

EU Constitution Newsletter

January 2005 • The Federal Trust, 7 Graphite Square, Vauxhall Walk, London SE11 5EE • www.fedtrust.co.uk

Since the Intergovernmental Conference came to an agreement on the EU Constitution the focus of the debate has shifted to the challenge of ratifying this constitution. This monthly newsletter will monitor the debate, events and developments surrounding the ratification process in all 25 member states. It will offer a particular UK perspective of this process and provide a forum for differing views on the debate.

Back issues are available at www.fedtrust.co.uk/constitution_newsletter.

Contents

1. Editorial	1
2. Overview of 25	2
3. News from the institutions	3
4. The UK debate	4
5. Countries of the month	5
The Ratification Debate in Slovenia.....	5
Greece and the EU Constitution.....	6
Update: Hungary.....	6
6. And finally: Update on Turkey	6
7. News from the Federal Trust	7

1. Editorial

Two member states of the European Union, Lithuania and Hungary, have already ratified the Treaty on establishing a Constitution for Europe with an overwhelming majority in their Parliaments. Others will follow, and by the summer break in 2005 probably 10 to 11 EU member states will have accepted the European Constitution: referendums are coming up in Spain, the Netherlands and France, while Belgium, Cyprus, Slovakia, Latvia, Italy and Germany plan to ratify the Constitution through parliament by late spring/early summer. Looking at parliamentary debates and opinion polls all over Europe, it is very likely that most of the other EU countries will ratify the Constitution in the second half of 2005 or in 2006, be it through a parliamentary vote or a plebiscite.

However, there are some member states in considerable risk of failing the ratification process: the United Kingdom, the Czech Republic and Poland – although it would be wrong to put all three into the same risk category. In Poland, President Kwasniewski has announced a referendum in connection with the presidential election in autumn 2005. The political elite

continued on p.3

The Federal Trust for Education and Research

Brendan Donnelly, Director

Newsletter Editor: Ulrike Rüb
ulrike.rub@fedtrust.co.uk

Further copies available from:
7 Graphite Square
Vauxhall Walk
London, SE11 5EE
Tel: +44 (0)20 7735 4000
Fax: +44 (0)20 7735 8000
www.fedtrust.co.uk/constitution_newsletter

...is a think tank that studies the interactions between regional, national, European and global levels of government.

Founded in 1945 on the initiative of Sir William Beveridge, it has long made a powerful contribution to the study of federalism and federal systems.

2. Overview of 25

Austria	Will seek ratification through parliament. Chancellor Schüssel says he would only support a referendum on an EU-wide basis.
Belgium	Most likely to seek ratification through parliaments (national and regional), despite Prime Minister Verhofstadt's early intention to hold a non-binding referendum.
Cyprus	Will seek ratification through parliament. There was no referendum on EU accession.
Czech Republic	Will hold a referendum, which is most likely to coincide with the general election in June 2006. The country could be the last member state to seek ratification. This delay is due to the time it will take to pass a general bill on referendums.
Denmark	Will hold a referendum, possibly late 2005 or early 2006. On 21 December, a clear majority (64 per cent) of members of the Socialist People's Party voted in favour of the EU Constitution in an internal referendum. The party has often tipped the balance in earlier referendums on the EU. Opinion polls suggest 54 per cent of voters would support the Constitution, while about one-sixth are against it and still about 30 per cent are undecided.
Estonia	Will seek ratification through parliament.
Finland	Likely to seek ratification through parliament.
France	Will hold a referendum, most likely in June 2005. On 31 December 2004, Chirac promised to hold the referendum 'before the summer'. The first fortnight in June seems most likely, as technical difficulties (printing and sending out information material) prevent an earlier date for the poll. From 12 January onwards, Chirac will discuss the formalities of the referendum with all parties represented in parliament. The Constitutional Court decided on 19 November that the French Constitution must be amended before France can ratify the EU Constitution. From 11 to 25 January, the assemblée nationale will debate these amendments in its committees and in a plenary session. The reforms are expected to be cleared fully by March or April.
Germany	A referendum would currently not be possible under the German constitution, and despite much debate about the possibility of holding a referendum, it now looks unlikely that Germany will change its constitution in order to allow for nationwide referendums. This is mainly because a relevant government proposal is opposed by the conservative party, whose votes would be necessary to achieve the required parliamentary threshold for changing the German constitution. In early November the governing coalition agreed to start the parliamentary ratification process, in order to be able to ratify the EU Constitution early in 2005.
Greece	Will seek ratification through parliament.
Hungary	Ratified the EU Constitution on 20 December 2004 by a parliamentary vote with 322 to 12 in favour and eight abstentions, easily achieving the necessary two-thirds majority. Hungary is the second member state to ratify the EU Constitution.
Ireland	Will hold a referendum, the timing of which is still unclear. It will possibly take place in late 2005/ early 2006.
Italy	The parliamentary procedure to ratify the EU Constitution is currently under way, with the government wishing to be among the first countries to approve the Treaty.
Latvia	Will seek ratification through parliament, probably before the end of January.
Lithuania	Ratified the EU Constitution on 11 November by a parliamentary vote with 84 to four in favour, with three abstentions. This made Lithuania the first country to ratify the text.
Luxembourg	The date for the referendum has been set as 10 July 2005, immediately after Luxembourg's EU Presidency ends. The Chamber of Deputies will first vote on draft legislation on the ratification of the EU Constitution, which will then need to be approved by the binding referendum. No referendum has been held since 1937 and there was overwhelming support in the Chamber of Deputies for holding a referendum.
Malta	Will seek ratification through parliament.
Netherlands	Will hold a referendum, most likely in spring 2005. It will be the first national referendum in the country's history. Both chambers of the parliament are currently discussing the Referendum Bill.
Poland	Will hold a referendum, probably during the second half of 2005, when the country elects its new President.
Portugal	Will hold a referendum, probably at the end of April 2005. An earlier planned date for the poll, 10 April 2005, has had to be dismissed due to the decision of the Portuguese President to dissolve Parliament at the end of November and call for early elections, which will take place on 20 February 2005.
Slovakia	Will seek ratification through parliament.
Slovenia	Will seek ratification through parliament.
Spain	Will hold a referendum on 20 February 2005, the first in the EU. The official campaign was launched on 4 January. Recent opinion polls suggest 43 per cent would vote in favour of the text, while only 4 per cent would vote against, with 23 per cent undecided and another 23 per cent abstaining. 60 per cent said they would 'definitely' vote in the referendum and 15 per cent 'probably', although 90 per cent confess they know very little about the EU Constitution.
Sweden	Will seek ratification through parliament. The bill will be brought to Parliament in May 2005 and is expected to be passed in December 2005. No referendum will be held after an agreement between Social-Democrat PM Göran Persson and four right-wing opposition parties that parliamentary ratification will suffice. Ratification is almost certain as pro-Europeans currently hold a majority of seats in parliament, with new elections due only in 2006.
United Kingdom	Will hold a referendum in 2006, after the country's Presidency of the EU. No date has been set as yet, but the Queen's speech included an announcement of the referendum bill. This bill is likely to be debated in early 2005, just before the general election which is expected to take place in May. The British government has argued against holding the referendum during its Presidency of the European Union (from July to December 2005.) The government hopes it can take advantage of the Presidency to persuade the public of the virtues of the Constitution and the European Union, thereby gaining momentum in favour of the text.

in Poland is split over the Constitution issue, and it would be very difficult to achieve a majority in the Sejm (Polish parliament) in favour of the Constitution. On the other hand, opinion polls show that most Poles are currently thinking rather positively about Europe's Constitution. In Poland, a referendum might therefore be a helpful instrument of ratification.

The situation is somewhat similar in the case of the Czech Republic. The ruling coalition enjoys only a thin majority of one vote in Parliament. Hence, the Government is initiating new legislation to enable a national referendum since it hopes that this will provide a way to ratify the European Constitution. The biggest opposition party, the ODS, and the Czech President Vaclav Klaus are also strongly in favour of holding a referendum, but for different reasons. They argue against the European Constitution and want to use the referendum to block the whole project. However, opinion polls show that a majority of the Czech electorate supports the idea of a Constitution for Europe, but since the referendum will only be held in connection with the next general elections in summer 2006 its outcome is open.

The situation in the UK is even worse. Prime Minister Blair has unnecessarily announced that a referendum on the Constitution will be held in 2006. The drastic change in his European policy may have come about because he felt under pressure from the Conservative opposition and large parts of the media. Another reason for his U-turn may simply lie in the hope that British public opinion on the EU Constitution will change in time. His first priority is to win the next general election, likely in May 2005. The outlook for winning the British referendum on Europe's Constitution is generally bleak, since all opinion polls show that the British people is split on the issue with a clear tendency towards more no- than yes-votes. Thus, the Government will have to make a tremendous effort to convince the British people that the Constitution is a good thing in itself and that it is good for Britain as well. The Euro-sceptics and the

Murdoch press will use all the traditional arguments on the loss of national sovereignty and the threat of a European super-state to fight the Constitution. They will not tell the people that - apart from the problem of the Polish and the Spanish with the EU's voting system, which was solved in the IGC, and apart from the fear of the smaller countries that they might lose their seat on the Commission, which was also solved in the IGC - the negotiations among the EU governments had been reduced significantly in their level of ambition through the large number of red lines drawn by the British Government (whether it was on taxes, CFSP, defence, justice and home affairs or the general expansion of QMV). They will also not tell the people that the major progress which could be made in integration in the form of the Constitution would be the strengthening of democracy in the EU (with a stronger role of the European and the national parliaments) and a Europe-wide strengthening of human and citizens' rights through the inclusion of the Charter on Fundamental Rights into the Constitutional Treaty - an important point for an ever-enlarging Union of a continental scale. And they will not tell the people that the referendum is about whether Britain wants to be an important power in Europe, able to secure the transatlantic link and to influence developments and decisions in the EU or whether Britain wants to lose its political weight as a leading partner and ally in Europe, also from an American point of view.

What would happen if one or more member states were not to ratify the Constitutional Treaty? In the case of several member states failing to accept the Constitution, Europe would be thrown into a deep crisis. It is difficult to believe that business would continue as usual in Brussels on the basis of the still existing Nice Treaty - after more than two years of negotiations in the European Convention and the IGC and two years of ratification procedures. After having digested the initial shock of the failure of the Constitution, the big majority of member states which has ratified the Constitution (and which could easily be made up of more than

twenty countries) may start to negotiate with the 'drop-outs' to try to seek individual solutions for them in the form of opt-outs and a second referendum on the Constitution under new conditions within a given time frame. In the end, there might be only one country out of 25 with serious ratification problems. If this were a big country like the UK, the situation would be very difficult. After the UK Government has negotiated a few opt-outs here and there, would it be possible simply to ask the British again, basically on the same issue, one year after the first negative constitutional referendum, with the hope for a positive turnout the second time? Probably not. However, since the tension between Britain and the rest of Europe would grow and become extremely strong all sides would desperately look for a way out of the deadlock. One solution might be then putting forward the question to the British electorate whether it could accept most parts of the Constitution or whether it would like to see negotiations on a retreat of the UK from the EU. In that case there would be a substantial likelihood that the British people - not only for simple economic reasons - would opt for staying in the EU as nearly all other people in Europe want them to do. So, why not avoid such dramatic developments by voting positively on the European Constitution at the first attempt for the sake of cohesion among the member states and the sake of a working governance system in a continuously enlarging EU?

Mathias Jopp and
Saskia Matl
Institut für Europä-
ische Politik, Berlin

3. News from the institutions

At the end of December the Dutch Presidency came to an end. In a statement made on 31 December, after officially handing over responsibility to his counterpart, Mr Juncker of Luxembourg, Dutch Prime Minister Mr Balkenende reflected on the 'major changes' of 2004. While the agreement on 17 December to open accession negotiations with Turkey and

Croatia in 2005 might be the most notable achievement of the Presidency, Mr Balkenende also praised the Constitution, which, he said 'will make the EU more effective and transparent and lay a firmer basis for future stability, security and prosperity.' Referring briefly to the hurdles yet in the Constitution's path, he added 'Of course, it will first have to be ratified'.

It is expected that the EP will be one of the first parliaments to approve the Constitutional Treaty, even though they play no binding role in the ratification process. The report of the European Parliament's Constitutional Affairs Committee (AFCO), which expresses support for ratification of the Constitution, is to be presented before a plenary session of Parliament on 11 January by co-author Richard Corbett, a British Labour MEP. The EP will vote on the report the following day.

Preliminary findings of the Autumn 2004 Eurobarometer, presented in December, showed - according to Margot Wallström, the new Communications Commissioner - 'very firm support for the idea of the European Constitution'. 68 per cent of those questioned throughout the EU-25 said they supported the Constitution, while 17 per cent opposed it. However, support for the Constitution in Denmark and the UK - each of which is planning to hold a referendum - fell below 50 per cent.

Mrs Wallström faces the tough task of popularising the EU, yet the process of ratifying the Constitution is likely to be equally testing in the coming months. She believes the Commission should avoid the risk of appearing to interfere in national debates which are dictated by national sensitivities. The Commissioner stressed that while the Commission should participate in the debate 'as Commissioners', it would be 'absolutely counter-productive for the Commission to try and impose anything on the member states'.

Jacques Chirac showed himself less convinced that his presence in non-French national debates on the Constitution would be detrimental to the 'yes' side. After talks with Spanish Prime

Minister Zapatero, Chirac confirmed on 8 December, that he - along with German Chancellor Schröder - would join Mr Zapatero's referendum campaign in Barcelona on 11 February. Spain is expected to vote 'yes' to the Constitution in a referendum on 20 February, although there are fears that turnout will be low. Being the first of the national referendums on the Constitution means not only the outcome in Spain is relevant. A strong vote of approval would, in Chirac's words, 'show the way' for the votes to come.

Alongside President Chirac, Prime Minister Zapatero and Chancellor Schröder in the Spanish referendum campaign, officially launched on 4 January, will be a host of football stars and other celebrities hoping to boost awareness of the debate. Distributing free copies of the Constitution at Real Madrid football matches is one reported technique which British politicians may wish to emulate when their own referendum comes nearer.

Jonathan Church
The Federal Trust

[First Results of the Autumn 2004 Eurobarometer](#)

4. The UK Debate

Marking time

In the weeks before and after Christmas, little has changed in the procedural or public background to the forthcoming British referendum on the European Constitution. The government is still expected to publish in January the text of the Parliamentary Bill which will make the referendum possible, and British public opinion shows little current sign of changing its hostility to the Constitution. There are, however, two new political developments which could affect in the longer term the likely outcome of the referendum. The first is the debate within the government as to whether it should try to conclude Parliamentary discussion of the

referendum Bill before the probable General Election in May of next year. The second is the marked recrudescence of personal and political hostilities between the Prime Minister and his influential Chancellor of the Exchequer.

On the first of these issues, the government is in something of a dilemma. Most observers believe that the government will win the General Election later this year, probably with a good majority. In theory, it should not matter greatly to the government whether it goes into the General Election campaign with the text of the Referendum Bill already on the statute book. It will simply present the matter as an item of unfinished Parliamentary business which it will conclude early in its next term of office.

Nevertheless, there would be some advantage to the government in being able to put the Parliamentary discussion of the Referendum Bill behind it before the General Election campaign begins. It may not have as good a majority in the next Parliament as in this one, there is much other political activity already planned for the second half of 2005 (including Presidencies of the EU and G8) and it might ensure that Europe will be even less of an issue in the General Election if the government could point to an already adopted Referendum Bill. But to adopt the Bill before the General Election would require the procedural collaboration of the Conservative Opposition in the House of Commons and in the House of Lords. That collaboration will only be secured at a political price.

The Conservative Party is favourable to the principle of a referendum on the Constitution. Indeed, it claims to be eager to have a referendum as soon as possible, rightly calculating that the sooner a referendum takes place, the less likely it is to be won by the government. The Conservative Party is therefore likely to demand that in return for its help in expediting the adoption of the Referendum Bill, that Bill should include a relatively early date for the referendum to take place, perhaps in early 2006. This is a date for the referendum at which the Foreign

Secretary, Jack Straw, has already hinted. If it were incorporated in the Bill, it would make yet steeper the mountain which the government will have to climb to win the referendum. In early 2006, a number of other member states would not have completed their ratification procedures, thus depriving the British government of a powerful argument about potential British isolation if it refuses the Constitution. Without this argument at its disposal the government may struggle to win over a sceptical British public opinion in a bare twelve months after May, 2005.

Further uncertainty is given to this debate by the second issue which has dominated the British political agenda in the first days of 2005, namely the poor and apparently deteriorating relations between Mr Blair and Mr Brown. Mr Blair has publicly stated that he will stand down as Prime Minister before the end of his third term in office if reelected in 2005. Immediately after the General Election in 2005, the race will begin for his succession, with Mr Brown the clear favourite to replace him. Those in the race to succeed him will be looking to ensure that the Prime Minister resigns at a time and in circumstances most favourable to themselves. The referendum on the European Constitution will be an important factor in this equation.

One widely shared analysis sees Mr Blair stepping down as Prime Minister soon after this referendum, irrespective of whether it has been won or lost. If it has been lost, so the argument runs, his moral and political authority will be destroyed. He would have no interest in clinging to a political office which he has anyway promised soon to leave. If the referendum has been won, he can gracefully retire as victor, having achieved at least part of his often proclaimed aspiration to reconcile the United Kingdom to its European identity and vocation.

But there is another analysis, which is less encouraging for Mr Brown, or indeed for any other potential candidates to succeed Mr Blair. It is that Mr Blair may change his mind about resigning as Prime Minister in his third

term, particularly if his likely successor is Mr Brown. In two years time, Mr Blair might well be arguing that a smooth transition to his successor has become impossible, either as a result of internal divisions within the Labour Party, or under the pressure of international events. In these circumstances, it would be at least arguable his duty to remain as Prime Minister, particularly if he can claim that his political authority has been reinforced by a successful outcome to the referendum on the European Constitution. For those who wish to supplant Mr Blair early in the next Parliament, there are clear attractions to an early referendum on the European Constitution. Even if it is won, it will still mark a relatively early point of pressure on the Prime Minister to resign. A later referendum might well give Mr Blair the opportunity to reestablish his hold on power in the third term, and conclude after a success in that referendum that the country cannot get along without him.

It would be unduly cynical to expect that the government's decision about the date of the referendum on the EU Constitution will be decided only by the personal ambitions and jockeying for power of the New Labour elite. Mr Blair in particular seems to have a genuine political and personal commitment to a full and constructive role for the United Kingdom in the EU. But it would equally be naïve to ignore the political context in which events will unfold over the coming months. Britain is certainly not the only country in which the European debate is influenced by personal rivalries between those in power and those who wish to be their successors.

Brendan Donnelly
The Federal Trust

5. Countries of the Month

The Ratification Debate in Slovenia

In 2003, when the EU and Nato accessions were getting closer, the Slovenian Parliament amended the

Slovenian Constitution, enabling the country to 'transfer the exercise of part of its sovereign rights to international organisations which are based on respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, democracy and the principles of the rule of law and may enter into a defensive alliance with states which are based on respect for these values.' Before ratifying such a treaty the Slovenian Parliament may, but is not obliged to, call for a referendum. The legislative body would then be bound by its result.

Ever since signing the Constitutional Treaty in Rome this summer, the coalition parties of the Government then in power have been sending out conflicting signals about the procedure they favoured for ratification of the Treaty. At different times, they seemed to favour a simple parliamentary ratification, while at others the possibility of a national referendum seemed the favoured option. Until the general election in October 2004, the leading party of the governmental coalition, the liberal democrats (LDS), seemed inclined to accept parliamentary approval without a general referendum. Even so, it was trying to postpone any final decision on the matter until after the general election.

The general election brought a political turnaround and after more than a decade of liberal and left wing rule, a coalition of conservative parties came to power. The new Slovenian coalition government, now composed of conservative Social Democrats (SDS), New Slovenia Party (NSi), Slovenian People's Party (SLS) and Party of Pensioners (Desus), is now definitely seeking ratification of the text EU Constitution's text through parliamentary approval. Since the parties of the present government had substantial influence on developments in the Convention, especially though Lojze Peterle (NSi), who was a member of the Convention's Praesidium, their eagerness for a rapid ratification of the Treaty by Slovenia comes as no great surprise.

Since there is no constitutional basis for the necessity of a referendum when acceding to international treaties, even

if those treaties have domestic constitutional implications, the new government will probably not be under a great pressure on the matter. Due to a general agreement between the coalition and the opposition on the general desirability of the Constitution, and with only one small parliamentary party announcing that they might not support the constitutional text (Slovenian National Party, SNS), it would be surprising if there were any substantial pressure in Parliament for a referendum. Following the same reasoning, the incumbent government can almost certainly count on the majority of Slovenian parliamentarians to support the constitutional text in the ratification procedure.

Manica Hauptman

Greece and the EU Constitution

The signatories of the European Constitutional Treaty hoped that it would enter into force 2 years after its signature in October 2004. To achieve this it must be ratified by all European member states in accordance with the constitutional procedures of national law relating to the ratification of treaties. In some states this is a purely parliamentary process, in others there will be a compulsory referendum and in yet others a consultative referendum.

In the case of Greece, the country will ratify the new EU Constitution in parliament, as was announced by New Democracy party on Friday 29 October 2004. In a recent statement, the Greek government spokesman Theodoros Roussopoulos said that 'the highest institution of democracy, the Greek Parliament, will ratify the European Constitution'.

In 2002, the Greek public displayed in opinion polls one of the highest percentages in support of EU enlargement and the fifth highest percentage of support for an EU Constitution. The Greek Prime Minister Costas Karamanlis said that the new Constitution contains 'many positive elements for a more functional and effective Europe.' He also said it would

benefit Greek tourism and the country's island and border regions.

The Greek socialist opposition leader and former Foreign Minister, George Papandreou, supported a national referendum which, in principle, would give the Greek people a chance to vote on the new EU Constitution. Papandreou also added that his party backed the EU Constitution but said its contents required public debate. Nevertheless, a referendum was never likely happen, as no referendums have been held in Greece on European matters before. The last referendum to be held in Greece was in 1974 with the restoration of democracy at the end of seven years of military rule, when the public voted for the abolition of the monarchy. The Greek government predictably rejected the suggestions made by the Socialist opposition to submit the Constitution to a national referendum.

The Secretary of State for European Affairs Ioannis Valinakis said recently that the Greek Parliament will vote on whether to ratify the newly adopted Constitution. According to Mr Valinakis, a parliamentary vote 'is no less democratic than a referendum', and he added that, 'around half the member states of the EU will ratify the Constitution in their parliaments, which is also our tradition here in Greece'.

The EU Constitution is seen in Greece as shaking up Europe's institutional architecture after its recent enlargement from 15 to 25 states and more in years to come. It is highly unlikely that Greece will be the country which risks jeopardising the Constitution's ratification by voting 'no'.

Dora Klountzou
University of Sussex

Update... Hungary

On 20 December 2004 Hungary became the second member state to ratify the EU Constitution after Lithuania. The Hungarian Parliament voted with an overwhelming majority (322 to 12 with

eight abstentions) in favour of the Constitution, easily reaching the two-thirds majority which was required.

6. And finally...

Update on Turkey

In terms of Turkey's efforts to join the EU, December was the most significant month since September 1963, when Turkey became an associate member of the EEC.

On 15 December, the European Parliament voted by 407 to 262 in favour of beginning accession negotiations 'without undue delay', although during the debate a number of EPP and far-right MEPs re-iterated their traditional doubts over Turkish accession. The EPP indeed managed to assemble sufficient support for the ballot to be undertaken anonymously, a move which caused some contention within the EP. Green Party MEPs protested by holding up placards saying 'yes' in all EU languages as well as Turkish.

The positive result in the EP set the tone for the meeting on 17 December between EU and Turkish leaders. The result also precipitated an EPP statement - agreed by the Commission President, Mr Barroso - which expressed general support for Turkey's accession negotiations while calling for a number of provisions to ensure that any such negotiations were not irreversible.

At the European Council meeting on 17 December which culminated in a final positive decision for Turkish negotiations, the question of Turkish relations with Cyprus proved a significant, but surmountable stumbling block. In the event, Turkey agreed that the extension to ten new member states (including Cyprus, which it does not recognise) of its 1963 customs agreement would be signed by the start date of accession talks, 3 October 2005. Mr Balkenende, European Council President, saw such a promise not as a 'formal and legal recognition [of Cyprus, but] a step that can lead to progress'.

While unanimous agreement was reached in the European Council, some unease remains over Turkish membership, which lies at least ten years in the future. The Austrian Chancellor, Wolfgang Schuessel, announced in light of the agreement his intention to hold a referendum on the issue in the future. In October, France was first to announce it would hold such a vote.

Jonathan Church
The Federal Trust

[Commission President Barroso's remarks made on 17 December on the decision to open negotiations with Turkey](#)

7. News from the Federal Trust

Forthcoming events

'Europe's Role in Global Environmental Governance', Brussels, 19 January 2005.

Confirmed speakers include two former Environment Ministers, representatives from the European Parliament and Commission, civil society and business. This event is kindly supported by the Network of European Foundations for Innovative Co-operation (NEF). Further details are available at www.fedtrust.co.uk/environment. This conference is by invitation only. For all enquiries, including about attendance, please contact Alexis Krachai at alexis.k@fedtrust.co.uk.

'The UK Presidency of the European Union', 9-10 June 2005.

This conference is organised in association with the Royal Institute of International Affairs (Chatham House) and the Trans European Policy Studies Association (TEPSA). Further information will be available shortly at www.fedtrust.co.uk/presidency.

Forthcoming publications

'The EU and Turkey: A glittering prize or a millstone?', edited by Michael Lake.

'This book is a honest and multi-disciplinary attempt to illuminate the dimensions of the challenge from different perspectives. I admire its breadth, depth and relevance and believe it will be a useful reference, not only for policy-makers and practitioners but for any citizen who reads it.'

From the Preface by Pat Cox, former President of the European Parliament

Available in March 2005. To pre-order copies please contact Brian Howlett at brian@fedtrust.co.uk.

The Federal Trust is a member of:



European Union
Studies Association
Information and ideas on the European Union