

## Empire or Partnership? Europe's Future

Introduction

*"EU Commission President calls for the creation of an EU Army"*

EU Commission President Jean Claude Juncker

9/3/2015

*"Fuck the EU"*

Victoria Nuland, US Assistant Secretary for State for European & Eurasian Affairs

7/2/2014

The Peace & Neutrality Alliance was founded in 1996. Its objective was and remains to advocate the right of the Irish people to have their own independent foreign policy with positive neutrality as its key component. Our vision of the future of Europe was and remains, a Partnership of Independent Democratic States without a military dimension that would include all European states, including Russia. The Irish political elite has already decided to destroy the long-standing policy of Irish neutrality and to ensure that Ireland was steadily integrated into the US/EU/NATO military axis. In response, PANA has sought to build an alliance to restore the values of Irish national independence, neutrality and democracy as stated in the 1916 Proclamation. It remains our objective and we are confident that we will defeat the emerging European Empire and its Irish supporters, and build a Partnership Europe in alliance with anti-imperialist throughout Europe.

In a succession of EU treaties, power was transferred from the Irish people and their democratic institution Dail Eireann, to the EU institutions, the EU Commission, the EU Court of Justice, the EU Central Bank, EU Council of Ministers and the EU Parliament. Even when the Irish people voted against the EU treaties as they did in the first Nice & Lisbon treaties (in which campaigns PANA played a key role in winning), the elite simply forced the Irish people to

vote again, and spent €millions using the full power of their media to ensure victory in the second referendums. The transfer of power, not just from Ireland, but all the other democratic states to the EU can only be understood as a part of the expanding US/EU/NATO axis.

The axis is committed to the doctrine of perpetual war. It is not the first and won't be the last empire to find itself caught up in perepetual warfare to maintain its political, economic and military domination. The axis sought to continually expand and use its military and economic power to destroy all opposition internal and external, to ensure total global domination. The Irish branch of the US/EU/NATO axis has increasingly sought to restore the deeply-rooted Irish imperialist tradition. The glorification of the imperialist 1914-18 war and Irish participation in it has been an important part of the elite's decision to restore imperialist values, as was its decision to denigrate the 1916 Rising commemoration by seeking to make it just a tourist attraction.

Apart from the EU treaties, the policy of Irish neutrality was also terminated by the decision of successive Irish governments to allow Shannon airport to be used to transit 2.25 million US troops to take part in their never ending wars. Ireland has become a *de facto* US air force base.

The creation of the EU Battlegroups was intended to become a key part of the process by which the EU evolved into a distinct political union superior to its individual member states, with its own military, where military decisions would be made by the EU leaders via the Council of Ministers, with no reference to national democratic assemblies and their people from whom they derive authority. Their function is to create a military caste loyal to the EU rather than the states from which they came, leading to the eventual formation of a European Army as advocated by the EU Commission President.

The decision of France to join the military part of NATO ensured the virtual termination of any effective internal independent opposition to US domination of the axis from the European elite. The EU was to be transformed into a state, albeit a client state of the United States of America.

The Great Recession, as it is called, was the result of many factors, principally the build up of debt in Western economies. The problems it has created threaten to undermine the authority of the Western elite. The consequences

of their austerity response have led to a reduction in support for the emerging European superstate. New formations of political forces critical of the globalization economic and militarist ideology that dominate the EU/US/NATO axis are emerging and growing.

However, the crisis did not stop the axis drive for expansion and global domination. Its decision to undermine and then support the overthrow of the democratically elected President of the Ukraine by neo-fascists has led to a growing conflict with Russia, an inevitable consequence of its perpetual war doctrine. Russia, however, is not a small country like Afghanistan, Libya, Iraq or Syria. It is a nuclear-armed state that defeated the last expansionist European Empire led by fascists. It is not going to crumble. It also has the support of other major states such as China, that know very well that if the axis does succeed in destroying Russia, as it has already done to Iraq, Syria and Libya, then they will be the next target. In short, China has no real alternative but to support Russia. This is a perspective shared by many other states, especially emerging states like India and those in other parts of the world like South America, and that seek a multi-polar world rather than a world controlled by a US dominated axis.

It should be a key objective for the global peace movement to call for the termination of all sanctions and inclusive negotiations between Russia and the axis. This also applies especially to those that function within the axis states like PANA, because it is in their interests, that the doctrine of perpetual war be rejected before it terminates all life on the planet. The decision of the axis to remove Gaddafi illegally and to destroy his state on the basis of an abused UN Security Council resolution that Russia "fell" for created huge distrust of the West on the part of Russia.

The problem is that because of the economic crisis, an increasing number of people, especially those living in the EU states, no longer support the doctrine of never ending globalization, which is the opposite side of the coin of perpetual war. The fact that the elite of some of the EU states are responding by being unwilling or unable to support the EU Battlegroups is another example of the crisis. Ten years after their formation, what were to be the flagships of an emerging European empire are looking a bit tattered. The peoples of the EU, suffering from austerity see no reason for Battlegroups or

the engineered crisis with Russia that is only deepening the economic crisis . Even elements of the EU elite are being forced to respond.

The core reality of the crisis in Europe is there is no European demos; there is no European people. There is no basis for a democratic European state. As the emerging European empire faces into its greatest economic and military crisis, it could disintegrate. The EU Battlegroups not only have not been used, they might never be used. Instead of a European empire there could emerge a Partnership Europe, a partnership of independent democratic states without a military dimension. The axis can be broken, and without it, the US could even revert to the founding principles of its founders of non interference with the internal affairs of other people's states.

Of course, none of this is inevitable. The axis could win, continue its doctrine of perpetual war leading inevitably to end all life on the planet. However, it seems realisticic and reasonable that the Peace & Neutrality Alliance, a small Irish peace group, should seek to build an Ireland, a Europe, a world, working with the World Peace Council and other peace groups to seek a better future for humanity than global obliteration.

Roger Cole

Chair

Peace & Neutrality Alliance

July 2015

Origins of the Empire

*"We are a very special construction, unique in the history of mankind. Sometimes I like to compare the EU as a creation to the organisation of the empire. We have the dimension of empire."*

Jose Manuel Barroso, EU Commission President 2004 -2014

EU Press Conference report, Daily Telegraph 11/7/2007

The European conquest of the world, began by the Portuguese in the second half of the 15th century, came to an end at the second half of the 20th century. The collapse of the European empires - British, Belgium, Dutch, German, Italian, Portuguese and Spanish - could not be reversed, although they did try. The ruling elite recognised this reality and that the only way their imperial domination could be restored, even if they had to share it with the US, was by creating a European superpower, a European Empire, as EU President Barroso called it, or as a " global player", the more acceptable terminology. An earlier EU President, Romano Prodi told the EU Parliament on the 13/2/01:

"Are we all clear that we want to build something that can aspire to be a world power?"

So the objective of the EU elite has hardly been a secret for some time now.

The EU elite transferred power away from the national democratic states to themselves via a series of treaties. When Ireland joined the European Economic Community in 1972 the government published a White Paper, which specifically stated that entry into the EEC would not affect the long established policy of Irish neutrality.

The Single European Act in 1986 proposed to ensure for the first time that European common policy provisions became part of European law. Raymond Crotty brought a case to the Irish Supreme Court to challenge the Government's right to endorse the Act. The Supreme Court judgment was that to transfer powers over foreign policy from the Irish people and their existing democratic institution, Dail Eireann, the people would have to be consulted via a referendum because ... Article Six of the Irish Constitution ensures that all power derives from the Irish people. Thus every time yet another European treaty transferred a slice of power away from the Irish people there had to be a referendum, unlike most other EU countries. The fact that the Irish Constitution ensured all power derives from the Irish people was and remains the greatest achievements of our long struggle against imperial domination.

The Masstricht Treaty in 1992 added defence policy provisions to the EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy. The Danish people rejected the treaty and obtained a number of concessions, including a legally binding Protocol excluding Denmark from the militarisation of the EU that would be added to

the next treaty, the Amsterdam Treaty. In the referendum in Ireland on the Amsterdam Treaty in 1998, PANA opposed the treaty (the only broad alliance to do so) and sought to ensure that a similar protocol be applied to Ireland. While it passed, 38% voted no (then the highest no vote ever) and the issue of neutrality had been made a key issue.

In June 1999 the EU established the Political & Security Committee (PSC) consisting of member states' Ambassadors to the EU and the Military Committee consisting of the member states' Chiefs of Defence Staff to advise the PSC on military issues.

In December 1999, EU leaders agreed to establish an EU military capability. The targeted size of the new EU military force (the Helsinki Headline goal) was to be an EU Rapid Reaction Force of 50-60,000 troops with a self-sustaining military capacity, including intelligence, air, naval and support units capable of deployment within sixty days to any region up to 6,000 km from the borders of the EU for up to a year. Since 7-9 back up troops is needed for every one in the field of battle, the EU elite was proposing a EU army of between 350,000-540,000 troops. In practice, EU states, most of whom were in NATO, and whose armies were committed to NATO operations, did not feel they could convince their own people to agree to an extra increase in military expenditure to pay for the extra troops, and the massively expanded air force capable for sending the 60,000 troops into a war on top of their NATO commitments. So despite their claim in December 2001 that it was "militarily operational" they had not done so and could not do so. In short, the statement was a lie, and the EU had to come up with a response accepting this reality.

The response came at the Franco-British military summit in Le Touquet, France in February 2003, when the leaders of the two major military states in the EU proposed the formation a much smaller Rapid Reaction Force, the EU Battlegroups.

### The EU Battlegroups

The initial proposal that there be thirteen Battlegroups with 1,500 combat soldiers each, two of which were to be operational at any one time was

accepted by the other EU states. Since each Battlegroup needed 7-9 back up troops the EU was to have at its disposal at any time an army of up to 27,000 troops. The number of Battlegroups have since been increased to eighteen and the size increased to 3,000, thus ensuring, in theory, an army of up to 54,000 ready to go to war anywhere in the world with five days notice, once a decision was made by the EU Council of Ministers.

Each Battlegroup having been sent to war, has the authority to stay involved in the war for 120 days. Each of the states, which take part by contributing soldiers, will also have to finance them. Since the Battlegroups can be deployed anywhere in the world, they have to be able to operate in hostile environments including deserts, mountains and jungles, so they have to have a high degree of training, equipment, command structures and planning units.

Since very few wars last only 120 days, after that period, the mandate would have to be renewed and since they had been committed, the EU leaders would clearly insist that that it would be renewed. The EU states that take part in the EU battlegroups are therefore committing themselves to the potential of direct involvement in the doctrine of perpetual war via the EU and would have to carry the massive financial cost involved as well as the inevitable deaths and injuries to its troops.

They also have to be trained to prepare to be an advanced guard for an even larger EU military force. They have to be: "the minimum military, credible, rapidly deployable, coherent force package capable of acting alone, or for the initial phase of a larger operation."

Each Battlegroup consists of at least:

Force Headquarters

Force Commander and Staff

A Mechanised Infantry Battalion

Battlegroup Commander and staff

Logistic Company

Fire Support Company with mortars and light artillery

Combat engineering platoon

Air Defence platoon

Reconnaissance company

Intelligence platoon

Helicopter support unit

Medical services platoon

Military Police platoon

Each of the mechanised infantry companies is expected to go to war armed with 10-12 combat vehicles armed with 30-90 mm cannons, supported with 6-9 light howitzers and 120mm heavy mortar systems, anti-tank missiles, air defence systems and helicopters, and fighter jets. By simply listing out the military equipment of the Battlegroups, it is obvious that they are not established to help civilians affected by floods or natural disasters, as claimed by the Irish government. They were established to go to war and kill the enemy. To quote the then General-Secretary of NATO:

*"EU battlegroups could be used to go to war. Why did the EU create the Battlegroup? It is not just to help rebuild a country. The Battlegroups are not there for building schools. We should not think the EU is for soft power and NATO is for tough power."*

Jaap de Hoop Scheffer in El Paris 10/3/2005

The Battlegroups are all military formations formed by bringing together troops from different states. The formations have included:

1. France-Belgium
2. Germany, Netherlands, Finland
3. Italy, Hungary, Slovenia
4. Greece, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Romania
5. Sweden, Finland, Estonia, Norway & Ireland

6. Spain, France, Portugal, Germany
7. Germany, France, Belgium, Luxembourg and Spain
8. UK
9. Italy, Spain, Greece, Portugal
10. Greece, Bulgaria, Romania, Cyprus
11. France, Belgium, Luxembourg
12. Poland, Germany, Lithuania, Latvia, Slovakia
13. UK, Netherlands
14. Italy, Romania, Turkey
15. Spain, France, Portugal
16. Netherlands, Germany, Finland, Austria, Lithuania
17. Sweden, Finland, Estonia, Norway, Latvia, Ireland
18. EUFOR
19. Italy, Slovenia, Hungary
20. Germany, Austria, Czech Republic, Croatia, FYRM and Ireland

Each of the Battlegroups has a lead country providing the Commander and most of the military resources with responsibility to ensure maximum coordination between the soldiers from the different countries. They seek to create over time a sense of European identity as distinct from national identity within the military, a sense of loyalty to the European Union, as distinct from loyalty to the individual member states from which they come.

#### The Nordic Battlegroup

The first Battlegroup the Irish Defence Forces participated in was the Nordic Battle Group led by Sweden. Virtually all of the Battlegroups are based on a group of countries near each other. Apart from Ireland, the participating countries, Estonia, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway and Sweden are adjacent.

The nearest adjacent country that participates in the EU Battlegroups is the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, so it rather than the Nordic Battlegroup is the obvious choice for Ireland. However the FF/PD Government decided that it would be the Nordic BG. It is not clear why they made that decision; however, the option of Irish soldiers fighting shoulder to shoulder with members of the British Paratroop Regiment that had killed unarmed civilians in Derry might not have been considered a popular option. However, now that UK/Irish relations are "better than ever", participation in the UK led Battlegroup is an option the Irish imperialist elite might agree to in the future.

Several of the countries involved in "our" BG, i.e. Estonia, Latvia and Norway are also members of NATO. One, Norway, is not even a member of the EU. Other non-EU states such as Turkey that are members of NATO also take part in EU Battlegroups. The reality is there are strong symbiotic links between the EU and NATO, and the Battlegroups are a key part of these military links.

A Commander of the Nordic Battlegroup, General Jan Stefan Anderson, claimed it would be used to help with natural disasters. It was armed with CV combat vehicles, Mowag Piranha troop carriers, Bofors AT light anti-tank guns, Psg sniper rifles and JAS 39 Gripen fighter aircraft among other weapons. It was not equipped to help with natural disasters. It was equipped to go to war.

Like all other EU Battlegroups, it did not go to war; neither did it help in any natural disasters. The fact that the Irish media just reprinted his statement with little or no comment, is just another indication of the total support it gives to the destruction of Ireland's independence, democracy and neutrality and our integration into the military structures of the EU/US/NATO axis.

### The German led EU Battlegroup

The next EU Battlegroup the Irish Army participated in was led by Germany in 2012. One hundred and seventy five Irish soldiers took part in this Battlegroup that was able to send over 3,000 soldiers into battle, twice the number originally envisioned. Given the need to have between 7 and 9 back up troops for every one in the field, this means that the Irish Army was participating in an EU military force able to go to war anywhere in the world with up to nearly 30,000 soldiers. The other countries participating in the Battlegroup were

Austria, the Czech Republic, Croatia, and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. The lead nation, Germany was a member of NATO.

The second operational EU Battlegroup in this period was led by Italy together with Slovenia and Hungary, so that in that period the EU had a military force of 60,000 able to go to war anywhere in the world after five days notice.

Just under 100 years after the foundation of the Irish volunteers that went on to fight against the British Empire in 1916, the Irish Army had become an integral part of a *de facto* regiment of an emerging European Empire.

The contribution of the Irish Army was 23 soldiers to the BG's Headquarters, and 153 to a fully equipped ISTAR (intelligence, surveillance, target-acquisition and reconnaissance) company. Its military equipment included mowags, LTVA sniper rifles, CTR, Orbitor UAV and comms equipment. It also included Mowag armored personnel carriers armed with machine guns and 30mm cannon and/or grenade launchers. An Orbitor UAV is a military drone. This is not equipment designed to help people effected by flooding. It is equipment designed to go to war and kill people.

The German contribution to the Battlegroup was easily the largest with 1,800 troops, including the force Commander; thus it dominated the Battlegroup.

The Fine Gael/Labour government had allocated €10.7 million to cover the potential cost of the 120 day war if the EU Battlegroup was sent into action. It is not unreasonable to assume that if it actually went to war, the cost would in practice been much greater, and since wars rarely last only 120 days, the real cost would have been much greater.

The reality is that over much of this period while the Irish Army has remained small, in fact, reduced in size, its military equipment has been substantially ungraded to ensure its comparability with EU Battlegroup and NATO forces. Prior to the financial crash it was incurring expenditure of over €1 billion per annum. **Ireland was spending more money per soldier than any other country in Europe on military equipment**, which is now up to standards set by NATO and the EU Battlegroups. This means that in order to ensure continuing participation in EU Battlegroups ... Ireland will have to spend money in buying new military NATO compatible equipment. For the first six months 2015

the Irish Army was again integrate some of its soldiers into the Nordic Battlegroup.

In 2013 there was only one operational Battlegroup, the UK Battlegroup. Since the British Government was under pressure from the growth of UKIP, including the commitment to have a referendum on EU membership of the EU in 2017, it refused to send it to Africa despite the EU request to do so, not wanting to give UK opponents of the UK's submersion into an EU Empire with its own military force. An example of these British views of the Battlegroups were expressed by Bernard Jenkins in an article in the Daily Telegraph on the 7/12/2013:

*"Just another step to a Euro-Army, a blow to the beleaguered UK defence industries and a nail in the coffin of NATO".*

In fact increasingly, countries such as Greece, suffering in particular from austerity, are unwilling to take part in Battlegroups and there have been several occasions where there have not been two operational Battlegroups. Since each state would have to pay to cover the costs for their own troops, in an age of austerity and massive cuts or indeed in an age of prosperity, if the BG's were deployed, they could be committing to a never ending war costing €billions. This is likely to be much less appealing than it used to be. Nor would it possible to hide the costs with or without the connivance of the media. A real indication that the lust for war is drying up was the UK Parliament's rejection of Prime Minister Cameron's desire to go to war with Syria in September 2013. If the people do not want to go to war with Syria, they sure as hell don't want to go to war with Russia. The US/Iran agreement on nuclear issues could also be another indication of a change in the doctrine of perpetual war in response to growing opposition to war among the people living within the EU/US/NATO axis.

The response of the elite is to seek better interoperability with NATO and to have the costs of the EU Battlegroups covered by a common EU fund to lessen the financial pressure on the governments of the individual states.

Another option is to make those BG's that are operational, permanent military forces and more integrated with NATO forces. The Visegrad BG of the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Slovakia is going to become permanent and more integrated with NATO when it becomes operational in 2016. This process

would allow those countries most in favour of the doctrine of perpetual war to put pressure on the leaders of other EU states to follow their example.

There is little doubt therefore that the elite's commitment to perpetual war is beginning to crack.

## NATO & the EU Battlegroups

The reason given for the creation of NATO was the threat of invasion of Western Europe by the Soviet Union. Therefore when it collapsed NATO should have disbanded having accomplished its mission. Instead it expanded especially into eastern Europe, giving itself a new global mission, the right to invade and conquer any country anywhere in the entire world. NATO, a nuclear-armed military alliance dominated by the USA is now totally committed to using its massively military power (it is responsible for 70-80% of global military expenditure) for absolute global domination via its doctrine of perpetual war. Its annual expenditure on its military is \$1.02 trillion. Add to that the expenditure of the once EU neutral states like Ireland, Sweden, Finland, Cyprus, etc. (now that the EU is a strategic military partner of NATO) as well as its allies like Saudi Arabia and Israel that have massive military expenditures, the US/EU/NATO axis and its allies already have total military domination of the globe.

Compared with this expenditure, its main "enemy" Russia, with only 3% of the world's GDP, spends \$90 billion annually on military expenditure, and the other great enemy (up to recently), Iran, with a GDP less than the Netherlands, spends only \$7 billion annually on its military. Despite this absolutely enormous military expenditure, NATO leaders have agreed that all EU states should spend even more on its military, ... at least 2% of their GDP on defence as a consequence of the NATO engineered Ukraine crisis.

This demand for an increase in military expenditure by those states that spend less than 2% on its military (only Greece, the UK & France already do so) will of course mean further cuts in social welfare, health and education and/or tax increases. In 1980 European countries in NATO were responsible for 40% of NATO's expenditure. However, following the end of the Soviet Union and

under pressure from their national electorates, it is now only 20%. These new commitments will reverse this downward trend.

The creation of a "European identity", an emerging European Empire, is key to the desire to reverse this trend in the hope that the different people of the national states of the EU might be persuaded to support cuts in social welfare and education to defend "Europe". There can also be little or no doubt that the EU/US/NATO sponsored crisis in the Ukraine is a key part of this strategy.

It is clear that the EU Battlegroups in this context are not separate from the US and can only be understood in the context of the strategy of the axis and US domination of the axis.

The development of a "European identity" is being used by an elite as a key part of the crucial necessity to get the peoples of the European Union to accept massive cuts in social welfare to pay for a build up in its military to prepare for a war with Russia or at least a proxy war in the Ukraine.

However, it is very clear that the EU Battlegroups are to be developed as a military force in ... a mutually reinforcing way with NATO troops. They are just part of the NATO/Partnership for Peace/EU/US axis. A report published in October 2005 by two ex-NATO chiefs, General Ralston and General Naumann, ... states:

*" Failure to meaningfully improve Europe's collective defence capabilities would have profoundly negative impacts on the ability of European countries to protect their interests, the viability of NATO as an alliance, and the ability of Europe to partner in any meaningful way with the US."*

In February of the same year, the then UK Minister of Defence in a letter to the House of Commons Defence Committee described the EU Battlegroups as being:

"Mutually reinforcing with the larger NATO Response Force.... and having the potential to act as a stepping stone-stone for countries that want to contribute to the NRF, by developing their high readiness forces to the required standard and integrating small countries' contribution to multinational units.

Wherever possible and applicable, standards, practical methods and

procedures for Battlegroups are analogous to those defined in the NATO Response Force. Correctly managed there is considerable potential for synergy between the two initiatives."

Ten years later this process is well under way with Finland in 2008, Sweden in 2013, the Ukraine in 2014 integrating their military into the 21,000 strong NRF effectively totally destroying their neutrality. There is little doubt that the Irish political/bureaucratic/corporate elite intends to ensure Ireland follows the same process. After all, since 2003 the EU Military Command HQ operates from the NATO HQ building in Brussels, and the NATO Military Command Staff and the EU Military Command Staff have established permanent liaison arrangements. There is also the obvious fact that the following EU states are also NATO members: Belgium, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia and Spain. The decision of France to rejoin NATO's integrated military command in 2009 was a crucial decision, which ensured a solid and powerful link between the EU and NATO military. At the NATO Lisbon Summit in 2010, the EU was formally recognized as a crucial "military partner" of NATO.

The EU Constitution and the Lisbon Treaty - Capstone of the European Empire

The forging of a European identity by the political elite is a long process. The political elite of the states of western Europe realising that they would lose their global Empires thought they could only regain their global domination by pooling their resources. The consequence was a series of treaties which transferred power away from the different peoples of Europe to a European political elite, which ... developed a deep hatred of national democracy, and a love of perpetual war. Their hatred of national democracy and desire for imperial power *via* a European Empire has driven them to launch wars not just on Islamic states but ... to extend their doctrine of perpetual war to Russia which they did by engineering a civil war in the Ukraine when they supported an illegal coup led by Ukrainian fascists, a coup jointly supported actively by the American Empire.

The central legal capstone of this process was the EU Constitution Treaty, renamed the Lisbon Treaty. It gave the European Union a distinct and separate

legal identity separate from and superior to the individual member states of the union. Ireland in legal terms now has a similar legal relationship to the European Union that Rhode Island has to the American Union. The same legal relationship applies to all the other states in the European Union.

It established a new post, the President of the European Union, who as President Chairs all the meetings of the leaders of the individual member states of the European Union.

It created another new post, a EU Minister for Foreign Affairs responsible for the EU Foreign, Security and Defence Policy with its own EU Dept. of Foreign, Security and Defence policy with a staff of 6,000.

Article 19(2) of the Lisbon Treaty states that when the EU has defined a common EU foreign policy decision, those member states on the United Nations Security Council will request the EU Foreign Affairs Minister to present that position. Member states of the EU are legally obliged to support the EU's foreign, security and defence policy:

*" Actively and unreservedly in a spirit of loyalty and mutual solidarity."*

The Lisbon Treaty also gave legal recognition to the EU Battlegroups and the European Defence Agency.

### Military Structured Cooperation

The Lisbon Treaty ensured the legal right for a group of EU member states to create a new distinct, separate and permanent military structures under article 28A(6), which states:

"Those member states whose military capabilities fulfill a higher criteria and which have made more binding commitments to one another in this area with a view to the more demanding missions shall establish permanent structured cooperation within the Union framework."

The EU groups of states that decide that they intend to create such a distinct, separate and permanent military force must inform the EU Foreign Minister and EU Council. A qualified majority can approve the formation of this military force. No single EU state, such as Ireland, which does not agree with the formation of this military force, can use its veto to prevent its establishment.

Article 28 E6 states:

"The decisions and recommendations of the Council within the framework of permanent structured cooperation, other than those provided for in paragraph 2 to 5 (dealing with admissions, suspension or withdrawal of membership) shall be adopted by unanimity. For the purpose of this paragraph, unanimity shall be constituted by the representatives of participating Member states only."

Therefore only states that are members of this new military force can make decisions about this military force. There is a lack of clarity as to what those decisions could mean.

Article 28 C allows the Council to entrust the implementation of an EU military task as outlined in the Petersberg Tasks, to a group of member states that have set up such a military force that have the capability to carry out that task to carry out the implementation of that task, with no role given to EU states that do not take part. Article 28 C also makes it clear that such a military force shall act:

*" in accordance with the principle of a single set of forces."*

A permanent military force acting as a single set of forces is an Army.

For example, if Germany, France and Poland combined parts of their military forces through structured cooperation they are creating a EU Army. Once approved by the EU Council via a qualified majority vote, it could carry out a more demanding mission, such as a humanitarian intervention or conquest of Libya. It would manage that conquest without any reference to any other state such as Ireland or Spain.

The people of Libya, Syria or any other state who did not agree with the military intervention or conquest of their country by the EU Army, are unlikely to make any distinction between EU states that are members of that EU Army and those that are not when they attack the EU. The Irish political parties and other social forces like Ryanair, Intel and the corporate media ... spent millions of euro to convince the Irish people to vote in favour of the Lisbon Treaty that allows for the creation of a European Army over which they have no control in establishing and no control over its military operations, the consequences of

which could result in the death and injury of Irish citizens.

The Petersberg Tasks -The tasks of the emerging European Army

The Petersberg Tasks, which are part of the Lisbon Treaty, give a legal backing to the tasks allocated to the EU Battlegroups and the other military formations that can be established by the Structured Cooperation provisions of the treaty. The treaty expanded the tasks outlined in previous treaties. The original tasks of humanitarian, rescue, peace-keeping and peace-enforcement missions have now been expanded into:

*" joint disarmament operations, military advice and assistant tasks and post-conflict stabilisation."*

Article 28 B (1) goes on to state:

*" all these tasks may contribute to the fight against terrorism, including by supporting Third Countries in combating terrorism in their territories."*

The EU institution, the International Security Information Service (ISIS) in its July 23rd, 2004 European Security Review, states that joint disarmament operations:

*" could include anything from providing personal security to UN inspectors to full scale invasions a la Iraq."*

The Irish government made great play during the debate on the Lisbon Treaty of the following paragraph in the treaty:

*" the common security and defence policy of the Union does not prejudice the specific character of the security and defence policy of certain Member states."*

It claimed this referred to states that were not members of NATO. However is absolutely clear that the *"certain member states referred to are the EU states that are also in NATO because the next two paragraphs state:*

*"Recalling that the common security and defence policy of the Union respects the obligations under the North Atlantic Treaty of those member States which see their common defence realised in the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, which remains the foundation of their collective ???*

*of its members, and is compatible with the common security and defence policy within that framework; convinced that a more assertive Union role in security and defence matters will contribute to the vitality of a renewed Atlantic Alliance, in accordance with the Berlin Plus arrangements (sharing EU/NATO assets)."*

Ireland by signing the treaty was agreeing to renew the vitality of a nuclear-armed military alliance and a more assertive EU security and defence policy that would be compatible with the nuclear-armed military alliance.

Nowhere in the Lisbon Treaty does it state that a UN mandate is needed for the deployment of the EU Battlegroups or other EU military formations that can now be created by the EU under permanent Structured Cooperation.

The European Defence Agency

The European Defence Agency (EDA) was established with an initial budget of €1.9 million in 2004 which increased to €30.5 million by 2011, a level which has remained unchanged up to 2015. The controversial beginnings of the EDA and the massive influence of the European military-industrial structures which lobbied the EU political elite to ensure its formation are well documented in Ben Hayes' excellent 2006 study for Statewatch and the Transnational Institute: "Arming Big Brother". The EDA was legalised by inclusion into the Lisbon Treaty.

Its role is to encourage the militarisation of the EU. Article 28(A) of the treaty states:

"Member States shall undertake to progressively improve their military capabilities. The Agency in the field of defence capabilities development, research, acquisition and armaments shall identify operational requirements, shall promote measures to satisfy those requirements, shall contribute to identifying and, where appropriate, implementing any measure needed to strengthen the industrial and technological base of the defence sector, shall participate in defining a European capabilities and armaments policy, and shall assist the Council in evaluating the improvement of military capabilities."

Thus the Lisbon Treaty, the *de facto* Constitution of the emerging European Empire, has a clause which means all EU member states, including Ireland,

have a legal obligation to improve their military capabilities and has an Agency with the function to ensure this process.

The Mutual Defence and Solidarity Clauses of the Lisbon Treaty

*Article 28 A (7) states:*

*" If a Member state is the victim of armed aggression on its territory, the other Member States shall have towards it an obligation of aid and assistance by all measures in their power, in accordance with Article 51 of the UN Charter: This shall not prejudice the specific character of the security and defence policy of certain Member States. Commitments and cooperation in this area shall be consistent under the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, which for those states which are members of it, remains the foundation of their collective defence and the form for its implementation."*

This article has all the qualities of a military pact, granting mutual assistance to its members. A separate and distinct European organisation, the Western European Union which had a mutual defence clause has been abolished because its last remaining competence, that of mutual defence, was now a key part of European law.

The Solidarity Clause Article 188R states:

*" The Union and its member states shall act jointly in a spirit of solidarity if a Member State is the objective of a terrorist attack or the victim of a man-made disaster. The Union shall mobilise all the instruments at its disposal, including military resources made available by the member states, to:*

*a) prevent the terrorist threat in the territory of the Member states, protect democratic institutions and the civilian population from any terrorist attack; assist a Member state in its territory at the request of its political authorities in the event of a terrorist attack:*

*b) assist a Member State in its territory at the request of its political authorities in the event of a natural or man-made disaster.*

*To implement the Solidarity Clause, assistance shall be requested by the political authorities of the Members(s) concerned and, if the*

*assistance has military or defence implications, decision must be taken by unanimity."*

This is a very broad mandate as it covers the threat of terrorism as well as an actual terrorist attack, leaving the way open for pre-emptive military actions. Does preventing the terrorist threat in the territory of the Member State include attacking a country outside the EU that is seen to be harbouring terrorists? What are the implications under the Solidarity Clause for responding to, say, a threat by Al Qaeda to attack EU countries supplying aid to the war in Afghanistan? How are the terrorists defined?

Even the NATO treaty does not require an automatic military response from all its members to an attack. Article 5 of the treaty states that in the case of such an attack, each NATO member:

" Will assist the party or parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area." [ROGER: I didn't know it was this vague, which is just as well as it gives NATO an out if Putin gobbles up the Baltic States. I know you don't share my fears about that but reading Article 5 re-inforces them.]

### Another Europe is Possible

For generation after generation the Irish people were divided between those that supported the British Union & Empire and those that supported an independent Irish Republic.

The British Union & Empire, however, is now, while still formidable, a shadow of its former power when it ruled over a quarter of the entire world. The UK's military power has shrunk dramatically even in the last ten years because of its economic decline, which is much more serious than the British media pretend. Not only could the Argies have the Falklands in the morning if they wanted them, Spain could have Gibraltar and France the Channel islands. On top of that, the Scots are going to bolt. While a significant minority living in the north east of Ireland regard themselves as British, and are loyal to Britain, the British State ruling caste are divided between those who see their future within the

emerging European Empire, and those that remain committed to British sovereignty. At the same time this decline in British power has resulted in the decline of British identity and the growth of a Scottish identity, a process that could be the final termination of the British state. The growth of Scottish separatism began with Thatcher but is really a consequence of Labour being destroyed by Tony Blair. Labour voters in Scotland have nowhere to go but the SNP. While the process of the decline of the British Union & Empire stretched over a long period of time, since it dominated Ireland for such a long time, it has also had a significant impact on Irish politics and identity.

However, the consequence of the transfer of power from the British state to the EU and its developing state institutions, the European Central Bank, the European Court, the European Council of Ministers, the EU Parliament and of course the emerging European Army which is spearheaded by the EU Battlegroups, is not just effecting Britain. Spain and Belgium are also facing alternate identities and potential alternate state formations within their territories. In Ireland, the response to the decline in British State power and the growth of EU state power by the ruling Irish political caste was to make the case that it was in the interests of the Irish people to support the growth of EU state power as part of a process, that would accelerate the decline of British dominance of Ireland. Their loyalty inevitably transferred from the Irish State to the emerging EU Union & Empire. Just as the former ruling caste saw themselves as British (with some seeking some Home Rule over minor domestic issues) and supporting British control over foreign, security and defence policy, the current ruling caste seek the same relationship with the European Union.

Since our foundation, the Peace & Neutrality Alliance has rejected this ideology of the ruling elite. We seek the establishment of a united democratic Ireland with its own independent foreign, security and defence policy with positive neutrality as its key component.

Our vision of the future of Europe is as a Partnership of Independent Democratic States, for the purpose of trade and commerce, with no joint foreign, security and defence policy. We seek to reestablish the broad based anti-imperialist alliance that opposed the British Union, not just in Ireland but throughout Europe.

PANA played a key role in winning the first Nice and Lisbon referendums. PANA also was crucial in opposing the destruction of Ireland's long standing policy of Irish neutrality and our integration into the US/EU/NATO military structures by the decision of the ruling caste to make Ireland a US aircraft carrier, by allowing millions of US troops and military equipment to land in Shannon Airport as the axis pursued its policy of perpetual war.

We so far have been defeated. The Irish Government no longer has a scintilla of an independent foreign policy. It sends troops to take part in the Afghan War even after the fig leaf of a UN mandate is terminated. It supports the mass murder of the children of Palestine by the US colony in the Middle East known as Israel. It supported the overthrow of the democratically elected President of the Ukraine and US/EU sanctions on Russia. It supported totally unjustified sanctions on Iran and only changed policy when the US did.

The Irish Minister for Foreign Affairs several times a year takes part in joint meetings of the US/EU/NATO foreign affairs ministers meetings.

PANA has always regarded its victories and defeats only as battles in a long war against imperialism and in favour of the concept of an independent Republic that began in the 18th century. Since the emerging European Empire and the American Empire that dominates it, only offers perpetual war, we remain confident that they will not win, or if they do, will not do so in our name. The axis is of course capable of total nuclear war and destroying all life on the planet, and it would be wrong not to assume their imperialist values will have that result. If the political elite of 1914 sleepwalked into a world war that killed millions of people, it would not be unreasonable to assume that a political elite, only a hundred years latter, would sleepwalk into a World War 3.

In Ireland the elite have been organised in the Fianna Fail, Fine Gael and Labour parties that have dominated Irish politics for decades. Apart from a brief rebellion by the Labour Party in the early 1970s, all three parties have totally supported this process.

In the last few years, however, their power has been seriously challenged. Their commitment to globalization economic policies has led to a massive economic crisis that has led to a massive cut in the living standards of millions of people throughout Europe and the United States, including Ireland. The

consequences have meant that the FF/FG/Labour parties that support a militarist ideology might need to form a coalition government for the first time to ensure a majority at the next election.

However, wars of the axis, especially their war on and destruction of the state of Iraq has resulted in powerful opposition to soldiers from the axis been sent to war zone from the peoples living within the axis states. The US-inspired massive NATO expansion into eastern Europe has led to Russia finally deciding to oppose its expansion with a determination of a state that has seen to many such expansions eastward from Napoleon to Hitler. It will accept yet another such expansion. It has decided to hold the line at the Ukraine. It will not allow Crimea which was part of Russia since the mid 18th century to become a NATO naval base.. This resistance to NATO expansion has even deeply concerned sections of the political elite of the European Union especially the major states that dominate it - France and Germany, if only on the grounds that very large and significant sections of their own people do not want to go to war with Russia over the Ukraine.

The core reality is that the economic crisis caused by many factors, in particular the creation of the single currency, and the doctrine of perpetual war is exposing the divisions within the EU.

The reality is there is no such thing as a European people. There is no European Demos .... There are in fact distinct and separate peoples: the Irish, the French, the Germans the Greeks, etc. As stated before, the transfer of power away from existing multinational states is also playing a part in encouraging national minorities such as the Scots, to seek independence. In such circumstances, political parties that define themselves as European, even if they declare themselves on the "left", will be shattered in the crisis caused by these imperialist wars and the economic crisis.

Of course, predicting the future is impossible. Nevertheless, as the economic and military crisis grows, as a consequence of the domination of the imperialist ideology, the analysis of PANA, that the objective of a European Union that is a partnership of independent democratic states for the purpose of trade and commerce, without a military dimension and with their own independent foreign policies, will gather support.

Therefore, the real issue for those of us that oppose imperialism is to develop a strategy to gain the support of the peoples in Europe that, because of the vocal commitment of those on the "left" to Europe, are increasingly shifting to purely right wing nationalist parties.

In Ireland the Connolly analysis provides a very powerful foundation for such a strategy, especially as we move towards the 100th anniversary of the 1916 Rising against British Imperialism. PANA seeks not only to rebuild the alliance of Republicans and socialists that led that Rising within Ireland, but also to advocate that the same strategy should become the core of the ideology of other anti-imperialist forces in the other states of the EU. A central part of our strategy therefore was to affiliate to the World Peace Council, the main global anti-imperialist peace movement.

The defeat of the emerging European Empire, the abolition of NATO and the revitalisation of the only global and inclusive organisation committed to inclusive global security, the United Nations, has to be the key objectives of PANA.

Another Europe is possible. Another world is possible.

Roger Cole

Chair

Peace & Neutrality Alliance

July 2015

