

NEW EUROPEAN



**Biannual Views
of International Affairs
Spring 2015**

NEW EUROPEAN

Biannual Views of International Affairs

Spring 2015 • Vol. 24 • No 1

Contents

Editorial, *page 1*

Debt, Sin and Denial in Greece,

Carlos A. Primo Braga, page 2

Closing the Gate on GMO and the Nefarious Transatlantic Trade Agreement,

Sir Julian Rose, page 6

Re-establishing Democracy in a Sovereign France,

David Acunzo, page 12

The European Arrest Warrant in Practice – Some Cases,

Ditte Marie Christensen, page 27

Large Scale – Advantage or Disadvantage?,

Jan Arne Bremnes, page 30

Thinking – a Criminal Act?,

Sir Julian Rose, page 32

Over the Farm Gate,

Sir Richard Body, page 36

The New European, *page 37*

NEW EUROPEAN

Editor: Luise Hemmer Pihl. Editor emeritus.: Sir Richard Body

Published by the Knud P. Pedersen Centre for European Studies

©: Knud P. Pedersen Centre for European Studies,

skrodhoj@gmail.com.

All volumes in the new series can be downloaded from

www.neweuropean.org

ISSN 0953-1432

Editorial

It becomes a red letter day when the *New European* is able to praise the EU Commission. It has approved the draft regulation which could make organic farming the backbone of European agriculture. Moreover, Lawrence Woodward from the Organic Research Centre has recorded how EU commissioner Phil Hogan has described organic farming as being “in the vanguard of the new EC’s agriculture policy for creating growth and jobs”.

Knowing how the Commission works, we assume that Mr Hogan has had talks with his officials and they are willing to give their support. It may be some while before his final words take a concrete form throughout the EU.

The EU commission has always had an open door policy, and for half a century this has enabled the lobbyists to plead their case with EU officials. If one looks at the ‘Yellow Pages’ for Brussels one finds that all the great chemical corporations in the world have an address in the heart of Brussels. Neither production nor marketing is carried out at these premises; instead they are a base for the corporation’s lobbyists. They live and work permanently in Brussels and by taking advantage of the open door policy they have a close relationship with the EU officials.

At first they may give an invitation to lunch or dinner to one of the excellent restaurants that exist in Brussels then follows a dinner party where wives are invited, at the weekend games of golf are played together or picnics for the families held in the Ardennes Forest.

This results in the close consultation between officials and the lobbyists when new regulations are drafted or policies devised. This open door policy started with good intentions, but over the years consumer groups and smaller companies have been unable to take advantage of it in the same way, as they simply do not have the same amount of money to spend in Brussels.

In addition there is the *Round Table of European Industrialists*, including most of the great industrial multinational corporations in the world. Some of these, as it is often said have a wealth and power greater than the average nation state. This organisation also has its lobbyists, and they are able to claim that the EU Commission does nothing to which the Roundtable might object.

There are members of the Green Party who believe that the EU can go on without being reformed and we wish that they would ponder if such a concentration of power is consistent with the green ideal.

We can be sure that the lobbyist for chemical farming have not gone to sleep; the Commission’s “Draft Regulation” may remain only a draft. *R.B.*

Debt, Sin and Denial in Greece

CARLOS A. PRIMO BRAGA

The future of the Greek economy and its place in the Eurozone are back in the headlines. The new government in Athens has adopted a confrontational strategy, building upon the anti-austerity stance that propelled Syriza and its allies to power. In the short term, it will buy some time for Greece. Unfortunately, it is doubtful that it will pave a sustainable way ahead for the Greek economy.

Debt and Sin

The confrontation is based on two distinctive narratives. Northern European countries – Germany in particular – interpret the Greek drama as a morality play. It is worth remembering that in Aramaic – the language most likely spoken by Jesus Christ – the words for sin and debt are used interchangeably. The Greek problem and its solution is often rationalized by the “austerians” in terms of the required atonement, via austerity, in view of the profligacy, corruption and lies that led to the economic disequilibrium behind the current crisis.

The size of this disequilibrium became evident in 2009 when the government communicated that the fiscal deficit was in double digits, a multiple of previous estimates. Greek debt reached 113% of GDP, signalling that sustainability concerns were going to make things even more difficult. By then, confidence in the Greek government was badly damaged. The ensuing adjustment programme negotiated with the “troika” formed by the EU, the ECB, and the IMF imposed strict conditionalities: a significant fiscal adjustment, structural reforms, and privatization efforts. The programme delivered a large “internal devaluation,” including wage reductions in parallel with a dramatic increase in unemployment, which skyrocketed from 7.7% in 2008 to a peak of 27.5% by 2013.

The adjustment was not sufficient to put Greece back on a debt sustainability path. It led to the largest ever debt restructuring experienced by a “developed” country in 2012. This episode could be characterized as the main event in the Eurozone sovereign debt crisis and it broke many of the “certainties” that characterized the EU’s rules, in particular the assumption that sovereign defaults were not possible.

One of the main consequences of the restructuring was to dramatically transform the composition of Greek debt: it became mainly a public sector affair, with the European Financial Stability Facility (EFSF), the IMF, and the ECB now holding almost 80% of Greek debt. Official creditors supported the bailout in exchange for the continuation of austerity measures. In order to expiate its “sins,” Greek society had to continue on an adjustment track that was expected to generate a surplus of 3% by 2015 and of 4.5% by 2016 and 2017.

There is a contrasting narrative that has gained attention as the impact of the austerity measures made the adjustment programme increasingly unpopular. According to this view, Germany and other fiscal “responsible” countries share responsibility for the Greek tragedy. Independently of Greek failings, it was the flawed design of the monetary union that created the conditions for the crisis. Not only many of these countries also failed to meet the Maastricht criteria for fiscal probity in the past, but they also closed their “eyes” to the many institutional failings of Greece. And for reasons of political expediency accepted its entry in the Eurozone, even though it was clear that Greece did not comply with the macro and institutional requirements to join the monetary union.

According to this narrative, Germany was able to run its current account surpluses on the back of the deficits of the periphery. The euro allowed countries in the periphery to borrow, for a while, at rates that were totally disconnected from the real credit risk involved.

Accordingly, the austerians should now recognize the error of their ways and allow Greece to experiment with a growth-oriented recovery programme. In short, the Greeks should not be singled-out by adopting a Mae West-style of behaviour (“I generally avoid temptation unless I can’t resist it”) in response to distorted incentives.

Denial

A compromise between austerians and the Greek government has been reached. Both camps are declaring victory in the extension of the Greek bailout programme for the next four months. Each side is playing to its own domestic constituencies. But what was accomplished is basically “to kick the can down the road” and to buy some time to rebuild trust between the relevant stakeholders. Syriza came to power on the back of its promises to renegotiate Greece’s sovereign debt and to put an end to the bailout programme. The recent deal does not deliver on any of these goals. PM Tsipras and his finance minister decided early on not to put emphasis on restructuring Greece’s debt. The debt is not sustainable at current levels and the implications are serious over the long-term (although the current burden of debt servicing is manageable). But it is also true that to focus on debt relief would be a non-starter, given the strong opposition of European institutions and governments to any hair-cut on the value of debt held by public creditors.

The negotiations focused on acquiring some flexibility of the austerity conditions. The list of measures provided by the Greek government on February 23rd is very close to previous commitments associated with the bailout programme. There are some hints of flexibility with references to the importance of fighting the humanitarian crisis and a moratorium on “auctions of the main residence of households below a certain income threshold” in the context of nonperforming loans. In practice there is a strong sense of “*déjà vu*” in the agreement.

The vagueness of the agreement could be interpreted as a “victory” for Syriza. Initial reactions from the IMF and ECB suggest that tough negotiations lie ahead. Maybe, this time Greece will be able to really do something about tax evasion and enforcement (by 2013 more than 80% of undisputed tax-related debt was outstanding). In the meantime, Minister Varoufakis should be reminded that “vision without implementation is hallucination”.

Confrontation will continue to be the mark of Greece’s relations with its creditors. As long as international creditors deny the need for another major debt restructuring and Greek authorities continue to play the populist card of making promises that cannot be implemented, the equilibrium will be unstable.

Instead of relying on the Greek classics for metaphors, all involved should remember the cautionary words of Polonius in

Hamlet: “borrowing dulls the edge of husbandry” (i.e., excessive borrowing can create disincentives to good economic policies). This in combination with a national culture of denial about social responsibilities generates an explosive mix. Difficult days are ahead for the Eurozone.

CARLOS A. PRIMO BRAGA is *Professor of International Political Economy at IMD, and Director of The Evian Group@IMD. He teaches in Breakthrough Program for Senior Executives (BPSE), the Orchestrating Winning Performance (OWP) program, and also the IMD-CKGSB Dual Executive MBA.*

Closing the Gate on GMO and the Nefarious Transatlantic Trade Agreement

SIR JULIAN ROSE

“What emerges is an understanding of TTIP as the political project of a transatlantic corporate and political elite which, on the unfounded promise of increased trade and job creation, will attempt to reverse social and environmental regulatory protections, redirect legal rights from citizens to corporations, and consolidate US and European global leadership in a changing world order.”

Seattle to Brussels Network, Kim Bizzarri

A key element of this Transatlantic Trade Agreement, but only one of hundreds of highly controversial proposals, is the move to deregulate the status currently accorded to imports of GM seeds and plants for cultivating in European soils.

A determined effort by all of us, who care about real food and real farming, will be needed to stop one of the most insidious attempts yet to end Europe’s widespread resistance to genetically modified organisms. In particular, the use of GM seeds in European agriculture, leading to genetically modified crops being grown in areas that have, up until now, successfully resisted the GM corporate invasion.

The EU has so far licensed just one GM maize variety (MON 810) to be grown within its territories, and one potato variety (Amflora) for industrial starch production. Up until now, the EU has acted according to a largely restrictive trade practice concerning GM and other controversial food products due to major public pressure, as well as under a broad EU ruling termed ‘the precautionary principle’.

All that could be about to go out the window under current negotiations between the USA and the European Commission to ratify a new trade agreement known TTIP, the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership.

The objective of this ‘partnership’ is to facilitate far going corporate control of the international market place and to prize-open the mostly

closed (but not locked) European door on GM crops and seeds.

While this corporate heist is being eased into place, replicas are being negotiated between Canada and the EU under the title 'Comprehensive Economic Trade Agreement' CETA.

And as if that wasn't enough, a further dismantling of trade tariffs is under way via the 'Trade In Services Agreement' TiSA: a wide ranging further liberalization of corporate trading conditions as a direct continuation of the WTO (World Trade Organisation) GATS agreement, with its highly onerous, corporate biased 'Codex Alimentarius' sanitary and hygiene rulings. Indigenous seeds and medicinal herbs are particularly under attack via Codex.

We can thus recognize, from the outset, that a very dangerous interference of the already leaky checks and balances that control the import/export market is under way here. The thinly disguised under-text reveals plans for a massive corporate take-over of all negotiated quasi-democratic trade agreements and food quality controls that currently take place between the US and EU. It is clear that the major corporate concerns are determined to overcome or dilute all resistance to their unfettered 'free trade' goals.

Where they are blocked, corporations are claiming the right to sue governments and institutions held to be 'infringing the principle of international free trade.' Such litigation procedures are not new, but the idea of writing them into a major trading agreement has sparked major controversy. For example in Germany, where one of the main Swedish nuclear power construction companies is attempting to sue the German government for billions of Euros, with the intention of gaining full compensation for the ban on nuclear power enacted earlier by the Merkel government.

To add a further sinister twist to this already draconian exercise in power politics, the court hearings on such actions are slated to take place in secret, in a court house in Washington DC. Such secret courts are already operational in the UK, where 'sensitive cases' can be heard out of sight of public scrutiny with no reports or summaries of the proceedings released into the public domain. Here we witness the Orwellian control system fully up and running, with its attendant undisguised destruction of many decades of hard won civil liberties.

The unremitting and relentless nature of this neo-capitalist and corporate centralization of power is causing significant resistance to manifest itself: "The opposition in Europe to a transatlantic free trade area believes it has the momentum, buoyed by scare stories regularly

amplified by the European media. A petition against the trade act surpassed the 1 million mark this week.” (The Guardian). We are all going to have to get involved to ensure a people led victory.

For the purpose of this summary, I am not able to cover the full gamut of trading controversies being brought to a head by the ongoing negotiations, preferring to concentrate on the food and farming implications. But it is very important not to lose sight of the true intention behind all aspects of these nefarious trade agreements.

As a precursor to TTIP, a major shift in GMO legislation was already voted in by the EU’s Environmental Council on 12 June 2014. After many years of EU member state disagreement on GM issues – leading to negotiation stalemate – this controversial agreement devolves GMO decision making procedures from Brussels to EU member states.

In the process however, it gives the green light to pro-GMO governments to allow the planting of GM crops in their countries, while anti-GM member states can put forward economic and environmental health arguments to ban GM crops. Under the first draft of this agreement, countries wishing to block GM plantings were called upon to seek permission to ban such crops from the very corporations that are proposing to introduce them! A proposal whose unprecedented arrogance echoes the corporate agenda of TTIP and CETA trade proposals.

Fortunately, after intensive public lobbying, this clause was dropped (November 11, 2014, Environment, Public Health and Food Safety Committee).

Nevertheless, what we have in front of our eyes is a strong GMO warning light. A dual alert in fact. Firstly owing to the EU Commission’s devolvement of ‘the right to decide’ to member states, and secondly owing to the TTIP agreement, which, if ratified, would allow GM crops and seeds currently banned in Europe – as well as various medicated animal products such as US hormone-enriched beef - to have a largely unrestricted flow into the EU. By-passing, in the process, the ‘precautionary principle’ and the European Food Safety Agency’s views (for what they are worth) on the efficacy of such products.

The TTIP agreement – if fully ratified, will, in effect, remove any differences in trade-related legislation between the EU and US. In corporate-speak, such differences are held up as being ‘trade distorting’. TTIP could also be used to attack positive food-related initiatives in the US, such as ‘local preference’ legislation at the state

level. It calls for ‘mutual recognition’ between trading blocks: trade-speak for lowering standards.

Consumer groups have already pointed out that mutual recognition of standards is not an acceptable approach since it will require at least one of the parties to accept food that is not of a currently acceptable standard. To put it in simple terms: the pressure to lower standards in Europe to ‘resolve the inconsistencies’ will be strong, and far more likely to succeed than the other solution: to raise standards in the USA.

Phrases like ‘harmonization’ and ‘regulatory cooperation’ are a frequently occurring part of TTIP trade speak. But in the end it’s all going one way: downwards – to the lowest common denominator.

According to Corporate Europe Observatory:

“Under TTIP’s chapter on ‘regulatory cooperation’ any future measure that could lead us towards a more sustainable food system, could be deemed ‘a barrier to trade’ and thus refused before it sees the light of day. Big business groups like Business Europe and the US Chamber of Commerce have been pushing for this corporate lobby dream scenario before the US-EU negotiations ever began. What they want from regulatory cooperation is to essentially co-write legislation and to establish a permanent EU-US dialogue to work towards harmonizing standards long after TTIP has been signed. Despite earlier reservations, the Commission now seems to go along with with this corporate dream. Leaked EU proposals from December 2013 outline a new system of regulatory cooperation between the EU and US, that will enable decisions to be made without any public oversight or engagement.”

What this means is that new, highly controversial GM seed lines will have virtually no publicly scrutinized safety-net to slow or halt their progress to the fields and dinner plates of Europe.

One of the most determined voices behind the realization of TTIP’s ambitions is ex Polish Prime Minister, Donald Tusk: As The Guardian tells us: “Taking office this week as the new president of the European Council, chairing summits and mediating between national leaders, Donald Tusk, Poland’s former prime minister, singled out TTIP as one of his main priorities for the year ahead” (report 08/12/2014). Tusk, as prime minister of Poland, had already displayed his bias towards big business, by backing strategies to sell tranches of Poland’s most productive farmland to the highest foreign bidders, while simultaneously cosyng-up to the EU Commission’s big chiefs. Tusk is

complicit, if not a leading voice, in supporting the overt centralization of political power in Brussels and the steady dismantling of national sovereignty: the right for countries to decide and control their own futures.

TTIP and CETA are perfect weapons for the long planned-for destruction of national sovereignty. Trade negotiators, GM exponents, big farming unions, agrochemical businesses and food processing giants are all in on the game and have strong lobby groups backing TTIP. Their view on what the word ‘cooperation’ means goes like this “A system of regulatory cooperation would prevent ‘bad decisions’ – thereby avoiding having to take governments to court later” (Corporate Europe Observatory).

These ‘bad decisions’ constitute any attempts by governments to rein in the overt lust for power which is the hallmark of the corporate elite. For example, biotech and pesticide giants Syngenta and Bayer are taking the European Union to court over its partial ban on three insecticides from the Neonicotinoid family, because of their deadly impact on bees. However let us be clear, the European Union is only acting this way because of intense public pressure to do so; left to its own devices there would be no discernible difference between it and the corporate elite who stalk the corridors of power at the European Commission and European Parliament.

The underlying goal of ‘regulatory cooperation’ between industry and the EU is to have a continuous ‘ongoing’ dialogue (known as ‘living agreement’) that could ultimately render any final TTIP agreement largely meaningless. Meaningless, because it could by-pass any failures of TTIP to gain concessions on food and environmental standards by focusing on altering ‘implementation rules’ – rather than taking the more arduous route of altering ‘the law’ itself. Tinkering with ‘implementation rules’ simply offers another way for corporate friendly concessions to become enshrined in common trading rights.

Reassurances from EU and US negotiators that “food standards will not be lowered” look highly suspect. Farmers should be alert to the fact that, because of TTIP, imports are highly likely be allowed that do not meet local standards, thus undermining national trading disciplines.

This applies across the spectrum and includes currently non-compliant GMO. According to Corporate Europe Observatory

“Regulatory convergence will fundamentally change the way politics is done in the future, with industry sitting right at the table, if

they get their way.”

If they get their way.

All groups and organizations that care about retaining a largely GMO Free Europe and the consumption of genuine, healthy food - in tandem with the ecological farming methods that produce it - had better jump to the task of stopping TTIP, and its related trading blocks, from destroying the last line of defence against a complete corporate take-over of the food chain.

Join the resistance! Check the internet and join one of the groups in your area that are committed to blocking TTIP and CETA.

JULIAN is an early pioneer of UK organic farming, an international activist and author.

His acclaimed latest book 'In Defence of Life' can be purchased from www.amazon.com and from Julian's web site www.julianrose.info

Union Populaire Républicaine: The party that wants to re-establish the sovereignty of France

DAVID ACUNZO

France is not a sovereign country anymore, and the policies and reforms imposed upon it are a root cause of the difficulties faced by the country. This is what the Union Populaire Républicaine (UPR), a French political party on the rise, asserts. To remedy the situation, the UPR propose a unilateral withdrawal of France from the EU, eurozone and NATO.

Successive French governments have failed to address the economic, social and political difficulties the country has faced over the past decades. On the contrary, the situation has been deteriorating, and the configuration of the main political forces reinforces the *status quo*. The *Union Populaire Républicaine* (UPR), a young party founded in 2007, has a radical proposition to right the ship: regain sovereignty of the country by withdrawing from the EU, the euro and NATO. This, they argue, will enable the implementation of policies which are adapted to and reflect French society and economy, as opposed to policies imposed and designed by distant technocrats in a Brussels office which serve the interests of industrial and financial lobbies and US geopolitical strategy. However, despite their growing size and unique propositions, the national media continue to neglect any mention of the existence of UPR.

France stuck in a latent crisis

France is currently facing a conjunction of crises. Unemployment rates have been increasing since 2008 (1,2), poverty since the mid-2000's (3) as well as inequality (4,5); deindustrialization has been continuous for at least two decades (6-8), and the farmers are literally in agony, with an average of more than two suicides per week (9).

This situation is fostering a more general societal uneasiness and a distrust towards mainstream politicians, who are losing whatever they have left of credibility (10,11). Successive left- and right-wing governments have so far failed to ameliorate the situation, always advocating more ‘reforms’ to adapt the country to the realities of today’s globalised world¹. Meanwhile, in the aftermath of the *Charlie Hebdo* attacks, the army has never been so present in the streets (12) and a much-decried surveillance law is being passed (13).

The choice for a credible alternative political force, however, appears inexistent when judging from the mass media. The main opposition party, the right-wing *Union pour un Mouvement Populaire* (UMP), recently renamed as ‘*Les Républicains*’² is plagued with internal fights (14), and their leader, former President Sarkozy, buried under scandals (15). The only alternative party presented by the national media is the far-right and notoriously euro-critical *Front National* (FN). Despite being often presented as rising increasingly close to power as time passes, the reality of the self-proclaimed ‘first party of France’ is very different: after 43 years of existence, the FN have never collected more than 14% of registered voters’ votes (16). Their electoral success is in fact only relative, being largely explained by an ever-climbing abstention from voting – the actual first party of France. The reason their success has been limited is fairly simple: a majority of the population rightly consider the FN to be a xenophobic and racist – and thus untrustworthy – party. The consequence is the inception into French voter’s minds of the idea that being strongly euro-critical is equivalent to being racist and xenophobic. The FN, presented as the sole political alternative, thus in fact constitutes the keystone of the political *status quo* in France: by linking the idea of a sovereign France to ideas widely considered repellent by the wider population, they cut off much needed alternatives from consideration and help to keep the two government parties in power.³⁻

1. The most recent bundle of neo-liberal reforms, perfectly in line with the EU Commission recommendations and agenda, is the so-called ‘*Loi Macron*.’

2. One can wonder where the idea for this new name came from. A hint might be found in one of the nicknames of the party leader: ‘*Sarkozy l’Américain*.’

3. The ideas expressed in this paragraph about the FN are defended by the UPR (see *e.g.* (17,18)).

The quiet rise of the *Union Populaire Républicaine*

It is in this apparently locked political situation that the popularity of the UPR is steadily on the increase. This party was founded in March 2007 by its main figure and current President François Asselineau, a high-ranking civil servant from the Ministry of Finance. By the end of 2007, the UPR counted only 47 members. Since then, however, the party has grown continuously and as of June 2015 claims more than 7,900 members, with an average net gain of about 8 new members per day⁴.

In contrast, the popularity of the other five or six minor French parties that enjoy some access to the mass media has dwindled over the past few years. For instance, the support of the left-wing *Parti de gauche* declined to 9,000 members, a 25% loss compared to 2012 (19). Worse still, the Greens (EÉLV) recently admitted counting less than 5,000 members, a 70% loss compared to 2012 (20). The UPR are clearly now comparable in size to these parties. In spite of this, they are virtually totally unheard of in the mass media. For mainstream politicians, analysts and journalists alike, the UPR simply don't exist. Even the French Wikipedia have categorically refused to allow the creation of a dedicated UPR page on the grounds that the party lacks mentions in the national media⁵. It is difficult not to conclude that this difference in media treatment is a plain case of censorship.

Deprived of mass media access, the UPR is a genuine grassroots movement, growing thanks to the Internet, local radio channels, word of mouth and actions on the ground. The website (upr.fr) compiles the detailed information on the party, including the recordings of the long in-depth talks given throughout the country. In these talks, François Asselineau and others explain the doctrine, analyses and worldview of the party. While the mass media and the political class cannot depart from almost exclusively national narratives with regard to national issues, the conferences of the UPR attempt to demonstrate the impact and importance of US and EU policies and institutions in the political,

4 The claimed number of members is updated daily and can be found on the UPR webpage www.upr.fr

5 The reader can however find the page of an – unknown – ancient Alsatian party of the same name, as well as a UPR Wikipedia page in various other languages, including English.

economic, social and cultural life of the country. It is quite remarkable that despite their length (usually four to five hours) and technicality (e.g. explaining how the euro currency is constructed, dissecting the Constitution of the Fifth Republic, or explaining the consequences of various articles of EU treaties), these talks are not only well-attended, but the main way the party is expanding.

The UPR: ideas, worldview and priorities

The triple-withdrawal

The UPR consider that the French government no longer has the powers needed to govern the country, since most strategic decisions are made in Brussels (EU Commission), Frankfurt (European Central Bank), and Washington DC (NATO). In addition, while most French parties advocate ‘Another Europe’ as a solution to problems within the EU, the UPR regard any drastic change in the European treaties as extremely improbable due to the diverging interests and required unanimity of the Member States in making changes to the founding treaties (Article 48 of the Treaty of the European Union, TEU). Their conclusion is that France must withdraw from these three institutions, by application of Article 50 of the Treaty on European Union (TEU) and Article 13 of the North Atlantic Treaty. If France fails to withdraw, they argue, the situation described above will surely keep on deteriorating.

The UPR are the only party in France specifically created for a unilateral exit from the EU, eurozone and NATO. Only two other parties mention the triple-exit: the M’PEP (*Mouvement politique d’émancipation populaire*) and the PCRF (*Pôle de renaissance communiste en France*), both far-left political formations⁶. The

6 The FN, like many other parties such as the conservative *Debout la France* (‘Stand up France’) or the far-left coalition *Front de Gauche*, have euro-critical discourses, but do *not* propose a unilateral withdrawal from the eurozone, let alone the EU. It is to be noted that the general public, as well as journalists, wrongly think that the FN propose to leave the eurozone and the EU. The UPR reviewed 14 concurrent and contradictory propositions that the FN made on the EU and euro withdrawal matters, none of them calling for a unilateral withdrawal from these institutions. (21)

opposite position is defended by the Green party (*EÉLV*), which openly advocate a federal Europe and an abolishing of the French Republic (22) – a stance which is against the French constitution. Virtually all the other parties, from the far-right FN to the far-left Communist Party, whether highly critical of the EU or not, advocate some kind of an alternative European Union project. They do this, however, without explaining that for any change to occur the approval of the 27 other Member States of the EU is required.. None of these parties appear to ever even mention the existence of Article 50 as a means to withdraw.

A hierarchy of priorities

The UPR attempt to position themselves in the tradition of the republican spirit of French society. Their motto, ‘The People’s union to re-establish democracy,’⁷ reflects their aim to gather people from various political sensibilities by transcending the classical left-right divide. For this purpose, they are careful to avoid some specific topics that strongly mark organisations on one side or the other of the political spectrum. In particular, societal issues which divide opinion such as immigration or gay marriage are put aside. The UPR’s stance is that French people should temporarily focus on the issues of sovereignty to regain political power. It is only then that democratic processes can occur to take decisions on various issues. So far, this strategy has worked: the author has personally met UPR members coming from extremely diverse political sensibilities. The left-right neutrality of the UPR was even officially acknowledged by the Ministry of Interior, as they classified the UPR in the category ‘*Divers*,’ *i.e.* neither left- nor right-wing.

The principles of triple-exit and hierarchy of priorities therefore constitute the core doctrine of the party, and are set in the 2007 UPR Charter that members should agree on before joining.

The EU and NATO: anti-democratic institutions under US influence

For the UPR, the EU is an anti-democratic institution. As seen above, its ideology, political line and institutional workings are set within treaties that effectively cannot be reformed, as any

7 In French: ‘*L’Union du peuple pour rétablir la démocratie.*’

substantial modification requires the unanimous agreement of the 28 Member States. The principal decision-makers, the non-elected EU Commissioners, are not accountable to the citizens and are notorious for being both advised and influenced by the private sector. The humanitarian situation in Greece (23), fruit of the Troika's austerity measures⁸, demonstrates that the EU is not working in the interests of the European people. Rather than fostering solidarity, the applied policies are stimulating resentment between European countries. Meanwhile, the EU is leading a dangerous foreign policy, and bears an overwhelming responsibility for the civil war in Ukraine and for the deterioration of relations with Russia⁹.

The UPR consider the EU – with its military counter-part NATO – as a geopolitical manoeuvre by the USA to subdue European countries and better control the continent. Indeed, the USA promoted and helped to finance the European construction at its infancy, and pushed for the creation of a common currency (25-27).

This position is not novel in France. The UPR often refer to the analyses of Charles de Gaulle, who clearly had this point of view. For de Gaulle, 'Europe ha[d] become, without even noticing it, a US protectorate,' and France needed to operate a 'second decolonisation' by getting 'rid of [US] domination' (28), cited in (29). De Gaulle considered that it would not be possible to formulate a political line amongst six Member States in a 'so-called integrated Europe.' He feared that the Member States would therefore choose to follow 'someone else from the outside that would have a political line.' Specifically, he referred to a 'federator,' who 'wouldn't be European' (30). But the Gaullists were not the only ones to hold these views in France: the French Communist Party (PCF) had similar analyses until the early eighties (31).

The UPR also note that the EU and NATO are intrinsically linked,

8 The so-called Troika refers to the EU Commission, the European Central Bank and the International Monetary Fund.

9 The UPR was the only party in France to denounce the support of the French government – because of European solidarity, or via the EU – to Eastern European neo-nazis (8). The UPR focused in particular on the Ukrainian case, where Dmitryi Yarosh, the head of the neo-nazi paramilitary organisation Pravy Sektor, was appointed special advisor to the Ukrainian ministry of Defence (24).

preventing any full independence of EU foreign and security policy. Very early on after WWII, there was the intention of ‘atlanticising’ any common Western European defence initiative. Indeed, the project of the European Defence Community (EDC), and then the Western European Union (WEU), which remained limited in scope, were both designed to include strong ties with NATO (32). While this was easily understandable during the Cold War, this tendency was not altered after the collapse of the Soviet block. On the contrary, the Treaty of Maastricht (1993) setting up the framework to build a Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) of the Union, subordinated it to NATO (Article J.4), while one of the main stated objectives of the WEU was ‘to strengthen the European pillar of the Atlantic Alliance.’¹⁰ Today, after termination of the WEU and its total replacement by the CFSP, the EU subordination to NATO is effective under Article 42 of the TEU. Similarly, Eurocorps, sometimes considered as the embryo of a European army, was linked to NATO by the SACEUR agreement, signed in January 1993 shortly after its creation. This agreement safeguards NATO’s primary access to the capacities of Eurocorps, as it can be put under operational command of NATO when needed (33). It is without surprise that the Eurocorps tagline reads: ‘A force for the European Union and NATO.’

According to the UPR, in parallel to trying to build a super-state, the EU is also encouraging the dismemberment of existing European nation states through its euro-region policy. The final result of this policy would be a federal Europe constituted of ethnic territories¹¹. This programme is already well advanced in the UK (Scotland) and Spain (Catalonia). It should be noted that the USA are definitely not in favour of a ‘Brexit’ (34) or a ‘Grexit’ (35) – *i.e.* a UK exit from the EU and a Greek exit from the euro respectively – but do not appear to be

10 See the ‘Declaration on the Role of the Western European Union and its Relations with the European Union and with the Atlantic Alliance,’ part of the Treaty of Maastricht.

11 This scheme would consist of dismantling France into roughly five euro-regions (Northern France, Brittany, Occitania, Alsace and Corsica). The French side of Catalonia and the Basque Country would merge with their Spanish counter-part. France would however gain the French-speaking portions of Switzerland and Belgium. It should be noted that the French Greens (ÉÉLV) actively promote the euro-region policies and make alliances with regional independence and autonomist movements.

as categorical concerning the idea of an independent Scotland (36) or Catalonia (37,38). For the UPR, as well as ‘federating’ Europe to better control it, the USA intend to prevent the emergence of any major Western European challenger by a divide-and-conquer strategy.

Reviving an independent foreign policy and the CNR consensus

The UPR insist that France would stay related to other countries through the numerous other bilateral and multilateral treaties that France has signed and ratified over the past centuries. The country would also remain a member of numerous international organisations including the Council of Europe, the UN, the OECD and the IEA. Only the EU treaties limiting France’s sovereignty would be revoked.

The UPR consider that France’s recent behaviour on the international scene dishonours the country. French diplomacy has become bellicose and aggressive (*e.g.* towards Syria, Libya, Russia), against its own national interests, and for the benefit of the USA. This behaviour is not unrelated to France’s membership of EU and NATO. Instead, France should try to develop constructive relationships with all countries of the world – which of course includes EU countries. A special focus should be dedicated to restore the links that France has with francophone countries, which have much in common with France and have been progressively neglected throughout the construction of the EU and the rapprochement with the USA.

France should defend its own interests on the international scene, whilst maintaining its universal values and its tradition as a balancing power against the hegemonic power of the period. The pre-eminence of the UN and international law should be re-established to solve global issues. The UPR refuse to acknowledge the so-called right of interference, used to intervene militarily in third countries when their leader displeases France and/or when France wants access to some of their natural resources.

Concerning domestic policy, the UPR proposals are directly inspired from the 1944 programme of the *Conseil National de la Résistance* (CNR – National Council of the Resistance) (39), responsible for many of the social advances that the country enjoyed after WW2. The CNR programme was at the origin of France’s social security system and many of the public services which are currently being dismantled; it also emphasised the idea of general interest over private ones, as well as the participation of workers in the piloting of the economy.

It is important to note that the common aspect of the political organisations signed up to the CNR in the 40s was that they were part of the *Résistance* and were fighting for a sovereign France, free from German occupation. Otherwise, their political sensibilities were very different and often incompatible. Indeed, the CNR gathered communist, socialist, moderate and conservative political organisations. The UPR's programme is intended to echo this consensus, in the hope that the ideas and views expressed in the programme will speak to many French people, regardless of their political sensibility, once they have acknowledged the necessity of the triple-withdrawal.

Of notable interest are measures that the UPR propose to reinforce democracy, such as the popular referendum and the full recognition of blank votes. A deep constitutional reform is also on their list of proposals, to try to prevent a reiteration of the decay that the Fifth Republic has been witnessing for the past 40 years (betrayal by the elite, transfers of sovereignty, modifications of the Constitution without referendums...). The renationalisation of some strategic companies and services, including the first TV channel TF1, is also proposed.

The economic doctrine of the UPR can be qualified as Keynesian. It is not anti-capitalist, but is strongly anti-neoliberal. It considers that markets should be regulated, wealth redistributed, and that the State has a large role to play in the economy, in particular through public services. The UPR also started a petition asking the French government to organize a referendum on the free-trade agreements (TTIP, CETA and TISA) currently being negotiated in secret between the EU Commission and the corresponding parties (40). These treaties, the UPR argue, will administer the coup de grâce to European democracies.

Finally, although the UPR are by no means at the cutting edge of political ecology, they do have propositions that talk to the partisans of this movement. The UPR propose a widescale national debate on French energy policy – that would necessarily include the topics of fossil fuels and nuclear energy –, concluded by a referendum. They defend food self-sufficiency of the country and are aware of world food security issues. They propose a ban of GM foods, including for animal feed, since French public opinion is strongly against them. They want to encourage local productions, and agricultural methods that respect health and the environment¹².

12 The first stated objective of the common agricultural policy is to

Political challenges for the UPR

The financial crisis, the euro crisis that followed and the steadily worsening difficulties that France is facing have contributed to making the ideas defended by the UPR more acceptable to those who hear them. The developments following the 2005 referendum have supported the explanations of the UPR: in 2005 the French people massively rejected the Constitutional Treaty by referendum (55% voted 'no' with a 70% participation rate). Despite this very clear decision, a copy-pasted version of the Constitutional Treaty, the Lisbon Treaty (41), was ratified three years later by the parliament. A portion of the population still resent this ratification 'by force'¹³ and have come to realise by themselves that the continued construction of the EU is anything but a democratic process. While these people could well be potential supporters of the UPR, the media blackout means only a small part of the French population have even heard of the party.

The UPR took part in their first nation-wide election in 2014, for the European Parliament Elections. They were one of the eleven parties able to present a list in each of the eight French constituencies¹⁴ (42) and collected in total 0.4% of the nationwide vote. They were also present in a handful of constituencies (14 out of 2,200) for the March 2015 local elections, and where they were present collected an overall average of 1.6% of the vote.

The main deadline the UPR are now preparing for is the 2017 Presidential Election. To get access to this election, the UPR presidential candidate will need to gather the support (by way of a signature) of 500 local representatives. In 2012, due to of lack of renown amongst local representatives, they managed to gather only 17 such patronages. The main challenge that the UPR is still facing today is thus to become known. Since mass media have so far refused to open their doors, this is not an easy task. Actions on the ground, such as conferences, public meetings and information tables in cities,

increase productivity (Article 38 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union).

13 Although the ratification of the Lisbon Treaty was legal, it did violate the spirit and principles of the French Republic, stated in particular in articles 2 and 3 of the 1958 Constitution.

14 There were in total 193 lists.

towns and villages therefore continue to be key. The campaign for the upcoming December 2015 local elections – the last elections before the Presidential one – will be decisive.

The UPR are a unique phenomenon in French politics. Their focus on the European question breaks the French politicians' big taboo of EU and NATO withdrawal. Meanwhile, their development in complete independence from the national media demonstrates the new political potential of the Internet. The success of the UPR constitutes the first instance of a post mass media political party in France. The steady growth that the UPR has been experiencing for the past eight years provides an indication that they may soon become a decisive actor on the French political scene. The future will tell if the ideas and ideals that the UPR carry will succeed in altering the dangerous course that France has taken.

Acknowledgement

The author warmly thanks Alain Morau for his helpful comments on an earlier version of the manuscript, as well as John Rattray, Luise Hemmer Pihl and Jocelyn Timperley for having proofread the final draft.

About the author

David Acunzo has a PhD from the University of Edinburgh and is a graduate from Mines ParisTech and Tsinghua University. He has been a member of the UPR for approximately two years.

References

1. Sapir J. Le chômage, M. Hollande et M. Sarkozy [Internet]. RussEurope. 2014 [cited 2015 Apr 28]. Available from: <http://russeurope.hypotheses.org/2522>
- 2.. Sapir J. Chômage et indécence [Internet]. RussEurope. 2015 [cited 2015 Apr 28]. Available from: <http://russeurope.hypotheses.org/3498>
- 3..La pauvreté progresse en France [Internet]. Observatoire des inégalités. 2014 [cited 2015 Apr 28]. Available from: <http://www.inegalites.fr/spip.php?article270>
4. Depuis 15 ans, les inégalités de revenus augmentent [Internet]. Observatoire des inégalités. 2015 [cited 2015 Apr 28]. Available from: <http://www.inegalites.fr/>

- spip.php?page=article&id_article=632&id_rubrique=171&id_groupe=9&id_mot=130
5. Boucaud K. Une France étranglée par les inégalités [Internet]. L'Humanité. 2014 [cited 2015 Apr 29]. Available from: <http://www.humanite.fr/une-france-etrangee-par-les-inegalites-558096>
 6. Demmou L. La désindustrialisation en France [Internet]. Les Cahiers de la DG Trésor; 2010 Jun pp. 1–50. Report No.: 2010/01. Available from: <https://www.tresor.economie.gouv.fr/file/326045>
 7. Mennessier M. Trente ans de désindustrialisation accélérée de la France [Internet]. LeFigaro.fr. 2014 [cited 2015 Apr 28]. Available from: <http://www.lefigaro.fr/conjoncture/2014/01/09/20002-20140109ARTFIG00287-trente-ans-de-desindustrialisation-acceleree-de-la-france.php>
 8. UPR. L'UPR exige que le gouvernement français cesse immédiatement tout contact et tout soutien aux responsables néo-nazis d'Europe de l'est [Internet]. Union Populaire Républicaine. Union Populaire Républicaine; 2014 [cited 2015 Apr 29]. Available from: <https://www.upr.fr/communiqués-de-presse/lupr-exige-gouvernement-français-cesse-immédiatement-contact-soutien-aux-responsables-neo-nazis-deurope-lest>
 9. Un suicide tous les deux jours chez les agriculteurs [Internet]. LeMonde.fr. 2013 [cited 2015 Apr 28]. Available from: http://www.lemonde.fr/societe/article/2013/10/10/500-suicides-recenses-chez-les-les-agriculteurs-en-3-ans_3493464_3224.html
 10. Le baromètre de la confiance politique – Vague 4 [Internet]. Sciences Po – CEVIPOF; 2013 Jan. Available from: <http://www.cevipof.com/fr/le-barometre-de-la-confiance-politique-du-cevipof/les-resultats-vague-4-janvier-2013/>
 11. Asselineau F. Pour la 1ère fois dans l'histoire du baromètre TNS-SOFRES créé il y a 12 ans, aucun parti politique répertorié n'atteint 30% d'opinion favorable [Internet]. Union Populaire Républicaine. 2014 [cited 2015 Apr 28]. Available from: <https://www.upr.fr/actualite/france/sondage-partis-politique-hollandens-tns>
 12. Marchand L. Plan Vigipirate : comment un dispositif exceptionnel est devenu permanent [Internet]. LeMonde.fr. 2015 [cited 2015 Apr 28]. Available from: http://www.lemonde.fr/les-decodeurs/article/2015/04/24/plan-vigipirate-comment-un-dispositif-exceptionnel-est-devenu-permanent_4621647_4355770.html
 13. UPR. L'UPR exprime sa totale opposition au projet de loi dit « Renseignement » qui légalise des méthodes intrusives de collecte et de centralisation de données [Internet]. Union Populaire Républicaine. Union Populaire Républicaine; 2015 [cited 2015 Apr 29]. Available from: <http://www.upr.fr/communiqués-de-presse/upr-exprime-sa-totale-opposition-au-projet-de-loi-dit-renseignement>
 14. NKM-Rachida Dati, une bataille sans répit [Internet]. LePoint.fr. 2015 [cited 2015 Apr 28]. Available from: <http://www.lepoint.fr/politique/nkm-rachida-dati-une->

bataille-sans-repit-26-04-2015-1924360_20.php

15. Vallereau M, Perrotin D. Retour de Nicolas Sarkozy : ces 9 affaires qui pourraient le freiner [Internet]. MetroNews.fr. 2015 [cited 2015 Apr 28]. Available from: <http://www.metronews.fr/info/retour-de-nicolas-sarkozy-a-l-ump-ces-9-affaires-qui-pourraient-le-freiner/mmjg!YJ5GToZBaLs/>
16. Pottier J-M, Cassely J-L. De 1973 à 2015, quarante ans d'évolution des scores du FN en un graphique [Internet]. Slate.fr. 2015 [cited 2015 May 1]. Available from: <http://www.slate.fr/story/99391/graphique-evolution-scores-fn>
17. Asselineau F. Le nouveau « dérapage » de la « collection Le Pen Automne-Hiver » est arrivé [Internet]. Union Populaire Républicaine. 2014 [cited 2015 May 1]. Available from: <http://www.upr.fr/actualite/france/le-nouveau-derapage-de-la-collection-le-pen-automne-hiver-est-arrive>
18. UPR. Le résultat des élections départementales dévoile une nouvelle fois le vrai rôle du FN [Internet]. Union Populaire Républicaine. 2015 [cited 2015 May 1]. Available from: <https://www.upr.fr/communiqués-de-presse/le-resultat-des-elections-departementales-devoile-une-nouvelle-fois-le-vrai-role-du-fn>
19. Bontemps-Terry N. Le Parti de gauche, rongé par la désertion de ses militants [Internet]. LePoint.fr. 2014 [cited 2015 May 1]. Available from: http://www.lepoint.fr/politique/le-parti-de-gauche-ronge-par-la-desertion-de-ses-militants-12-07-2014-1845585_20.php
20. Ça Vous Regarde - Le débat : EELV : un parti au bord de l'implosion ? [Internet]. LCP Assemblée Nationale; 2015 [cited 2015 Apr 28]. Available from: <http://www.dailymotion.com/video/x2khflc>
21. Le FN ne propose pas réellement de faire sortir la France de l'Union européenne ni même de l'euro [Internet]. Union Populaire Républicaine. 2014 [cited 2015 Apr 28]. Available from: <https://www.upr.fr/dossiers-de-fond/fn-propose-pas-reellement-faire-sortir-france-lunion-europeenne-meme-leuro>
22. Mots Croisés : "À quoi nous sert l'Europe ?" [Internet]. FranceTVinfo. 2013 [cited 2015 May 1]. Available from: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KRKiDKg2NnU>
23. Adetunji J. Suicide, HIV and infant deaths soar in post-crash Greece [Internet]. The Conversation. 2014 [cited 2015 May 1]. Available from: <https://theconversation.com/suicide-hiv-and-infant-deaths-soar-in-post-crash-greece-23492>
24. UPR. L'UPR appelle tous les députés à déposer une motion de censure contre le gouvernement français au sujet de son aide à l'Ukraine [Internet]. Union Populaire Républicaine. Union Populaire Républicaine; 2015 [cited 2015 Apr 29]. Available from: <http://www.upr.fr/communiqués-de-presse/upr-appelle-les-deputes-a-deposer-une-motion-de-censure-contre-le-gouvernement-au-sujet-de-son-aide-a-ukraine>
25. Aldrich RJ. OSS, CIA and European unity: The American committee on United Europe, 1948–60. *Diplomacy & Statecraft* [Internet]. 1997 Mar;8(1):184–227. Available from: <http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/pais/people/aldrich/>

publications/oss_cia_united_europe_eec_eu.pdf

26. Evans-Pritchard A. Euro-federalists financed by US spy chiefs [Internet]. The Telegraph. 2000 [cited 2015 Apr 28]. Available from: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/1356047/Euro-federalists-financed-by-US-spy-chiefs.html>
27. Asselineau F, Grison F-X. La réunion secrète du 11 juin 1965 au Département d'État américain sur l'Union monétaire européenne [Internet]. Union Populaire Républicaine; 2014 Jun pp. 1–19. Available from: <http://www.upr.fr/wp-content/uploads/dossiers/DEPARTEMENT-D-ETAT-AMERICAIN-Note-du-11-juin-1965-V15.pdf>
28. Peyrefitte A. C'était de Gaulle. Édition de Fallois. Fayard; 1997.
29. Asselineau F. 4 janvier 1963 : « La réflexion de nouvel an » de Charles de Gaulle, il y a 50 ans jour pour jour [Internet]. Union Populaire Républicaine. 2013 [cited 2015 May 1]. Available from: <http://www.upr.fr/actualite/france/voeux-francois-hollande-vs-charles-de-gaulle-il-y-a-50-ans>
30. de Gaulle C. Conférence de presse du 15 mai 1962 (questions européennes) [Internet]. INA – Charles de Gaulle Paroles publiques. 1962 [cited 2015 May 1]. Available from: <http://fresques.ina.fr/de-gaulle/fiche-media/Gaulle00078/conference-de-presse-du-15-mai-1962-questions-europeennes.html>
31. Asselineau F. Quelle était l'analyse du Parti Communiste Français (PCF) sur « l'Europe » de 1947 à 1980 ? [Internet]. Union Populaire Républicaine. 2013 [cited 2015 May 2]. Available from: <http://www.upr.fr/dossiers-de-fond/quelle-etait-l-analyse-du-parti-communiste-francais-leurope-les-annees-1947-1980>
32. Western European Union [Internet]. Centre Virtuel de la Connaissance sur l'Europe (CVCE). 2013 [cited 2015 Jun 7]. Available from: <http://www.cvce.eu/recherche/unit-content/-/unit/72d9869d-ff72-493e-aoe3-bedb3e671faa/1c06c877-402b-45d1-a126-792e99cf3fc3>
33. Kleine M. Integrated Bi- and Multinational Military Units in Europe. In: Nolte G, editor. European Military Law Systems. De Gruyter Recht; 2003. pp. 889–908.
34. Norman L. Obama Says U.K. Should Stay in EU [Internet]. The Wall Street Journal. 2014 [cited 2015 Apr 28]. Available from: <http://www.wsj.com/articles/obama-says-u-k-should-stay-in-eu-1401984621>
35. Spiegel P, Donnan S. Washington urges eurozone leaders to compromise with Athens. The Financial Times [Internet]. 2015 Feb 8. Available from: <http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/o/ef32bod2-af8d-11e4-b42e-00144feab7de.html#axzz3YdiBxyJ1>
36. Brooks L, Carrell S. Obama's Scottish independence intervention gets a cautious reaction [Internet]. The Guardian. 2014 [cited 2015 Apr 28]. Available from: <http://www.theguardian.com/politics/scottish-independence-blog/2014/jun/07/obama-scottish-independence-referendum-intervention-gets-a-cautious-reaction>

37. Obama avoids commenting on whether Catalonia's independence would be a risk for Europe's growth [Internet]. Catalan News Agency. 2014 [cited 2015 Apr 28]. Available from: <http://www.catalannewsagency.com/politics/item/obama-avoids-commenting-on-whether-catalonia-s-independence-would-be-a-risk-for-europe-s-growth>
38. Hayden C. Official White House response to the people of Catalonia [Internet]. The White House. [cited 2015 Apr 28]. Available from: <https://petitions.whitehouse.gov/response/our-response-people-catalonia>
39. Programme de Libération [Internet]. Union Populaire Républicaine; 2011 [cited 2015 Apr 29]. Available from: <http://www.upr.fr/wp-content/uploads/presidentielles/Programme-Liberation-Nationale.pdf>
40. UPR. Pétition pour l'organisation d'un référendum sur l'accord de libre-échange UE-Canada (CETA), le traité transatlantique (TAFTA) et l'accord sur le commerce des services (TISA) [Internet]. Change.org. [cited 2015 Apr 28]. Available from: <https://www.change.org/p/gouvernement-français-pour-l-organisation-d-un-référendum-sur-l-accord-de-libre-échange-ue-canada-ceta-le-traité-transatlantique-tafta-et-l-accord-sur-le-commerce-des-services-tisa>
41. Giscard d'Estaing V. La boîte à outils du traité de Lisbonne [Internet]. LeMonde.fr. 2007 [cited 2015 May 1]. Available from: http://www.lemonde.fr/idees/article/2007/10/26/la-boite-a-outils-du-traite-de-lisbonne-par-valery-giscard-d-estaing_971616_3232.html
42. Il y aura 193 listes aux élections européennes [Internet]. L'Obs. 2014 [cited 2015 May 5]. Available from: <http://tempsreel.nouvelobs.com/politique/elections-europeennes-2014/20140505.OBS6141/il-y-aura-193-listes-aux-elections-europeennes.html>

The European Arrest Warrant in Practice - Some Cases

DITTE MARIE CHRISTENSEN

Since 2004 the European Arrest Warrant has been in force and has successfully been the means of securing that serious criminals were made accountable for their actions. Some instances are often mentioned: a would-be suicide bomber from London, a mass murderer from Germany, a drug smuggler from Malta and a cross-state gang of robbers. In these cases the European Arrest Warrant has been applied according to its original purpose. But it is also important to focus on cases when it has been misapplied.

Austria wants Thomas Sørensen extradited

In 2012 Austria issued a warrant against Thomas Sørensen, accusing him of having kidnapped his son. The matter arose from a disagreement between the parents; Thomas Sørensen had been given custody of his son Oliver by Denmark, whereas the mother had been given custody by Austria. The mother had left Denmark with Oliver, causing Thomas Sørensen to go to Austria and fetch his son back to Denmark. This act resulted in an arrest warrant for kidnapping and a claim that Thomas Sørensen should be extradited to Austria. But as what he had done was not considered a crime in Denmark the Danish Ministry of Justice took the exceptional decision not to extradite him. Theoretically this is against the European Arrest Warrant, and Thomas Sørensen is no longer able to leave Denmark as he is in danger of being arrested and sent to Austria while the arrest warrant is active.

Slovakia wants Danish accountant extradited

Also in 2012 a Danish accountant was arrested during a stopover in Iceland because of an European Arrest Warrant issued by Slovakia. According to Slovakia the Dane owe €12.000 for taxes and wages in connection with a company for which he had worked during the years 2006 to 2008. The accountant had not been informed about the

arrest warrant, but he was, however, given the assistance of a lawyer to represent him in Iceland. Finally the Icelandic Supreme Court decided to extradite him to Slovakia where he would in the worst case risk 6 years in prison. He spent 72 days imprisoned in Iceland and Slovakia until the accusation against him was dropped.

Spain wants Corinna Reid extradited

In 2008 the Spanish authorities demanded Corinna Reid extradited from Great Britain on the basis of a murder charge. Two years previously Corinna Reid and her husband had visited Tenerife with their two children, and it sadly happened that one of the children, an 18 month old boy, died from bronchitis during their stay. In 2007 Spain issued a EAW for the parents because the boy's body had been found containing drugs at the time of death, which caused him to be considered the victim of a murder. The drugs belonged to Corinna Reid's husband who was at the time being treated to stop taking drugs. Apparently the little boy had been able to swallow some of the stuff. The husband admitted his guilt and denied that Corinna had had anything to do with the incident. Nevertheless, Spain demanded that she be extradited. Corinna spent a year in pre-trial detention under appalling conditions in Tenerife until she was released conditionally in 2010. She cannot, however, leave Spain and join her family in Britain.

Turkey wants Deborah Dark extradited

In 1989 Deborah dark was found not guilty of drug related crimes by a French court and returned to Britain – ignorant of the fact that prosecuting counsel had launched an appeal and that the case continued against her in absentia. The result was that she was sentenced to 6 years imprisonment, of which she was not, however, informed. In 2005, 15 years after the final closing of the case, France issued an EAW for Deborah, resulting in her being arrested, first in Turkey, later in Spain and finally in 2009 at home in Britain. Despite the fact that a British and a Spanish court decided that an extradition of Deborah was against the law, she was unable to leave Britain until 2010 when France at long last abolished the EAW.

Greece wants Andrew Symeou extradited

In 2009 Britain extradited Andrew Symeou to Greece on a charge of murder in accordance with the EAW. In 2007 Andrew had been present when a British man had been knocked down and had

subsequently died; on a basis of doubtful evidence he was pointed out as the perpetrator. In 2009 A British Supreme Court approved the extradition; resulting in 10 months in a Greek prison, after which period he was released on bail, however without being able to leave Greece. In 2011 the case against him was initiated and resulted in his being acquitted and enabled to return to Britain.

Portugal wants Gary Mann extradited

In 2010 Gary Mann was extradited to Portugal by Britain on the basis of an earlier sentence from 2004 for creating a disturbance, although this sentence had been commuted by the Portuguese court from a prison sentence to a voluntary deportation and a promise not to return to Portugal for one year. Five years after the original sentence Gary Mann was arrested according to an EAW and the British court was unable to turn down the extradition although the original trial had been very flawed as Gary Mann had not had an opportunity to employ proper legal assistance and interpretation. In 2011, after spending a year in a Portuguese prison Gary Mann was sent back to Britain where he served a few months in prison until being finally released.

Hungary wants Michael Turner extradited

In 2009 Hungary demanded that Michael Turner be extradited according to an EAW. He ended up spending 4 months in a former AVH prison in Budapest, although the Hungarian authorities still had not decided whether to accuse him of fraud. He was released to Britain in the following year on condition that he return to Hungary in connection with the case. Three years later Michael Turner's case finally came up in court, and he was sentenced to pay a fine and received a suspended sentence.

Italy wants Óscar Sánchez extradited

In 2010 Óscar Sánchez was arrested on a EAW issued by Italy. He was charged with drug smuggling and was speedily given a 14 year prison sentence. He spent 20 hard months in a prison in Naples until it was proved that he was innocent and had been the victim of an identity theft committed by the Neapolitan mafia.

DITTE MARIE CHRISTENSEN *is a law student.*

She made this research for the Danish People's Movement Against the EU.

Large Scale - Advantage or Disadvantage?

JAN ARNE BREMNES

All through my life I have felt a proud scepticism about anything large scale. In particular about units that are founded on the notion that the bigger you are the stronger you are. What or whom is that you should be stronger than? What is the purpose of becoming bigger and stronger? It would be natural to celebrate such a way of thinking if the purpose were to exercise an indisputable goodness towards all human beings and not just for those who are part of the community.

In the Holy Catholic Capitalist Social Democracy which with some small variations almost entirely embraces all political thinking in Norway we have embraced the principle of competition – the capitalist way of thinking. But in Norway we have taken the consequences of the notion that it may give rise to imbalances in our society if people or groups become too big. That is why we have The Competition Authority (Konkurrencetilsynet). Although the purpose of the Competition Authority is to *ensure* competition we realize that big units may create an imbalance in relation to what we in our democratic society consider to be important values. That is why we need an independent authority that monitors just that. Fortunately the battle of competition is not fought with war equipment in our society.

In the international community, however, we do not have an authority that monitors this in the same way as in Norway. Here countries are in fact free to enter into more or less binding agreements

or pacts about cooperation without anyone having the authority to stop it. Cooperation between nations is important. But when you sell some of your liberty in order to obtain security or to obtain economic or material growth it often creates a channelling or centralization of

power that may have fatal consequences. Even if these units are built on the principles of democracy. “Power corrupts, and total power is total abuse of power”. History tells us that these words contain some truth.

Within a nation an imbalance in power structures is less dramatic than in the international community. Globally our point of reference is our common earth. “Sky is the limit”. An imbalance in this system might lead to disastrous consequences Today we have no known outer enemies of our planet. To have almost world dominion in such a system would be a highly problematic thing.

The EU is built on among other things a wish a wish to be an international stabilizer – a power to be reckoned with. This also includes a wish for growth. Who would not want to be the greatest factor of power? There is no reason to doubt that the idea of the EU is built on good intentions. But for what should it use its power, and against whom?

The EU has its natural borders. But new constellations may arise. More or less strong ties among the great factors of power in the world may change the structures of power in the world community dramatically. At present we are seeing campaigns against comprehensive trade agreements between the EU and the US. It itself this is natural, but it is important to be aware of which powers are behind, and what sovereignty will be left to individual countries. We need a global Competition Authority that works.

I do not believe in an anarchic way of governing, but in a healthy and vigorous democracy built on an explicitly autonomous way of thinking. In order to ensure this we have to be alert to the wish of individuals, groups and countries to become stronger through alliances that would imperil the wish for autonomy in other individuals, local communities and countries. “Large scale advantages” may be good, but they also have distinctly negative aspects – for some.

JAN ARNE BREMNES is a member of the board of Norwegian No to EU and a member of the Christian Democrats (KrF).

This article was first published by NO to EU in Norwegian and can be read at

http://neitileu.no/kunnskapsbank/publikasjoner/gjesteskribent/ukens_skrivent_8_2014:jan_arne_bremnes

Thinking: A Criminal Act?

SIR JULIAN ROSE

“If my thought-dreams could be seen, they’d put my head under a guillotine...” – Bob Dylan

Well Bob, I’ve got news for you – they can – and that is what lies in store for all of us unless the ‘thought police’ fail to get their newly evolved ‘anti humanity’ mind scanning weapons legally integrated into everyday life.

As ‘the war on terror’ is notched-up to a further level of intensity, and the false-flag flagellations of New World Order exponents start outnumbering the real flag emblems of nation states, we know that we are witnessing a serious expansion of the control system’s morbid attempt to dominate humanity and completely crush the power of independent thought and action.

Have no doubt, this is the intention. The current ongoing shepherding of great swathes of human beings into mind controlled pens of fear and passivity, is the precursor of a time in which any independent thought process will be treated as a serious threat to the ‘normality’ of a subdued and static status quo.

A ‘thought crime’ would include ‘envisioning a better world’ and considering ways of bringing it about.

But hold on ... aren’t we here already? Those who challenge the status quo’s perpetual commitment to war, resource mismanagement and rabid social inequality, are already seen as a threat to the state and singled out as potential terrorists.

It is only a small step from here to governments backing early warning counter-terrorist security measures that would legalise the brain scanning (overt and covert) of ‘suspects’ held to be harbouring illicit thoughts. As such thoughts, the argument would go, would be deemed to be forerunners to inciting anti-social and criminal behaviour.

Thus, to implicate the offender as a threat to the establishment, all that is needed is evidence that certain neurons situated in the area of the neocortex associated with ‘free thinking’, were actively engaged over ‘x’ period of time – and that this was sufficiently ‘abnormal’ for the individual to be singled out for special attention.

Under the designation ‘Remote Neural Monitoring’ we can already have our brains scanned and not even know it.

Yet the legacy of a largely brain-dead humanity is already strongly in evidence, and independent thinking individuals are an unusual enough commodity to be considered ‘rare breeds’, marginalised and even castigated, in this bleak era of fear-induced mass conformism and mind-numbing political correctness.

We who follow our hearts and deeper intuitions do indeed belong to the rare breeds stable – and every attempt is being made to ensure that the stable door is locked and bolted so that we can no longer pass our messages to the outside world.

On the flip side of the same coin we have ‘thought control’ – which is at an advanced stage – having been a major part of the control system’s sinister arsenal for many decades. A weapon with a special place in the carefully orchestrated strategy that surrounds the ever expanding ‘war on terror’.

The recent Charlie Hebdo horror debacle serves as a powerful reminder of just how easily millions can be instantly brought into line – when their everyday slavery is threatened by a sporadic act of preordained violence.

Let us briefly recount this phenomenon: a satirical magazine in Paris publishes, not for the first time, a stupidly insulting depiction of Mohammed. Right on cue, a clique of highly trained ‘Muslim terrorists’ perform an instant mini-massacre in a Jewish supermarket and then occupy the magazine’s HQ. The building is surrounded and the invaders are shot.

The violence, being vivid, open and rebellious, is depicted by mainstream media headlines, statesmen and the thought police, as a preposterous threat to the sanctity of freedom of speech and the very fabric of French society. Tens of thousands of placards bearing the words “Je Suis Charlie” are instantly rolled out, and the largest number of French citizens since the liberation of Paris at the end of World War 2 – well over 1.5 million – solemnly take to the streets holding up these placards “Je Suis Charlie.”

And what really is this statement saying?

It is a show of solidarity with a sick periodical that deliberately inflames racist passions by pushing the legal parameters of freedom of speech to their limits – deliberately stimulating controversy and thereby attracting ‘scandal value’ sales. It is a political tool to incite hatred and racial prejudice.

Meanwhile the perpetrators of the killings are held up as symbols of Western hating Middle Eastern/Moslem sects, bent on dispensing carnage and death to a civilised, humanitarian, law-abiding Western nation. All of which is one huge lie – from beginning to end.

Outstanding for its outlandish hypocrisy is the extraordinary omission of the hell that has been unleashed, year in year out, on the peoples of Iraq, Libya, Afghanistan, Syria .. by a carefully crafted US/UK/France military consortium. Those who master-minded the post 9/11 secret service sponsored vilification and destruction of anything that dared stand up to the hegemonic perpetual war ambitions of nations bereft of any vestige of humanitarian, spiritual or self respecting values.

If the Charlie Hebdo attack had indeed been carried out, of their own free will, by those down-trodden and abused citizens of countries bombed to hell and back by US, UK and French invaders, the millions who took to the streets of Paris would be none the wiser. Their herd-like narcissistic response had already been assured.

They had been successfully mind-controlled into seeing only that their freedoms and cultural mores had suffered an ‘unprovoked’ challenge.

This is the sedation formula which has been used in every one of the so called ‘terrorist attacks’ fomented and staged by the CIA, MI5 and Mossad triumvirate over the last two decades - and well before. Attacks that enabled posturing public figureheads to pronounce an indefinite ‘war on terror’ – the terror which they had themselves been instrumental in setting in motion.

Mind and thought control leads on directly to internet control. Charlie Hebdo film footage that showed contradictory evidence to the mainstream story, got taken down after more than 2 million hits in less than 24 hours – and there was no ‘blood and gore’ on show – no excuse for the complete removal of this evidence.

All of us who run websites seeking to expose the lies and reveal the truth, know just how tenuous the situation is. Shots keep being fired across the bows of our information ships – and increasingly into them. It’s being going on for years. But now, as the battle lines of extremism

are once again been drawn and the orchestrated warmongering drum-rolls intensified, the glimmering lights of truth are systematically being shut down.

The widely documented David Icke insight: the establishment's rolling-out of its provocation formula 'problem, reaction, solution' is in full swing. The 'solution' requires little speculation: a complete clamp-down on any and all information that contradicts the controlling establishment's phoney 'terrorist inspired' battle plan...“all in the interests of public safety and long-term security”.. of course.

We can all play our part in countering this world-wide attempt to suffocate the voice of truth and to replace it with a global ministry of lies. By resolutely refusing to be corralled into the grey soup of mass indoctrination we will be boldly flying the flag for the liberation of humanity.

It has come down to this. Holding our ground, thinking creatively and keeping open the lines of communication: these are now the primary tools of the resistance. The lines in the sand that we will never allow ourselves to retreat from.

It is from such acts of bravery that victory can and will be realised.

JULIAN ROSE is an early pioneer of UK organic farming, an international activist and author.

*His books, *Changing Course - for Life* and *In Defence of Life* can be purchased from Julian's web site www.julianrose.info*

Over the Farm Gate

SIR RICHARD BODY

Organic farmers used to say they believe in Muck and Mystery. The Muck was what could be seen and smelt coming out of the farmyard: we know now that the mystery was the work of many millions of microbes that could not be seen or smelt. These tiny creatures beavered away in the earth, eating leaves that had fallen from the tree months before and blown about by the wind, straw and the remains of last year's crop and other organic matter and converting it into fertiliser. If we pick up a handful of soil that has been organically husbanded for 2 to 3 years it will be teeming with many tens of thousands of microbes, and these help to change the texture of the soil and will pass through our fingers easily and smoothly as if lubricated.

All round the world farmers and gardeners have been persuaded to treat their crops with herbicides to kill weeds and other plants which stifle the growth of the crop. All these herbicides, however, are biocides – that is, they kill life. Thus they kill the microbes and after a few years of spraying every year countless millions of living creatures die. No doubt every gardener and farmer applies these herbicides with good intentions but the microbes that survive may nonetheless accuse the farmer and gardener of the mass murder of their kith. These herbicides are poisons and biocides.

Assuming that there will be in the next half century shortages of some kinds of food, it should be obvious that to maximise the output they should be grown in those areas where the soil, climate and terrain are most suitable for it. Although that may be common sense, it will no doubt lead to pressure groups, lobbyists and other campaigners to urge various government intervention. They will propose organisations, programmes at the taxpayers' expense and other steps, all of which will need thousands of civil servants to put them into effect.

The New European

The *European necessity* is an expression sometimes used in the Danish debate on the European Union as a staple way of saying that the country has no choice. This caricature by Constantin Hansen is from 1952 and shows the politician A. F. Tscherning trying to convince a voter (who had only got the vote in 1849) that the “European necessity”, that is the great powers of Europe, required that the continuation of the policy of keeping Holstein within the Danish realm should continue. He feared that the prevalent desire to separate Slesvig from Holstein and make it part of the kingdom would lead to another war. Which it did in 1864, resulting in the loss of Slesvig.

Den europaiske Nodvendighed



Bondenennen: Seer du den Rjæmpe?

Bonden: Nej

Bondenennen: Hvad! Er du blind? Seer kunret! Det er jo den europaiske Nodvendig.

Bonden: Jisses Jo! Nu seer jeg ham, det er en altheretedes Kurl.

Farmer's Friend (Mr. Tscherning): Do you see this giant?

Farmer: No.

Farmer's Friend: What! Are you blind? Just look! It is the European Necessity!

Farmer: Jiminy! Now I see him; he is a real devil!

NEW EUROPEAN



ISSN 0953-1432