in so many forms, from the clear and long tailing evidence of British collusion in so many cases right up to the failure to repatriate prisoners to their home countries as they are entitled to under EU law, and now with the seemingly God given right to force through treaties and constitutional changes no matter what the views of the people are?

*"The Republic guarantees religious and civil liberty, equal rights and equal opportunities to all its citizens, and declares its resolve to pursue the happiness and prosperity of the whole nation and all of its parts, cherishing all of the children of the nation equally and oblivious of the differences carefully fostered by an alien government, which have divided a minority from the majority in the past."*

# THE COMPLETE FAILINGS OF THE LISBON TREATY

To understand on where the alternative will lie for the future in regards to Ireland and the EU, it is important to analyse the outcome of the Lisbon Treaty vote and understand exactly *why* people voted against it. First and foremost are the obvious inadequacies of the document which left the Irish people feeling undermined and responding to these glaring holes in the path of our future. Secondly, was the feeling of being left out of the loop in relation to the substance of the document.

**22% of No voters voted this was simply because they did not know enough about it, and over 50% of people who did not vote felt the same way.**

This fault of being un-informed lies at the feet of the EU and the Irish government, who proposed and put forward an unreadable document to the large majority of its recipients, but we also have to realize that despite the hard work put into the No campaign it still left a very large percentage at odds to what it was all about. What could have been done better to narrow this gap of misinformation? The following is the main findings as a result of a study done in the aftermath of the Lisbon Treaty in Ireland. This gives a clearer, but not outright, insight into the trends of the voters involved in the Lisbon campaign.

- Over half of the people who did not vote in the referendum said this was due to a lack of understanding of the issues; younger people were much less likely to participate than their older counterparts (a ratio of 2:1)
- For the "yes" voters, the prime motivation was the feeling that "Lisbon" was in Ireland's best interest; the reasons mentioned were mostly one-dimensional, centred around how Ireland has benefitted from the EU
- The "no" voters presented a much wider diverse spectrum of reasons to explain their preference. They displayed a multidimensional character of the explanations: a lack of information (a quarter of "no" voters) led the way.
- The young people who participated, women and those not working were significant supporters of the "no" vote; the majority of professionals, managers and retirees were backing the "yes" campaign.
- In the "no" camp, voters thought that the result would put Ireland in a strong position to renegotiate the treaty, to allow Ireland to maintain its neutrality and to keep its tax system (all backed by three-quarters of voters or more)
- The "yes" voters felt less strongly about the issues, but they did emphasise the fact that the result would weaken Ireland's position in the EU (two-thirds of "yes" voters)

- A large majority of Irish voters (68%) said the "no" campaign was the most convincing; even a majority of "yes" voters felt that way (57%)
- Within the "yes" camp we found more people who changed their minds during the campaign (25% of the "yes" and 17% of "no" voters started out from a different position)
- [http://ec.europa.eu/public\\_opinion/flash/fl\\_245\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/flash/fl_245_en.pdf)

It is important to accept and understand the reasons why the people voted against the Treaty and to move forward on this, especially since the government is looking into a second Lisbon Treaty rather than acknowledge the will of the people and to adapt to the changed environment. The obvious moves by European leaders to try and force Ireland to a second vote must be resisted to retain the integrity of the apparent and so called democracy within the EU.

Firstly to look at the figures, it portrays some alarming results. The large percentage who simply did not know what the Treaty entailed is the one that stands out the most. This is as a result of the treaty being purposely made unreadable. But why, despite the No campaign being the most convincing, did we not make it more accessible to people to understand the document as a whole and what effect it would have for the future? The document was purposely complicated; did we make it uncomplicated enough? One liners and points being made were enough to get the large majority of main issues across but it still left people at odds to what the overall effect would be despite the success of highlighting these important sections. The undecided or uninformed voters are the major swing elements to any vote, and with the percentage highlighted, it is important to mobilise for any prospective future vote on any issue to ensure that the actions and effects of any mentioned vote are clear for them to see, to understand, to decide and to vote on. As seen with Lisbon, the main large corporate papers and outlets are overwhelmingly in favour of whatever the government wants and will try to push this message across to the mass populous. The people have seen through this media propoganda for this time, but with a more cohesive and coherent attempt likely to mislead the public for the future European treaties, the onus is falling even more on us to get the real outcome across and to make it clear and understandable.

By looking at the figures it confirms the Yes campaign was based around linear issues and the main emphasis of their campaign being on 'Good for Ireland' to try and convince people to vote their way. The main Yes voters in employment were professionals and senior managers, all profit pushers and the holders of ideals in agreement with the capitlistic nature of our government who are willing to sell out the Irish people and her resources at any cost to benefit themselves which can be seen clearly by the sale of Irelands natural oil and gas resources in a time of rising costs to foreign corporate syndicates. An argument put forward by Marian Harkin MEP for the North Western region was that the head of the American Chamber of Commerce had encouraged to vote yes, but did not make mention of the veiled threat this 'encouragment' held.

She wanted you to listen to an individual speaking for *foreign* interests, speaking for a *foreign* corporate investment grouping, interested in making more **profits** for *foreign* companies, to direct and dictate the future of *Ireland* and its people.

## What was the argument in different areas?

The No vote had given the survey a larger variation of reasons for their decision on the treaty, given the fact that there were no plus points, as shown through the one sided response of the Yes voters. A large amount of the No voters also decided their way on the basis of Irish neutrality, showing that issue is still as important as it ever was, and a basic and common interest is still held on the issue of neutrality and sovereignty. The Irish nation is a race of independent and proud people, and will continue to be for the future despite the attempts to hijack these emotions to get people to vote Yes for Lisbon, scare mongering with such things as they were being anti-Irish for voting No and everyone would lose their jobs. Are people not losing their jobs currently anyways due to the mishandling and shortsightedness of the Irish government over the last decade in running the economy?

The culmination of all the lies, misinformation and general disregard coming from the EU consistently for the last decade has resulted in this No vote. Any sense of democracy which once prevailed in the halls of the EU headquarters has truly evaporated from the scene and they can only pay lip service to the word which the union was apparently founded upon. The citizens of the EU can no longer have a say if the representatives have their way. This small percentage of people who are supposedly elected to relay the thoughts and feelings of the people on issues to the EU now feel that this base of support which has chosen them are no longer fit to decide for themselves on issues concerning their own future.

It is this view and sense of elitism which is running its course through every vein of the EU machine at the present time and is the nucleus of the erosion of democracy within it. The power of choice must be given back to the people to decide their own future and not sidestepped when they know problems will arise when the facts are put to the citizens. This is the fact they have overlooked with Lisbon, because it would be too difficult to ratify with every member state if put to a vote, and it was the core of its downfall and the complete failings within it.

## **THE NEXT STEPS FOR EUROPE**

So now as a result of the outcome of Lisbon the EU is left in a political limbo, what to do and where to go? The view being pandered by EU officials and the Irish government is that Lisbon WILL be accepted in some form or the other, maybe with some small tinkering or changes as other parties wish to do. This is not the way. The people have spoken and this voice has to be respected. Lisbon IS dead and should be looked upon that way, not the current angle being taken at it by the government and her allies. How many changes would be adequate, to change a totally unacceptable document into a reformed and acceptable one?

The French President has spoken in private to his colleagues that Ireland will vote again, and although that statement is now being denied, it is clear that as head of the EU his plan is to get the acceptance of Lisbon at all costs. Michael Martin TD in response to this issue has *stated 'Ireland herself will decide its future'*. Has Ireland herself not already spoken on this future with it's vote? Or is this a point which has been overlooked by the government in their eagerness to sort out this issue to the satisfaction of their European masters?

The Lisbon Treaty was drafted and attempted to be implemented through the assumed support of the people and this is where the greatest flaws are. The EU has moved far from any former sense of democracy it ever had, to a state of affairs where issues like this are forcibly put through with veiled threats against all those who oppose it. Democracy at work? Instead of the current route being undertaken by the European Union it should re-assess its position and standing with the people and realize that it is rapidly losing touch with reality. Let us go back to the drawing board and re-affirm the confidence that a true genuine Union would install in its members. It is time for the main puppet masters in Europe to realise that a federal and united Europe is not the way to go for the future.

This treaty in this form or another has been rejected three times and a new alternative has not been formed in response to this blatant unwillingness of the EU to formulate any type of separate route to give the people. They are running a one way street and have failed to realise that there is the need for a total change in direction now, not a reform of the current one. The EU needs to start becoming more accountable for its actions and for taking its steps for the benefit of all of the European citizens and not just for the prosperity of a few.

The centrality of the European Union has to be broken down immediately. Flexibility for countries to decide on their own issues must be granted back to full status. As we stand now Irish fishing boats are standing idly by in ports so that foreign boats can fish in our waters, and fishermen dumping good catches overboard to comply with irrational EU quotas. This is just one example of a single sector, but the similar effects imposed on other areas can be seen with a simple evaluation of these too.

Many of these ailments of the EU can be fixed with a new approach and system to passing any laws or articles which effect the citizens they supposedly serve. Drawing up these plans with the assumed support of the people, or knowingly with the support of few but for the betterment of even fewer, is not acceptable. It is clear to see from the Lisbon Treaty that the union no longer seeks the permission of the people to grant or dismiss issues that will effect how they live their lives through the non granting of referendums in all countries. It is only through the foresight of previous leaders that we have been given the chance to have our say via the ballot box, and if it was not for this, the Lisbon Treaty would have been passed here without hesitation.

Representatives are supposed to uphold the views of the people no matter what, and this is no longer the case. They are elected by the people to voice their concerns, but this duty has rapidly changed to doing what this minority of representatives think is best themselves. The European Union has become a forcibly guiding hand over every area of issues in all of its member states today, implementing its stances and views quite adamantly into each society in an attempt to grasp hold of everything and to hold power on all issues.

The thinking of the EU has to change now. The European Union is NOT a new style United States of America. Its members range from far differing regions, races, religions and viewpoints among other things. We can not try to emulate the USA with a complete federal Europe and army. The members have a far too wide ranging and differing interest in a range of different matters and agreement is not certain on many issues. This is where the fault line lies. The heads of the Union expect miracles from every country to get fully behind everything that they propose, a situation which is unrealistic and will never occur as each individual country will be looking out for its own interests, not for the betterment of the EU.

This situation has to change immediately to re-affirm any confidence within the citizens for this Union. Reform needs to occur as in that everything reverts back to a loose economic or international relations grouping, not a complete and whole entity that speaks on every issue.

The Union must be supported by the will of the people and not any other way. There is too much influence from Brussels on far too many issues in too many countries, a situation which needs to recede. Let countries get back to having their own input on what is important to them rather than having the eyes of people who think they know better looking over their shoulders at every turn.

Let the fishermen fish. Let the army go. Let the federal Europe disappear.

And most of all let the people decide.

