



Newsletter

September 2019

President: Lord Watson of Richmond, CBE.
Chairman: Laurence Smy



Developing Global Citizens

President: Lord Watson of Richmond, CBE.
Chairman: Laurence Smy
Vice Chairman: Antony Frost

www.european-atlantic.org.uk
Registered Charity No 306950



Newsletter

September 2019

Contents

Editorial	1
TEAMGlobal's Mission, and Brexit	2
TEAMGlobal Tour to Brussels	4
Global Challenges and Policing	5
TEAMGlobal Trip to Brussels: Learning Points	8
TEAM Visit to SHAPE	10
A Tale of Two Cities: Westminster and Brussels	11
Reflections on Brexit: a Risk worth Taking?	14
TEAMGlobal Members' Day 2019	15
American Politics in the age of Trump	18
Notes on the Chagos Islanders Fight for Human Rights	21
The European External Action Service	23

EDITORIAL

First, please accept our apologies for the tardiness of this newsletter. The usual editor, Kevin McSharry, has been unwell, having suffered injuries in a road accident. In his place is myself, Michael Ghirelli, whom you can blame for any typos and other shortcomings in this edition. Lawrence Smy, Chair of TEAMGlobal, is recovering from an operation, so that he too has had to temporarily withdraw from active participation and leadership. Antony Frost is currently standing in as leader of TEAM, and is of course working with his boundless energy, enthusiasm, and efficiency. We wish Lawrence and Kevin a rapid recovery and look forward to their return.

For TEAM, this has been an active and packed four months since the circulation of the newsletter at the start of the year. In April, the tour to Brussels was attended by a group from the University of East Anglia. Included were visits for talks to the EU Parliament, British, American, and Irish representations to the EU, and visits to the NATO headquarters and to SHAPE at Mons in southern Belgium. The visit was made all the more interesting by the uncertainties generated by the intended withdrawal of the UK from the EU. It was not all intense and earnest study and enquiry, however: Brussels is an exciting and vibrant place with much to offer, and we were pleased to be conveniently based in a hotel at the very heart of the mediaeval city. We should thank all involved for their positivity and enthusiasm, and of course especially Antony Frost for his superb organisational skills.

Members' Day fell on June 17th. Groups from a number of schools attended three talks at the hall of the church of Our Lady of the Rosary in St Marylebone. We are increasingly aware of the threat posed to humanity by climate change, global warming, and environmental degradation. In the first talk from Joyce Forbes of the Extinction Rebellion Press Team we heard giving a possibly controversial argument for direct action to avert the global emergency. Following this, David Snoxell, a retired UK ambassador, introduced us to an issue of which almost certainly none of us had much awareness – the scandalous and shameful treatment of the people of the Chagos islands by successive British governments. Finally, delivered with humour and wisdom, was an analysis by John Wilson on the inevitably fascinating impact of the Trump presidency on American political life.

In the afternoon, TEAM moved on to Westminster, to enjoy a sumptuous tea in the House of Lords, and be addressed by Angela Smith, Baroness Smith of Basildon, leader of the Labour peers. Many of us have at times asked what purpose that institution serves, and what work it does: she was able to offer us a justification of its existence and of its essential role in the UK democratic process. Doubtless, some of the audience were convinced, and some not; but one message from Lady Smith should be heeded and acted upon by all who were there: our country is facing its greatest crisis since the Second World War; it is a ship adrift and moving dangerously close to the reefs and cliffs; young people have or will soon acquire the vote; and it is vital that they use their vote to help navigate the country to safer waters, so securing their own and all people living here more secure and prosperous futures. Voters need to be well informed and wise: what follows in this newsletter hopefully will offer the opportunity to become better informed voters able to play their part in the democratic process.

Michael Ghirelli, Interim Editor

TEAMGlobal's Mission and Brexit

Dirk Hazell



The need for TEAMGlobal has never been greater.

With the flailing and failing current generation of political leadership, both in the UK and in many other jurisdictions, young people need all the legitimate empowerment they can acquire. Relevant knowledge is an essential ingredient of any sustainable ability to ask and articulate.

On such a highly populated and competitive planet, and with very significant challenges to co-operative and rules-based globalisation, Britain's young people today need more than ever to understand and undertake informed discussion of world affairs.

Within the USA, the word *liberal* has too widely and for too long been applied as a derogatory description. Within the UK, the equivalently lazy and misleading catch-all term of abuse is *federal*.

For the UK to re-enter sunlit political uplands, successor generations will, however, need a much deeper appreciation of the word *federal*.

They will need to form views, for their coming time, on the best allocation of power between the various levels of government both internally within the UK and, externally, on the extent to which the post-1945 diminution of the Westphalian priority given to the nation state best serves humanity.

Particularly if Brexit proceeds, the British public may soon become enforced participants in deciding whether the heavily centralised British state is reformed along more federal lines or whether it is instead subjected to the revolution of countries leaving the UK which would still leave the issue of how much England particularly should be centralised. Many of those who promoted Brexit dissembled about control from "Brussels" when in fact most legitimate grievance is instead about excessive control from Westminster's chronically unreformed political system.

And do younger people want a political system - the EU's! - which has generally tended to push political forces towards a centre most can tolerate or would they prefer a more divisive and strident left-right dichotomy exacerbated by the economic sacrifices imposed by Brexit?

Since TEAM was founded six decades ago, globalisation and the UK's EU membership have significantly increased freedom of movement of capital.

Young people need to be equipped to understand the benefits and restraints arising from this freedom of movement.

With reforms to the supply side of the UK's economy in the 1980s, the UK became spectacularly successful at attracting inward investment. Indeed, this model became the

foundation on which industries such as manufacturing of cars and their components came to be based. As the Japanese authorities and corporations have politely made plain since the 2016 referendum, this investment was based on the UK's membership of the EC/EU, and on the UK from within the EU pro-actively configuring EU rules needed to develop the single market.

To try to achieve a socialist post-Brexit agenda, the hard left would be compelled to try to imprison capital already in the UK. A return to rigorously enforced exchange control would be an obvious tool as, probably, would be state direction of investment including pension funds. There is no reason to think this economic trajectory would ultimately differ from that of the USSR/Warsaw Pact, Castro's Cuba or socialist Venezuela.

The more probable English hard-right outcome could be economically "successful" but at a price.

To compensate for the enhanced risk of investing in an economy outside the EU - the world's largest economy and with massive clout as the global soft superpower in negotiating international trade deals - the UK would need credibly to offer a higher rate of return than comparable investment within the EU. This offer would also need to be denominated in hard currencies outside the control of the UK government.

In contrast to the EU's social market, that would require enhanced, but politically authoritarian, economic neoliberalism: cutting corners on environmental controls, health and safety and other forms of social protection, and also cutting tax and public services. In crude terms, it requires a significant transfer from wages (and therefore consumption) to returns on capital. This benefit for the few, not the many, is precisely why some of the less benign offshore billionaires are so keen on Brexit.

Some of these outcomes could be mitigated by the UK's remaining in the single market and/or the customs union but even then the British public would soon enough come to experience the practical difference between being rule-makers within the EU and rule-takers from outside.

TEAMGlobal must help to empower the young to undertake well-informed debate of factors so vital to their future.

Dirk Hazell

TEAMGlobal Study Tour to Brussels

Jasper Haywood reports on an inspiring and hopeful trip

Taking part in the TEAMGlobal Study Tour was a thoroughly enjoyable and worthwhile



Photo: Jasper Haywood asking a question during the visit to NATO.

experience. On an administrative level, the organisation of the trip was exemplary, with a huge thank you to Antony Frost for his charismatic and enthusiastic leadership, as well as his 'get-together'. Reflecting on the trip, I am still amazed at the sheer amount of talks and visits each day involved, all of which were enlightening and interesting. Specifically, I came away from the trip having advanced my learning in three important areas.

Primarily, the access to expert policy-makers on such a wide range of important topics was something I have never experienced. None of the talks felt like student-teacher presentations, and at all venues, I felt comfortable to question and challenge all speakers. Admittedly, some speakers did ambiguously answer questions, but even in such cases, what they did not say was as valuable as what they did. I was able to gain a greater depth of understanding into a policy-area I am familiar with. In particular, I have an interest in emerging, human-centric security threats, a focus of one of my modules. Indeed, being able to question important figures at NATO about how complex issues can be distilled so as to be relatable for policy-makers was invaluable to my studies. This opportunity brought to life the content of my studies and identified that topics integral to academic study may not carry the same weight in regard to practical policy-making. However, I also learnt a great deal on this trip. Of note, was the focus on Russia and the threat it poses to the European Union. I came away from the trip with a fresh insight into the strategies employed by the EU and NATO toward Russia. Both of these areas of understanding aided my research for assessments upon my return.

Secondly, this trip was also an opportunity to build networks with influential people. Despite considerable nerves, I thoroughly enjoyed the opportunities to network at the East of England Partnership Office. Having never networked in such a setting before, I quickly learnt how to sustain an interesting conversation whilst gaining the information or insights I wanted. Indeed, I followed up a number of these connections upon returning home, potentially widening my opportunities post-university. Of note was the assistance that the UK Permanent Representation offered since my return to the UK, with informative follow up emails of opportunities in Brussels.

Thirdly, I am currently studying an MA in Public Policy. Having watched events unfold in the UK since the unfortunate referendum in 2016, I have increasingly lost faith with party politics. Both sides of the political divide seem unable to compromise and reach consensus. However, seeing the institutions of the EU, in particular, the European Parliament as well as the smaller institutions and representations, has given me some much-needed hope! Specifically, it has demonstrated the sheer scale of power held in Brussels. Indeed, the close proximity of the institutions, both large and small, has shown me how well the EU works and how efficiently it operates in contrast to the somewhat archaic British system. This has reaffirmed my belief that for any nation or institution looking for influence on a global scale, representation in Brussels is a must. Secondly, seeing the curved chamber in the European Parliament, as opposed to the diametric sides of the House of Commons, was a visual symbol of the consensus approach to politics that we should be striving toward. Whilst somewhat bittersweet in the context of the UK's withdrawal, this visit gave me hope to believe that a common-sense approach politics is possible.

Overall, the Study Tour was an unforgettable experience. It combined specialist knowledge and access to experts with practical networking to offer a brief, hopeful respite from the chaotic state of politics in the UK. This trip has demonstrated the importance of the EU, and the power of Brussels in the world. Finally, it broadened my horizons beyond UK politics and set my sights on a career in Brussels. For these reasons, I cannot thank, nor recommend, the Brussels Study Tour enough.

**Jasper Haywood: University of East Anglia
MA Public Policy and Public Management**

Global Challenges and Policing

Daryl Kenny



Central to debates about the changing nature of the contemporary developed world is the idea that the nation state is somehow being undermined by a combination of globalizing and localising forces. Giddens (2009) describes 'globalization' as the growing interdependence between different peoples, regions and countries as social and economic relationships stretch worldwide. Many others have noted that the social 'size' of the world is becoming progressively smaller and much more networked. Although many states are reacting against such processes by applying increasingly rigid control measures and strengthening their borders, Bobbit (2002) suggests that globalization will diminish the role of the nation state and increase the prominence of market-based economies. Nation state bureaucracies, such as the police, have similarly become subject to influences and

events beyond their control.

As an attempt to ameliorate the effects of globalization on policing activities, international police agencies have been set up such as Europol and Interpol, though they currently have very limited enforcement capacities and are essentially information and intelligence hubs. The main beneficiaries of globalization are not geographically bounded state agencies but free-wheeling international corporations, who have been vaulted into new positions of unprecedented power and influence. Indeed capital and big business has embraced opportunities to expand globally and have already internationalized to such an extent that they can substantially evade the authority of national governments. Capital has scoured the world looking for the cheapest, non-unionised, de-regulated labour markets in order to maximise profit.

Old constants such as work, family and community have been replaced by the necessity for personal mobility and flexibility. Daily lives are now revolving incessantly around monetary needs rather than social needs, re-shaping human existence into a series of predatory encounters where other human beings are viewed exclusively as potential consumers. The police are not immune to these forces and they too have been confronted by continual change, fragmentation and new patterns of personal mobility. As a result policing has become progressively complex, with resources stretched locally, nationally and internationally dealing with a variety of new issues such as cybercrime and human trafficking as well as increasing involvement in non-crime issues. At the same time, police forces have been pressurised to attain ever greater levels of 'efficiency' and 'effectiveness', creating fragmented structures with individuals undertaking narrowed, compartmentalized roles (e.g. civilian investigators, Police Community Support Officers). It is not clear where these trajectories are taking the police but globalization and market forces are changing the way policing is being organized and run. The situation facing the police service is whether it should embrace the moral and ethical drivers underpinning globalization. At present police services are almost entirely contained within national boundaries and to embrace globalization policing would need to become much more transnational, inevitably leading to a conflict with the currently dominant ideology of free market economics or 'neo-liberalism'.

Economic forces

'Neo-liberalism' is characterized by private (rather than state) ownership of assets, minimal redistribution, efficiency, and the maximisation of personal profit. Neo-liberalism is concerned with 'self-reliance', 'free markets' and a 'minimal state', with advocates suggesting that state run organisations, such as the police, are too expensive, inefficient and unresponsive to meet public demand. The argument for reductions to state services centre upon the idea that many citizens have become too dependent upon the 'nanny state'. However, policing is not motivated by profit, and consists largely of individuals undertaking selfless and impartial public service duties. Police organizations are not businesses. If the police were to adopt neo-liberal orientations it would fundamentally alter the purpose and nature of public policing services. As Webley (2015) indicates, the main problem with neo-liberalism is that it ignores shared human environments and views people as economic instruments to be exploited.

It is perhaps unsurprising, therefore, that the last few decades have been characterized by increasing levels of inequality, social exclusion and punitiveness. Society has become less stable, more competitive and increasingly devoid of community cohesion. At the same time people have become subjected to a broadening network of administrative controls. Britain is also experiencing its longest period of pay stagnation since records began in 1855 and many families have simply elected to preserve their lifestyle by depleting their savings and taking on more debt. Economic hardship has also been identified as a significant feature underpinning criminality. Grover (2008) notes how 'the material circumstances of most offenders are notably marked by acute socio-economic disadvantage' and the police markedly spend most of their 'crime-fighting' careers pursuing people who dwell principally within social housing. In stark contrast to this, thousands of wealthy families in Britain use tax fiddles to squirrel away roughly £13 trillion in tax havens and undeclared assets around the world. Many of these people criticize 'welfare scroungers' whilst simultaneously siphoning off money which could be used to help build and support schools, hospitals and security infrastructures. The police are increasingly being called to incidents that highlight the crumbling nature of social provision and rising levels of economic inequality.

Equality and inequality

Since 1973, inequality in take-home pay has increased more in the UK than anywhere else except the United States (Judt, 2010). The UK now has the largest variation in living standards between regions in the whole European Union (Webley, 2015) and as a result, there are persistent gaps between the life chances of people from different backgrounds. Instead of equality before the law, different groups receive different treatment according to wholly extra-legal considerations. Groups that are lower in power and status, such as the poor and the unemployed, are disproportionately likely to be treated as suspects at each stage of the criminal process and future communities are likely to be segregated more by economics than by any other factor. Police funding has increasingly been localised, meaning that wealthier areas receive more police funding than poorer areas – an odd development, because much of the crime that the police deal with is strongly correlated with levels of poverty. With police forces spending most of their money on wages the majority of 'savings' required under neo-liberalism have been achieved through internal reorganisations; freezes on recruitment; reduced procurement, police staff redundancies and the closure and selling off of police stations and other buildings.

Perhaps it is time for us, as a society, to move away from a world in which policing is thought to be purely to do with crime control and to recognize that policing deals with the aftermath and repercussions of policies that do not help and support people. Perhaps it is time for us, as a society, to shift attention towards improving the psychological and social wellbeing of citizens by seeking to build societies based upon reciprocity, mutuality, sharing, cooperation and the recognition of the needs of our fellow human beings.

Dr Daryl Kenny



TEAMGlobal Trip to Brussels

Key Learning points: a Personal Perspective

By Dr Daryl Kenny



THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE (The first EU institution)

- Based in Strasbourg –Established in 1949 (2000 employees). 15 employees in Brussels
- Completely distinct from the European Union
- 47 member organisation (representing 820m people)
- Its focus is on human rights
- Funding is from member states (including Russia)
- Operates as a counterpart to NATO (set up at the same time)

States wanting to get into Europe join the Council of Europe first. Considered a stepping stone for entry

THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION

- The EU's political executive
- It takes responsibility for decisions as a whole
- Is independent from national governments
- Seeks to promote the general interest of the Union through treaties, initiating laws and policies around the four freedoms (goods, services, labour, and money).

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

- The EU Parliament represents the citizens of EU countries. Its members are directly elected by those citizens every five years.
- The European Parliament goes to Strasbourg, France, 12 times a year for one week.
- The European project has always been about peace and reconciliation, it is a political project rather than an economic project.
- It is not a federal super-state: it is an alliance
- The whole place works through compromise
- There is no majority in the EU Parliament and never has been, if you want anything to happen you have to cross party lines.
- Under David Cameron the UK Conservatives moved a notch to the right in the EU Parliament.
- MEP's are powerful, they can make changes.
- The European elections are growing in importance. There is more and more awareness that governments have to deal with things at a European level. For example, migration, cybercrime and climate change.
- The whole thing is not a bottom-up process, it is a top-down process, because the EU was set up by nations.
- British schools don't tend to teach students about the EU.
- The EU is a peace-project.
- The Parliament takes decisions on European laws jointly with the Council. If the Parliament and the Council cannot agree on a piece of legislation, there will be no new law.
- The Parliament elects the President of the European Commission and approves the 28 members

THE EUROPEAN COUNCIL (not visited due to emergency meeting about Brexit)

- The European Council brings together the presidents or prime ministers of the EU countries. They meet at least four times per year. The European Council sets the EU's main priorities and overall policy directions. It is chaired by a president who is elected every 2.5 years.
- One representative per EU country
- Represents the interests of EU countries/their governments
- Defines the general political direction of the EU

IRISH PERMANENT REPRESENTATION

- EU/US relations under strain (Trump)
- The centre is losing out to extremes
- The political centre is retreating
- People are angry - Globalisation has not given out economic dividends equitably, Expectations have not been realised. Inequality has led to instability and increased migration
- Big transient corporations are difficult to tax
- People are being spoon fed by social media
- The EU is popular – many countries want to get into the EU
- The EU is a soft power in a world of power politics.
- The EU pools sovereignty, it strengthens sovereignty.
- The EU is rules-based and operates under democratic principles.
- Leaving the EU will make the UK weaker, poorer and more isolated

UK REPRESENTATION

- Brexit is the biggest civil service project since the Second World War.
- There is a list of MEPs that we do not communicate with.
- UKIP representatives never align themselves with EU interests.
- A lot of Brits have applied for Belgium citizenship.
- The core essence of being a diplomat is to build relationships with people.

EUROPEAN EXTERNAL ACTION SERVICE (EEAS)

- The building is protected and guarded by a private, profit-making company (Securitas) whose guards carry 9mm semi-automatic pistols and wear body armour.
- The EU and the US are stepping up cooperation on defence
- The EU will be weaker without the UK
- The UK will be weaker without the EU
- Russia does not want the EU to flourish. Russia is not a functioning democracy, people are not happy in Russia due to rising inequality. Wealth is being captured and held by those at the top whilst ordinary Russian citizens have to pay more for their food and housing.
- GRU were involved in the Salisbury attack – they used a nerve agent for the first time in 70 years on Western soil.
- We don't know exactly how much effect the Russian interference/disinformation had on the Brexit vote.

NATO

- Engaged in 'defensive offence'
- Operates as a security guarantee
- ONLY France and UK lead NATO operations.
- Involved in intelligence gathering
- On Russia: '... pretty much everything we hear is the opposite of what is true and they repeat it.'
- NATO operates in cyberspace; a new domain for military operations. Cyber threats are becoming more frequent, more destructive and more coercive. Nowhere is the fog of war thicker than in cyberspace.
- Industry owns the majority of cyberspace.
- NATO has no offensive capability; those capabilities remain with the nation states.
- The cult of the strong man is rising again. Hungary, Poland and Romania are autocracies, they are moving away from traditional liberal democracy.

SHAPE (SUPREME HEADQUARTERS ALLIED POWERS EUROPE)

- Resurgent Russia. We are not back in the Cold War – things have changed but we are being confronted by Cyber, Intelligence and Economic attacks. These threats are multi-dimensional. To combat this SHAPE undertake Enhanced Forward Presence, Intelligence, Air Policing and an Enhanced NATO Response Force. Russia wants to exploit/undermine the rules-based system and build 'spheres of influence'
- Russia actively disrupt/interferes with information
- International Terrorist Groups
- Migrant Crisis
- China is on the horizon
- Deterrence by military posture

MISCELLANEOUS:

- 17 million Europeans live or work in an EU country other than their own.
- 9 million have benefitted from Erasmus
- Appetite to do more on security & defence BUT only 2% of EU budget.
- Brexit will fail and will be seen to fail. When/if Britain leaves the EU it will be weaker, poorer and more isolated.
- The European institutions are simply places where politicians from all EU countries can meet in order to work and advance together towards concrete results.

Dr Daryl Kenny

Visit to SHAPE

On Friday, 12th April, the group on the Brussels tour visited the Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers in Europe, to be greeted by Lieutenant Colonel Krzysztof Plazuk, PAO Liaison Officer. We had presentations on NATO and SHAPE, and a question and answer session with Mark Laity, Chief of Strategic Communications at SHAPE, Adviser to SACEUR. There followed a bus tour of the military compound.



SUPREME HEADQUARTERS ALLIED POWERS EUROPE

5 APRIL 2019



EUROPEAN ATLANTIC MOVEMENT



A Tale of Two Cities: Facilitating the Democratic Process in Westminster and Brussels

At the end of the TEAMGlobal Study Tour to Brussels this spring, TEAM Chairman Laurence Smy held a feedback session at the central building at the SHAPE clubhouse in Mons. Each one of us were seated in chairs arranged in a broad circle facing him, and we were invited to comment on what we had gained from being on the tour, what had been particularly valuable or less so, and whether there were any suggestions of improvements or changes that might be made for the future. The feedback given indicated that for the group, the whole experience had been positive and valuable; interestingly, a recurring comment from the females in the group, and made too by a couple of the males, was that they would have liked to see more women giving presentations at the various institutions we visited. Certainly it is true that there was a predominance of white men speaking at the various European Union offices, the embassies, and the NATO buildings. The problem is that choice of speakers is out of TEAM's control: the speakers were not necessarily selected by Antony Frost who had organised the tour with his usual unlimited energy and superb efficiency; we have to have the speakers allotted to us by the various institutions we visit. The consequence then may be an unsatisfactory gender balance; however, the group did confirm that though the presentations of course varied in quality, for the most part the various speakers were informative and entertaining and provided useful insights into the working of the EU and NATO, and that the whole programme presented a very positive and valuable experience. It is worth commenting that everyone agreed that one of the best presentations, was given by a woman, Ms Chelsey Slack, who holds the post of Deputy Head, Cyber Defence, Emerging Security Challenges Division, NATO.

Now it may seem the obvious and natural arrangement of seating for the feedback session was to organise the group in a circle facing the Chairman. However, there is an alternative arrangement that the Chairman could have organised: he could have placed the chairs in two rows facing each other, with the females on one side facing the males on the other, and had them perhaps debating a controversial matter such as women's rights or female competence. Of course, he didn't do this, and assuredly would not have tried to arouse possible anger and aggression and confrontational debate. Now I am confident that the group on the tour this year held sufficiently egalitarian, liberal and progressive values that they and would almost certainly been unhappy with so deliberately provocative an arrangement. They would instinctively have understood that a circular seating arrangement would facilitate a more harmonious group discussion, whereas a layout with opposing rows would surely be confrontational and an encouragement to conflict.

I thought about this travelling back to Britain on the Eurostar. Surely this same principle holds for larger groups, such as national legislative and debating assemblies, whether national parliaments or local and regional councils. In Brussels, TEAM had visited the central legislative body of the EU European Parliament, where we had a talk and presentation from Anthony Teasdale, and Henry Wasung. After the talks, Henry took us

into the gallery overlooking the main debating area of the appropriately named Hemicycle to see a broad almost circular debating hall. Here sit the 751 democratically elected Members of the European Parliament, representing the 28 countries of the EU. Myself, looking across those broad and spacious circuits of seats, I constantly thought back to the British House of Commons, a narrow cramped rectangular chamber in the Palace of Westminster, with opposing rows of benches facing each other across a narrow space. It seemed that one parliament has been designed as an assembly for discussion to reach compromise and carefully considered decisions, and solutions satisfactory to the assembly as a whole. The other in contrast, looks to have been handed down from past generations, a place designed for adversarial politics.

At the Hemicycle, each MEP sits at a seat with a desk in front and can lean forward to a microphone and a console that enables electronic voting. An MEP gets the attention of the Chair by pressing a button and has a sufficient but defined period of time to make succinct and disciplined points. When the debate concludes, the Member may then vote



simply by pressing operating a switch. In a hall so vast – jeering and cheering and cat-calling would be difficult and ineffective, and any inappropriate yelling in say Latvian or Finnish would be lost in the process of translating that first into the core languages of English, French and German, and then on into say Portuguese, Greek, or Irish. The whole arrangement of space and seating is organised for considered and civilised debate. Furthermore, the MEPs themselves are from a range of political parties, from 28 member countries, and elected by a system of proportional representation. Though the parties are grouped into socialist, social democratic, liberal, conservative and other alliances, overall none of these groupings make up a controlling majority. This

means that the different groups have to negotiate with each other carefully in the back rooms prior to debates, in order to establish a majority in favour of some item of legislation. Compromise to find a mutually satisfactory conclusion in a calm and civilised manner is built into the very system. This harmony may be under threat, however: it may be a challenge to accommodate the possibly more fractious members representing Eurosceptic, nationalist and populist MEPs newly elected in May of this year.

What a contrast with the European Parliament is presented by the British House of Commons! Who has not witnessed over recent months the agonising processes televised into our homes by which our elected representatives struggle towards some final decision solving the intractable problem of Brexit? We see the MPs crammed into the banked green benches of Government and Opposition parties facing each other with the intention of scoring points rather than any attempt to find compromise and common ground. There is often riotous and inappropriate behaviour, noise, and the constant display of several MPs leaping to their feet struggling to catch the eye of the Speaker or at the end of each speech. Then follows the arcane, tedious and time



European Parliament, Brussels



Consuming ritual of MPs traipsing through to the lobbies, the tellers coming forward and nodding little bows to the Speaker, “The ayes to the right...the noes to the left...” “The ayes have it, the ayes have it. Unlock! Unlock!”. Some people may find this great entertainment, wonderful drama, but most of us we can only ask whether this is an appropriate way to facilitate the democratic process of reaching a decision. The very layout of the chamber, with two parties opposed to each other in hostile ranks facing across a narrow space surely encourages adversarial debate. This arguably is made worse by the election of the MPs by a first past the post system: in the past, certainly, this has assured that either Labour or the Conservatives would have an absolute majority, that minor parties have no part to play in the legislative assembly, and that seeking any sort of compromise is deemed unnecessary and is perhaps anathema.

One of the factors influencing the way people voted in the Brexit referendum was the issue of democracy. We may dismiss the more lurid and paranoid fantasies - the “EUSSR”, “Nazi EU”, “Fuehrer Merkel”- but there are more sober and considered opinions held by many reasoning electors who would argue that the democratic process in the UK has been threatened and compromised by the UK’s submission to the authority of the EU. According to this view, British parliamentary democracy is subject to the decrees issuing from the European Commission bureaucracy. Yet there is a European Parliament, elected by fully representative electoral system of proportional representation rather than the strange and unjust arithmetic of first past the post. Arguably, the parliament in Brussels presents a more efficient and less confrontational machinery of debate and decision making than what prevails at Westminster. Of course, merely to change the seating arrangements of the House of Commons, and to initiate a more effective and rapid system of electronic voting than the current arcane ritualised process would not itself ensure more harmonious and less confrontational processes, but surely democracy would be better served with procedures better suited to the twenty first century. Hopefully, the TEAM visit to the European Parliament did offer the evidence to the group members that perhaps the idea of an undemocratic, dictatorial, and authoritarian EU set against a democratic UK may be the wilder fantasies of our more paranoid fellow citizens rather than any objective reality.

Michael Ghirelli

Reflections on Brexit: A Risk Worth Taking?

Dr. Marc-Philippe Cooper, The Open University

Looking back at the UK referendum of 2016 and the decision made to leave the EU (albeit by a very small majority), those who voted to exit were motivated by a number of factors some directly related to the EU, some tenuously related and others unrelated to UK membership. This article is not concerned with why people voted the way they did, nor about expectations, but rather what they wanted from it. Accordingly, the article focuses on the idea of Britain becoming once again a great global trading nation.

This needs to be viewed in the context of the likelihood of a 'no deal' Brexit becoming a reality given the race for the Conservative party leadership, as I write, and the results of the European Parliamentary election in this country. If there is no deal then WTO rules kick-in and if there are no free trade agreements then the UK trades under WTO rules. A report (6th December 2018) entitled 'What would trading on WTO terms mean?' published by the academic think tank 'The UK in a Changing Europe' concludes 'that trading on WTO terms would be highly damaging to UK trade with the EU and other countries'. The report comprehensively debunks the claim made by Jacob Rees-Mogg, the arch Brexiter, about 'falling back on the WTO' as something not to be worried about. The reality is there is a lot of complicated WTO law and the UK will adhere to WTO rules regarding trade with the EU and other countries which will involve more tariffs on more goods, as it tries to negotiate free trade deals to avoid such a scenario. Under WTO rules, at the extreme end, cars are taxed at 10% and dairy products (on average) 35%. To avert this scenario the UK government has planned a 'temporary schedule' covering 87% of imports which will be tariff free. However, this will involve either more government borrowing, or cuts somewhere in the government budget, or it could be off-set against the monetary contribution we would have made to the EU budget or a combination of these three alternatives – regardless such policy action has to be paid for.

Existing free trade treaties which we already have as a member state of the EU will also have to be renegotiated; a slow start regarding preparations in this matter have been made. If we do leave, the UK ceases to be a part of the Single Market and as such our market will represent a significantly smaller market and this will mean a weaker hand in trade negotiations. While adhering to WTO terms means some goods would be subject to tariffs like food and there would be notably higher trade barriers compared to the EU's Single Market with no tariffs for members trading with each other. The UK will be treated like any other third country so that means not only tariffs, but also border checks. Discrimination is the most important WTO principle, so if the UK government decided not to check goods crossing the Irish border then it would have to be consistent and refuse to check goods at UK ports from other countries. Outside of the EU, the UK will have to agree a new list of tariffs and quotas, while regulations regarding 'non-tariff barriers' like product standards and safety regulations will involve both sides trying to work together with each other's regulations. All of this is compounded by a lot of time and political energy which will have to be spent negotiating the future trading relationship with the EU (stage

two), our largest trading partner by a long way, having not even completed the withdrawal agreement (stage one), the easy bit !

It makes the romantic notion of Britain being an independent global trading nation able to swim freely between the big trading blocs of the world economy look fanciful, at best, and a cruel deception perpetrated by Brexiters at worst. All this begs the question whether Brexit is a risk worth taking? Indeed, a 'leap in the dark' as Cameron warned; he was right about this, but wrong to hold a referendum – he lost.

Marc-Philippe Cooper

TEAM Global Members' Day, June 27th, 2019.

A Large group gathered for the annual Members' Day at the Catholic Church of Our Lady of the Rosary, Old Marylebone Road. The first talk was from Jayne Forbes, Spokesperson on the Press Team of Extinction Rebellion. She outlined the climate crisis confronting humanity arising from global warming and the environmental degradation resulting from overpopulation and the effects of excessive consumption on depleting natural resources. David Snoxell then followed by bringing to the meeting's attention the Chagos Islanders' fight for human rights and the condemnation by the United Nations of Britain's continued occupation of the islands. Finally, John Wilson of TEAM Global, gave an entertaining and informative account of politics in the age of Trump. After lunch, the group assembled at Parliament, and while enjoying a sumptuous tea, was entertained and informed by Baroness Angela Smith, Leader of the Labour Party Lords in the House.



Visit to the House of Lords



Students from Gumley House on the terrace at the House of Lords

Visit to the House of Lords



Antony Frost addresses the groups at the House of Lords

AMERICAN POLITICS IN THE AGE OF DONALD TRUMP



TEAMGlobal Members Day June 27, 2019

I should begin by declaring an interest. I am a free market conservative although not a social conservative and am not a fan of Donald Trump.

Perhaps we should start by considering a fundamental concept of American government. The American founding fathers, fearing that too much power might fall into the hands of a particular faction or class, divided powers of government into three distinct branches under the system of checks and balances. The abuse of power by the President could be checked because Congress can deny the executive funding or can refuse to pass enabling legislation. The President can check the power of Congress by vetoing legislation thus requiring a supermajority of both the House and the Senate for a bill to become law. The Federal judiciary can check the abuse of power by the legislative

branch or the President by declaring the act to be unconstitutional.

The system of checks and balances can be effective in preventing the abuse of power feared by the Founding Fathers, but in the absence of reasonable compromise by various competing political factions, it can also result in gridlock. During long periods of American history, a somewhat right of centre Republican Party and a somewhat left of centre Democratic Party provided effective government and sensible legislation even when the White House was in the hands of one party and one or both houses of Congress were in the hands of the opposite party. When compromise has failed however, it has sometimes brought devastating consequences, most notably in 1860, resulting in Civil War - the bloodiest conflict in the western world in the century between the battle of Waterloo and the outbreak of World War One. Over much of the last 20 years, an absence of centrist parties willing to make compromises in the interest of the country has brought political gridlock and the failure to address a range of serious national issues. Many observers argue that polarisation today is greater than at any time in the last 150 years.

So how did the American politics reach this point? Much has changed in party politics and in the American economy in the last 40 years. Historically, blue collar workers have supported the Democratic Party, but in recent years the Republicans have become increasingly successful at targeting disaffected white working class Americans.

During most of the 20th century, Americans assumed that even semi-skilled industrialised union jobs would offer workers a middle class life style and that each generation would be better off than the previous one. For a long time and for many Americans, the so called American dream was true. Americans were therefore generally satisfied with a free market economy and wide scale socialism was less popular in America than in other areas of the world. Most Americans including even semi-skilled industrial workers believed they were middle class and the term working class was not widely used in America until recent years.

In the last 40 years, much has changed. For the majority of Americans, especially those with lower incomes, their standard of living had not improved. Many who had unionised jobs in heavy industry have been especially hard hit by globalisation, facing job losses and a real decline in income when forced to move into the service industries. This has come at a time when communities in the so called rust belt and in rural states have been devastated by the opioid crisis with an annual death toll from drug overdoses greater than American deaths in the entire Vietnam War. Although immigration, legal and illegal, has probably had little impact upon the economic changes these people face, they tend to see immigration as a major cause of their problems and Trump has made this a hot button issue to mobilise his base.

The Republican Party policies including under Trump have been more favourable to the wealthy than the policies of the Democrats, but the Republicans have been highly successful in winning over many white working class voters, especially white males. Partly this is by promoting social conservatism and emotive issues such as gun control and by appealing to religious conservatives by advocating restrictions on abortion and by opposing the complete separation of church and state. Republicans also promote fear

among poor whites by reminding them that 2010 generation, America, for the first time in its history, will no longer have a white majority. Trump has played on this fear to make immigration a major issue in exciting his base. The Tea Party also plays on the deep resentment poor whites hold for the educated urban liberal elites. The Tea Party faction in the Republican Party has been especially successful in opposing traditional moderate Republicans.

Trump has exploited all of these insecurities brilliantly and has a core of support of perhaps 40% who at this point think he can do no wrong. His campaign has scapegoated immigrants, especially Hispanics, and has suggested that free trade is the source of most of America's economic problems. Since he can mobilize this base against any Republicans who might oppose him, denying them nominations in Republican primaries and caucuses, moderate Republicans who personally detest Trump have been largely unwilling to criticise him publicly. Many traditional free market Republicans have been reluctant to call Trump out when he opposes free trade, allows the federal deficit to get out of control, or attacks fundamental civil liberties. At the same time, they fear that in 2020, as in the recent congressional election, Trump may cause Republicans to lose in suburban middle class districts and that his policies and presidential style may alienate those outside of his base for years after he has passed from the scene, making Republicans a minority party for a generation.

Trump and his supporters have also been able to exploit changes in the media to their advantage. Forty years ago, the average American received most of the news through radio and television via the public airwaves. As a condition of getting a license, federal law required broadcasters to present political balance in news coverage and in some circumstances allowed public figures the right of response to broadcast programmes. Today many Trump supporters exist on a steady diet of Fox cable programmes and internet postings preselected by algorithms to reinforce their opinions including constant attacks by Trump on mainstream journalists as enemies of the people whose criticisms of him are denounced as fake news and lies. To be fair, the liberal elites almost never venture beyond the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, CNN and MSNBC for their news coverage either.

While there has never been a golden era in American politics where campaigns focused only on rational, informed debate on public issues based on the honest use of objective facts, Trump and his supporters have explored new depths of dishonesty and divisiveness. America is likely to pay a high price for this, both in the increasing contempt many Americans have for public officials and for the democratic process itself. In this climate, citizens have come to see those who are different from themselves in ethnic background, religion, cultural attitudes, or political beliefs as the enemy.

By his dishonesty, his divisiveness, and his contempt for the law and for fundamental constitutional principles, Trump has also seriously undermined the traditional respect Americans have held for the President as Head of State. Although historically many Americans who have disagreed with the President politically, they have still expected the President to speak for the entire nation in times of crisis and to publicly defend the fundamental values of the country. Trump has seriously demeaned the Office of the

Presidency in ways such diverse individuals as
or Obama would never have done.

ington, Lincoln, Truman, Reagan,

Even if Trump and his supporters are voted out of office in 2020, they are likely to cast a long and ominous shadow over American politics. Americans need to address some very serious problems in the coming years including how to make the white working class in the flyover states more optimistic about its future in a changing country. They need to restore America's faith in its fundamental institutions including the wisdom of the constitution, the respect for the rule of law, and the importance of free speech and the protection of a free and responsible press in keeping political leaders honest and in promoting reasoned debate on public issues. Above all, Americans must come to accept that fellow citizens who disagree with them may be their political opponents but should never be their enemies. After Trump and the Tea Party, achieving this may be a Herculean task.

John Wilson

Notes on the Chagos Islanders' Fight for Human Rights

David Snoxell, a retired UK ambassador, spoke on this issue at the TEAM Global Day, on June 27th.



In 1793, Diego Garcia was made home to a French colony using slave labour on plantations. At the end of the Napoleonic War, Mauritius and the Chagos Islands were ceded to Britain in the Treaty of Paris. It was in 1965 that, before granting independence to Mauritius, that the UK separated the Chagos archipelago from Mauritius, creating British Indian Ocean Territory (BIOT). Two years later, Britain allowed the US to use the largest island, Diego Garcia, as a military base, and soon after, the forced expulsion of around 1,500 Chagossians began. Most were moved to Mauritius or the Seychelles. Chagossian refugees in Mauritius were paid compensation, and more offers followed contingent on them signing agreements not to return to their homes. British passports were granted to some Chagossians, many of whom moved from Mauritius to Crawley.

A UK government feasibility study into resettlement had concluded it would be expensive and difficult. However, in 2010, documents published by Wikileaks revealed that it was the establishment of a marine park that gave the excuse to the British Government to resist allowing the Chagossians to return. A UK diplomat said that “establishing a marine park would, in effect, put paid to resettlement claims of the archipelago’s former residents”.

On 25 February 2019, British Government actions were ruled illegal at the International Court of Justice which declared that the agreement to separate the Chagos Islands from Mauritius in 1965 prior to decolonisation was unlawful. In 2019, the United Nations general assembly overwhelmingly backed a motion condemning Britain’s occupation of the islands. The vote, which left the UK diplomatically isolated, set a six-month deadline for the UK to withdraw from the archipelago and for it to be reunified with neighbouring Mauritius.

David Snoxell is co-coordinator of the Chagos Islands All-Party Parliamentary Group, and a former High Commissioner to Mauritius. He considers that bringing the issue back to the United Nations General Assembly and before the International Court of Justice, after 52 years, is the most important development since the detachment of the islands in 1965. We are now awaiting a decision from the UK as to whether it will abide by international law and respect the highest court on the globe and the will of the overwhelming majority of member states of the United Nations. In the meantime, the Mauritian Government has remained civil and polite towards the UK in his handling of the issues while being necessarily direct and pointed. Mauritius, the Chagossians, the UK Parliament, and the British public have long hoped for a settlement of these issues. David Snoxell is optimistic that the chances of success are now much greater. His impression is that amongst all political parties in Mauritius, there is the agreement on the two main objectives – to recover sovereignty, and to allow the Chagossians to return.



TEAMGlobal Study Tour to Brussels: The EEAS

Joshua Grinsell, MA International Security, University of East Anglia

The European External Action Service (EEAS) was established in 2010 to serve as the European Union's primary instrument for its Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP). With the member states retaining their own foreign policies, often heading in divergent directions, it has proven difficult at times to produce a coherent common approach for the bloc. However, as the European Union's competencies evolve and expand further, the member states have the opportunity to use the External Action Service as another tool complementing their foreign policy arsenals, which has already been used to significant effect.

Represented in the Commission by the High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy and administered by a Secretary-General, the EEAS is tasked with “working closely with the foreign and defence ministries of the Member States and other EU institutions” (EEAS, 2019) in an effort to better coordinate the bloc’s policy both in bilateral relations with non-member states and at higher international bodies such as the United Nations, as well as internally through the Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO) programme, in which Member States have pursued so-called “enhanced cooperation” (Troszczynska-van Genderen, 2015, 12) on matters ranging from an improved operational mobility to a joint medical command. This is actively pursued in its composition as well as in its actions, with EEAS staff coming from the rest of the Commission and being seconded from member states’ governments and militaries combined with a dedicated Secretariat managing the day-to-day operation of the Service (Keukeliere and MacNaughtan, 2008, 81), but in spite of such significant infrastructure being installed in Brussels, the Member States have diverged on a number of policy areas, with a particular flashpoint being the response to the Russian occupation of the Crimean Peninsula. Whilst the Central European and Baltic states formerly within the Soviet orbit have frequently challenged Russian attempts to influence them (Nitoiu, 2016, 377), member states who were dependent on their energy grids or preferred bilateral engagements with Russia were much less inclined to provoke Russia (377-378), although the European Union was able to overcome these divisions and support the implementation of sanctions, apparently surprising Russia in the process (Nitoiu, 2016, 378).

This is not to say that the External Action Service and other institutions within the Commission are redundant, however. In the areas where the European Union has sole competency to conduct affairs on the part of its members, such as trade, the External Action Service plays a significant part. The Lisbon Treaty grants the European Union the right to represent its membership in global institutions where it is granted exclusive competence, such as the World Trade Organisation, although the Member States concurrently hold membership individually and send delegations to lobby in favour of their individual interests (Patterson, 2018). This position extends also to the European Union’s bilateral relations, with the bloc undertaking partnership agreements with 16 of its neighbours in Eastern Europe and the Middle East and North Africa (European Commission, 2019) and concluding an Economic Partnership Agreement with Japan, that came into force in February, which has removed 97% of tariffs on EU exports to Japan and saved European businesses over €1bn in duties (European Commission, 2019), thus allowing the Union the means to wield considerable influence in global trade matters. However, it is important to note that any agreement reached by the European Union and its partners is still subject to the same co-decision procedures as other EU legislation, with the additional requirement of consent to enter negotiations from the European Council, serving as the voice of the Member States, before it can be ratified (Troszczynska-van Genderen, 2015, 10).

In the areas where responsibilities are shared or the lines between the competencies are blurred, however, the External Action Service’s role is to act as an arbiter and harmoniser of the Member States’ interests, especially in institutions like the United Nations. Although the EU has an “enhanced observer status” that grants it powers to speak at, make proposals and amend draft resolutions in the General Assembly (EU Observer, 2011), it

lacks the means to vote on these resolutions and cannot be given the right to sit on the Security Council like its Member States can. Instead, the External Action Service serves to act as a coordinator and mediator between the diplomatic missions of the Member States at the United Nations in discussing upcoming proposals and their impact on the entire bloc, so as to encourage Member States to pursue a common agenda or smooth out points of contention between them. With regards to NATO, where 22 countries are simultaneously EU and NATO members, the European Union has pursued a close relationship since the foundation of the Common Foreign and Security Policy, and despite some PECSO as being a challenger to NATO arrangements, the NATO Secretary-General has in fact welcomed such initiatives as “complementing” and “contribut[ing] to fairer burden sharing” on European defence and security cooperation (NATO, 2018). Although the External Action Service’s capacity as an organisation is limited compared to the foreign ministries of the EU Member States, its role in supporting and harmonising the bloc’s foreign policy initiatives provides the opportunity for the European Union to complement the actions of its members. Its prominent place in the United Nations and G-20 give the individual nations of the bloc more power and strength together than if they acted separately. So long as the Member States can achieve unity on their foreign policy, the External Action Service provides an opportunity to make the European Union and its members a powerful force on the diplomatic stage.

Bibliography

- European Commission (2019). *Migration and Home Affairs: European Neighbourhood Policy*. [Online] accessed from https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/international-affairs/european-neighbourhood-policy_en [Accessed 25/05/2019]
- European Commission (2019). *Press Release – EU-Japan trade agreement enters into force*. 31st January [Online] accessed from http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-19-785_en.htm [Accessed 23/05/2019]
- European External Action Service (2019). *What we do*. [Online] accessed from https://eeas.europa.eu/headquarters/headquarters-homepage/2725/what-we-do_en [Accessed 22/05/2019]
- Keukeliere S and MacNaughtan J (2008). *The Foreign Policy of the European Union*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan
- North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (2018). *Doorstep Statement by NATO Secretary-General Jens Stoltenberg prior to the European Union Foreign Affairs Council meeting*. 20th November [Online] accessed from https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/opinions_160495.htm [Accessed 23/05/2019]
- Nitoiu C (2016). *Towards conflict or cooperation? The Ukraine crisis and EU-Russia relations*. *Journal of Southeast European and Black Sea Studies*, vol 16(3), 375-390
- Patterson Q (2018). *Can the UK Rejoin the World Trade Organisation. A Response from the WTO*. 18th June [Online] accessed from <https://briefingsforbrexit.com/can-the-uk-rejoin-world-trade-organization-a-response-from-wto/> [Accessed 22/05/2019]
- Phillips L (2011). *EU wins new powers at UN, transforming global body*. *For the EU Observer*, 3rd May [Online] accessed from <https://euobserver.com/foreign/32262> [Accessed 23/05/2019]

Troszczynska-van Genderen W (2015). *In-depth Analysis: The Lisbon Treaty's Provisions on CFSP/CDSP State of implementation*. For the European Parliament, DG EXPO/B/PolDep/Note/2015_263 October 2015 – PE570446