

European Union – The Mask Slips

The prospect of the proposed European Constitution being put before (ugh!) *the people* for ratification in the forthcoming British **referendum** has shaken the European ruling class so much that some of them have accidentally **said what they really mean**. So now, briefly (for soon the oversight will be weaselled out of view with a torrent of non-denying denials), we can plainly see that all that talk of the benefits of Unity and the sacredness of Treaty Obligations is just code for them ruling the rest of us without restraint or accountability. In reality they have as much respect for either concept as a pigeon has for the statue it perches on.

The EU's External Relations Commissioner Chris Patten said that

A British 'No' vote in a planned referendum on the European Union constitution would be tantamount to a vote to leave the bloc

because, after all,

"What's the point of being inside and endlessly, truculently making trouble," he said.

"Making trouble" is, as President Chirac **made clear** recently, EU-code for not silently doing whatever France and Germany say.

Chancellor Schroeder was even more explicit:

Aware of the paralysis a British rejection could cause the bloc, German Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder told Focus magazine he wanted the new constitution to permit implementation of new voting rules even if not all countries had ratified the deal.

In other words, Schroeder is proposing to abrogate the existing EU constitution, as defined by the most solemn and binding treaties to which any of its members have ever committed themselves, and which require unanimity for any changes, and to replace it by a constitution that allows France and Germany to change the constitution as they please.

Well, so be it. The only question in our minds is whether the resulting entity should be called the Fourth Reich or the Sixth

Republic. Presumably the European

thing would be to adopt a statesmanlike compromise and call it the Fifth Eurenial.

By the way, Bernard Connolly, whose book we illustrate above (click the picture to buy it), really is a whistleblower, unlike **some** who are so designated. The vicious way he was **treated** by the leviathan for exposing its true nature has never received anything like the opprobrium that it deserves.

Sun, 04/25/2004 - 14:10 | [digg](#) | [del.icio.us](#) | [permalink](#)



Bernard Connolly

It is not clear to me what the ruling was against Bernard Connolly and why it was bad. On the linked article I read:

The EU's top court found that the European Commission was entitled to sack Bernard Connolly [...]

What is wrong with that? Isn't any employer fully entitled to fire employees which are critical of them, or for any other matter of their choosing? Unless I misunderstand this article, this is simply an issue of free association and freedom of contract, and not about freedom of speech.

Could someone please clarify what would be the problem with this ruling?

Henry Sturman

by [Henry Sturman](#) on Sun, 04/25/2004 - 19:48 | [reply](#)

When is it desirable to make a decision by referendum?

When is it better for politicians to make the decision?

by a reader on Sun, 04/25/2004 - 22:00 | [reply](#)

Why Was Firing Connolly Wrong?

The head of a company has been skimming money and defrauding his shareholders ever since the company was first launched. Some of the shareholders think something funny is going on and pressure the boss man to get an auditor in. The boss man does so and gives the auditor a carefully doctored set of records. The auditor finds out that they are doctored and begins telling people. The boss man demands that the auditor give the cooked books back, demands that he shut up and fires him. Now imagine we are not dealing with

a businessman, but with an organisation with taxpayer's money and arbitrary powers.

by [Alan Forrester](#) on Mon, 04/26/2004 - 00:24 | [reply](#)

Then the contract entitles boos to do so. Or what?

When an auditor company is being hired both sides are supposed to sign a contract that should allow/disallow the auditor to disclose any findings. Or some state law can allow the auditor to do so. We are not in a court room to figure it out. So, why would I comment on other party's commercial contracts? Do we have a moral right to do so?

by a reader on Mon, 04/26/2004 - 08:38 | [reply](#)

Re: Bernard Connolly

A person should have the right to spend his own money for whatever lawful purpose he wishes, and in particular, to hire and fire whomever he likes and not give any reasons except as required by the relevant contracts. The reasons may be arbitrarily whimsical or hypocritical or base or evil, so long as they are not unlawful. He also has the right to require, as a condition of employment, that his employees not reveal the extent of his wickedness or hypocrisy.

The European Commission does not have any of those excuses or rights. It is not a person or company but an arm of government whose legitimacy depends in part on its being impartial between legitimate political opinions. In particular, it is not permitted to use its spending power, including the power to hire and fire employees, to encourage or discourage the expression of any legitimate political opinion. It is not using its own money, but exclusively other people's, which it obtains by force with the legitimacy of government action. This legitimacy depends in part on its not being whimsical, hypocritical, base or evil: obeying the letter of legal constraints is not enough. It also has to have 'transparency' – i.e., unlike a private citizen or company, it has an obligation to keep everything it does open to public scrutiny except where there is a publicly-justifiable reason to keep it secret.

These are some of the reasons why I think firing Connolly was wrong.

by [David Deutsch](#) on Mon, 04/26/2004 - 16:31 | [reply](#)

Governments Have Different Obligations

I think that David is exactly right here.

This is why I think that governments should be bound by, for example, anti-discrimination rules that would be wrong to impose on private businesses.

Gil

by [Gil](#) on Mon, 04/26/2004 - 18:59 | [reply](#)

Copyright © 2007 Setting The World To Rights