

Vote No To The New EU Constitution

As the **Daily Telegraph** says today:

this mind-numbing, 260-page document [...] is the capstone of a federal state, and gives the EU a foreign minister, a criminal code, a European prosecutor and a police force. We face a net loss of vetoes in about 40 areas and the constitution sets in stone an outdated, over-regulated economic model just at the moment that it is failing.

As **Perry de Havilland of Samizdata** says:

it is a constitution quite unlike the more famous US one. The EU constitution will incorporate, amongst other things, the essence of the **Charter of Fundamental Rights**, which requires not that the state refrain from making laws in many areas of life but that laws be mandated to ensure 'rights'. This includes such wonders as the 'right to education' including the phrase "this right includes the possibility to receive free compulsory education" (which is of course not in fact free at all and suggests we have a 'right to be compelled'). And wonders of double talk such as:

Equality between men and women must be ensured in all areas, including employment, work and pay. The principle of equality shall not prevent the maintenance or adoption of measures providing for specific advantages in favour of the under-represented sex.

So the much awaited document will prohibit discrimination between men and women... unless it is decided to pass laws *requiring* discrimination between men and woman. Clearly the Charter of Fundamental Rights which the new EU Constitution will aim to enforce is nothing less that the 'right' to require all European states to maintain regulatory welfare states. The much vaunted priests of democracy want to make sure that the constitution ensures that all you can vote for is who gets

to regulate you rather than whether or not you will be

regulated at all.

It is not too late for Britain but the last bastion is indeed the one on which the battle will be fought. Perhaps, just perhaps, when comes time for the UK referendum, that vast and growing tower will be struck by lightning and come crashing down.

Cast your votes accordingly, readers.

Perhaps the most important consideration here is one that is hardly ever mentioned – perhaps for reasons of unconscious political correctness – even by the staunchest opponents of British integration into a European entity: *Britain's existing (unwritten) constitution and political culture are incomparably better than their European counterparts*. Even if the proposed new order were an improvement for the rest of Europe, which it probably is not, it would still be a catastrophe for Britain and a tragic loss for the world.

It isn't going to happen.

Sat, 06/19/2004 - 20:25 | [digg](#) | [del.icio.us](#) | [permalink](#)

"It isn't going to happen."

Let's hope so but, like for the war in Irak as should be obvious by now, wishful thinking does not suffice.

by a reader on Sun, 06/20/2004 - 00:57 | [reply](#)

wishful thinking works great

aren't you aware that we favoured the war in iraq?

-- Elliot Temple

by a reader on Sun, 06/20/2004 - 03:04 | [reply](#)

Seeing how English Hooligans

Seeing how English Hooligans are behaving in my country, I wouldn't be so sure in your cultural superiority.

Where can you actually read the EU thing?

by a reader on Sun, 06/20/2004 - 09:05 | [reply](#)

English Hooligans and French Judges

Somebody wrote:

'Seeing how English Hooligans are behaving in my country, I wouldn't be so sure in your cultural superiority.'

These hooligans are not politicians, merely common thugs.

However, when these common thugs come back to Britain if criminal charges are filed against them they may get trial by jury, unlike France where they would be tried by a judge. Accordingly, in this sense, our laws are more open to discussion than French laws since a jury may choose not to enforce a law they think is being wrongly applied or a law they think is just plain pants.

Also, our thugs don't seem quite as bad as the French ones:

http://www.littlegreenfootballs.com/weblog/?entry=10860_French_Antisemitism_Watch

by **Alan Forrester** on Mon, 06/21/2004 - 00:54 | [reply](#)

Here it is

the EU thing, if you really want to read it. 275 pages of EU constitution. "Reader friendly!"

by a reader on Mon, 06/21/2004 - 09:29 | [reply](#)

Alan, I think the way people

Alan, I think the way people behave says a lot about a country's political culture.

And the EU thing keeps crashing my browser. :P

by a reader on Mon, 06/21/2004 - 14:01 | [reply](#)

Wouldn't it help parents in Germany?

There's the stupid contradiction you pointed out, but point 3 of the same article guarantees parents to educate their children as they see fit.

by a reader on Mon, 06/21/2004 - 14:33 | [reply](#)

YES TO THE EU CONSTITUTION

As we all know, a tree can not make a forest. We all need each other to survive and that is the essence of washing our hands when in essence it's one that requires it.

All Farm Animals are not equal, but with the EU constitution in existence in Europe, all Farm Animals will be PROTECTED at the least which is a fundamental objective of A.V Dicey's doctrine of Rule of Law and Separation of Power... .

by **PI** on Wed, 02/02/2005 - 20:19 | [reply](#)

YES TO THE EU CONSTITUTION?

PI wrote:

'As we all know, a tree can not make a forest. We all need each

other to survive and that is the essence of washing our hands when in essence it's one that requires it.'

What does that have to do with the EU Constitution? Without the EU Constitution we will be able to trade and interact with people in other EU countries without the regulations and bureaucracy of that pointless document getting in the way. So we will have more access to other Europeans without the Constitution, not less.

'All Farm Animals are not equal, but with the EU constitution in existence in Europe, all Farm Animals will be PROTECTED at the least which is a fundamental objective of A.V Diecy's doctrine of Rule of Law and Separation of Power...'

Protected from what? People already feed and house farm animals, they don't need protection.

by [Alan Forrester](#) on Mon, 02/21/2005 - 18:10 | [reply](#)

political and cultural superiority of britain?

british political and cultural superiority is a joke, how can a country that throught the ages sought the desruction of so many states see itself as this great nation. what half decent country would allow the suffering of others simply because it ensured its self-enrichment. the malvinas are so rich in natural resources that would be of great use for the argentinian economy, yet the greedy culture of britain is willing to kill innocents to enrich itself. i'm sure you can be proud of your nation, who wouldn't be, coming from a country that has left countless other countries detroyed all the while not allowing them to recover from the mess your 'great culture' left them? very proud indeed.

by the way what is the culture of britain? it seems to me you try to hijack the cultures of those countries you've conquered during your sick military campaigns. without the many immigrants that are forced to look for work in your country due to your gluttonous culture, there would be no worthwile culture worth mentioning.

i suggest the british take a good long look at themselves before commenting on the political and cultural aspects of other countries, maybe if they do, people might actually have some sort of respect for a country void of political and cultural morality.

by a reader, from an occupied country on Sat, 04/22/2006 - 21:09 | [reply](#)