

## Tony Blair, Consummate Deceiver on the EU

Written by K B Napier

Wednesday, 06 March 2013 19:20

---

In 2007, when the treaty of Lisbon was being discussed in secret – by leaders and not the public - ECAS (the European Citizen Action Service, based in Brussels) asked for documents on the process concerning the UK's position on the 'EU Charter of Fundamental Rights'. This request was refused, even though it is 'legally' required by the EU... which proves the EU can do whatever it likes. The requests were continued and have only just been granted freedom of access (2013).

The request for open access was put in before discussions were held on the Lisbon Treaty. But, the EU did not wish to let the public know what was going on – they wanted secrecy to avoid public disquiet. When access was denied, the ECAS complained to the European Ombudsman, who wanted open access, in 2011. However, the EU again refused. So, in 2012 the Ombudsman said that the EU was guilty of a "*serious instance of maladministration.*" (Really, the same charge could be made against the entire EU administration!).

Article 42 of the Charter specifically deals with this open access. The EU finally released documents at the end of December 2013. Citizenhouse.eu says this may suggest the EU is at last going for more transparency ( [http://www.citizenhouse.eu/images/stories/Ombudsman/4.03.2013/Final\\_Version\\_Access\\_to\\_Documents\\_Press\\_Release\\_01.03.2013\\_Elisa.pdf](http://www.citizenhouse.eu/images/stories/Ombudsman/4.03.2013/Final_Version_Access_to_Documents_Press_Release_01.03.2013_Elisa.pdf) ) , but, when a fascist dictatorship agrees to transparency, you can be assured that it is anything but – it simply means that the darker, non-transparent side is kept even more secret! Just look at Obama and his Marxist government – plenty of 'transparency' on paper but none in practice.

The documents prove that the EU wanted to remove all references to the binding nature of the Charter "*as a way to address UK concerns*". The EU's legal service also supported this non-transparent 'transparency' (ibid), saying "*The Charter would continue to apply to Member States regardless*" (ibid, p1). The EU thought this would lead to "*amputation by one of its two legs.*"

And so an opt-out was suggested. But, as we know, Blair did not use this opt-out, because he firstly wanted to get as much traction for gay 'rights' as possible, using the EU demands as his excuse. It was only after the UK gained these 'rights' that Blair's hench-women demanded to use the opt-out! WE DID HAVE THAT OPTION – BUT HE REFUSED TO USE IT.

What was happening was that the EU members had their own agenda: "*This suggests that governments cannot be trusted to negotiate on our fundamental rights on their own. It appears that the need to reach an agreement among themselves takes precedence over the maximum*

## Tony Blair, Consummate Deceiver on the EU

Written by K B Napier

Wednesday, 06 March 2013 19:20

---

*protection of our rights."*

(ibid, p1).

(ECAS and the EU Rights Clinic are now making the documents released by the Commission available to the public as a way of enhancing citizens' awareness of their EU rights and further contributing to the European Year of Citizens which in 2013 is dedicated to the rights that come with EU citizenship. These documents, as well as a Background Note offering an explanation of what is contained within them, are accessible on the European Citizens House website ([www.citizenshouse.eu](http://www.citizenshouse.eu)) and the EU Rights Clinic's blog ( <http://blogs.kent.ac.uk/eu-rights-clinic/> ).)

The dictatorial nature of the EU is found in one of its documents: *"6. The rationale of the ECJ's case law is that individuals, in their contacts with Community law, can expect homogeneous standards of human rights protection ensured by the ECJ, whether that law is implemented by the institutions themselves or by Member State authorities acting as "agents of the Union" ."* (Note to President Barroso, 6th Aug. 2007 and marked 'Confidential'; Paragraph 6, p1).

Paragraph 7 states that

*"only the Strasbourg Court is competent".*

The comment concerning its own 'amputation' is found in para 8, p2).

Reading between the lines, this means the EU can impose its laws, or Member states can do it as their 'agents'... thus telling us that the Member states are not able to make their own decisions but must foist on us whatever the EU demands. This is further found in para 9 which says, *"As a main effect, the ECJ would be put in a very uncomfortable position having to apply two different norms of human rights compliance to Community law: the Charter for the Institutions; and. "general principles" for the application by Members States. Possibly, it would be forced to consider itself no longer competent to control human rights compliance by Member States when implementing Union law. This would put a lot of confusion in an already complex and fine-tuned equilibrium between the two Courts, and would be a serious step back from the substance of the Constitutional Treaty."*

Note the statement! The EU 'had' to insist on all members accepting the Charter, or the EU would be thought of as incompetent *"to control human rights compliance"*! And para 11 implies that even if the UK opted-out it would not make any real difference as the UK law would mimic the EU demands anyway. (Para 12).

## Tony Blair, Consummate Deceiver on the EU

Written by K B Napier

Wednesday, 06 March 2013 19:20

---

The 'Conclusion' said an opt-out is preferable so that the EU law would not have to be altered. Of course, suitable blackmail and pressure meant that Tony Blair did not opt-out but only made public sabre-rattling appear to suggest he wanted an opt-out! This is the deception of politics. Also, later meetings were kept to a minimum, NOT to help Member states but to serve the EU President! The fewer the meetings, the less that could be discussed and disagreed upon. Such vital issues were only discussed on five days, leaving no room for genuine discussion or proper conclusions. (Note to President Barroso, 6th June, 2-7: Confidential). The relevant Ministers of Foreign Affairs were only involved on one of those days (17th June) and even then they could only talk about "general" matters.

And yet, "2. *This agenda suggests that the very few meetings ahead of the European Council will significantly shape it.*" (ibid, p1), indicating that the views of member states were irrelevant : "*The Commission should be in a position in these meetings, to influence the debate while helping the Presidency. To this effect, as extensive as possible prior coordination with the Presidency will take place in order to coordinate and optimize the roles of each.*"

Proving that member states did not have time to discuss the weighty impact the Charter would have on member states: "*This is particularly the case for the meeting of 19 June, where the text of the settlement and mandate for an IGC will be circulated for the first time, and delegations will be asked to react on the spot, and where your representatives will need instructions from you.*" Note that – on-the-spot decisions made after the first reading of the notes!! But, those representing the President would have had full briefings beforehand! Blair went along with all this.

*"It would therefore be essential, and in line with past practice, that the Commission's representatives be enabled to see the texts in advance of the full mandate text in advance of the 17th June). This should be in the interest of the Presidency, as it would help a precise coordination during these crucial meetings."* (ibid, p2). Very clearly, the idea was to give great advantage to the EU but none to member states. AND BLAIR KNEW THIS WAS HAPPENING.

That this proved to be the case is found in another confidential note to the President, dated 21st June. "*It seems established that the Charter will be binding*" (para 1). Paragraph 2 says that it was not likely that the EU would implement an opt-out for the UK, because otherwise many other members might wish to follow the same path. This is support for the EU but denial of rights for the UK. Another reason given was that it would be "hard to sell" an opt-out from fundamental rights. This may be true as far as MPs are concerned, but not for the people. The 'fundamental' rights referred to invariably are those of gay activists.

## Tony Blair, Consummate Deceiver on the EU

Written by K B Napier

Wednesday, 06 March 2013 19:20

---

So, the Charter that has brought havoc to Britain, on gay 'rights' and the rights of foreigners who commit acts of terror, were the result of just ONE DAY's scanning of what the ERU demanded. Blair made a public fuss about it, but did nothing, because the EU demanded his subjection. And, of course, he had the idea that he would become an EU President himself, so he took it easy, pretending to make a fuss while fully supporting the EU. There you have it.